

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, October 18, 1973

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file the answer to Question 264.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the 1970 Annual Report of the Alberta Housing Corporation.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Fuel Shortage

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Minerals. The question deals with the announcement from the Middle East yesterday with regard to possible oil cutbacks in North America.

What contingency plan or plans has the Government of Alberta either negotiated or discussed with the federal government to alleviate the projected fuel shortage in eastern Canada and the Maritimes this winter?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, there have been no contingency plans discussed with the federal government by our provincial government.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has there been consultation between the Government of Alberta and the Government of Ontario or any of the Maritime provinces regarding the shortage this winter, in light of the announcement I referred to.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, there hasn't been consultation with the Province of Ontario since our meeting on Monday last with Mr. McKeough.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Did you deal specifically in that meeting - or did the government deal specifically in that meeting - with the Government of Ontario on the projected shortage this winter?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, we discussed with Mr. McKeough the question of natural gas. I can't recall discussing the question of crude oil.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. In light of the constitutional arguments of the Government of Ontario as presented before the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board and the Board's ruling that it had no jurisdiction, what methods will the government utilize to assure that there is no unwarranted drain on Alberta's resources, in light of the announcement made yesterday?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure to what the hon. member refers. Which announcement was made yesterday?

MR. CLARK:

The announcement that over the next number of months there will be a severe cutback, as far as oil is concerned, to eastern Canada.

MR. DICKIE:

Perhaps the hon. member could clarify the question again. He is talking about crude oil and an announcement of the cutback in crude oil?

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister then. In light of the announcement made that there will be a cutback in crude oil to the eastern portion of this continent and that this will certainly have an effect on the Maritimes and eastern Canada, what steps can the Province of Alberta take to guarantee there will not be an unwarranted drain on the Alberta reserves?

MR. DICKIE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think those announcements were made by the Minister of Energy, Honourable Donald Macdonald about possible cutbacks he was suggesting east of the Ottawa valley as a result of some of the actions that might take place on the part of the Middle East countries.

We have been endeavouring to get some information to determine exactly what the nature of those cutbacks might be. I think it is fair to say at this time that no one is quite certain yet just what the nature of those cutbacks would be.

We haven't had any discussions from them on what they suggest might be the consequences of that. I think our position would be that we'd wait to hear from them. I anticipate this perhaps to be one of the items we would discuss with them at our meeting on October 29.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question to the minister. What is the present status of the proposed Mackenzie Valley pipeline, and has the province completed any studies which would indicate the effect such a pipeline will have on the marketing of Alberta oil and gas?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker - dealing with the Mackenzie delta pipeline, that's the gas line - we have been in contact with the parties involved, that is, the consortium that is building it. They have made representations to us to keep us up to date with actions in respect to the development of that line. After we receive those representations we continually check, from our point of view, the question of reserves and the position of the province of Alberta in respect to that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview with a supplementary, followed by a supplementary by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc. Then perhaps we could get on to another topic.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs whether any discussion took place with respect to the security of supply for eastern Canada - both the Quebec and the Maritime market - when representatives of the Alberta government met with Arab countries several weeks ago?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I have been looking into the whole matter of what was discussed at that meeting. I was not personally present, and I will get the information for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say one thing about the security of supply, which I think deals with the questions asked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The context of his questions, as I take it, had to do with the security of supply to eastern Canada as a result of the Middle East war, and whether or not we've been discussing with the federal government any contingency plans as a result of that war.

I just want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there have been discussions with the federal government on security of supply and a contingency plan, but not in relation to that war. Those discussions, at the request of the federal government, have been treated as confidential and are not free for the Alberta government to discuss. But that was a prior time period.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc with a supplementary.

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplementary to the Minister of Mines, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could advise the House as to the present percentage of practical maximum capability in the operations of the Alberta oil industry, insofar as producing potential is concerned?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, the information that has been conveyed to me by the Energy Resources Conservation Board is that it is at maximum capacity at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Peace River Iron Ore

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Industry could advise the House if there has been any progress made in recent months towards a start on the development of the Peace River iron ore deposits?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, if you speak in terms of development in recent months as such, no. If you speak in terms of preparing, reviewing and determining how best we can pursue the development of these ore deposits, yes.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do I gather that the work is being done by the department, or is there a commercial interest, at the moment, in the deposit?

MR. PEACOCK:

We presently have three programs of discussion going on, one with the private sector, one within the provincial government and one with the federal government.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Gasoline Prices

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. He announced yesterday over the air that he anticipates an increase in gasoline prices in Alberta as a result of recent developments in oil prices. Is he prepared to recommend a reduction of gasoline taxes in this province with a view to reducing gasoline prices?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to correct the impression the hon. member has as to what I actually said. I think the question that was directed to me concerned a possible increase in the price of crude oil and whether an increase in the price of gas at the pumps could be expected. I think my answer was, Mr. Speaker and I think it's important to make sure the hon. member has it clear - if there is an increase in the price of crude oil, the practice in the past has been that gasoline at the pumps would go up approximately 1 cent for every 25 cents per barrel increase.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. minister that I understood him very clearly. But is he prepared to recommend a reduction in the gasoline tax in this province with a view to reducing gasoline prices to the consumer?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I think that question has been answered a number of times in this Legislature, and I'm sure the hon. Provincial Treasurer would clarify any misunderstanding the hon. member might have on the answer.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. minister. I was also hoping for a sensible answer, but I'm not getting it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

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

Tartan Breweries

MR. DIXON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was planning to direct my question to the Premier, but in the Premier's absence I would like to direct it to the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

Does the government plan to intervene in the closure of Tartan Breweries in Red Deer, having in mind that the government has money in there in the amount of \$500,000 to provide new employment?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure why the hon. member has addressed the question, which concerns industry, to me. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce could comment.

I think the House knows that this advance was committed in 1971 by the former government, and after the last election we felt morally obliged to carry on the commitment. Other than that, and the efforts of the Minister of Manpower and Labour in his concern for the people who are employed in the project, and of course the concern to the Minister of Industry and Commerce in work that they had done, I can't say anything further in answer to the question.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary then to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. I was wondering, Mr. Minister, through you Mr. Speaker, is it a fact that Mr. Ginter has ignored a board order and that this is what the argument is about? What is the situation as far as the Board of Industrial Relations ruling? Is the board order being ignored or is it not?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the question before us is one of several months standing, and it is difficult to know, even from daily contacts, when the particular brewery is in operation and when it's not. We are checking this out at the moment because of its importance to Red Deer and to Alberta generally.

With regard to the specific question placed by the hon. gentleman, I suppose I would have to say that in some respects the management of Tartan Breweries has in fact disregarded some of the orders of the Board of Industrial Relations. Subsequent to that several events occurred that have been discussed in the House, but they are worth reviewing to keep up to date on the matter.

One was that a court order had been made to Mr. Ginter. This he ignored. It landed back in court. The order of the court had supported the initial position of the management of Tartan Breweries and set aside the decision of the Board of Industrial Relations, which then permitted Mr. Ginter to return to Red Deer and open his brewery. That was late last week and early this week. Since then, the Calgary Labour Council has taken a very specific view as to its position with respect to employees working for this particular management. In view of that, Mr. Ginter is now reassessing his position as to whether or not he will continue with the operation at Red Deer.

In the meantime it is my understanding that the Board of Industrial Relations, Mr. Speaker, intends to challenge the particular decision of the court with respect to the initial decision by the Board of Industrial Relations.

MR. DIXON:

One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and maybe I can direct it to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce, regarding the plant at Red Deer. Is there any liaison at all between the government and the principals operating the brewery at Red Deer?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, as far as the Department of Industry and Commerce is concerned, no. We haven't had any conversation or any dialogue with them.

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. Could the minister advise whether the Calgary Labour Council is able to exert influence by blacklisting products produced by this particular brewery?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking for information which is really not specifically within the knowledge of the government department but it may be a matter of general opinion.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview with a final supplementary.

MR. NOTLEY:

I would like to direct a supplementary to the hon. Provincial Treasurer for clarification only. Did I understand him to say that the half-million dollar grant had actually been given to Tartan Breweries, or is that still in abeyance until this is settled?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, no I did not say that. I said that the commitment and agreement had been made prior to the last provincial election, similarly to the Procter and Gamble grant for pollution control equipment. The nature of it at

the time we took office was pretty well exactly the same. I would have to check specifically whether any funds have been advanced. I am not sure.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

Imperial Oil Refinery -- Calgary

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Would he advise the Assembly as to the present status of the Imperial Oil Refinery in Calgary which is scheduled to be phased out?

MR. PEACOCK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to. Mohawk Oil Company which is a Canadian-owned refining company had set up a consortium with Calgary Refining Company, which is a company of former employees of Imperial Oil, and with a 40 per cent interest on behalf of the employees and a 60 per cent interest on behalf of Mohawk, forming a company to make an offer to Imperial Oil to take over and keep the refinery in Calgary operating on the basis of an economic and engineering study that is presently under way. The decision on that will be made within the next 60 days.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In view of the fact that the engineering study referred to security of supply for crude oil to the refinery, is the government prepared to guarantee a guaranteed supply of crude to the refinery if they proceed?

MR. PEACOCK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think certainly the government would be looking at that problem and if that is a problem we would certainly give it every consideration at that time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View with a supplementary, followed by a final supplementary by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce could advise whether the consortium of the Imperial Oil employees and Mohawk had applied for a loan through the Alberta Opportunity Fund to help them purchase the refinery?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge they have not applied for any loan.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether it is the government's position that Alberta refineries should be given first call on Alberta crude oil?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a policy of government that has yet to be resolved. In due time it will be announced to the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain followed by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

Beavers

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Lands and Forests, and with your permission I require one sentence of preamble. In the Stony Plain constituency, and I imagine other constituencies in rural Alberta, there are many acres of farmland being flooded by beaver dams.

Is there any consideration being given to transplanting these beavers into some other area of the province, say, the wilderness area?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sure, sure.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, from time to time we do have some severe problems, due to the beaver dams that are constructed and valuable farm land flooded as a result. We work on a program with the Department of Agriculture to relieve these problems and at the same time take into consideration the necessity of the beaver population in the province. I am afraid I don't have specific information with respect to the problem in the hon. member's area, but I would be pleased to look into it.

MR. PURDY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Agriculture. Because some farmlands are being flooded, would there be any compensation available to the farmers?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we will have to look into that matter. It would depend on the location, the number of farmers involved and whether or not the land was being flooded because of the beaver dams. But we will look into the situation. I am aware of at least one of the locations and my predator control specialist, in conjunction with the Department of Lands and Forests, will have a look at it.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Does the department have a policy of permitting very responsible persons, such as district engineers and Department of Highways game warden officers, to shoot beaver on rare occasions when they are doing severe damage to trees - say, in a park in a small town?

DR. WARRACK:

We were forced into accepting that kind of situation last year, as the House might recall, from an occurrence in Lethbridge. It is our policy, Mr. Speaker, to avoid, if at all possible, a situation where any beavers cannot be dealt with on a live basis. If it is essential that their removal be final then we will do that, but only as a last resort.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen followed by the hon. Member for Camrose.

Provincial-Municipal Finance Council

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. What is the current ratio assessment between arable and pastureland at the present time?

MR. RUSSELL:

I would have to go back to the department and find out what it is. It hasn't changed. It's what it has always been.

If the hon. member is referring to the recommendations of the Sibbald report, those were not adopted, as some members may be aware. Insofar as the specific matter of the ratio is concerned, I believe that would be a matter to

be considered by the new provincial-municipal finance council and possibly also the land use forum, although I'm not certain about the latter. I believe it's rated 1 to 2.3 but I would have to check.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. minister when will the final report of the task force be made available? Last year an interim report was available but we are still waiting for the final report.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, we were waiting in consultation with the two municipal government associations as to how best to proceed with the other recommendations. We have now agreed on the format of the provincial-municipal finance council and as soon as the report is referred to that body I expect we will be dealing with it in a public way.

MR. FRENCH:

My final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the government giving any consideration to having a scientific study made of this very important topic?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose that was one of the objectives of the Sibbald Report. The reaction to that was so strong and so varied throughout the province that I would be guessing if I thought the provincial-municipal finance council wanted to conduct yet another study. But insofar as the general matter of real property assessment and taxation is concerned, they will be dealing with that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member ...

MR. FRENCH:

A final supplementary question ...

MR. SPEAKER:

This is the hon. member's post-final supplementary!

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House, could the minister give us some indication of when we will receive a final decision in this whole matter?

MR. RUSSELL:

I expect it will be some time, Mr. Speaker, because the matters of land use and land taxation, particularly in the rural areas of our country, are becoming so complex and really very contentious in many ways, that before we can have a committee come up with a recommendation which will be acceptable to the people most directly involved, I would think it would be some time before that could happen.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Camrose followed by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

Rosehaven Pay Discrepancy

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question left over from last Tuesday to the hon. Minister of Labour. Would he advise this House if a satisfactory conclusion has been reached in regard to pay discrepancy at Rosehaven, and if not, when does he expect results?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the problem is currently before the Human Rights branch - this week. As soon as they make their opinion known to me I will be happy to

share it for the information of the House. It's an important matter and I appreciate the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Hunting - Extent

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Do reports indicate that there has been increased hunting pressure as a direct result of increased food prices?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I think if the question had said "indirect" I would be able to answer simply, "yes". It is a fact that the number of hunting licences we are selling is running about 10 per cent above last year. I would conclude along with, I think, the hon. member that one of the reasons - perhaps not the only one, but one of the reasons - would be the factor he mentions.

MR. DRAIN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of this increased pressure is the minister considering adding to his force of game wardens for the matter of enforcement?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's support on that point. I certainly hope so.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the hon. minister feel, from his remarks, that perhaps it is cheaper to buy meat than to hunt meat?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking for an expression of opinion which might perhaps be best put to an abattoir.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the supplementary is not necessarily with relation to abattoirs, but with slaughtering of animals, and it is to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Are there any restrictions on bear hunting in northern Alberta this fall?

MR. SPEAKER:

Clearly the hon. member is asking concerning hunting regulations, which are a matter of public knowledge.

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

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary. The regulations are not always a matter of public knowledge. They can be passed while we are having lunch.

Gas to Coal - Conversion

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Has there been any compilation of pros and cons completed, regarding the conversion from gas to coal in large industrial plants in Alberta?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I was just trying to think. We do have a report from the Energy Resources Conservation Board dealing with the use of coal versus gas. I can't recall having seen a report which deals specifically with the industries and the pros and cons they might consider in the use of coal or gas, nor have I seen a specific report by the government dealing specifically with such industries from the government's point of view on that point.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary. Has the government taken a stand in connection with such conversions?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, this really deals with the question of the use of coal versus gas, and that is presently under discussion. I think over the next few months more details will be made available on that issue and the government will be announcing decisions on their policy in that regard.

MR. TAYLOR:

One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In your discussions with the minister or ministers of the Ontario government, has such conversion been emphasized as very necessary in Ontario?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have had discussions with Ontario on that aspect. They had reviewed briefly with us the steps that are being taken in Ontario in that regard, and some of the difficulties and costs involved in such conversions.

Freight Rates

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder did the government make any progress at all in its effort to get the federal government to recognize the varying freight rate problems, Canada as opposed to the U.S., of Montana coal going into the Ontario market?

MR. SPEAKER:

The connection of the hon. member's supplementary with the question is somewhat tenuous, but perhaps the minister might answer now that it has been raised.

MR. DICKIE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member, if I have the question correctly, was referring to the comment the other day about the coal going from Montana to Detroit and that for the comparable distance in Canada the cost was 30 per cent less in the United States. We anticipate, Mr. Speaker, that a great deal of that information will come out in the study that is presently being conducted by Ontario on the transportation question. I'm pleased to advise that the members doing that study for Ontario are meeting with representatives in Alberta to have input from the Province of Alberta.

MR. PEACOCK:

I might just add that at present we are carrying on negotiations with Mr. Marchand in regards to the transportation rate that reduces that 7 mill rate to a 5 mill rate, which is the American rate.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Faba Beans

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Is your department presently doing a study on the possible cultivation in the province of the faba bean?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will recall that two years ago we initiated some research plots with regard to horse beans or faba beans. This past summer there have been several hundred test plots planted throughout Alberta in conjunction with the agricultural service boards and most of the municipalities. We expect an evaluation of that program this winter, well in time to advise farmers of the suitability of the crop in Alberta.

In addition to that, the hon. members might be interested to know that preliminary research done in feeding faba bean in place of soya beans has been very rewarding. In other words, faba beans can replace soya bean meal in most of the rations.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lacombe no longer wishes to ask a question.

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

Drivers' Licences - Pictures

MR. WYSE:

A question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Highways. Has the minister received any representation objecting to their pictures having to be on the new drivers' licences?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WYSE:

Is the minister aware that this is a matter of conflict with some religious groups?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is just a statement in the way of information even though it is followed by an interrogation mark.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question then. Is the minister considering any exceptions to the law in this particular regard?

MR. COPITHORNE:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question - thank you.

MR. DRAIN:

A supplementary to the Attorney General, Mr. Speaker, on this same question. Would this not in fact conflict with The Bill of Rights?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. Member for Lethbridge West followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

School Leaving Age

MR. GRUENWALD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Would the minister inform the House as to whether he has had representation from parents, groups, home and school associations, school boards - or anyone, for that matter - regarding changing The School Act, that portion which suggests that children must stay in school until age 16 rather than 15, as it used to be, prior to the rewrite?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, we've had some representations, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GRUENWALD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that there is quite a number of students who are out of school with parental consent who are under age 16, is the minister considering changing this Act - or that portion of the Act, Section 133 - so that it will be meaningful, and if necessary, enforceable?

MR. HYNDMAN:

We'll consider it, Mr. Speaker. We get quite a number of representations regularly, as I think have been received by Ministers of Education over a number of decades, on this subject. The question is, what kind of amendment might be best proposed. In that regard I'd be happy to receive any suggestions from the hon. member who just posed the question as to what he might recommend.

MR. GRUENWALD:

One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister have a position on this as yet?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

Universities - Effect of Budget

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Advanced Education. In view of the extra costs engendered by the government for an increase in the minimum teaching certification from three to four years, is any thought being given to increasing the budget to the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Advanced Education funds the budgets of the universities, but not on a faculty basis. We have just completed a three year university finance plan in which we finance the universities on a formula that is really a global budget figure. At the moment it is \$99 million. It will be \$107 million next year and \$114 million the year following. We do not approve any specific budgets. That decision is made by the local authorities in the institution, the Board of Governors.

With respect to the teachers and the matter of training of teachers, the provincial Department of Education has a contract with the University of Alberta on that subject.

MR. GRUENWALD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Advanced Education, regarding the budgets you referred to. Are they three-year projected budgets? Are they fixed or would you modify them from time to time as need is shown?

MR. FOSTER:

They are fixed, Mr. Speaker, unless new courses or programs are approved, at which time we review the budgetary implications of that decision.

Secondly, unless there is an increase in enrolment within the university - in the case of Calgary it is 5.5 per cent or 5 per cent and in the case of the University of Alberta it is 7.5 per cent. If there is that change in enrolment during the life of the arrangement, we will be happy to review the financial situation with the institution concerned.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Has the minister had any discussions or indications that the University of Alberta and the University of Calgary may phase out some of the present faculties they are maintaining at the present time, because of a shortage of funds?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely possible that a university may at any time decide to determine or cancel certain programs or courses which may or may not result in the release of certain staff, academic or non-academic.

I have been told through various means, including the media, that the implications of the three-year university finance plan are that certain cuts may be necessary in some areas by all institutions. That, Mr. Speaker, could carry on into some considerable debate as to whether or not the level of funding is adequate or, alternatively, whether or not the level of services and support being provided by the institution is a little higher than it really should be - which is probably a longer debate than the question period would allow for.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight with a supplementary, followed by a final supplementary by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. LEE:

I have a supplementary for the Minister of Advanced Education. In light of the fact that the government has initiated a number of programs, for instance in early childhood education, mental health and so on, was any consideration given to providing the acceleration of funds to universities which specifically prepare personnel in these particular programs - or consideration of something like earmarked funds?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, we are faced with something of a conflict here, in the sense that the universities are suspicious of the intrusion of government in their internal affairs, that is right, valid, and natural. Yet there are certain government priorities which we would like to see carried forward in an institution. And, as a result, we would like to see in some cases the priorities of some institutions changed.

That is a subject of some conversation, Mr. Speaker, and discussion between the various departments of government and the institutions of the faculties involved. Certainly when these program approvals come to us, we are involved in discussing the priorities of the individual department of government with that department, and appropriately, with the institution concerned.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View with a final supplementary.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Advanced Education can advise whether the commencement date of the law faculty at the University of Calgary has been determined?

MR. FOSTER:

No, not as yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary to this question, Mr. Speaker, if I may. What is the obstacle to the determination of the commencement date of the law faculty in Calgary? Is it political, economic or bureaucratic?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

MR. DIXON:

On a point of order. I notice that you want to cut off the supplementary. I originally asked a question but my question was not really answered.

All I wanted to know from the hon. minister, was is there any faculty, not course, that is in danger of being done away with, either at the University of Calgary or the University of Alberta in Edmonton because of the so-called shortage of funds?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think I answered that question by saying that the decisions on budgets are made internally by the Board of Governors. If they decide that in any particular year they need to cut \$400,000, \$500,000 or \$50 they have to make a decision about where they get those funds. I would seriously doubt that a university would consider cutting out an entire faculty. That consideration, if it is being made, has not been brought to my attention.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Early Childhood Services

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is directed to the Minister of Education. Could the hon. minister advise this House if directors of the Early Childhood Services and coordinating council have yet been selected, and when may we hear an announcement in this regard?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago all but one of the members of the coordinating council were selected. They've already had one meeting. I believe another one is coming up, in about a week or so, and over the last week we have been considering seriously the appointment of another representative of the Native people to the board.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands.

Harradence Commission

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Solicitor General with reference to the issue which I raised previously, dealing with allegations made against two members of her department having perhaps tampered with evidence given by the warden of Spy Hill to the Harradence Commission. Was the discussion between Mr. Harradence and the two members of your department private, or will the information be made public?

MISS HUNLEY:

I didn't ask Mr. Harradence whether it was in private or not. He reported to me that he had seen them and that he was satisfied that they had not, in any way, coerced the people who were giving evidence. That's all I have at the moment.

As I said yesterday, I have asked for the transcript. When I get the transcript I think I'll be in a better position to assess what I have been reading in the paper and what is concerning the hon. Member for Mountain View.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary. In light of the fact that the hon. minister has had a discussion with Mr. Harradence on this issue, is she satisfied that there was no tampering with the witness in Calgary?

MISS HUNLEY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary, was the meeting with Mr. Harradence held in Edmonton, Calgary or elsewhere?

MISS HUNLEY:

It wasn't held out on a road allowance west of Calgary, anyway.

[Laughter]

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on which crossroad was the meeting held when Harradence was appointed?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands followed by the hon. Member for Smoky River.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Who ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order!

MR. SPEAKER:

I'm aware that the hon. member wished to ask a supplementary, but we have just two or three other names left and perhaps we could come back to the question.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order.

MR. SPEAKER:

I'm suggesting to the hon. member that we might revert to the topic after we have finished the list.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands followed by the hon. Member for Smoky River.

Crude Oil Supply

MR. KING:

A question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. In terms of the consultation that has taken place sporadically between the federal and the provincial governments on energy matters, I'm interested in knowing whether or not the question of the security of supply of crude oil east of the Ottawa Valley had been under active consideration in these consultations prior to the suggestion being made by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs in a letter of January 11?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I take it the hon. member's question deals with security of supply and I would like to pinpoint the dates because the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs mentioned that.

When the question was originally asked I took it that that was the recent consultation. If I could clarify the hon. member's question concerning that security of supply question, there were discussions prior to September 13 - that's the meeting I had with the Honourable Donald Macdonald in Ottawa and there hasn't been a question of security of supply since that time.

MR. DIXON:

Supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by a further supplementary by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands.

MR. DIXON:

Is the hon. minister aware, Mr. Speaker, that western crude is now being shipped further east than the Ottawa Valley ... ?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is making a statement of fact in the guise of a question.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands.

MR. KING:

I would like to direct this question also to the Minister of Mines and Minerals, Mr. Speaker, and ask if it is within his knowledge to expand upon communications from the federal government in which they discounted the need for a pipeline to Montreal, suggesting that it was unnecessary and not feasible.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I can say this, that I have noted that the Honourable Donald Macdonald has expressed concern about the shortage in eastern Canada. That would certainly support his position when he suggested that the pipeline be extended to Montreal. I can also advise the members of the House that when we met with Don Macdonald on September 13 in Ottawa, we did discuss the question of a Montreal pipeline. At that meeting we asked a number of questions concerning the pipeline, including its cost, how he anticipated it might operate, how it would tie in with the question of a security of supply aspect, and also the question that dealt with the effects on Alberta.

Since we returned, we have requested that some information be prepared for us on the full implications to Alberta of the Montreal pipeline, and we anticipate having that information for our further meeting on October 29.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, as the minister is aware that the oil is being shipped by tanker east of the Ottawa Valley, I was wondering if there was any discussion with the federal government prior to this oil being shipped at the present time by tanker?

MR. DICKIE:

No, Mr. Speaker, this is really the reverse of what normally has happened with the Ottawa Valley line's understanding and we did receive information that oil was going to the head of the Lakehead and then going from the head of the Lakehead by tanker to Montreal. We had received no information prior to that step being taken. I would anticipate that that would be an action by the companies involved and they would have no reason to advise us of that.

MR. DIXON:

One final supplementary to the minister. Has there been any indication from the federal government regarding the longstanding agreement of protection of oil

west of the Ottawa Valley? Is the federal government now, because of the energy shortage, sort of taking a blind eye to the situation?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that question of the Ottawa Valley line and their general policy on that was discussed at the meeting of September 13, and certainly with the action to date there hasn't been any suggestion of a violation of that policy.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Smoky River followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Boxcar Shortage

MR. MOORE:

A question, Mr. Speaker, to the Deputy Premier and Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister's department received any response from the Canadian Wheat Board or the railways regarding the shortage of boxcars in the Peace River country on the NAR and Great Slave Lake Railway?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I have not had a reply from the Canadian Wheat Board as yet, but on representations from the members for Peace River and Smoky River, representations have been made to the Canadian Wheat Board to try to alleviate the boxcar shortage, particularly on the Great Slave Lake Railway.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Farmers' Mortgages

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. During the summer months a settlement was made with a farmer in northern Alberta regarding a mortgage problem. I was wondering if there is any similar fund that would assist an urban person who is in mortgage difficulty?

MR. RUSSELL:

I'd like to refer that question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture who was involved in that settlement, Mr. Speaker.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the particular case the hon. member refers to was dealt with [by] the Agricultural Development Corporation in its usual manner of assisting people in refinancing and re-establishing themselves on a farm in Alberta.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, having regard for the member's concern for urban people, that the very great advantage that has been enjoyed by urban people in housing through Central Mortgage and Housing and the Alberta Housing ...

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Deputy Premier is clearly debating.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the hon. Deputy Premier. Can the Minister of Agriculture advise the House, in general terms, what percentage of the Agricultural Development Corporation loans are for refinancing of former mortgages?

DR. HORNER:

I think it's in the material tabled in the House, Mr. Speaker, on the opening day of the fall session. If the hon. member will check that he will

find that somewhere in the neighbourhood - I could be wrong but it's in that document - about 12 per cent is debt consolidation.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, a further analysis of the loans show 87 per cent of the loans made have been made to farmers who have had total assets of less than \$50,000.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can any person in difficulty in an urban area appeal to the Alberta Housing Corporation for a loan to refinance his home, similar to the Alberta Agricultural Fund - which I am sure nobody in Calgary or Edmonton can qualify for?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a hypothetical question. The direct lending program, insofar as mortgaging or placing mortgages on properties, is common knowledge to everyone. I can't recall a specific case, like the one the hon. member suggests, coming before the corporation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Calgary - Harradence Inquiry

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Harradence Commission is actually making an investigation with regard to a matter which is under the jurisdiction of the Solicitor General, what is the minister's justification in discussing matters, which are the subject of investigations, in private with the commissioner?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is clearly debating.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Department of Highways and Transport

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity today to announce the signing of a major agreement between the provinces of Alberta and British Columbia. Negotiations have now been finalized, and effective November 1, 1973 an agreement has been reached for full and free reciprocity of licensing between commercial vehicles not exceeding a gross vehicle weight of 12,000 pounds.

This means that Alberta licenced vehicles can now freely enter the Province of British Columbia, pick up goods and return without payment of dual licence and registration fees. Prior to this agreement, Alberta vehicles having a gross vehicle weight of less than 12,000 pounds were required to purchase both British Columbia and Alberta licence plates.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first such agreement negotiated with the Province of British Columbia, and it will certainly be a benefit to the citizens of both provinces in the encouragement of an expanded flow of goods and transportation facilities between the provinces.

Mr. Speaker, on April 6, 1973 this government announced Alberta's intention to join the Uniform Vehicle Registration and Proration Agreement. It pleases me to report to this Assembly that negotiations to join that agreement, which affect all vehicles in excess of 12,000 pounds gross vehicle weight, are going very nicely and we have every anticipation of entering into that agreement as of January 1, 1974. The combination of these two agreements is truly a major step forward in the endeavours of this government to expand trading relationships with our neighbouring provinces and the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, a further point on this same topic. Approximately two weeks ago in Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, at a meeting of ministers responsible for motor vehicle administration, one of the prime topics discussed was that of establishing licensing reciprocity and proration with all provinces throughout Canada. Mr. Speaker, the initial discussions on this matter were very successful and will continue through the Secretariat of the Canadian Conference of Motor Transport Authorities. At this time I am not able to speculate on when a Canadian agreement could be signed. However, I can say that all provinces were receptive to the general concept of reciprocity and proration. Alberta has gone on record as being a supporter of such a move as well as an initiator of such a proposal.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

265. Dr. Buck asked the government the following question:

For each of the provincial constituencies outside the boundaries of Calgary, Edmonton and Lethbridge:

1. How many projects under the early Childhood Services Program have been approved as of September 30, 1973?
2. What was the amount of grant for each project?
3. List the total grants per constituency?

MR. HYNDMAN:

On a point of order, I was prepared to move an amendment on this question on Tuesday and the Member for Clover Bar was absent. He is absent again today. I would be prepared to allow the question on the Order Paper on one more occasion.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree to the suggestion of the hon. Government House Leader?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

266. Mr. Benoit asked the government the following question:

1. How many university extension courses are presently conducted in Alberta:

- (a) in Red Deer
- (b) south of Red Deer?

2. What extension courses are being conducted in which municipality? How many students enrolled in each course?

3. How many courses previously conducted in the above area were discontinued before they were completed? Why were they discontinued?

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask permission of the House to withdraw this question in order that I may reword it and resubmit it for a broader scope of information on the subject.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the House agrees to the request that Question 266 be withdrawn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

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

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

Copies of all correspondence, policy statements, commitments and financial agreements between the City of Calgary and the provincial government concerning the design, construction and financing of proposed 9A Street North-West Louise Bridge.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to accept this motion with an amendment [seconded by the Minister of the Environment] that would read after "west of the Lake Louise bridge," - "subject to the concurrence of the senders of that correspondence."

MR. LUDWIG:

I would like to take part in the debate on this motion. One of the major objections by residents to having any kind of public project going through their area is the fear that they are going to have to purchase new homes, for higher prices and perhaps have to undertake higher mortgages when they cannot afford to do so because of age or income.

I think that is one of the problems caused here and elsewhere in Calgary is the government's, not reluctance, but its delay and dragging its feet in bringing in proper home-for-home expropriation legislation. I wish they could expedite this thing because this is the greatest worry these people have. Many of these people would not object to any new ...

MR. YOUNG:

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the debate is supposed to be relevant to the motion in question. The motion in question is not the substance, which in my interpretation is currently being debated, but whether or not the information will be produced.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the practice has been established in this Legislature for many years that the issue concerning the motion is discussed quite broadly and that has always been a practice. If the hon. Deputy Premier will just contain himself, that if I'm violating the rules he has sure set a lot of bad precedents.

MR. SPEAKER:

I must say that the point of order taken by the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place is valid. If the practice to which the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View refers has indeed been as extensive as he says, then insofar as the present incumbent of the Chair is concerned, that would indicate a certain laxity in the application of the rules.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to challenge ruling, I don't want to. I cannot produce Hansard to show the scope and breadth of these debates on these motions for a return here and in every legislature ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is debating the point of order which has now been disposed of. If he wishes to debate further the motion for a return that would be in order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I made the point I wanted to make. Thank you very much.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What was it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Highways and Transport has indicated that he would wish to move an amendment. Perhaps if he is still so minded he might wish to move the amendment at this time. I might say that the Chair has received a copy of the amendment.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I so move, seconded by the Minister of the Environment.

MR. SPEAKER:

It has been duly moved and seconded that the Motion No. 257 be amended to read:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing copies of all correspondence, policy statements, commitments and financial agreements between the City of Calgary and the provincial government concerning the design construction and financing of the proposed 9A Street North-West Louise Bridge, subject to the concurrence of the senders of that correspondence.

[The motion as amended was carried.]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. R. Speaker proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Sorenson:

Be it resolved that the government prohibit the hunting of hen pheasants in the province of Alberta.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I would beg to withdraw this particular motion. Since I put it on the Order Paper the necessary regulations [have been] enacted and at the present time and in the present season the hunting of hen pheasants has been prohibited. I request that the motion be withdrawn at this time.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the motion be withdrawn as requested by the hon. member?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion is withdrawn.

2. Mr. Purdy moved, seconded by Mr. Moore:

Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta attempt to develop a plan in coordination with the Canada Grains Council, the Board of Grain Commissioners and the Canada Wheat Board to prevent the further closing of grain elevators in rural Alberta and to provide for a continuation of necessary services that are presently provided at local delivery points.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, continuing from where I left on my debate on the motion on March 27 last, I have two other points to discuss dealing with the situation in the rural areas because it makes it extremely difficult, Mr. Speaker, for the rural people of the Province of Alberta to deal with the hauling of feed grain and wheat in particular owing to the long distance to delivery points, in many cases some 50 to 70 miles.

It also makes it increasingly difficult for local governments to construct roads that have to carry loads in excess of 1,000 bushels to make it worthwhile. In most cases the farmer is obliged to pay an additional 11 cents a bushel to haul that increased distance. The municipality - the local government - is also forced to build roads which must be capable - although they are not really constructed at the time to carry loads of such dimension - some three and five times the normal capacity of the existing road. Consequently, by additional mill rates levied by local governments in the rural areas, this is another increase in the burden our rural people have to carry.

Since speaking last March 27, further closing of delivery points has occurred throughout the province and in some cases where delivery points and elevators have been destroyed by fire, the companies have shown their intention and their unwillingness to rebuild. In some cases - in one case in particular where an elevator plus a feed grain mill was lost in the area in my constituency, this elevator had a capacity of something like 130,000 bushels. Now, with the large crop taken off in that area the people find it very difficult to deliver their quotas. In fact, many have not even begun to deliver their quotas to these elevators.

It must be remembered, as I pointed out before, in most cases these elevators have been built somewhere around 1915, 1925 and 1930 at a very low cost at that time. The figures I have received, Mr. Speaker, are that some of those elevators were built at a cost of less than \$30,000. Yet, when the rebuilding program is asked for they said that for economic reasons it is not possible to rebuild. So the farmer is forced into a squeeze whereby he has to travel many more miles, not only for his prepared feeds but also for the delivery of his grain.

Certainly the announcement by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and Deputy Premier, the hon. Dr. Horner, that the provincial and federal governments now intend to open for storage at least, these elevators that had been closed to facilitate the storage of feed, would be welcome to the people in our area because some of the elevators are still intact. It may be possible that the hon. minister may be able to make these available for storage of feed grains.

We also know, Mr. Speaker, that the feed grain situation in some areas is very critical. The feeder associations and also the feeders of cattle and the large hog operators are unable to buy feed grains at this time.

Because of the adverse weather conditions they are not able to harvest. Apparently also they must harvest damp and often tough grains. So the hon. minister's announcement is certainly welcome, and it is hoped that this can be accomplished before the crop year of 1974.

The cabinet tour of Southern Alberta was certainly brought up-to-date on the abandonment of the delivery points in that area. The two points primarily in question were the Magrath and Dalemead areas.

Mr. Speaker, it is sometimes impossible to argue the case with the large grain elevator chains, though most of us have been able to. Most times we find it very difficult because the economic situation of grain handling is something similar to the repair situation of farm machinery in the smaller towns and villages where the closure has occurred and the larger centres are the only points where farmers are able to obtain their repairs for the machinery.

If it were possible, Mr. Speaker, through some action of the Minister of Agriculture, perhaps to set up a committee to study the points that will be closed in the future it would certainly be very helpful to the rural people. They could normally either adjust, or could approach the municipalities or counties for the construction of roads that would be able to carry these loads.

I'm thinking of one particular case, Mr. Speaker. Just this year, a farmer hauling an 800 bushel load with a hired truck was hauled on the scales and a fine was levied of somewhere around \$250. This was certainly not advantageous to that farmer. After going through all the trouble of harvesting wet and damp grain he was met at the scales and prosecuted in the process.

I would certainly hope, Mr. Speaker, that some pressure might be brought to bear, either on the railroads or on the elevator systems, that the government, or at least the Department of Agriculture receive notice two years in advance before any closure occurs. Then adjustments can be made. But simply pulling up, closing and locking the elevator doors, is not very friendly toward the farmers of Alberta.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I only say this. In viewing all the closures that have occurred in my constituency alone and the adjacent constituency to the north and to the east, I can only come to one conclusion, there certainly is no dialogue between the elevator companies, the railroads and the government.

Thank you very much.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, could I speak briefly to the resolution before us and take the opportunity to advise the House with regard to the government's position on the feed grain matter in relation to the question of how we can use these rural elevators in such a storage program.

I think it is essential, Mr. Speaker, to outline briefly what I think are the really necessary ingredients of a proper feed grain policy. Number one is that we have that price, that the feed grain is going to be available to feeders in Alberta and that it be widely known. We are hoping that price will come forward very shortly now after our discussions with Mr. Lang.

Secondly, and along with that, of course, is that it is absolutely essential for our feeders, particularly in the livestock industry, to have access to that grain in that it is in the elevator. Mr. Lang has assured us of that access and negotiations are now going on with regard to what handling charges might be charged to farmer feeders in Alberta buying directly from the elevators.

Thirdly, of course, the other cornerstone of an effective feed grain policy has to be some trade equalization with regard to the end product, which is meat. If we can get those three things, then I think we can have an effective feed grain policy.

In addition to that, I think, Mr. Speaker, to allow for the question of an adequate supply of feed grain available to our livestock industry in Alberta, we also have the permission of the federal minister responsible for the Wheat Board and his assurance that our grain commission can become an agent of the Wheat Board. This is absolutely essential before we can make proper use of the grain elevators that the elevators of the line companies in the pool might not want to operate.

This ties in with a question of the Member for Camrose a day or two ago, relating to the question of the Canadian Grain Commission's hearings in Red Deer with regard to the tariff structure that will be paid for handling and storage. If you adjust your tariff structure and make it more profitable to handle, hopefully that's what will happen. The grain will be handled and moved.

We have some suspicion that in the past it was sometimes more advantageous for some of the elevator companies to take some of their elevators and use them as a storage mechanism because the return was pretty good once they got them filled up and moved the agent out. Then they just sat there full of grain and made money doing it. This is why the tariff structure that is paid to the elevator companies for handling and storage is so important. In our view it should be gauged to encourage the elevator companies to be very active in handling that grain, moving it out rather than just keeping it intact.

So we think there is a role our grain commission can play in reactivating the elevators these companies would like to close in a number of areas. One is in the provision of a storage facility for feed grains, which would then be available to our farmers.

Another area which is going to become more pressing is the question of the provision of rapeseed to crushing plants within the province and the use of our seed cleaning co-operatives throughout Alberta as a real adjunct in that entire area. Both the seed cleaning plants at Olds and Innisfail have had contracts in the past with the only crusher that we have in Alberta at the moment to do this particular job for them, to do some of the cleaning, then move it into a storage facility.

There is another area, Mr. Speaker. I think one of the problems in looking at the question of trying to develop more malt houses in Alberta has been that the cost of a malt house, including storage, has been pretty substantial. If we can, in a particular area, take over the grain elevators as a ready-built storage facility for a malt house, we bypass pretty quickly one of the major capital costs involved. We are looking at that. We intend to play a part in that area because it becomes pretty important that you have a substantial amount of storage for a malt house operation. The entire Red Deer area, and a circumference of several miles, has been regarded as sort of the top malting

barley production area in the province. This, in fact, might be a really worthwhile expansion, not only of our rural industry but in the use of the elevators that are not required for the speeded-up handling that we envisage with regard to grain for export.

So really what we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, is a new concept that hasn't been really developed yet, that in grain for export we have speeded-up mechanics.

This part of it has been developed in the past several years, particularly the last two years, with regard to the studies that the grain group in Winnipeg has taken, also the study that the Palliser Wheat Growers initiated concerning the movement of grain by unit train. Additional studies are now going on in western Canada with regard to the movement of grain by truck to a larger, centralized area. The latter two studies are still being evaluated. One was done in Brandon, the other in Moose Jaw in the past year, and we hope to have some information on those fairly shortly. Certainly the study the Palliser people sponsored with regard to the unit train showed that there could be substantial savings in that area.

The essential feature then, Mr. Speaker, is to try to work the grain elevators not required in the export system into a system for storage, not only for the livestock industry, but to provide, if you like, the necessary supply for processing in a variety of industries, whether it be rapeseed, malting, a question of durum supply for our macaroni and soft wheat industry, or a question of certain other areas we are looking at in regard to specialty crops. We certainly are concerned about closing or dismantling any of these elevators because we think there is a use for them in this general area of making sure we have a supply.

So we envisage, Mr. Speaker, a division of the elevator system in Alberta, one that will be the export division, if you like, and the other the local storage division within Alberta.

We think we've made a breakthrough with Mr. Lang in his allowing us to be an agent of the Canadian Wheat Board. Anyone who is knowledgeable about the area will immediately know that then the Canadian Wheat Board will be doing the buying and we'll only act as their agent in the financing. The necessary involvement of government will become much less. As a matter of fact, I think it wouldn't work unless we were the agent of the Canadian Wheat Board, operating in conjunction with it.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that such a system would, in fact, strengthen the Canadian Wheat Board in its overall knowledge and overall involvement in the grains industry generally.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to really stress that somewhere between 65 and 70 per cent of the gross return to farmers in Alberta comes from the livestock industry, and this is absolutely essential in any consideration we might have in regard to a feed grains policy. So we think we have to have that fair balance between the feed grains producer and the livestock producer. In comparison to that, Mr. Speaker, the figures are almost reversed in the other two western provinces. In other words in Saskatchewan, I think, 75 per cent of the total comes from grain and grain products and only 25 per cent comes from livestock. In Manitoba it's about 35 per cent livestock and 65 per cent grain. So there's a pretty major switchover when you get into Alberta.

Again I want to say that in my view the livestock industry is the key to secondary industrial development in rural Alberta, and we intend to take the necessary steps to make sure that our livestock industry, in fact, continues to expand. There are some pressing problems that don't relate to this resolution, Mr. Speaker. I won't go into them at this time, only to mention that they are related to the question of the provision of feed grains at a fair and balanced price, having regard to other farmers right across the country.

In our negotiations with the Province of Quebec, we have agreed with them that there should be equal access and that the differential should be a proper differential, having regard to handling and transportation. In fairness to the Province of Quebec, they, as a matter of fact, have said to us, we would like to see the feed freight assistance removed, and if the federal government has this money to spend, give it to us so we can spend it on agriculture in Quebec in our priority areas.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, we agree with that view of the Province of Quebec. We think the feed freight assistance should be removed. Once you get beyond that, we think there should be equalization with regard to the use of the

Crowsnest Pass rates on feed grain to eastern Canada and the alternate rate that goes from western Canada to the east on dressed meats.

We've been given some assurance by Mr. Lang that this, in fact, will take place and that he'll step it up ahead of the 1974 situation.

Since Mr. Lang's visit to Edmonton a few days ago he has been willing to follow that up on an official basis. We expect some detailed discussions with regard to all those areas in the next few days. If we can resolve this, then I think we can have an efficient feed grains policy. I think we can make the best use of these structures that are presently on trackage throughout Alberta and make them useful components of a total agricultural policy within the province.

[The motion was carried.]

3. Mr. Moore moved, seconded by Mr. Cookson:

Be it resolved that this Legislative Assembly support the Alberta government in its applications to the federal government for the removal of quota restrictions on Alberta rapeseed delivered to crushing plants within the province.

[Adjourn debate: Mr. Buckwell]

MR. CLARK:

On a point of procedure. The hon. member, Mr. Buckwell is speaking at a trustees convention in Medicine Hat, a commitment that was made early last year in May - in that period of time - and I wonder in light of that - the member will be back this evening - if it would be possible for this motion to retain its place on the Order Paper.

DR. HORNER:

We would certainly be agreeable to that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the Chair is correct in assuming that there is unanimous consent in the House to the request by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

4. Mr. Ghitter moved, seconded by Mr. Farran:

Resolved that the government consider the introduction of legislation to this Assembly designed to remove existing group discrimination currently experienced by residents of Alberta under the age of twenty-five years and designed to encourage the establishment of social equality and fair treatment for young Albertans.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, when first this motion was introduced to the Legislature the grass was turning green on the lawn and now we have reached the fall, the stage of the falling leaves - rather an inappropriate time really to talk about youth. You're supposed to think about spring and sunshine when you're talking about youth, not about winter and snowballs. However, this resolution is a very interesting resolution. It does deal with discrimination in the areas of discrimination experienced by those under 25.

I think, frankly, Mr. Speaker, that anyone including youth has to establish a place for themselves in life. Not only do they have to seek recognition but they have to qualify for recognition. Assuredly the time of the teens is probably one of the most difficult and indecisive times in anyone's lifetime. It's an area of uncertainty we all have to get through - until you reach, of course, the area of great statesmanship now experienced by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

In the wide-ranging presentation of this resolution, the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo exercised a little freedom in moving around in different areas and I hopefully intend to do the same.

Mention was made of the work ethic and a statement was made by the hon. member that, in fact, this was not a rejected ethic. What is the basic, fundamental, underlying principle of the work ethic? Basically, Mr. Speaker, it is insecurity. So when you talk to a generation which has already experienced affluence you must realize then that in fact it has taken a second look at what comprises the work ethic.

Possibly, one of the reasons for their rejection of money lies in the realization that they have already experienced affluence, and their awareness that the erosion of money is not really indicative of something that you should put away and store up.

An additional factor is the ability to work for six months and spend a six-month holiday sometimes on the largesse of the state.

Another factor is the availability of jobs. The net value of jobs, of course, is equated to the ease of requiring another one, and certainly this is no problem in this day and age. Then, of course, there is the kindly and 'patronistic' hand of government that reaches out and pats youths on the shoulder and tells them, in fact, that the kindly government will do things for them that people usually do for themselves. We have the 'make work' schemes. Really, what you accomplish with these particular schemes more than anything else, I think, is the fostering of the attitude that, in fact, government can do all things for you.

Another probable factor is the loss of faith in the future, for instance, the awareness of pollution, the realization that the end could come with an atom bomb and the problems that are related to population.

However, to attribute to the youth of the '60s the story that they, and they alone, were the generation of protest that I am not prepared to accept. I think back to my own youth and I think of the protest times of the thirties. In reality what has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the mover and the seconder of this resolution have in fact rediscovered youth and they are overwhelmed. But really what it is is simply a repetitive process that has always been and will always continue. The youth grow up and the adult generation is nonplussed, become squares; they think in terms of the past and they forget that they, in their youth, were turned down on various protests.

I can think of the protests of my time, the protest against Japanese imperialism in China - which was a good substitute for the Vietnam war - the repeal of section 98, and those of my friends who volunteered, rode the rods to Montreal and then travelled by freighters to Spain where some of them died. I think probably this is just a characteristic of youth and youth will always protest.

But basically I think this resolution's intent is really to act as a smokescreen and to get a reading from the Legislature on what thoughts are, in relation to insurance.

Mention was made in my earlier remarks of government insurance and the deal that young people get in Manitoba and in Saskatchewan. It is certainly far superior to what they get under our private enterprise system in Alberta. However, I have little faith in governments, as such, to relate to the realities. Under the harsh rule of the private enterprise system you become very much aware that if you show a loss you are not going to be operating very long.

However, governments do take a more patronistic view to it. I would think more of a political view. I think this would probably extend to the area of government insurance as well as everything else. How else can you interest the 18-year-old voter unless he is aware that he does in fact get a better package.

There is definitely a stronger accident pattern insofar as young people are concerned. If you are not prepared to accept this, stand on Jasper Avenue and watch a traffic light change. Take a look at the driver who spins his tires and goes whistling around the curve. I challenge you to tell me that this driver is 55 or 60. He's a young swinger and he's going places - until something happens.

So there are two things which occur in the driving development of a young driver, from my assessment of it. One is the careful beginning, which has been drilled in as a result possibly of driver training. The second process is the acquisition of confidence. This builds up to a tremendous peak. If the driver is fortunate, he has a little nip or so, a curled fender or some minor traffic

occurrence. This then will allow him to reassess his basic thinking and in many cases will result in an excellent driver.

There is no question of the courage of the youth. Those who fought at Thermopylae or the heroes of the ... [Inaudible] ... were also used. I think in your teens and in your early twenties you have a feeling of invincibility, the feeling that you will live for ever. It's no coincidence that the best fighter-pilots were young, because they were invincible and there was no such thing as tomorrow because it will never come. These are some of the factors that have to be considered in evaluating the risks of young drivers.

I think a direction that could be pursued far more vigorously is the introduction and use of training-traffic simulators in the driver training courses. These in effect permit a direct experience and the development of reactions to situations that do occur.

Another minus factor I might mention, Mr. Speaker, and it's sadly enough a fact of life, is that there is, in fact, a drug culture. Regrettably the members of this particular culture are to a greater degree members of the youth groups than other parts of the population.

However, having said all these things I do not want it to be construed that I have taken a niggardly or retrogressive view of our youth. I have great confidence in them. I am aware that they will meet the challenges. The things we might look at with some dismay are, in reality, healthy manifestations of growing up.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the companies should build into their insurance policies a rebate scheme whereby if a youth has had a satisfactory driving record for two or three years, this should be taken into consideration and proper rebate made.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this covers my contribution to the big debate. Thank you.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make just a couple of brief remarks relating to this motion. First of all, I would like to congratulate my learned colleague from Calgary for presenting this motion to the Legislature.

I want to share an experience which I had last February which relates to this particular motion. That was the opportunity to attend, as a member of the Canadian delegation, a Commonwealth Youth Ministers' Conference in Zambia last February. At this time the nature of the discussion related mainly to two topics. Those were the education and training of youth in the Commonwealth countries, and methods by which youth could be involved and participate in national policy and national decision-making.

The impression I was left with at this conference was, first of all, that Canada is probably miles ahead of most of the Commonwealth countries. I was amazed by the condescending and patronizing attitude which many nations take toward youth and their involvement in any number of affairs.

The proposals at that particular conference ran all the way from the establishment of youth corps, which were basically para-military kinds of organizations with a forced kind of conscription, all the way through to youth organizations which are really a patronizing establishment of an organization to just take youth and put them aside, keep them out of our hair so that we can get on with the business of the country, education and so on.

I am a little concerned that here in Canada we also carry this attitude into our policies to a great degree. I would like to refer to a federal document which was presented, I believe, in 1968. It is called "Now It's Your Turn". This was a study that was established by the Secretary of State for the federal government, looking into how youth could be involved in national policies. It is my belief that the Local Initiatives Program and Opportunities for Youth were some of the programs that came as a result of this study.

It is my concern that in the programs we do present in the province and very often in Canada, we have a tendency to provide for the participation of youth in such a way that we keep them cut of our hair. Opportunities for Youth types of projects are very often established on this basis: that youth will develop services strictly related to youth itself.

I must congratulate one initiative by the federal government. In one way the Local Initiatives Program with many of the shortcomings it does have, at least integrated the initiatives of youth in these policies. It is probably one of the most positive programs to do this, that I have seen.

The real thing we do have to look at though, is the breaking down of the legal and policy barriers that we put in the way of youth in their involvement in policies.

The one that has been referred to, of course, often in this debate is that relating to automobile insurance and its application for the under-25 driver. It is a concern that I certainly share and would like to concur in many of the remarks. It is my feeling that it is an area that we have to deal with. It's an area in which we have to come up with a policy, so that those drivers under 25 will not be penalized just by the fact that they are in a certain age group.

It has been my experience that some of the finest drivers we have, particularly due to many of the driver education initiatives that are now being put through by school boards, are probably better drivers than a good percentage of us in this House. It is my hope that we, at an early time, can come up with a policy which will guarantee that youth will not be penalized by their age in this area.

These are just a couple of comments I want to make and the main thrust of them is that we involve youth, not in a patronizing kind of a way as has too often been the case, not by setting aside separate organizations for youth, but as far as possible integrating their efforts into our programs.

Thank you.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I think I should make just a very few brief remarks regarding this motion and particularly in reference to the numerous times that speakers have referred to the discrimination against youth regarding automobile insurance.

Now I'm the first one to recognize that there was a time when they paid a lot more premiums than anyone else, but I also recognize that the statistics bear out a justification for what was happening at that particular time. However, the situation is correcting itself rapidly. Every year the situation improves.

The last time I saw the statistics, males under the age of 25 constituted about 20 to 25 per cent of the drivers on the road, but they did cost about 35 per cent of the claims. Somewhere or other this has to be reckoned with. Now, I'm sure that there are not many adults, regardless of their records, or whether they are parents or who they are, who would want those losses tacked on to their premiums because they, too, would say, now we are being discriminated against. So there is a reason, a solid reason, why people in a particular category will have to pay more.

I say the situation is improving and it is because even in this last year - since this motion was introduced, as a matter of fact - there has been a further grouping of the ages where under-age drivers are classified. It used to be from 16, 17 and 18 in one group, and then the 18 to 21. Now these two groups have been thrown together completely. Therefore, the rates for many of the young people in that 16 to 17 group are enjoying a tremendously better rate than they did just a few months ago.

But what I think is really important, as the hon. Member for Calgary mentioned - I forget his constituency - is the training program. This is doing a good job. For any youth today who takes driver training, right away if he is a 16 year-old, his immediate benefit is a 15 per cent discount, plus a two-year driving experience rating which is a really great thing. If he continues with his good driving habits and has no accidents he will retain that 15 per cent saving all through his life, as a matter of fact, and if he gets to the point where he has five years accident-free, he will also have a continued saving and will never be penalized for an unavoidable accident or one where just bad judgment is involved.

These things, I think, are important, Mr. Speaker, because any time people feel they are being picked on, discriminated against and treated badly just because they are in error, they make a mistake and they are penalized for it. This causes a great concern with young people, and certainly with the drivers.

I believe the attitudes that adults have toward these people have an awful lot to do with their behaviour. I think that if we would try to rehabilitate them, try to save them trouble and help them to avoid the problems they get themselves into, even though they are making their own decisions, we could do an awful lot for them.

I refer again to the driving situation. I've known situations where drivers have had convictions as long as your arm, right up to the point where they would be losing their drivers' licences because of the point system. If you can show them that the road isn't really just for them, it's for everyone else, and that they get into these troubles because they assume the road is for them only and not for anyone else - this seems to be a serious attitude nowadays - that it was they who were causing the problem, not anyone else, they seemed soon to realize that many of these things can be resolved within themselves.

So I concur in the motion. I think it is good to take what steps we can to prevent the present problems with our young people. If there is any discrimination, naturally we will want to remove it. But the situation isn't as bad as some people try to make it. I think, generally speaking, our total society is interested in accepting our youth for what they are. We look up to them and anticipate great things of them. They are good citizens and we expect to help them to be even greater.

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a couple of observations.

I fully concur with this resolution insofar as car insurance is concerned. I feel that many of these youngsters who spin their tires, as was mentioned, are penalized before they do anything wrong. We have many young people who are good drivers, cautious drivers. Where it shows up most - and I don't know if many of you are aware of this - look at the school bus operators. There are young people under the age of 25 who can drive a school bus with up to 50 students or more, and the rates of insurance are not any higher than they are for anyone above 25 years of age. Yet when this same driver sits in his own personal car, up go his insurance rates. And this is something I cannot see any justification for.

However, I would like to mention that it seems all the hon. members refer to car insurance. But this resolution does not only speak about insurance. It says "...social equality and fair treatment for young Albertans."

I would just like to mention employment for our young people.

I am sure that the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour, who at that time was the associate superintendent of the Edmonton Public School Board, will recall. I remember very well, as a school board member myself, that the Edmonton Public School Board would send out letters. Usually they selected the very top students, telling them how good it is to teach in Edmonton, what bursaries they had available. They tried to lure them into the cities. But the situation has changed over the last couple of years and now there are a few more teachers than is necessary.

Just this spring a student who is one of my constituents, finished four years of university and made an application to the Edmonton Public School Board for a position. He received a letter, which I saw, saying that at present we are not considering any people outside of Edmonton, particularly if they don't have at least four years' experience.

Now how are these young people ever going to get experience and prove themselves? How many are disappointed after spending the best part of their lives going to school and then getting that treatment?

Another example occurred this past spring when there was a managerial position open in one area. Applications were piled a foot and a half high. There was one person in particular who was selected and I wanted to find out how the selection was made. Their best applicant was not accepted and the reason was that he was already 38 years of age. Now if 25 is considered immature, and 38 is too old, when are these people ever going to get a chance?

So all I can say is that I fully concur with this resolution. I think we should look forward to such legislation and I am willing to support it fully.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this resolution, which is designed to remove existing group discrimination experienced by those under 25. Some hon. member ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. Unless the record is in error, it would appear that the hon. Member for Drumheller has already spoken on this resolution.

MR. TAYLOR:

That's unfortunate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair is unable to agree with the hon. member's suggestion that it is unfortunate that he has spoken.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take part in this debate because in the last two years it has been most interesting to me to look at the statistics that have been compiled by my department in regard to accidents relative to safety on the highways, to the people involved in the accidents and also the costs, not only to the people who are in accidents, but the costs to the general public as a whole in ensuring that there is some reasonable equality in protecting people on the highway.

I was recently in New York State and saw a very interesting number of statistics. I hope to get some more statistics in regard to their insurance rates, which were quite interesting to me, also in regard to their attitude towards drivers of all kinds. I have not, at the present time, had the opportunity to receive that data, so consequently I would like to adjourn this debate to a further date when I have that material in hand.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it that the hon. minister has leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

We haven't quite reached the 4:30 starting time for the next order ...

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I thought before moving that we call it 4:30 o'clock, in order to be able to start that, I wonder, on a point of order, if I might ask the Leader of the Opposition, or the acting leader, to express an opinion as to whether, it was contemplated that Motion No. 5 would be proceeded with next Tuesday. Also, may I perhaps ask if the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview could indicate by tomorrow noon whether it is his intention to proceed with Motion No. 6.

Insofar as the subject matter of both of these is within the terms of reference of the board of review established by the government, I think that all members would find it easier to plan next Tuesday afternoon if they knew whether or not those two motions were going to be debated or not. I think, perhaps, if notes could be exchanged by tomorrow noon we would all know what the situation is.

I move we call it 4:30 o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

As a matter of fact, if I just may interject, I was going to mention these two resolutions. It seems to me that although they were in order when first put on the Order Paper, they might, in fact, now not be in order, since it is quite conceivable that the debate might, in some of its aspects, be construed as an improper attempt by the Legislature to influence the proceedings before the Royal Commission.

I would therefore respectfully suggest that the hon. members might perhaps request the leave of the House to withdraw these two resolutions so that we are not squarely faced with a point of order over them.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Clark has indicated that he planned to ask the House for permission to withdraw No. 5.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House then accept the request made through the hon. Member for Drumheller that Resolution No. 5 be withdrawn?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, to expedite the business of the House, I, too, request leave to withdraw Resolution No. 6.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree that the hon. member may withdraw Resolution No. 6?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

A point of order of a different matter, but relating to the activities of the House. I was wondering if the Government House Leader could advise whether it is the intention of the government to put a resolution on the Order Paper to debate the report that has been tabled on the rules of the House - that we would discuss it at this particular sitting?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I noted comments attributed to the hon. Leader of the Opposition regarding the report. It seems to me at best those comments are premature in the sense that no motion has been put forward by the government to accept, or in any way deal with the report.

It's certainly not the government's intention in any way to foist any changes upon members of the Assembly insofar as the report essentially deals with the privileges and rights of the members of the Assembly and doesn't deal with the situation regarding the Executive Council. I'm bearing in mind the attitude which has been expressed by the other side. We wouldn't intend to take any action on the report at this time, certainly not in the foreseeable future, which would mean that the House would revert, after the expiry of this fall sitting to the situation as it was in the spring of 1972 when the temporary rules we are now operating under will expire.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order, I was under the impression that under the rules every report that is tabled by the committee is debatable. I think that if the government does not make the motion, it is not following proper procedure. I believe that is almost tantamount to saying, well we've given you our word.

So if they don't debate it in the House, then they should keep quiet about people debating it outside the House, because it's been practice - it's practice almost everywhere - that reports of committees tabled in the House are debatable. They are usually tabled by motion. Now I may be wrong. It may have been an exception, but the general practice is, I believe, as I am stating it to be. So if the government starts the practice of tabling reports and not debating them, then let's debate them when we can.

After all, we do have freedom of speech in this province, Mr. Speaker, even though some hon. members there may not think so. I believe we have.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, in the first place it should be made clear to everyone, it is not a government report. That appears to have been overlooked by the hon. Leader of the Opposition as well, in his intemperate comments.

Apart from that, there is nothing in the rules that I can see, Mr. Speaker, that prevents any member of the Assembly from bringing forward a motion, a substantive motion, to deal with the report, to accept it or reject it, or simply handle it. In my view, there is no obligation, Mr. Speaker, on the government, as distinct from the Legislature, to bring forth a motion to discuss a report.

In view of the comments made by the other side, we intend to take no action on the report.

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I didn't ask the question with a view to provoking partisan debate, but simply as a member of the committee who is not aware of the plans of the government or of the loyal opposition - the non-independent portion of the loyal opposition - or what their intentions are.

Without provoking any further discussion on the matter I would simply, as a member of the committee, like to strongly urge the Government House Leader possibly to reconsider the desirability of not putting the motion on.

I think the contents of the report are such that they have much to commend them and should be examined objectively by the House. But I will do a little missionary work outside the House on the partisan representatives in this Assembly.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring the attention of the hon. Mr. Speaker to Rule 29 and I would appreciate a ruling on it. Rule 29 (i) states, "The following motions are debatable: for reference to a committee of a report or any return laid on the Table of the Assembly."

Now, if that is not a return, it doesn't matter who laid it, whether the Minister of Education laid it or somebody else. We should be allowed to debate it and I agree with the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc that the government is ill-advised not to permit us to debate the importance of rules which may affect our future in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

In reply to the hon. member's request for ruling I would have to observe that, although Rule 29 says that these motions are debatable it doesn't say that they must be made.

I would have to agree with the observations of the hon. Government House Leader that the report is a report of the committee of the Legislature, not a government report. I would assume it to be in order, subject to the actual text of whatever motion might be offered, for any member of the Assembly to move that the report be debated, or that it be concurred in or not concurred in, or referred back.

MR. ZANDER:

You lost that one, Albert.

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

Bill No. 214

An Act to amend The Pharmaceutical Association Act

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in moving the second reading of An Act to amend The Pharmaceutical Association Act, seconded by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

Prior to dealing with the contents of the bill I would like to put some very important facts on record which really provide a basis or premise for the bill that is being introduced.

The first point I would like to make is that Canada is very fortunate to have the Canadian Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association which was founded about 1914 as a voluntary, non-profit, national scientific trade organization and which today has from 45 to 60 companies as members. This association, through the years, has proved to be very responsible, most responsible in fact, and it demands exacting standards from its members, exacting standards of quality control to ensure drug safety and efficacy, plus strict adherence to a code of ethics. It encourages research also.

With reference to prices, a recent study of the 25 most frequently used, most frequently prescribed, pharmaceuticals including antibiotics, oral contraceptives, hormones, drugs used for the treatment of heart disease, asthma, high blood pressure, and mental illness showed that the manufacturers' selling prices have declined over 22 per cent since the products were first introduced. This is most revealing when you consider the inflationary rise of prices of most products today. I believe the one group that has largely been responsible for this has been the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association of Canada.

The third point I would like to deal with, as a premise for this bill, is the matter of research. Unless there is some profit motive, there is generally little research done. Humanitarian motives are good, but it has been shown that unless there is some profit motive, there has been little real progress made in research.

It is essential that there be a continuing and effective research for new drugs to meet the needs of Canadian people. Undoubtedly, a vast amount of money has been wasted because some of those who have been carrying out the research, the scientist-oriented, have not been oriented to the needs and wants of the general public but rather to what they thought was very important.

In the last ten years the Canadian pharmaceutical industry has provided some \$158 million for research in Canada and is endeavouring to carry out research to meet the specific needs of the people of this country. Few, if any, new drugs have been developed in countries which do not offer adequate incentive and protection for the inventor. In Canada a patent system provides only limited protection to the drug-discoverer to recoup his investment, let alone make a profit. It also results in the disclosure of information about new compounds, making it easier for competing companies to develop something better or less expensive.

With reference to competition, it is interesting to note that no single company in the Canadian Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association holds as much as seven per cent of the highly competitive Canadian pharmaceutical market. That again is a revealing fact.

With reference to benefits from drugs, drugs have certainly played a part in reducing suffering and in sharply reducing and curtailing death rates. Drugs have been a major factor in the overall death rate decline for many diseases. I mention only three: for tuberculosis there were 8,149 deaths in Canada in 1930 and in 1970 there were only 527; for whooping cough there were 1,374 deaths in 1923 whereas in 1970 there were only 6, and for venereal diseases of all types there were 967 deaths in 1937 and only 42 in 1970. This dramatic decline in deaths is even more remarkable when it is realized that the Canadian population has more than doubled since 1930. Drugs have played a most important part in this reduction in the number of deaths.

The next point I would like to deal with, which is most important, is the minimum standards of drugs. The therapeutic efficacy, we might say, must be of primary consideration in any comparison of one drug product with another. To do other than permit the bill the wisdom, the training and the knowledge of the dispenser or the druggist, and the wisdom, the knowledge and the training of the physician prescribing the drug and making his judgment, would certainly not be correct or wise.

The Canadian government, through the Canadian Development Corporation, is endeavouring to lower the cost of drugs and at the same time encourage research. As a matter of fact, last May the Minister of Health and Welfare for Canada revealed that 22 categories of drug products failed to meet the standards of the drug quality assessment program, which are in effect the same as the minimum drug quality standards under the Food and Drugs Act of Canada. No member of the Canadian Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association was included among those 22 offenders, and most of them were Canadian companies producing low-cost chemical

copies or products first marketed by other firms. Of course, there were also a few international firms among these 22 also.

I mention these points to emphasize the importance of this bill and the importance of recognizing that the dispenser, the druggist and the physician must have complete freedom in deciding what is and what is not an equivalent of any drug.

Before dealing with the details of this particular bill, I would like to say that this is not applicable to Alberta only. The steps being taken by the Canadian government show the concern right across Canada about the cost of drugs. The British Columbia government has also provided, under its bill, provision for the pharmaceutical Association to take a stand. That Association has, under Bylaw 44(11), passed on May 3, 1972 the following:

No pharmaceutical chemist shall dispense a drug on the prescription of a practitioner except as named, whether by chemical, proper or brand name, when the prescriber stipulates 'no substitute', or specifies the company of manufacture; But nothing shall prevent a pharmaceutical chemist from dispensing a brand other than that named in the absence of such stipulation by the prescriber provided that a product of satisfactory quality is used, and that the price to the recipient is less than the price of the product prescribed.

The Manitoba Legislature also took a very definite stand and have in their act, provisions which are lawful today, somewhat similar to those contained in this particular bill.

I would like to deal with the details of the bill. Section 62 of the Act has been utilized by a large number of druggists in the province. Section 62, and I quote, states:

Where a prescription refers to a drug or drug combination by a brand name or a name other than its generic name a pharmaceutical chemist, in dispensing the prescription, may use a drug or drug combination that is the generic or brand name equivalent of that named in the prescription, unless the prescriber indicates otherwise:

- (a) by designating the name of the manufacturer, or,
- (b) by specifying that no equivalent is to be dispensed.

This bill deletes Section 62. This was brought into the Act by the former Minister of Health and Social Development, the hon. Dr. Donovan Ross. I think it has served a good purpose. I do think that in the light of developments across Canada that a comprehensive section is now required. That is why I have introduced this bill deleting that section and introducing another.

In the first place Section 62 is completely discretionary. There is no compulsion and consequently all conscientious druggists use it and, as in every group, there are a few who are not quite so conscientious. So the discretionary part is one thing I think is wrong with the present section.

The legislation, as I pointed out, strikes out Section 62 and starts out by defining an interchangeable pharmaceutical product. This is used partly equivalent to that named in the former section. This bill sets out what an interchangeable pharmaceutical product is, as a product containing a drug or drugs in the same amounts of the same active ingredients in the same dosage form as that directed by a prescription.

Now I would like to pause here for a moment and say, here is a place where the doctor and the druggist must have some discretionary authority. I think the bill provides for that. If the doctor wants a certain drug which he is satisfied has been doing, and is doing, the job then he has every right to put that down, and that is the drug dispensed.

If a customer wants a certain brand name under this bill he, too, has a right to that brand name. So the interchangeable pharmaceutical product has to meet the requirements of the physician and druggist. I think this is only right and proper because they are the professional people in this act.

The druggist commits an offence, if he dispenses a drug that costs more if there is a lower priced one that will do exactly the same kind of job.

Who is to determine whether it will do exactly the same job or not? I think there again it must depend upon the physician and the druggist. The dispenser

is protected from damage claims when he uses his judgment by replacing a prescription with a lower price interchangeable pharmaceutical product. If, in his judgment, one of the lower-priced drugs contains the same dosage and meets the definition of the interchangeable pharmaceutical product then no one can bring a claim against him because he has done that. As a matter of fact he will be required by law to do so, if the equivalent - the interchangeable pharmaceutical product - will do exactly the same job.

The bill also sets out what should be on a prescription and it provides authority for the Minister of Health and Social Development to require any person operating a pharmacy to make available to him any information as far back as six years. I think this is important because the Minister of Health for the province should play a key role in a bill of this nature.

At the present time, as I said before, even though there are many druggists today who are providing the lower-priced equivalent to their clients, there are some druggists who are not doing so. This bill would become mandatory in that respect where there is satisfactory reason to believe that they are actually equivalents.

To show the range that faces a druggist, I have taken from a submission made by the Alberta Pharmaceutical Association three products and have shown how many prices there are available for what could be considered a pharmaceutical equivalent.

Take hydrochlorthiazide. The purpose of this drug is to expel urine where a person with high blood pressure has too much fluid in the body. The brand name is Hydrodiuril and it is manufactured by Merck, Sharp and Dohme Canada Ltd. It sells for \$3.95 per 100 pills.

The other prices. There is a drug by the same name hydrochlorothiazide manufactured by Drug Trading Co. Ltd., which sells for 80 cents per 100 as against \$3.95 for the brand name.

MTC Pharmaceutical Ltd. has a product called Diurine for which 80 cents is charged for 100 pills. The Chemical Drug Co. Ltd. manufactures Hydrochlorothiazide at 81 cents per 100, and the ICN Canada Ltd. manufactures urozide at \$1.00 for 100 pills.

So for this one particular drug the price ranges all the way from 80 cents per 100 to \$3.95 per 100, and each is supposed to contain the same dosage and so on. Whether or not they do exactly the same job must, of course, rest with the physician and the dispenser.

Another drug mentioned in these various prices shown in the pamphlet issued by the Alberta Pharmaceutical Association is tolbutamide. This is for a mild diabetic where more than diet is required. The manufacturer's name is Frank W. Horner Ltd. and the product name is Mobenol and it sells for \$4.80 for 100 pills.

There are at least three other products that could be considered in the equivalent range. Novopharm Ltd. manufactures novobutamide at \$1.50 for 100 as against \$4.80 in the other. ICN Canada Ltd. manufactures oramide at \$1.50 for 100 and Stanley Drug Products manufactures butamide under the same product name at \$1.50 for 100. Others I won't mention because they are in the same price range. We have the price ranging from \$1.00 for 100 tablets to \$4.80 for 100 tablets, and again the dispenser and the physician decide whether it is the exact equivalent before making the change. Penicillin G Potassium, again under the Charles E. Frosst Company manufactures Megacillin 500 at \$13.50 for 100. Frank W. Horner Ltd. manufactures Fivepen at \$5.22 per 100 as against \$13.50 for 100. The Chemo Drug Company Ltd. manufactures Penicillin G at \$2.50 per 100. So here we have the price ranging from \$2.50 per 100 up to \$13.50 per 100 under the same name and apparently containing the same dosages.

So hon. members will, I am sure, agree that the patient or the purchaser is at a loss. Again, great emphasis must be placed on the doctor and the dispenser, the druggist or the pharmacist, to determine whether each of these is the equivalent or otherwise. If the druggist is not now dispensing the equivalent at the lowest price, this bill would require him to do so. This would undoubtedly save the people in the Province of Alberta many thousands of dollars every year, because a vast number of these are purchased.

The bill is not intended as a criticism of the vast number of druggists and physicians who today are doing just what the bill intends should be done. It is a severe criticism of the druggists who are not following this practise at the present time. A number of senior citizens have come to me, as they have

probably come to every hon. member of the Legislature, and complained about the high price of the drugs they are getting. When you check the drug with some of the apparent equivalents, even some druggists claim that the lower price would have done the same job. If that were so, then the patient should have the benefit of the research that has taken place.

In closing, I'm not concerned whether this particular bill passes or if changes are required. I am concerned with the principle. I would have no objection if the hon. minister wants to pick and choose from this particular bill and take the meat out of it and put it in his own act. I am concerned that the people of this province everywhere, not just those who are presently securing the benefit, can expect to receive the lowest possible price resulting from the tremendous research that has been carried on in these various drugs. No druggist anywhere in the province should be in a position where he can capitalize on the research by placing extra dollars in his own pocket or the pocket of the manufacturer of that particular product. If we are able to lower the price for even some of the citizens of this province, this bill and this discussion will have been well worth while.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, this particular bill is an interesting one and one in which I am sure, in terms of its fundamental basic objective of lowering drug prices to needy persons, we all concur in this Assembly. All of us at all times will be concerned, are concerned, that the drugs be made available at the minimal cost.

I find it somewhat disconcerting and a bit challenging to hear the suggestion advanced to us that the members of the Alberta Pharmaceutical Association, or at least some of them, may not be, in fact, providing drugs, dispensing drugs when they could do so at the lower cost. I would think this is something which that association would be glad to take up with the hon. member, if he could, in fact, produce some evidence of that practice. Certainly it's one which I do hope he will draw to the attention of that association if, indeed, he does have evidence.

However, Mr. Speaker, coming back again to the basic objective, as I understand it, which is that of providing drugs at the lowest possible cost, I say, all members must be in agreement with that. I am sure, and would like to reiterate for the benefit of the Assembly, that this is certainly the policy of this particular government. We have studies underway currently to determine how it is possible to provide drugs at lower cost and how the quality of these particular drugs can be assured in terms of their equivalency.

One of the problems which does arise in trying to ensure that the cost of drugs is minimal is how to do that, and at the same time provide assurance that there will be adequate research for new products. The development of a drug is a very costly exercise. The research required is quite extensive and with the concerns which have arisen out of such episodes as the thalidomide case, the requirements have been increased very substantially in terms of what the drug manufacturers must show. As the hon. member suggested, the federal government, through its research facilities, has become considerably more active in this area in recent years and is doing considerably more than in prior years to ensure that the quality of the drugs is up to standard.

However, I want to draw attention to the Assembly of a particular, and I think very basic, provision in this bill and that is its suggestion of definition, which is included herein. Specifically it states that an interchangeable drug is, "a product containing a drug or drugs in the same amounts of the same active ingredients in the same dosage". I reiterate, "the same amounts of the same active ingredients in the same dosage".

Mr. Speaker, it is this particular challenge which makes it so difficult to determine whether drugs are really equivalent. In other words, what we have here is a chemical definition of equivalency, if you will. In this sense the term "interchangeable" is used rather than equivalent. A drug that contains these particular amounts of the same active ingredients is deemed to be, by law if this were passed, interchangeable with another drug of the same dosage containing equivalent amounts.

Mr. Speaker, the concern of doctors and also of pharmacists is not just the chemical equivalent but rather the therapeutic equivalency. Those two are not necessarily the same and are frequently not the same.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill first appeared on the Order Paper I became interested in it through some of the responsibilities which I consider I have. I discussed the matter with Dr. Chatten at the University. Dr. Chatten, or

Professor Chatten, as he is referred to by the Pharmaceutical Manufacturing Industry, is quoted in this little brochure. At the time I discussed it with him I hadn't seen this little brochure but I think it has appeared since that date. He teaches at the university here. He has returned rather recently from a year's sabbatical in England where he was studying drugs and the British system.

Dr. Chatten had some very deep concerns with respect to this very narrow definition of equivalency for the purposes of interchangeability, as it appears in this bill. He emphasized that the concern of doctors and the concern of pharmacists has to be the therapeutic equivalency and not the chemical equivalency. In other words, to use a term pharmacists frequently use, it's a bioavailability of a drug that determines its effectiveness.

To relate this very briefly to the argument of cost: even though the drug is \$1 cheaper for a bottle of pills, if the bioavailability or if the therapeutic equivalency is different, then it can be a very costly saving. It is one that, quite frankly as I read reports and statements, the pharmacists are not sure about and even the medical profession is concerned about. There is, apparently, no definitive method yet of being able to determine whether the therapeutic equivalency of one drug to another is equivalent, if I can repeat myself.

So, this, to me, is a very dangerous area for us to be moving into. If we consider this bill, we ought to be aware that the chemical equivalency is not necessarily - and as I understand it is not even likely - to approach the therapeutic equivalency.

It is, Mr. Speaker, expressed most strongly by the pharmaceutical manufacturing industry itself. It says in the paragraph on page 24 - I assume that most members received this courtesy of the pharmaceutical industry - in rather heavier than usual for the booklet black type, I quote:

In short, the concept of generic or therapeutic equivalency is, at best a myth, at worst a hoax, and a retreat from quality drug products. The concept is logically unsound, scientifically untenable and ethically inadmissible.

They are talking about the therapeutic equivalency and how to determine it.

I talked to a doctor here in Edmonton who has been in practice and he tells me that he doesn't want anybody changing the prescription that he writes. He says when he prescribes a new drug it takes him quite a number of cases before he is sure how that drug is going to affect a patient. Even having determined how it affects one patient, it may not have the same effect upon another patient. We're into an area that is most complex. I would again alert the Assembly to the fact that the chemical equivalency, as it's expressed here, overlooks a number of matters.

One of the characteristics of drugs, Mr. Speaker, which apparently needs to be considered is the inert substances in a drug. These apparently can affect the active ingredients. So referring, as this bill does, to the active ingredients, and precisely the exact amount of the active ingredients, without reference to the inert substances, may not take into account the differences which may appear in terms of the effectiveness of the drug.

Mr. Speaker, I should like, for a moment, to touch on two other items in the bill. One is the particular method devised for the doctor in order for him to be sure that no one will interchange the prescription.

In the Act as it now stands all the doctor has to do is designate the name of the manufacturer and specify no equivalent is to be dispensed. But in this proposal, Bill No. 214, as I understand it, the doctor would have to write out the prescription in his own handwriting.

I question, Mr. Speaker, whether in today's world when doctors are being provided with all kinds of specialist assistance in order to be more productive in their practice - and if I may as an aside suggest, to overcome problems of legibility in their handwriting - we should be reverting to a system which requires doctors to have to write out a specific prescription in their own handwriting. In short, it seems to me that that is a backward step in terms of a method of assuring that the prescription cannot be changed.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I have some concern about the possibility of the consumer being able to specify what brand he or she likes over the suggestions of the pharmacist. I believe, as I interpret the bill, that if a doctor prescribes a specific drug the consumer cannot alter that prescription or select

another drug that's interchangeable. However, if the doctor has not so indicated, but just writes out the prescription without reference to a brand name, the druggist or the pharmacist is then free to make a selection. A consumer could supposedly, under this bill, exercise his somewhat greater knowledge or preference and indicate a specific brand name.

Really, I wonder if this is necessary and I wonder if it might not be something that could lead to an argument and perhaps a difference of opinion as to who is the greater expert, the consumer, who over many years may have had experiences with a number of drugs, may decide that brand X is the one.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, again I would like to reiterate that as far as I am concerned, and I am sure as far as other members are concerned, any system which would produce a lowering of drug prices would be more than welcome. I question, however, if this particular approach is the approach which should be used.

Finally, I again suggest to the hon. member that if in fact he has evidence that some pharmacists by the use of their discretion are extracting from consumers thousands of dollars a year, perhaps he ought to take that to the attention of the Alberta Pharmaceutical Association. As I understand, the objective of that association is to provide quality service, and I am sure they do so having regard to the public interest.

MR. CRAWFORD:

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

MR. LUDWIG:

I would appreciate having an opportunity to speak on this bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

Under the circumstances does the hon. minister wish to withdraw the motion?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I waited to see if anyone opposite was going to speak. It appeared there was no one and I was about to adjourn the debate, but I have no objection to the hon. member proceeding.

MR. LUDWIG:

I will withdraw my offer to speak if he wants to adjourn the debate.

MR. CRAWFORD:

I agree with the suggestion you made as being the reasonable one and I am glad to withdraw the motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

We are back to square one.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I first wish to commend the hon. member, Mr. Taylor, for bringing in ...

MR. SPEAKER:

With respect to the hon. member may I just interject? My understanding is the motion is withdrawn because as hon. members know when such a motion is defeated the person moving it loses his right to speak.

MR. LUDWIG:

I wish to commend the hon. member, Mr. Taylor, for bringing this very vital issue to the attention of this Legislature. I was surprised that we have some pharmacists in this House and that remarks may have been made that perhaps might even question the purpose of these members being in business when I understand that perhaps they chose not to become involved.

I am concerned about the position of one minister who is not only a druggist or operates a drug store, but is also the Minister of Consumer Affairs. There

may be a conflict here because some of the abuses in the drug business perhaps ought to fall completely and squarely under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Consumer Affairs and perhaps something can be done to see if there are abuses, to see if there are people in the drug business, and I am talking about pharmaceutical drugs, who may be taking [advantage of] unsuspecting purchasers who are not too knowledgeable and do not seek out the best prices available.

I am also interested to know whether the government under the Minister of Health and Social Development, has taken any initiative and provided leadership to educate the public to the alternatives expressed by the hon. member, Mr. Taylor, and the hon. member, Mr. Young, so very effectively. Both gentlemen appear to be very knowledgeable in this area and appear to have done a lot of work. Are we doing what we can as legislators and perhaps as ministers to point the way so the public can do better?

I wish to return to my opening remarks. This subject is very timely because of the fact that many elderly people who must have drugs to survive are now receiving drugs through the government if they fall into categories of age or financial inability to buy. Is the government now buying drugs at the best possible prices that are obtainable, or do we just supply the money and the people who need drugs buy them at whatever prices they can find? If this is so, then it's something that should be looked at almost immediately, because when government pays for something, the price may not be that much of a factor to the purchaser.

I am not saying this is happening, but many elderly people are given drugs paid for by the government. Are they to buy at a certain place? Are they to buy at a certain price? Or do they go to a druggist who gives them the prescription and then sends the bill to the government? I am not sure just how this happens, but is there room here for some investigation to see whether or not the druggists are not doing rather well for themselves at the expense of public funds.

I am not saying that there is anything unethical about the way druggists, pharmacists operate, like I would not say that there is anything unethical about doctors signing prescriptions. This bill raises the question, Mr. Speaker, are there situations where doctors have interests in drug stores where they send prescriptions? They might be perfectly honest, but it's a profit. The profit motive is that they must make a profit or the drug store could not stay in business.

These are factors that have to be looked at. These are factors which are raised by the public from time to time that some doctor insists that the patient take his prescription to a certain drugstore and no place else. One could hardly allege that there is something wrong with this but the suspicion is raised. It's up to someone in the government to establish that this is not done. If it were done perhaps action ought to be taken that it is not done, not only from the point of view of treating the patient fairly, but from the point of view of honest business dealings and the best possible spending of public funds.

I'm concerned particularly about this issue where the public gets the drugs paid by the government. Are we controlling the buying or are they buying at random? I'm wondering whether our legislation - this should be raised or looked into as to whether a person who is in the drug business may be in the government. He may have the only drug store in the country and may well be able to make a pretty good killing as a result of government expenses on government-paid drug purchases. Would this person be protected under The Legislative Assembly Act, or is this something that because it doesn't come in big sums may be an exception, Mr. Speaker?

These are just points that this bill raises and I believe we should receive answers to these questions. It would be interesting to know how many doctors, perhaps some in this House, may have a drug store as a sideline, or it may not be a sideline; it may be one of the major incomes for him. How many doctors in the province direct the purchase of drugs to a favoured drugstore?

I have been a member of the Committee on Professions and Occupations and we had these bodies, the medical and pharmaceutical people, come before us. I am sure that everybody is alert to the fact I may violate some of the principles of secrecy of the committee, but there isn't any secrecy about the committee. They have already tabled a report. So as far as that report is concerned, Mr. Speaker, it is no longer in any way a secret. In fact all the hearings and deliberations were made in public. Since I did not attend some of them recently with a view to expediting the business of that committee, I understand it didn't help.

[Interjections]

I thought that would get a rise. It's a committee, Mr. Speaker, that when I'm there they all fight with me and when I'm gone they fight with each other, so you can't win. But in any case, I won't mention the very latest secret, in case somebody is concerned that I might violate a privilege of a committee.

But, in any case the ethics of professions received a very thorough and I believe a very needed going over in public and the ethics of the pharmacists and of the medical people were very broadly and rather often raised and presented to the committee. I should anticipate that it might make some recommendations although not too much in the field of ethics, but the self-government of these professions does not in any way preclude them from going into any kind of business they like. I understand it doesn't even stop them from going into politics if they feel like it.

But those points I raised about a minister who is a pharmacist and does business with a government and may be an influential member of the district with the only drugstore - I would like that question answered.

I would like perhaps the hon. minister, Miss Hunley, to advise us whether she has provided anything like even a glimmer of leadership to a lot of people who are spending money, heavy money. Did I hear someone throw a question at me or was it my echo?

[Interjections]

MR. GHITTER:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes.

MR. GHITTER:

I'm wondering if the hon. member feels he can continue to run out the clock for the next seven minutes, because he is offering little to the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Deputy Premier said I should listen to my head rattle. I could do better than that, I could listen to his rattle - and it does rattle - it rattles a long time sometimes. I've even seen his teeth rattle sometimes when he couldn't have his own ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. Possibly the hon. member could now revert to the subject under discussion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

In summing up, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that the points raise are valid ones. We have medical people here who may have had questions thrown at them concerning the propriety of dispensing of drugs by preferred druggists, the question of price to the public and the issue of public paid drugs. Do you provide the cheapest available, or do we let them spend as they wish because they are using public funds? Is the incentive to these older people to buy at the cheapest rate. It is there, or is it not there. I am sure these are legitimate questions.

I wish to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member, Mr. Taylor, stated that he was not concerned whether this bill would be passed in its entirety. That is rather a lot to expect. I found out on this side that when you debate a bill it is sometimes easier to convince the dull, the uninformed and the

prejudiced, in which case the hon. member's bill is in triple jeopardy in this House because the principle of ...

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's gratuitous reference to all the members in the House in the manner in which he has just done it, is quite out of order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I will apologize. One of the top Conservatives in Parliament used this expression and he got quite a reception on it. I should probably know better than to follow a Conservative.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is not entitled to debate the matter in that fashion, and the Chair is not responsible for what may be said outside the House.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw that statement.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Five minutes, Albert.

MR. LUDWIG:

What was that? I didn't hear that question. If the minister wants to ask me a question he should have the courtesy ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. If the hon. member wishes to continue his speech, would he do so?

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I wish to bring to your attention that I was interrupted and I thought there was a question coming from somebody. I am entitled - in fact it isn't against the rules to ask any member a question, but it does require ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. I must ask the hon. member not to persist in this present irrelevance.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, then I wish to wind up by commending the hon. member Mr. Taylor who has a reputation for bringing these serious public interest issues to the House. He has made his point. I don't believe there was any opposition from the other side to his bill. Because of that, I believe that since they are not talking against it, perhaps they could stand up and support this bill which is timely, necessary and in the public interest. Unless somebody has anything to say that this bill is not in the public interest, or is not well prepared or well presented, then they ought to go against it. Mr. Speaker, I urge all members to give support to this bill, notwithstanding the fact that it came from the opposition side of the House.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago, when I asked leave to adjourn the debate, the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View indicated he had something to say on the subject. He was apparently mistaken. I will say for him though that he did not speak long, it only seemed a very long speech. I would again, Mr. Speaker, ask leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, before moving to call it 5:30, for this evening we will start on page 2 of today's Order Paper with second reading, the first being Bill No. 69, The Department of the Solicitor General Act, followed by the following Bills: No. 76, 77, 78, 79, 84, 85 and 86. If Her Majesty's legislators proceed with dispatch on second reading, we then move into Committee of the Whole beginning with No. 57, The Disaster Services Act.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:26 o'clock.]