

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, October 30, 1973

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

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 89 The Expropriation Act

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 89, being The Expropriation Act.

Mr. Speaker, this very important legislation is in keeping with the spirit which was created in this Legislature by the passage of The Alberta Bill of Rights.

The due process of law known as expropriation is, through this legislation, made much more fair to the citizens of the province of Alberta. The bill provides for notice to the owner of property where a proposed expropriation is to take place. It provides for an inquiry procedure and machinery whereby an owner can object to the taking of his land.

The bill requires the taker to pay to the owner a reasonable compensation before the owner gives up possession and without prejudice to the owner's right to claim further compensation. It contains many more procedures and principles of procedural fairness.

Mr. Speaker, both in the Seventeenth Legislature and in past Legislatures, both sides of the House spoke in favour of the concept of a home-for-a-home in awarding compensation in the event of expropriation. Mr. Speaker, in this bill that concept is enacted.

I have before me, Mr. Speaker, a proof of the actual bill and the bill, in its final form, will be printed and will be available on Thursday. I understand it will be mailed to all members by the Legislative Assembly following that.

It is intended, Mr. Speaker, that the bill will be left on the Order Paper and will be re-introduced in the spring so that, in the interval, members from both sides can consult their constituents in regard to the matters raised in the bill.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, it would be ungrateful on first introduction if the Assembly did not recognize the important work which the Institute of Law Research and Reform did in providing this Assembly with the background information by which this bill was prepared.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 89 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour, that Bill No. 89, The Expropriation Act, 1973 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

-----  
INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to beg leave of the House to introduce three distinguished gentlemen in the members gallery, members of the Federation of Alberta Metis Settlements: the president, Mr. William Erasmus; the executive director of the Federation, Mr. Richard Poitras and a director of the Federation, Mr. Adrian Hope. I would ask that they stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of the House, two distinguished young men in the public gallery. Mr. Bill Piers, a former page boy here, is accompanied by his friend who is also at university, Mr. Stewart Money.

I am sure we are glad to have these two fine young men with us today.

## FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table Motion for a Return No. 248, partially. This is the type of motion for a return that involves copies of correspondence. We've received written permission from all but two of the persons involved to table those letters.

This deals with the land transactions in the vicinity of Airdrie, and we've been advised that the permission is coming in writing, but not having received it as yet this final day, I would like to table the portion of the return that is complete.

I will table the other letters involved as soon as possible.

I also would like to table the written answer to Question No. 271.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table six copies of the report of the Task Force on Consumer Affairs, consisting of government members, Messrs. Ashton, Cookson, McCrae and myself. This relates to gasoline pricing and marketing in Alberta.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the response to Question No. 272 as ordered by the Assembly.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the reply to Question No. 177.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have a number of documents to table. The first one is required by statute, as in the first three cases, Orders in Council affecting three acts: the first, The Blind Persons Act; the next one, The Disabled Persons Act; and the next one, The Old Age Assistance Act. These are tabled routinely every year and report on Orders in Council passed pursuant to those Acts.

Another statutory return, Mr. Speaker, is the Report of Inspection, Laboratory Animal Care and Facilities, Alberta Universities for this year, also as required by statute.

The last one is the response to Question No. 262 relating to hospitals, auxilliary hospitals, nursing homes and senior citizens' lodge locations in the province.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Adoption of Infants

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Health and Social Development if he has had an opportunity to do the checking-out he indicated he would do for the House yesterday concerning the adoption of infants?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity.

First, the policy as I outlined to the House yesterday in regard to adoptions is being followed by the department. I think the figures I will be able to give the hon. Leader of the Opposition will satisfy him in that respect.

The number of children placed outside Alberta during 1973 has totalled 12 out of 661 placements to the end of September. The situation I outlined is that they were primarily older children, some of mixed race or with some disability, for whom many efforts had been made in the province for placement, but no success had been reached. That is so in all cases. All but one of the 12 were either Indian or partly Indian children, and those placements did take place outside the Province of Alberta, some of them in the United States.

There was only one infant placed, aged one. That child was placed in the province of Ontario. The reason, in that case, was that the mother who surrendered him at birth indicated a very strong preference to have him placed in a Jewish home. It was not possible to place the child in a Jewish home in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that the House know that each one of these cases is personally reviewed by the Director of Child Welfare before a placement is made outside of the province. That is so because of the government's policy that placements outside Alberta not take place unless there are no opportunities within the province. It was also true of the Indian children. They were placed only after a very careful review of their files and another review over again of the available adoptive homes in the province.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, the figures for 1970 show that out of 1,537 adoptions, 48 children were placed outside the province. In 1971, out of 1,446 children placed, 81 were placed outside the province. In 1972, out of 1,003 children, 27 were placed outside the province. I've mentioned that for the period up to the end of September in 1973, only 12 out of 661 were placed.

I should mention, Mr. Speaker, that because of cooperation through the various jurisdictions in Canada, some children, found not possible to place in other jurisdictions, have also been placed in Alberta. I just reiterate that these placements outside the jurisdiction take place because it's deemed to be in the interests of the child to have a willing parent somewhere after every effort has been made to place the child in Alberta, rather than not to have adoptive parents at all.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. What is the follow-up procedure by the Department of Health and Social Development on placements that are made outside the province?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, each jurisdiction has its own right to deal with children within the jurisdiction. When children are placed in Alberta from other areas, including some from abroad, they come under the jurisdiction of the Province of Alberta and receive every protection here.

The follow-up in the other jurisdictions is, therefore, a matter for the provincial governments there.

MR. CLARK:

One last supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Is it fair to say that there were no young people, other than the 12 you mentioned today in

your comments, available for adoption in Alberta who were placed outside the province during this portion of 1973?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is the information it has been possible for me to obtain since yesterday. It was based on as careful a checking of accurate records that could be done in the period available. If it's out it's by one or two - no more than that, I'm sure.

Provincial Energy Marketing Board

MR. CLARK:

Could I direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Minerals and ask him if the government is in a position today to indicate whether it will introduce legislation at the energy session the first week in December concerning a petroleum marketing board in Alberta?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, the government is looking at a number of options. I think we've mentioned one or two in the House already, and I can also advise that a marketing board concept is one that is being considered.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for ...

Ottawa Discussions on Energy

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, in relation to that, I wonder if the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs could advise the House more specifically as to the outcome of their discussions in Ottawa yesterday?

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly this is a matter of considerable scope which the government might wish to deal with on Orders of the Day.

MR. GETTY:

It had not been my intention to deal with it on Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker. However, if it's the preference of the House to do that [I will]. It may be that an initial report will cause members to want to follow up with other questions and it may be more helpful for them to do it now. I'm at the mercy of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Laughter]

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. minister then proceed to deal with the question if he wishes.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I think I could describe it as a good meeting at which considerable progress was made. It went for four and a half hours and it covered quite a variety of subjects. I can touch on them for the members of the House.

The Alberta group, by the way, was made up of the Minister of Mines and Minerals, the Provincial Treasurer, the Attorney General and myself, plus members from the various departments. We met with the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, Mr. Macdonald; the Minister of Finance, Mr. Turner; the new head of the National Energy Board; another member of the board and various members of their departments and agencies.

Initially we had a briefing on the events in the Middle East that are affecting energy today in the world. We had a discussion of security of supply

and price for Canada. We had a report by the federal government on what it felt [to be] the effects of recent policy decisions taken by producing nations in the Middle East. We had a report on the minister's visit to Venezuela. We had a report on the minister's visit with Governor Love, the President of the United States' advisor on energy.

We had a report on some of the programs which the federal government is developing as contingency plans as a result of the various events that are taking place in the energy field in the world. We discussed alternatives to the federal export tax, we discussed a pricing of crude in Canada, how price might be established in the future and the freeze which has been on crude in Canada. We discussed a proposed Montreal pipeline.

We had a good discussion on the conditions in the Syncrude project which require federal government cooperation. We discussed natural gas pricing and the method that might be used for the solution of the problem faced particularly in Ontario but in other parts of Canada, with the policy statement by this government and the belief of this government that the people of Alberta should receive fair market value for their resources when they are sold, in this case, natural gas.

We had a discussion about the role of the federal government and the responsibilities of the Alberta government with regard to research and development of the Alberta oil sands.

Then we had a discussion on the possible agenda items for a national energy conference which we feel will probably take place sometime in late spring of 1974.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, so much for the discussion. What areas of agreement did the ministers find with the federal government?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the meeting was not intended to strike a particular agreement on any issue - there are, as you members know, a variety of differences of opinion which have come up in the energy field in Canada - it was to make them as fully aware as possible of our feelings and explore alternatives which could bring together differences of opinion.

We reached consensus on one matter which I think is significant to the members of the Legislature and that is on the fact that it is a free international market price which will be used for the pricing of crude oil in Canada in the future. That is significant in relation to selling Alberta's resources and certainly significant in the development of the Alberta oil sands under the Syncrude proposal and others.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview with a supplemental, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, and then the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

Oil Marketing Board - Federal Position

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question to the hon. minister is: can he advise the House at what point - if there is a point - will there be a disclosure of the specific position taken on particular items, i.e., the marketing board proposal of the province for example?

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Minerals pointed out that this was one of a variety of options which the provincial government is discussing, reviewing and talking to the federal government about, when a decision is made on which of the options or alternatives are adopted by the government. Probably this will be apparent in December in what is referred to as the energy session.

Crude Export Tax - Federal Position

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Did the federal government give any indication that it is willing to drop the export tax on Alberta crude?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that the federal government recognized that the export tax is not one that is greeted with great enthusiasm by Alberta. They have expressed, I think, a feeling that they may have, in a rush, done something - that there may be a better way of accomplishing what they felt was an intention to protect Canadian interest from abnormal, unusual market situations in the energy field. I think there may be ways in which we can accomplish it without an export tax and still recognize Alberta's ownership position of the resources.

Syncrude - Federal Position

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, the last question I'd like to ask the hon. minister is if he could advise the House as to whether the federal government gave any indication of where it basically stands on the Syncrude project?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think it would be a fair assessment to say that the federal government would like to see the Alberta oil sands developed. They would like to see the Syncrude proposal go ahead. They would like to cooperate with the Alberta government in seeing that the development goes ahead. They would like to have the royalty agreement, which Alberta has struck with the Syncrude group, fit the existing policy and legislative details of the federal government's tax legislation. We are working cooperatively to do just that.

National Energy Conference

MR. CLARK:

I have a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Was the federal government agreeable and did it give you a commitment to go ahead with a national energy conference?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Minister of Mines and Minerals might want to amplify the role that the ministers of mines will be playing in this area, because in a meeting scheduled for November 22 and 23, considerably more work will be done on an agenda in this regard.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I can perhaps supplement that.

At a meeting of the mines ministers in Victoria in the early part of October, this was one of the areas discussed. It was decided at that time that at the November meeting they should deal with as No. 1 item on the agenda, a national energy conference, and the items that would make up the agenda at that meeting. So that would be the discussion that would take place in November, to set some recommendations by way of an agenda that could take place for the forthcoming national energy conference.

Oil Marketing Board - Federal Position (Cont.)

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, if I might pose a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. In light of what you have said about the federal government's position on the export tax, what discussion took place on the other option that was announced on December 4, namely a national marketing board? Further, while I'm on my feet, has the Alberta government taken any position with respect to a national marketing board?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, there was not a great deal of discussion regarding a national marketing board, although it did come up as part of a general discussion on energy and where the federal government might be going in the energy field in that area. I think it was clear that the minister did say, though, that they were not considering a national marketing board which would purchase all oil produced in Canada.

Crude Export Tax - Federal Position (Cont.)

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Is the government making plans, in the event that the federal government withdraws the 40 cents export tax, to step in and make sure that that additional possible revenue comes to the people of Alberta?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

DPW Projects

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Public Works. Can he advise the House if there are any major DPW projects either under tender, or due to be tendered, in the city of Calgary?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, not in the immediate future.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, can the hon. minister advise the House if there are any major DPW projects due to be tendered, or are being tendered at the present time, in the province of Alberta?

DR. BACKUS:

Again, not in the immediate future. Most of our projects for the immediate future are of a smaller nature, not of a major nature.

MR. LUDWIG:

A further supplementary. Are there any DPW projects which are designed to be commenced in the late fall or winter to provide winter employment in this province?

DR. BACKUS:

There are a number of DPW projects being undertaken as winter works. They tend to be of the smaller nature. Quite a number have been started and will be started in the next month in the hope that some of the outside ones will be at a stage where they can be continued right through the winter. Then there are a number of renovations or maintenance projects to be carried out through the winter months.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps we might come back to this topic if there is time.

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

Remembrance Day Holiday

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. It is a follow-up to my question of yesterday. Has the cabinet reached a decision with respect to declaring a holiday on Monday, November 12?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the Executive Council will not proclaim November 12 as a holiday.

December 24 - Holiday

MR. FRENCH:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. As December 25 this year falls on a Tuesday, will December 24 be declared a holiday?

DR. HOHOL:

It seems to me it is a holiday of sorts. It is Christmas Eve, if I recall.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Plastic Pipe Shortage

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Telephones and Utilities. I was wondering if he had anything further to add to the shortage of plastic pipe in Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member like some more pipe?

[Laughter]

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed to have to tell the House that the outlook is bleak. I wish I had a magic wand I could wave to produce plastic pipe, but it looks at the moment as though we may be some 650,000 pounds of resin short. The shortage is due to CIL not being able to fulfill their commitments of delivering some 5 million pounds of resin for this year. They have delivered so far 4.1 million pounds. They may be able to work it up to about 4.75, but we are about 650,000 pounds short which will affect a number of co-ops which were hoping to have their systems completed this year.

The hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce has been working very hard to try to find a solution to this grave problem for the rural gas co-ops. Perhaps he could add something to what I have said.

MR. STROMBERG:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Do you believe that this shortage would continue into next spring and summer and affect construction for the co-ops?

MR. FARRAN:

Can I turn that question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce to answer, Mr. Speaker?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities has mentioned, we have been working together in determining how we can overcome this shortage. The shortage occurred, of course - and I think all members should bear in

mind, as the hon. Minister of Telephones has mentioned, that we have jumped from 900,000 pounds a year in 1971 to well over 4.5 million pounds this year in requirements of polyethylene which is the pipe that we use for for rural gas. So that has put a stress on the supply of products in Canada and the United States.

The reason why the shortage takes place, of course, is a technical one. One of the components of polyethylene is high-density polyethylene resin and it's not made in Canada. It's imported from the United States and we're short of that.

What we have done in regard to industry and the Research Council, is attempt to get a new composition and to have new components, or at least substitute a component for the high-density polyethylene so that we will have pipe for 1974. We are working on that now and it's a little too early to determine whether we will have a substitute for polyethylene pipe in time for the 1974 construction.

But I would support what the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities has stated, that the situation is very, very critical and that we are looking at no greater supply for 1974 at this time than we have experienced in 1973.

MR. STROMBERG:

One last supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. Has your department given consideration to the use of aluminum pipe?

MR. FARRAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are in touch with Alcan on that possibility. The aluminum pipe also requires a plastic coating. There is also a possibility of changing the mix, as the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce said, and using some imported German resin. But whether this will be CSA-approved in time, I cannot say.

The shortage, Mr. Speaker, derives largely from the acute shortage of a certain catalyst which is used in making the hard form of polyethylene pipe required in gas systems. There is just none available in the United States. CIL has sent two scouts out to see if they can find some, but we may not have an answer until next week.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly this might be the last supplementary on this topic from the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

MR. HO LEM:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. In view of the fact that the supplies must be imported, can the minister advise why there has not been a stockpile established in anticipation of the demands, and if there has not been such a policy set up, will there be a stockpiling policy set up for future demands?

MR. SPEAKER:

We have gone into this topic at considerable length and possibly the policy with regard to stockpiling might extend the discussion further. We have a number of other questions waiting.

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

#### Garbage Burning

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, this question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Would the minister consider an amendment to The Public Health Act to allow burning of garbage, on a controlled basis, by municipalities with a population of under 25,000?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, as the regulation comes under the Department of Health and Social Development, I'll allow my colleague to answer the question.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Board of Health has given consideration to that. It is not prepared at the present time to recommend burning on that basis.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Rapeseed Crushing Plant

MR. NOTLEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Can the minister advise the House whether the principals of the proposed rapeseed crushing plant at Sexsmith have expanded the scope and the size of their operation from the time that you made your announcement on this proposition last March?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I can advise that I'm hoping we'll have some final information with regard to that particular plant in a matter of days. There has been consideration, by the principals involved, to expanding the plant to include the question of production of a much more purified form of rapeseed protein also.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the hon. Minister of Agriculture advise the Assembly what the status is today of the proposed co-op?

DR. HORNER:

The status of the co-op is that any money that has been put together by the co-operative is in trust until such time as the entire financing of the project is approved.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise whether there has been any change in the proposed structure of the plant, given the minister's comments about the plant being larger? Will the percentage that the co-op is to have in this plant remain the same or will it be reduced?

DR. HORNER:

That will depend, I think Mr. Speaker, on the total outlay or proposed capital expenditure in relation to the amount that the co-op, in fact, might want to become involved in. There are two other co-operatives in the Peace River country that are interested in rapeseed crushing. It would be my hope, for the benefit of northern Alberta particularly, that we could get those three co-operatives together with the expanded proposal if it is financially feasible, and if the proposition is worthwhile that we could put it all together and really have an exceptionally fine plant with the most advanced technology in the world.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, one final ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps we could come back to this topic if there is time. The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Student Loans

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. Is the minister planning to change the ruling as to what constitutes an independent status for the purpose of student loans to enable post-secondary students of the age of majority to obtain assistance without contributions from parents?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to examine and review the regulations established in our department at any time. If the member has some recommendations he would like to bring to our attention, I wish he would do so.

While I am dealing with the question of age of majority, I would like to restate a position I took in this House some time ago on that subject. That is, that the age of majority legislation that defines at law an adult of the age of 18, has nothing to do with whether or not we, as a society, should expect parents of that person to make some contribution to his post-secondary education.

Mr. Speaker, this is a subject that could go on for some time and one I look forward to debating, but I would appreciate hearing from the hon. member if he wishes to discuss the matter of amendments with me.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Housing - Financing

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the minister advise if he is prepared to change Alberta Housing Corporation regulations which are contributing to the demise of older, single-family residential ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please come directly to the question without debating the point that he has in mind.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, will the minister consider changing Alberta Housing Corporation lending regulations to include good risk areas not covered by conventional mortgage sources?

MR. RUSSELL:

As a matter of policy, not of regulation, Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Housing Corporation has been giving preference to loan applications from those areas in the province that are not covered by conventional lenders.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can the minister advise when the Alberta Housing Corporation will lend mortgage funds on single-family homes on 25-foot lots in older, residential communities?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is going into considerable detail. If the minister has that information at his fingertips, perhaps he might wish to answer; otherwise the question perhaps should have been put on the Order Paper.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Are co-operatives eligible for loans from the Alberta Housing authority?

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, they are, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding that there is a very interesting application from a co-op now presently being processed that will provide some homes in the hon. Member for Drumheller's area.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister considered evidence and statistics of sales on homes on 25-foot lots which indicate they are sold for apartment sites because financing is not available ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. The hon. member is adding to the topic which was suitable for the Order Paper.

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

Social Assistance Administration

MR. BENOIT:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Health and Social Development and concerns the administration of social assistance - with a word of explanation. Formerly a lot of it was administered by the smaller municipalities, then it gradually drifted to the province.

What is the government's policy for the future, to decentralize the administration of social assistance to the smaller municipalities, to centralize it at the provincial level or to proceed and attempt to centralize it at the federal level?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, certainly there would be no reason to want to centralize the administration at the federal level. I think the system that should be kept in Alberta in the foreseeable future is one where the municipality and the province both have some responsibility in that respect.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the government giving any consideration to decentralization of health and social development regional offices, i.e. social workers living in the communities they work in, rather than living in a central point and driving to that community?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Health and Social Development is one of the most decentralized departments of government. It has the largest group of employees and 35 offices for the department alone spread throughout the province. I think that is substantial decentralization.

As far as having the sub-offices in other areas within each region, there would be some difficulties related to that. It is certainly something that can be looked at from time to time, but problems of administration and problems of case load would result from not being related to the regional office.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

"No Shooting" Signs

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Could the minister advise the House of the significance of "No Shooting" signs on land? Specifically, if a landowner posts his land with "No Shooting" signs, can he allow any shooting privileges on that land?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member appears to be asking a question of law rather than a question of departmental or governmental policy.

The hon. Member for Calgary ...

MR. COOPER:

A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. Are there any provincial regulations governing posting of signs on land?

MR. SPEAKER:

With great respect, the hon. member's further question is subject to the same strictures.

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

The Municipal Election Act

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs. This question is posed as a result of Resolution 21 coming out of the AUMA meeting, in which all ministers ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Could the hon. member please come directly to the question. His reasons for answering the question must be his own.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, the question is, would the minister indicate to the members of this House if legislation will be introduced this fall or in the spring session to amend Section 155 of The Municipal Election Act in order to allow municipalities to utilize the simple "X" form of balloting without need of a plebiscite?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, as a result of correspondence I have had with the City of Calgary concerning their worries about this, I had indicated to His Worship that I would attempt to get legislative approval for that particular amendment at the Spring, 1974 session.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would this be in time to come into effect by the October civic election?

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of the legislation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Royalty Revenues Allocation

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier. What is the government's present position with regard to allocating royalty revenues from natural resources located on Metis settlements to the Metis Betterment Trust Fund?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that matter was discussed by the Executive Council two weeks ago and further information was required; I believe it's back on the agenda of the Executive Council two weeks, or three weeks from now.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

AHC Branch Offices

MR. WYSE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the government planning to establish more branch offices for the Alberta Housing Corporation? If yes, where will the branch offices be located?

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes they are, Mr. Speaker. I believe the next one, as far as priority is concerned, would be Lethbridge in an attempt to serve that area of the province generally south of Calgary.

Government Offices - Decentralization

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary then to the hon. Premier. With decentralization of major government offices such as at Camrose and at Ponoka and, I believe, Lacombe, is the government considering decentralizing any major government offices in southern Alberta, and particularly southeastern Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, as I am sure hon. members are aware, our plan with regard to decentralization is one that extends throughout the entire province. It involves decisions from time to time that have to be made, as we see it, balanced in terms of both the departments and the nature of their responsibilities. There is no intention merely to seek decentralization of any one particular operation on an overall geographic base unless it can be effectively fit within the responsibilities involved.

I would think, though, insofar as the area represented by the hon. member is concerned, that in due course in terms of development that will arise relative to natural gas, some energetic efforts will be made by both himself and by other citizens of the area with regard to those sorts of matters.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

EFRC Telephone Rates

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. In all EFRC areas being formed, are standard rates being charged?

MR. FARRAN:

No, they are not, Mr. Speaker. The rates of course have to be approved by the Public Utilities Board but there is no such thing as a flat rate which is uniform from one end of the province to the other. Even the monthly residential rates as they stand now vary from one telephone district to another and have for many years, as the hon. member probably knows from the days when he was Minister of Telephones.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In EFRC areas, are the flat rates charged based on the mileage the way the crow flies from the area to the central exchange, or on what criteria?

MR. FARRAN:

The Public Utilities Board approves the rates, but it is on a cost-of-service basis so it depends to a large degree on the number of subscribers linked. It is 30 miles as the crow flies between exchanges; this is correct. But there is a difference between the engineering requirements for, say, 180 subscribers and the engineering requirements for 500 subscribers.

MR. TAYLOR:

One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the EFRC areas that were composed several years ago between Calgary and Edmonton, will these rates be broken down in time or will there be an additional rate charged in view of the long distance?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, you could look at the program in two parts. In the rural areas they have the choice of one free-calling link. It is not really free-calling because it is substituted with a flat rate on the monthly bill. The other part is the metropolitan fringe areas around Calgary, Edmonton and Lethbridge for a 30-mile radius. The idea is to substitute a nominal monthly charge at both ends for the toll charge by the call.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Fish Creek Park

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is directed to the Minister of Lands and Forests. It is regarding a motion for a return that I asked for during the spring session regarding Fish Creek Park in Calgary and it was turned down because they said the land was still under negotiation. When is the government going to be in a position, Mr. Minister, to make all correspondence available on land purchases in that area?

DR. WARRACK:

Well, above all, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to report the very substantial progress we have made on that matter in acquiring the majority of land necessary for the park. I would suggest to the hon. member that if he would like to place that matter on the Order Paper we would be pleased to consider it.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the development at Fish Creek Park and the freezing of some 2,000 acres of land for development, what is the government doing to replace this portion by providing other 'developable' land in other sections of the city?

DR. WARRACK:

That is not within terms of the responsibility of the Department of Lands and Forests, Mr. Speaker. What the government did was, in some 2,850 acres to be more exact, go ahead with the procedure that made it possible to obtain that land for provincial park recreational purposes for all of the people of the city of Calgary.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that in so purchasing that land we would not at the same time, in standing ready to obtain it at fair market value, be responsible for the provision of substitute land for land we purchased at fair market value.

MR. YURKO:

I wonder if I might add something to the answer from our hon. colleague. We made a decision this year to table all the negotiations in terms of land purchases as a result of a request which was turned down last spring. The information is bound and ready to be tabled. However, we have to get the permission of the other parties to table that correspondence. This permission is being obtained and just as soon as it is obtained, all the correspondence back and forth - in terms of the purchase of the land - will be tabled. I suspect that it will probably be tabled in December.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Does all the correspondence include everything and not just correspondence on the actual land sales? What I would like is, right from the promotion of day one. Will all of that be included in this submission?

MR. YURKO:

It is the intent, Mr. Speaker, on land that has been purchased, to include pertinent correspondence between the minister and various sellers of the property. It is intended to include all the correspondence.

MR. SPEAKER:

We have time for just one further question. The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

DPW Projects (Cont.)

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Public Works. Can he advise if the DPW projects, as budgeted for, are proceeding on schedule, or are there some delays in moving some of the projects?

MR. SPEAKER:

With respect, the hon. member is really asking for detail with regard to various projects which should be asked for on the Order Paper.

MR. LUDWIG:

May I reword that? I am just concerned about major projects, which the minister probably would know about.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair has no idea how many projects may be involved. The hon. minister will know better whether this is the kind of detail which should be sought on a question on the Order Paper.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Office of the Premier

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I thought that members of the Assembly might find it useful if the government developed, to some extent, its plans and intentions with regard to the session of the Legislature commencing on December 3. There may be some misconceptions and I believe it is important to explain what the government's intentions are with regard to seeking the approval of the Legislature relative to certain government bills.

The purpose of the segment of the second session of the Seventeenth Alberta Legislature which we proposed by motion on the Order Paper to commence on December 3 would be, essentially, to deal with a legislative framework for those items requiring legislative concurrence. These are set forth in my statement made on October 4, 1973 which was tabled in this House on October 10 and, in particular, the necessary legislative approval to change The Mines and Minerals Act and any other applicable acts that deal with a maximum royalty provision.

Second, to establish, if legislative framework is required, the necessary provisions for a reference price approach which was referred to in the statement of October 4.

In addition, to repeal The Mineral Taxation Act as it exists today and replace it with a new freehold mineral taxation act so that the taxation of freehold minerals in the province is dealt with in an act separate from an act that involves both Crown and freehold production.

In short then, Mr. Speaker, the legislative program commencing on December 3 will involve amendments to The Mines and Minerals Act, the repeal of The Mineral Taxation Act, a new freehold taxation act, and The Arbitration Act which is presently on the Order Paper and deals with the important question of arbitration of natural gas disputes and commodity value of natural gas.

There could be, Mr. Speaker, other items of legislation regarding oil and gas that would be presented to the Legislature for approval. There may be, of course, a situation that, in the very short time period we're facing, we are not able to complete - as I mentioned in my statement of October 4 - the full overhaul of oil and gas legislation and that it will come in two parts, and that is in the portion of the second session commencing on December 3 and then again

in the spring session or the third session of the Seventeenth Alberta Legislature.

It will not be the intention of the government to have regulations involved or attached to the proposed legislation. There will be no royalty formula that will be presented to the December session. What will be sought is legislative approval of a new framework for oil and gas royalty and oil and gas legislation. When and if the Legislature so concurs we will then proceed to go to work as quickly as we can to establish the necessary regulations in accordance with the traditional practice in this province, with the hope that we can have new royalty schedules authorized by the Executive Council as early as possible in 1974.

We do not want to commit ourselves, because of the magnitude, to any particular date. All we can say is that the magnitude of these royalty regulations is such that it is only fair for us to consult as fully as we can through the Minister of Mines and Minerals with the affected lessees, and we intend to do that, and as has been answered already by myself in the House - with regard to a question raised to me by the Member for Calgary McCall - to welcome and consider any submissions by any interested groups that they would like to make, both with regard to the legislation and with regard to proposed royalties.

I just want to make it absolutely clear that it is not our intention that when we reassemble on December 3, or any period during December, to be in a position that the regulations are there or the royalty formula is there. We will seek the legislative framework in principle that is required to make the general moves that follow through on the policy statement of October 4.

Quite obviously the complexities of the incentive system also will not be prepared in time for the reassembling on December 3. They will hopefully be ready for regulation and Executive Council approval again as early as possible in 1974 and, hopefully, concurrently with the passage of regulations dealing with new oil and natural gas royalty formulas and provisions.

Mr. Speaker, I should just mention as a footnote that there will be some other business that is partly on the Order Paper and partly on 'leave to introduce', as mentioned in the Votes and Proceedings, that we will attempt to clean up during December.

I hope that this will give hon. members an opportunity to understand the basic intentions of the government with respect to the work we propose by way of government business when we reassemble on December 3.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, we welcome the indication from the Premier as to the business, or the approach the government will take, on the so-called energy session starting on December 3.

I would have to say this, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate very much that it may not be possible to have all the regulations or, in fact, the royalty formula completely spelled out, as far as regulations are concerned, for discussion by members of the Assembly at that time. But let me make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House are not enthused at all if we're being asked to become involved in a session where we're going to have legislation by regulation. The government of this province is now becoming more actively involved in the industry through the Alberta Energy Company and through its endeavours at Suffield, many of which we support.

Mr. Speaker, speaking as an individual, I would find it very, very difficult indeed to be called back for a session starting on December 3 to be asked to give carte blanche legislative approval to the government with no indication of what its regulations or royalties are going to be.

#### Northern Affairs

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to announce the appointment of members to the Northern Alberta Development Council.

Mr. Speaker, in September of 1973 the government requested nominations for the eight-member council which would be helping the government to plan and design practical programs affecting matters such as industry, transportation, education, agriculture, social programs and local administration in northern

Alberta. In considering the large number of nominations, Mr. Speaker, we decided to divide the North into seven areas to give the best possible geographic representation.

The members and the areas that they represent are as follows: Mr. Bob Duncan of Fort McMurray, representing the area described as McMurray-North; Mrs. Bertha Clark also of Fort McMurray, and she will represent the south Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche area; Mr. Ralph Steinhauer of Saddle Lake who will represent the area Bonnyville-St. Paul and Andrew; Mr. Ike Lawrence of High Prairie who will represent the Slave Lake-Whitecourt area; Mr. Len Pelland Jr. of McLennan who will be representing the Grande Prairie-Smoky River area; Mr. Jim Fletcher of Peace River who will be representing the Peace River town and Fairview west area; and Mr. Bill Napier of High Level who will represent the area north of Peace River.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that these appointments will be for a period of one year only. As Minister responsible for Northern Development, I will act as the chairman of the council.

I might point out also, Mr. Speaker, that a meeting of the new Northern Alberta Development Council will be convened in Peace River in the very near future, and one of the first items of business to be discussed will be transportation systems in northern Alberta.

Department of the Solicitor General

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to advise the members of this Assembly of the present status of the Impaired Driver Program, commonly called the Alberta Check Stop.

I believe it is also timely that I give credit where credit is due, and this is to my colleague, the Hon. Merv Leitch. I'm sorry, he is absent today. The hon. Attorney General expressed some of his deep concerns about impaired drivers in his speech in this House in the spring of 1972. I recall being very impressed by his concern. Since that time he initiated this present program. He encouraged its development and he was very involved in bringing it to its announcement stage. I'm sure he is as pleased as I am over the enthusiastic acceptance it has received to date. It is to the Hon. Merv Leitch, for his very positive action many months ago, that the plaudits need to go.

The public response to phase 1, which we call the awareness phase, has been extremely favourable and most of you are very aware of that portion.

The enforcement phase, which is phase 2, will begin on November 1, and my reason for speaking on the matter again today is to advise the hon. members of some of our follow-up advertising and, of course, to request their endorsement and support of phase 2.

Mr. Speaker, I will now embark on what, when the school kids do it, is called Show and Tell.

Posters of this type will be on display in various businesses across the province. Most of these you will see in magazines, so perhaps you are already familiar with them. This is one of the principal ones we will be using. These will be seen in the Alberta Liquor Control Board, in the offices of members of the Independent Insurance Agents' Association of Alberta, the Alberta Hotel Association, the Canadian Restaurant Association, automobile rental agencies, the Association of Industrial Safety Personnel, the Alberta Motor Association and service stations and other businesses which request them. I might say that our response from business and industry has been extremely enthusiastic.

Enclosures are being printed for insertion in liquor bags and beer boxes at outlets of the Alberta Liquor Control Board. We do not have the enclosures yet. They will look like this, but they will be in colour. It says, "Did you know, four drinks in two hours by a 150-pound person means a blood alcohol level of .086 per cent?" And another, "Did you know about breathalyzers?" It was my intention, Mr. Speaker, to have a copy for each member, but they are not yet ready.

Enclosures are also being planned for insertion and distribution to homes in the billings of utility companies, which is another way that industry has endorsed our plan and is anxious to cooperate with us.

The Check Stop signs for 120 Check Stops have been produced by the highways department and have been distributed to RCMP detachments and municipal police forces. I would suggest, hon. members, that you will see an increased police presence and an indication of these signs in 120 different areas throughout Alberta, commencing November 1. These are under the control of the local police detachments, city police or RCMP.

Last but not least, Mr. Speaker, the policemen doing the checking and the public of Alberta will thank the motorist by handing the driver one of these pamphlets. I would ask the pages if they would circulate them for me, please.

I'm sure the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury will be pleased to see that we took such fast action on his request.

The initial plan is intended for one year's duration, but we will be monitoring during the entire time to determine whether or not it is effective. Certainly it is our sincere wish that it will be.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would request the hon. members not only to endorse this project, but also to encourage the support of their constituents.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

#### WRITTEN QUESTIONS

281. Mr. Wyse asked the government the following question:

What is the total dollars the Alberta government received in fines collected for violations under The Canadian Wheat Board Act from September 1, 1971 to the present or to the latest date up to which figures are available?

DR. HORNER:

We agree to the question and move that it be made a motion for a return.

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

1. How many senior citizens in Alberta now receiving Old Age Security pensions, with or without guaranteed income supplements, are also in receipt of social assistance or social allowance of any kind from the Department of Health and Social Development?

2. What is the total amount of the payments being made through these allowances each month in 1973 for which figures are available?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to Question No. 282 and would like to table it.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. Deputy Premier, with regard to Question No. 281, suggested it become a motion for a return. Did he mean an order for a return under the rules?

DR. HORNER:

Sorry. Yes, an order for a return.

MR. WYSE:

I so move then, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

It's not necessary. It's an order now under our rules.

283. Mr. R. Speaker asked the government the following question:

1. How many pheasant hunting licences were sold to Albertans, to those outside Alberta but Canadian, and to non-Canadians for the 1973 hunting season?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the information isn't available in precisely the manner requested. However, we have done our best to bring as much of the precise information into the answer as we can and have it up to October 15, 1973, and I table that information.

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

With reference to The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Act Fund for the fiscal year 1971-72:

- (a) What is the total amount of fees collected?
- (b) What is the total amount of recoveries?
- (c) What is the total receipts?
- (d) How much was paid for ambulance services?
- (e) How much was paid for hospital and medical services?
- (f) How much was paid in claims?
- (g) What costs were incurred?
- (h) Were there any miscellaneous expenditures; if so, the amount of same and the general nature of same?
- (i) What is the total expenditure?
- (j) How much interest was earned?
- (k) What is the book value of securities including earned interest as at March 31, 1972?
- (l) How much cash was in the bank as at March 31, 1972?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I accept Question 284 and beg leave to table the answer.

#### MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the report of the Select Committee on House Rules.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

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

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, if the Committee has come to order, I realize it is not usual to have the Speaker present with the Committee in deliberations, but I understand we might consider that today for consideration of the House Rules.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I so move, Mr. Chairman.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Speaker entered the Assembly.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

I believe, also, some members felt that having the Acting Law Clerk, Mr. Bill Wood, here this afternoon might be of assistance insofar as he redrafted a number of the amendments which are proposed this afternoon. I believe Mr. Wood is available if someone could have him brought in.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, while we are waiting for Mr. Wood to come, by way of general remarks, first I suggest that the Committee should proceed further through this report. We're now at Section 12 concerning Introduction of Visitors, and a number of members have indicated they would like to proceed further on a clause-by-clause basis rather than simply a section-by-section basis, which I think would enable us to proceed more expeditiously.

Secondly, perhaps I should mention at this time that it is the government's intention, if this report is accepted, to establish next fall - that would be the fall of 1974 - something like a select evaluation committee of the Assembly for the purpose of assessing at that time how these rules have gone during the spring session and then make any recommendations, so that before they are made permanent - insofar as next year is an experimental year - we could assess how they had gone during the year of 1974.

[The Assistant Legislative Counsel, Mr. W. E. Wood, entered the Assembly.]

MR. CLARK:

We are quite agreeable to that procedure. Might I further add there has been a suggestion that in dealing with Section 12, the Introduction of Visitors, if we were to take the amendment of the member, Mr. French, which he has before us now, and then adhere rather firmly to it - I believe there have been some discussions with regard to people involved in this area - hopefully we might be able to move through that one, as long as there is a clear understanding by all the members that we clearly adhere to what the rules are.

It says, other than "... groups of school students with prior permission of the Speaker ..." as far as other guests are concerned. I think that may allow us to get around the problem, clearly recognizing - the members on both sides of the House - that the rule as we now have it would be enforced and that the operational portion is "with prior permission of the Speaker", other than for students.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Any further comments? We are on the amendment of Rule No. 12, moved by Mr. French.

[The amendment was agreed to.]

MR. HENDERSON:

Just a technicality, and I would presume the Legislative Counsel would deal with this. Obviously the amendment putting the old rule back in doesn't belong at this particular point in the rule book because we are dealing with the question about the Speaker's authorities here and maybe it would be better going back under Rule No. 5.

I just bring it up. But I presume there will be no objections to reorganizing the rules somewhat by Legislative Counsel later on.

[Rule No. 13 (1) through (6) were agreed to without debate.]

Rule No. 13 (7)

MR. STROM:

I have looked through the recommendations that have been made and I note in Chapter II on Rule No. 9 (1), "Mr. Speaker shall preserve order and decorum and shall decide questions of order ..." Now, the point I really want to make is in the matter of "order and decorum". It seems to me that there is a real danger of losing decorum simply by losing the approach that we use in addressing one another.

I for one, for many, many years, have felt that the system of referring to each other by our constituency is a good one. I think of times when we get into rather heated discussion and, at that point, I personally don't like it when we start using the individual's name because we are really dealing with a matter of an individual who is a representative of a particular area. In his responsibilities as that representative, he is taking certain action, he is saying certain things that, in my view, I would hate to think would reflect on my relationship when I step outside of this Legislative Assembly where I would then be prepared, maybe, to speak to him on a first-name basis. The action that I take in here is related to the position that he fills as a member of a certain constituency.

As I say, I looked through the rules and I don't see anywhere where it suggests that we refer to each other by the name, an hon. Member for the constituency of - whatever constituency he happens to represent. I would like to know whether any members of the committee had that point under consideration and whether they consider it worthwhile, because I really think it would make it easier for the hon. Speaker in maintaining order and decorum, and it would put it on a level where I think it ought to be when we get into areas of debate.

MR. AMERONGEN:

Mr. Chairman, this relates to another point that comes up occasionally - it occurred a number of times today - and that is, the use of the word "you". It is getting to the point sometimes where it seems perhaps we are in committee. I am wondering whether the memo which I sent around about this, earlier this year, was perhaps adequate. I have thought of following up on that. Notwithstanding the way it may appear to hon. members, I have a real reluctance to intervene or to interfere in what is going on in the House.

But we are, perhaps, as the hon. Member for Cypress mentioned, getting a little bit too slack in our language when we are debating in the House where, as I understand it, the members expect me to apply formal rules of debate very much for the reasons mentioned by the hon. Member for Cypress.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I don't take issue with the hon. Speaker and my hon. colleague, but when I read the Hansard in Ottawa, even the greatest parliamentarian ever known in Canada, the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker, was as recently as two or three weeks ago cautioned by Mr. Speaker to address the Chair. So sometimes when this happens in the heat of debate, it is not deliberate; it is something we are perhaps just not conditioned to too much.

When I sometimes address an hon. member by name, it isn't that I want to avoid the rules, but sometimes it is what comes to my mind. It is pretty hard to remember 75 constituencies. It is easy to remember the name, so it is a convenience.

I know the rules do now allow it, but I'd like to suggest that there be a great amount of flexibility in this regard unless someone meant it to be an affront or something. But generally, Mr. Chairman, it is unintentional. The person is not concentrating on these fine rules so much as making his point. I would point out that this does happen, but not deliberately. So sometimes I believe in a bit of laxity and, rather than interrupt a member who used somebody's name, it would be preferable if he was permitted to use the name unless he made a practice of it.

It is just my recommendation, particularly based on Beauchesne, that everything possible should be done to permit a person to express himself as freely as possible, providing it doesn't flagrantly violate the rules. That's just my personal opinion on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Any further discussion?

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to voice my view on the flexibility and what it brings about. There are times, of course, when perhaps the hon. Speaker has been very easy with the conduct in the House, and certainly if it has been very lax it has not perhaps been intentional. I think the greater the flexibility, the greater the laxity becomes over a period of time, perhaps without intention. I think, when heated debate takes place, that flexibility and laxity become something less than what is desirable for the decorum of this House.

I would not like to see the flexibility stretched even to the point that it has been at this time. I think there have been times when it has been far too great. I think we have to reflect, when citizens-at-large come to observe the conduct of the members they have elected and hold rather highly, that if they witness some of the kinds of conduct, although perhaps unintentional, that have taken place in this House, the language that has become so lax in this House, this takes away a great deal from the prestige or the office that we are elected to hold here.

So therefore, from my view, I would like to see perhaps at times even a bit less flexibility. There may be some flexibility, but I think we have been stretching it far and I wouldn't like to see it go any farther.

MR. STROM:

I hesitate to raise it again, but I would like to know whether the committee gave any consideration to making it a rule that a member ought to be addressed by his constituency rather than by his name when the Speaker is in the Chair? I appreciate the informality that we use in Committee and I don't object to informality as long as it doesn't interfere with the decorum of the House. I am convinced that in the kind of debate that we can get into that it is of value to have some rules relating to decorum.

Maybe I'm being rather sticky, but after observing over a great many years, that is one point that I have appreciated whenever it has been enforced. I certainly want to say to the hon. Speaker that I think this is something that becomes difficult for him, unless we're prepared to give him some guidelines.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Chairman, the matter was not raised in the committee and was not considered in the deliberations. In fact nobody brought it to our attention before we had our hearings. It probably could have been considered, but it wasn't.

I note that it isn't included in the general rules in Beauchesne. It is referred to in the annotations. But the committee didn't really take any consideration of this suggestion of Mr. Strom's.

MR. AMERONGEN:

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that we leave the situation as it is. It's clearly parliamentary tradition that one doesn't use the word "you" in debate in the Assembly or when sitting as an Assembly, neither does one use another member's name. Once in a while it slips out. Perhaps it has become too common in this Assembly and for that I think the Speaker has to accept the blame with a promise of reform.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee I would like to express my personal view which is basically in accord with that expressed by the hon. Member for Cypress. It would be preferable, in my view, and would add to the decorum if we could, as members, observe that form of recognition and address at all times during debates.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just refer to Beauchesne on the matter raised by the hon. Member, Mrs. Chichak. I subscribe to this view expressed in Beauchesne. It's Rule 119. It says:

One of the main functions of the House consists in debating public issues, a function which can only be filled by complete freedom of speech. There will always be contests between groups and parties, minority and majority, and, in the debates that follow, the rules of procedure are all-important. Delays, multiplicity of amendments and even obstruction must not always be regarded as illegitimate political weapons. Rules of absolute rigidity have no place in the House of Commons.

And I want to read one more:

... A great deal of latitude must be allowed in the House of Commons which is a forum where every phase of public affairs can be discussed and every Member has the right to be heard, even if in doing so he sometimes disregards the rigidity of procedure.

I want to just make the point that my view is that sometimes we're not all experts, we're not all so steeped in the knowledge of rules that we can live rigidly within them. I take the position that the decisions are much easier to arrive at if a person can express himself without being bound rigidly by the strict rules. In my opinion, in my study of Beauchesne, a Speaker can rule out every question on some decision or rule that had previously been made. But this is not done. So, I commend the present Speaker for having been understanding, but I state that if a Speaker wanted to be rigid and enforce rules strictly it would, in my opinion, inhibit debate.

I believe that this statement in Beauchesne is something that has developed through centuries of tradition in the British House of Commons which is a lot more lax than perhaps anything we have in Canada. And that is the Mother of Parliaments, Mr. Chairman.

Just a comment I wanted to make as to what I think is the proper approach.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Member for Cypress. In my view, the laxity of the rules in a moment of the heat of debate is not what we're talking about. I think when one sits and witnesses, it's the day-to-day use of the first person in the question period that is a bad habit to get into. I think when one, instead of speaking to the Chair, speaks to the member across the floor, it puts the Speaker more in the position of being a referee because the situation is far more likely to get out of hand.

In my own experience speaking to the Chair, even when you're steamed up, there is far less likelihood of getting into a real hassle with the gentlemen on the opposite side. I think the point raised is well taken. The use of the first person in debate has gone too far. Adherence to the general tradition of using the member's seat certainly is correct and I think should be preserved.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, this raises a point in regard to referring to ministers. Usually when we're doing that we refer to "The Minister of Agriculture, The Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs ..." Does that mean then that we have to refer to them by their constituencies rather than by their ministry?

Further, I would suggest then that when using this method of referring to an hon. member by his or her constituency, possibly we should have maps or seating plans set out on our desks for quick reference when we're in debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well, we'll continue on Chapter 3, Rules ...

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to add a word or two to what the hon. Member for Cypress said and particularly what the hon. Member for Norwood had said. I think habit becomes the norm. She has pointed out if we're flagrantly breaking the rules then it becomes normal and then we're going to go farther than that. As the two hon. members have mentioned, if we stick fairly strictly to this rule, I think we're going to be the better for it.

MR. STROM:

I would like to make a point in closing as far as I'm concerned. I didn't move an amendment. I didn't want to.

I would say that for those of us who have been around for a very long time, like myself, we are maybe bound by tradition. I'm not going to argue that tradition is the thing that should bind us to anything. But I wanted to raise this so that it would be something that the members would think about, because I'm sure we are all interested in helping the hon. Speaker to maintain order and decorum in debate.

[Rule No. 14 was agreed to.]

[Rules Nos. 15 through 17 were agreed to.]

Rule No. 18

MR. KING:

I think that there's just one typographical error. Rule 18(1)(a) should read: "... immediately after the orders of the day ...", rather than, "... immediately before ...".

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Chairman, if I might revert to No. 14; "Every member desiring to speak is to rise, uncovered ... ." Now, you'd better say what you're going to uncover.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Buckwell, that's been agreed upon. You'll just have to watch for the uncovering.

Rule 18, we have an amendment.

MR. RUSTE:

Has the amendment been moved?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Not yet. I'm just waiting for Rule 18.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Agriculture that Rule 18 be struck out and substituted as per the amendment which has been circulated, I believe, to all members earlier today.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, on Rule 18, when you get down to 2(b), is it my understanding that there is a cut-off here as to when debate quits here. At 2:00 o'clock?

AN HON. MEMBER:

In the morning?

MR. RUSTE:

In the morning, yes.

My question is, is there a possibility that something could be introduced, we'll say, at 1:00 a.m. and that would, in effect, limit debating time on this matter?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I understand that the amendment simply applies the advice of the law clerk to a more intelligent setting forth of what is now in 20 single-spaced sentences into one sentence and has been with this Legislature ever since it began in 1905 - that is, in effect, a closure at 2:00 o'clock in the morning.

I don't know whether it has ever been used but perhaps the fact that it has never been used demonstrates that it is properly drawn. In any event the Section 18 as it now appears in Volume 2 reads like one of my speeches. It goes on for 20 lines without an end. Therefore the redrafting is that of the law clerk - to improve clarity.

MR. KING:

I would still like to ask the law clerk if there is an additional typographical error even in the amendment. I am not quite sure how you can proceed with closure before the order on which you are going to close is called. I think you proceed with closure after the order is called.

I think it should read "... immediately after the order of the day ...".

MR. CHAIRMAN:

We will just have Mr. Wood's comment on that.

MR. WOOD:

That seems to be an acceptable change to me from my understanding of what actually happens.

MR. KING:

I thought it was a typographical error.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The subamendment moved by Mr. King and seconded by Mr. Gitter?

[The subamendment was agreed to.]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The amendment as moved by Mr. Hyndman and seconded by Dr. Horner?

[The amendment to Rule 18(1) was agreed to.]

[Rules Nos. 18(2) through 19(3) were agreed to.]

Rule No. 19 (4)

MR. KING:

Mr. Chairman, sorry, one other slight problem. If we go back to Section 19(4), something that I am just considering now, it provides that a minister of the Crown who has moved second or third reading of a bill has the right of reply, that is, he can close debate on second or third reading of a bill which he has introduced. It doesn't provide the same right to other members who may be introducing public bills other than government bills.

I think it should read, "... and to a member, who has moved the Order of the Day for second or third reading of a Bill ...", rather than restricting it to ministers of the Crown.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The discussion here at the Chair is that the member would include "Minister" and anyone making the motion. We will revert to Rule No. 19(4). Will you make that amendment, Mr. King?

MR. KING:

If that is how you would like to proceed, I will move an amendment to Section 19(4) to delete the words "Minister of the Crown" and replace them with the single word "member", which could include any minister of the Crown.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

That has been moved by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Benoit.

[Rule No. 19(4) was agreed to as amended.]

[Rules Nos. 20 through 22 were agreed to without debate.]

---

Rule 23

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Section 23, we have some amendments proposed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, there is a rewrite of the entire Section 23 dealing with speaking times and setting forth essentially four situations where there are differing speaking times.

Under Clause (a), unlimited speaking time would be allowed the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the Provincial Treasurer on the occasion of the Budget Address, and "the mover in debate on a bill proposing substantive amendment to more than one statute", which would refer to what we commonly call an omnibus bill where there is a substantive amendment. Those persons would have unlimited speaking time.

Clause (b) relates to the privileges of a mover in debate on a resolution or a bill. This would be a public bill either introduced by the government or by a private member, which bill proposes to create a new statute or amend another statute. In that case that person would have 30 minutes in speaking after having opened the debate and 30 minutes in closing the debate.

Under Clause (c), relating to substantive amendments to more than one statute, a member other than the mover would have 40 minutes speaking time, on the philosophy that because more than one statute is involved perhaps members would feel constrained by the next rule in their time for debate.

And clause (d) is the general rule which sets forth 30 minutes as a general rule for speaking time in debate on a resolution or a bill. Members will recall the previous rules of the House said 40 minutes and the committee recommended 20 minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Could I have a motion to move this amendment, Mr. Minister?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I so move, seconded by the Minister of Public Works.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Any debate on this motion?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to propose an amendment to the amendment in Clause (d) which strikes out the word "thirty" and replaces it with the word "twenty". In my mind if we are just going to leave it at thirty I don't know why we bothered changing the rule essentially from the way it now stands.

I think I became convinced sitting on the other side of the House some years ago - in spite of the fact I am probably one of the leading offenders in taking the time of the House and speaking on any subject, as I am doing now - I still stand convinced that 20 minutes debate on principle on the substantial majority of bills, other than the omnibus bills, is adequate for members to deal with it.

I can't help but contrast the attitude that the amendment - not my subamendment, but the amendment - reflects in stating "30 minutes" to what I witnessed on the other side of the House last year. I thought it looked like a real well-oiled machine, you know. Each new member was standing up very snappily and stating his case, about 15 minutes. I almost thought that there must have been an edict issued inside the Conservative caucus that 15 minutes was it, don't follow the bad example of those long-winded Social Creditors.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

And now I find that apparently there has been a change in attitude on the part of some of the members seated opposite who weren't on the committee, and they are more inclined to favour verbosity, I guess, than they were last year. I realize there is no particular logic involved in picking the number of minutes attached to it, but I suggest the recommendation of the committee regarding 20 minutes for debate on principle on the substantial majority of bills is adequate. If we are just going to stick to 30 in there I think we might as well stay where we are because I don't think we can significantly affect the rules under which the House is operating in any way, shape or form that is going to streamline and expedite the business before the House.

I accordingly move, Mr. Chairman, that the word "thirty" where it appears in clause (d) be struck out and replaced with the word "twenty".

I don't need a seconder in committee, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The motion is quite clear. Any debate on it? Mr. Benoit, followed by Mrs. Chichak.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Chairman, in light of the fact that we are going to be using this for one session on a trial basis before we make our final commitment, and in light of the fact that there has been considerable opposition to the originally-suggested 20 minutes, I think that I am in favour of defeating the amendment and staying with what we have before us.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

That is, defeating the subamendment, Mr. Benoit?

MR. BENOIT:

Yes.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Chairman, I likewise would have to rise and speak against the subamendment. I have to call to mind the times in which 20 minutes would just not allow us to present the kind of debate that is necessary to put forward, or express on behalf of our constituents, those concerns that one must bring forth to the Legislature.

I am not referring to debate which is really not a concise and very full kind of debate, where there is debate for the sake of debate. I am referring to times when it is necessary to bring the real issues before the House, before this Legislature.

I think since the report of the committee on rules was made available to us, some members in this Legislature have taken a careful account of the time taken by various members in the House to present a constructive debate, trying to take into consideration what aspects, or what part of that debate might have been left out that really did not add to the points being raised. There have been instances where really there could not have been anything taken out of some of this debate that would have minimized the speaking time. It seems that the record has indicated that out of necessity the time has gone over 20 minutes by 10 and 12 and perhaps 15 minutes. Although I think that 40 minutes is perhaps more than ample, 20 minutes would really not provide the kind of time that is necessary to bring issues on matters such as energy, on matters with respect to the spring session when one is debating the Speech from the Throne, on matters of resolution where you must bring very constructive kinds - or feel you must bring to this House - the constructive issues.

I feel that 20 minutes is just not long enough, and I would rather stay with the amendment as it is being proposed, and would have to vote against the subamendment.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Chairman, speaking in favour of the subamendment, I wish to point out to the hon. members one particular thing that has occurred over the years. There has been an expansion of the number of constituencies we now have in the

Legislature. It can be anticipated, as the population grows, that this trend will increase. There is much that can be said in amplifying remarks, but frankly Mr. Speaker, I think if it can't be said in 20 minutes, it shouldn't be said at all because in reality there is a lot that can be said. If you analyse the gist of the average 40-minute speech you will find there is a sort of double-stuffing process going into the chicken.

There is this reason and several others. One is the opportunity for involvement. You only have a very limited amount of time available, and there may well be members who have contributions to make toward a debate, but because of the verbosity, the long-windedness of some hon. members - and I may include or exclude myself, depending on the circumstances - the opportunity is not presented. Beautiful words of wisdom that might well change the whole spectrum of the thinking of the province of Alberta are lost to posterity forever!

So I submit that 20 minutes is adequate.

MR. ANDERSON:

My good friend said just about everything I was going to say, but I'm in favour of this subamendment. I think if members do their homework and come here and talk to us for 20 minutes, we will listen. But if they are going to sit and ramble for half to three-quarters of an hour, if they look around they are talking to themselves. I would just wish that this "20 minutes" goes in and that we come prepared and say what we're going to in 20 minutes. Then people will listen to us.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I'm afraid I must most regretfully differ with my friends on this side of the House. Unaccustomed as I am to agreeing with my colleagues across the floor, I do think there is a good argument for the 30 minutes.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, on most bills we don't really have members taking the full 40 minutes in any case. The only time 40 minutes are normally used is when we have the omnibus bills where we are dealing with perhaps four or five major acts that are being changed. I understand that provision is made for that in the rules. Also, the time when members normally take the maximum is during the Speech from the Throne or the Budget Debate, where quite properly they may have a number of important issues they want to bring to the attention of the Assembly.

It's on the Budget Debate and the Speech from the Throne debate that I think the 30 minutes is a good compromise. I felt, before, that a 40-minute rule was probably reasonable because if you spoke any longer than 40 minutes, you lost your audience completely. I think that 30 minutes allows enough opportunity to make whatever points the individual member wishes to place before the Assembly.

I'm inclined to agree with Mrs. Chichak that 20 minutes is just a little cramped if you are trying to cover more than two or three subjects. I don't think that we would want to inhibit debate in any way.

I must say that I have to place myself in a little different position as the left-wing member of the left-right caucus in the House. Sometimes I think there are occasions when a point of view needs to be expressed, and that expression may take more than 20 minutes. That's not always going to be the case by any means, but I think that 30 minutes is a reasonable trade-off between the rule as it presently applies and the proposal of 20 minutes.

Certainly on omnibus bills we are talking about a different state of affairs. If we are going to deal with five or six acts that are being repealed and incorporated in an omnibus bill, 40 minutes may be necessary.

But I just conclude my remarks by saying that I don't really think the length of speeches has been a problem in this House. It's a very rare occasion when members, except on general debates, take the full 40 minutes. Usually we are looking at speeches of 10 or 15 minutes and sometimes even less. So why, under those circumstances, should we put a ceiling of 20 minutes which may, from time to time, inhibit a member from making some points that, in his or her judgment, need to be made? I believe that 30 minutes is a reasonable compromise and I support it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Dr. Buck, do you wish to say something briefly?

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, very briefly. There is an old saying the preachers have, that no soul is saved after 20 minutes of the sermon.

I believe that at the university we can divide the university - and practically the entire world - into two groups, the arts men and the science men. The arts men are the ones who go on and on and on and on, like the lawyers and the ones who like to think they are lawyers. They go on with great verbosity, whereas the true science men who try to do it by point form, do it - bang, bang, bang, by points.

So if you are to limit your debates to 20 minutes, I genuinely believe what the hon. Member for Lethbridge East had to say, that there would be more preparation if you knew you had to condense everything into 20 minutes. I think we are all guilty of spending the first 10 minutes on the preamble and then we give the speech in the next 10 or 20 minutes.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see it 20 minutes.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one or two brief comments too. I can't see why we want to change it from the 30 minutes. Those who want to speak just 20 minutes can still do it. We are not interfering with their rights. If a member wants to expand something and deal with a number of things in his constituency in the Throne debate, or deal with a number of items in the Budget debate, surely 30 minutes isn't out of the way. So let's compromise by going 30 minutes and then these chaps can speak 20 minutes.

MR. LEE:

I would like to speak for the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Lee, for the subamendment?

MR. LEE:

Yes. As many members on the other side have said, we have a number of members in the House now and I feel personally that it is an imposition for any particular member to go beyond 20 minutes. I would like to remind the House that we do have a score of opportunities to present our position on a particular topic. We have both second reading and committee to present a position on bills. We have the Throne and Budget speech, Estimates and resolutions.

I think that on positions other than this, where we are prepared perhaps for a particular debate, our position would be one of an extemporaneous kind of intervention. As the Member for Lethbridge has said, after a while you find out that you are sort of talking to yourself. I have found in the House here that when a number of people speak on a particular motion or resolution, after a while they are speaking to themselves and they are repeating positions that have already been presented by other members.

I would like to align myself with the subamendment and say that since we do have 75 members now, perhaps we can limit it to 20 minutes and have more clear-cut room for debate.

DR. BOUVIER:

I would like to align myself against the subamendment, because I don't feel it is the length of time that members speak that takes up the time of the House - it's the frequency with which some members speak. If a member has nothing to say in the first place, whether he takes 20 minutes or 30 minutes to say it, doesn't make much difference because he still has said nothing. This is what takes the time of the House. But when you do have something to say, I feel you should have at least 30 minutes in which to say it.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

In dealing with this matter, as one who doesn't get up too often to express himself in this House, I remember that during a political campaign my adversary, who was quite formidable - I won't mention his party - when he got through speaking asked his colleague, right in public, what he thought of his speech. He said, "It was short." He said, "Yes, I make it a point not to be tedious." The friend replied, "Yes, but you were."

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that we should stick to the 30-minute rule. Some members can express themselves effectively, quickly and to the point, and some cannot. The more experienced ones can, and some cannot. I believe some members who are perhaps not as capable should be given the opportunity to make their point. There are different levels of education, there are different levels of experience, and I am speaking for some of those who are perhaps not able to marshal their ideas together and prepare speeches. For those people the 30 minutes, if they need it, gives them an opportunity to express themselves as fully as they can on a particular issue.

I know there are a lot of professionals here. I am not saying lawyers are any exception to long-windedness, but some people can make their point in 10 minutes and some need more. We should tolerate this problem. As some members have expressed, those who want to make their points who are experienced and capable, will find other means of expressing themselves and still take the time they need. So you are not curtailing the person who, perhaps, gets up often.

Some MLAs who want to speak on behalf of their constituencies get up once during the session to make a speech, and you are going to bring him down in 20 minutes. They are entitled to make a speech and they need more than 20 minutes. Twenty isn't very much. I would like to oppose the subamendment.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. KING:

I would just like to ask if the hon. member, since he has declared a vested interest in the question we are considering, can vote on it?

MR. HENDERSON:

I would like to close the debate. I have a few more relevant remarks to make.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Not yet. A couple of members wish to speak.

Mr. Young.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I have some concern and would prefer the 20 minutes in terms of the kinds of speeches which I think will fall within this particular rule. There are a number of exceptions provided. However, I do recognize it is a major move from 40 minutes to 20 minutes. Since this is a one-year trial period, I would be happy to try it at 30 minutes and see the results of that experiment.

MR. GHITTER:

I would like to make a few comments. I am a little surprised in a sense, from the point of view of members of the opposition, and speaking as a backbencher. There are times - they may not happen very often - when an hon. member who is not in the front row, for example, might want that opportunity to go on at a little further length. Although it seldom happens - and I think that the members are concerned about the time of the House - I don't think this is any time-saving situation at all, because somehow we fill up the time in here. I don't know how we do it. It just means we will have one more speaker and it will go on and on.

But I am always concerned about the limiting of debate. I know you don't judge a good address by the length of it. Many say, if you can't say it in 10 minutes don't say it at all. But I think that when you consider some of the things we are debating in the House, and sometimes the infrequency of

opportunity - I disagree with the member immediately behind me about the frequency of opportunities, because I think there may be frequency of opportunities in the front bench but from the point of view of opposition, and maybe backbenchers, that frequency of opportunity doesn't occur as often as we might like.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. GHITTER:

I think there are times when 20 minutes just isn't long enough for trying to get a point across. Now we are suggesting cutting the time in half - from 40 to 20 - and that is just too much. I think we have to go on the good will of the members of the House, that they will try to do their best within the time limit allotted. I think most times the speeches go for 10, 12 and maybe 15 minutes and that is all. But for the odd occasion when someone feels strongly and they want to present a point of view, I think it would be a very bad mistake on the part of the legislation to say, no, we're going to put him down to 20 minutes. Because I don't think a lot of things can be developed, in the way a member may want them to be, in that short a period of time.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Before we vote on the subamendment, the hon. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark would like to say something.

MR. AMERONGEN:

This is partly selfish. It seems to me that one of the hardest rules to apply is the rule concerning relevance. I would think that with 20-minute speeches, that rule would be a lot easier to apply. I think there is also a trend in parliaments and legislatures towards shorter time limits, including Ottawa, where this was dealt with at some length by a committee dealing with the rules there. I realize it would take longer to prepare a 20-minute speech than to prepare a 40-minute speech on many topics.

That reminds me of a story of the old Roman. He was a science man and he wrote a long letter to his friend, and at the end of it he said, "I'm sorry, I didn't have enough time to write you a short letter."

Now one thing I think would be of interest to private members is that with a 20-minute limit it may be a lot more difficult to talk out a resolution or a motion that someone might be reluctant to see come to a vote.

I think we are overlooking the substantial exceptions in the rule, and also the fact that it is only for a trial period. If it doesn't work it can be changed. If it were a substantial detriment it could be changed even before the trial period was over.

Finally, I would think that a shorter time limit would increase the frequency of opportunity for members to speak more than it is now.

MR. HENDERSON:

I just want to say another word or two on the matter. The Member for Edmonton Meadowlark has covered some of the points I wanted to cover. I can only say it is my extreme disappointment to find as many liberals in the crowd as there are. I think the words of the Member for Calgary Buffalo, rising to fill the time available, are relevant and I am sure this guy Parkinson obviously was a public employee and was probably a court reporter at some time, or a house reporter or something.

There is no doubt about it, we do use the time that is available. Of course, I don't accept the argument that most of us speak only 15 or 20 minutes, because obviously the rule isn't aimed at those people. The rule is aimed at those who carry on at greater length.

I stand convinced, having sat on the back benches on that side and having sat on this side, that 20 minutes is adequate to get your point across. There are ample opportunities during study of Estimates and so forth to make the

points. I think that in the longer speeches, significant points are often lost in an exercise of trying to separate the wheat from the chaff.

With regard to the point about the trial year, obviously if we are going to try - it's a trial year - to make some meaningful changes in the rule, this is the year to do it and to go the 20 minutes. Because in my mind that is the best reason for saying, let's try the 20 minutes. If we think it is too short at the end of the year we can lengthen it back out to 30. But I venture to guess that once we change the rules, we try it for a year and then after that the rules will sit for another ten years before they get looked at again. So I think the period of 20 minutes is adequate. I can only hope that - as I say, there is no logic in anybody's opinion as to what's adequate or inadequate. I hope that the members would demonstrate that they're prepared to vote their own personal convictions and there is no party vote on this particular issue because I'm quite certain that anybody with any element of logical thinking will have to agree with my subamendment.

[The subamendment was defeated.]

[The amendment was carried.]

Rule No. 24

MR. KING:

I'm sorry, I thought you would call the subsections as well. In 24 (2) we have one slight problem. In the third-last line it says " ...or at the hour of five-thirty o'clock p.m., whichever shall be first." According to earlier rules we have adopted, we don't adjourn at 5:30 o'clock on Friday afternoon and so I think that the words "hour of five-thirty o'clock p.m." should be deleted and replaced with the words "normal hour for the conclusion of the afternoon sitting of the House", otherwise we might be here for quite a while on Friday.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Do you want to make that amendment? I'm sorry, I was supposed to take it clause by clause. Section 24, Clause 2 - do you have an amendment, Mr. King?

MR. KING:

Right. I would move that in the third-last line of Rule No. 24 (2) the words "hour of five-thirty o'clock p.m." be deleted and replaced with the words "normal hour for the conclusion of the afternoon sitting of the House," so that it reads " ...the debate will conclude when all members who wish to take part have spoken, or at the normal hour for the conclusion of the afternoon sitting of the House, whichever shall be first."

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Any further questions on that amendment?

MR. BENOIT:

Does he mean by that that normal closing in the afternoon would be maybe 11:00 o'clock at night?

MR. KING:

Starting at 8:00 o'clock. I hope we're into the evening sittings of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Benoit, that subamendment is with regard to the afternoon.

[The subamendment was carried.]

[Rule No. 24 (2) as amended, and (3) were agreed to.]

[Rules Nos. 25, 26, 27, and 28 were agreed to without debate.]

Rule No. 29

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I would move that Standing Order No. 29 be struck out and the following substituted therefor. The amendment has been circulated to all members of the House; seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight.

[Rule No. 29 (1) as amended was agreed to.]

[Rule No. 29 (2) through (4) were agreed to without debate.]

Rule No. 29 (5)

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, there is a part in here referring to, "Any return, report or other paper required to be laid before the Assembly in accordance with an Act..." and it goes on to say it "... shall be tabled in two copies for placement in the records of the Assembly and with the Legislative Library."

Isn't it a custom that one of these, or a copy of these reports has gone to the office of the opposition as well, for their information?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is the mover or the seconder prepared to answer that?

MR. KING:

I'm not sure that I followed him but I think perhaps he should read both Clause 5 and Clause 6 together, because Clause 5 deals with information which is ordered by the Assembly as a whole, rather than information which a particular member of the Assembly wants and asks for as a question and a return.

Questions and returns are dealt with in Clause 6 and it says that the member who asks for it gets a copy in that case. Otherwise, if there is no particular individual interested, the idea is just to deposit it in such a place that any member of the House can see it, but without going into the cost of duplication.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, my point was that I understood this refers to any return or report that is tabled by requirement of legislation and so on. I feel that one copy of this should go to the opposition office as well.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I don't think the proposition is unreasonable. Maybe the Leader of the Opposition expressed his views because we get into a tremendous duplicity of filing things in this particular building. I know, from the short time I was Leader of the Opposition, we just don't have the office staff to keep effective orderly filing systems to deal with the tremendous number of reports and so on that are tabled.

I think the amendments that are proposed here - this one and others which say that things being tabled that aren't asked for shouldn't be distributed around the building unnecessarily - are, I think, sound ones.

I think if anybody wants this particular information he can simply ask for it and probably get a copy of it. We should let it go at that.

[Rule No. 29 (5) as amended was agreed to.]

[Rule No. 29 (6) as amended was agreed to without debate.]

[Rule No. 29 (7) as amended was agreed to.]

[Rules No. 30, 31 and 32 were agreed to without debate.]

Rule No. 33

MR. HENDERSON:

I would just like, on 33, to bring to the attention of the members, so they are aware of the significance of the amendment, that it removes the requirement

for seconding any bill or resolution when the Speaker is in the Chair or in committee in the House. That requirement has been removed completely from the rules. The motion, in this particular copy, doesn't bring it to the attention of the members but that, in effect, is the consequence of the change in the rule.

[Rules No. 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41 and 42 were agreed to without debate.]

Rule 43 (1)

MR. KING:

Just one minute. We almost achieved a great coup d'etat right there. Hon. members should be aware that Standing Order 42 (11) is one of the instances of correction. So actually, what was being approved - I would have liked to have thought - would have been the uncorrected version, but that is not the case. We should be dealing now with the memo that came from Mr. Young, the Acting Chairman of the Committee and we should be looking at the page at the bottom of which are the words, "volume 2, (15) substitute." That was the page we should have been dealing with.

MR. BENOIT:

In which there is no (11)?

MR. KING:

Exactly.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, while the hon. members are locating that particular page, it would be useful to express that with approval of Section 42, there will now be no votes in subcommittees when dealing with the Estimates. I draw that to the members' attention in case it was missed.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, while we're finding out where we are. I wonder if either the Acting Chairman or Chairman of the Committee or the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark would like to deal with Section 43, and the question with which we very often have had a problem within the Assembly, and that is when the Chairman's ruling ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

We must finish Section 42, Mr. Clark.

MR. CLARK:

I'm sorry, I'm moving along too quickly.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No, I had read out Clause 11 and I realize I didn't have the correct copy until Mr. King brought it to my attention. So there is no Clause 11.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CLARK:

Dealing with Section 43. Several times during the last two years we've had a procedural wrangle in here when the Chairman's ruling is challenged when we're in committee. As I read Section 43, this is the section which pretty clearly sets out this situation.

I'd like to ask either the Acting Chairman of the Committee, or the resident expert, or someone to deal with this particular section so that in the course of the next year we don't find ourselves in that kind of bind, as we have on more than one occasion.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Chairman, this is rather difficult to approach, but Section 2 - and I realize this puts a tremendous strain on the Chairman - to me this is where most of our troubles come in, where we're not strictly relevant to the item or the clause under consideration. To me this is one of the bad features, maybe, in the committee where things might get a little out of hand. We almost go through the whole gamut of a bill or somebody's antecedents, rather than sticking to ... I think this Section 2 here - maybe we could take this to heart and it would save a whole lot of time in the House.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, it is usually customary to raise the matter of relevancy when someone else is speaking, but I have a quotation here from Beauchesne which I think deals with this point very well. It states here on page 111 - it's the tail-end of Rule 119:

Relevancy is not easy to define. A wrong comprehension of it may have a serious effect on the freedom of speech. Members are often deprived of their right to speak on the pretext that their remarks are irrelevant when as a matter of fact they refer to matters perhaps remote but yet related, even indirectly, to the question under debate. In border line cases the Member should be given the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to state on the matter of relevancy, that an effort should be made to try to understand the point of view of the person speaking. In his own mind he may be relevant even though for someone who may not have heard all of his remarks, or have thought along the lines that the member is speaking, it easy to restrict him, strictly, to relevancy.

I appreciate the manner in which the hon. Speaker has been interpreting this rule to give it a wide latitude so that perhaps the member speaking may be given a chance to express himself even though he may not be strictly relevant. On strict ruling of relevancy, many members may just not be able to express themselves. They may want to elaborate a bit more and I believe this rule in Beauchesne explains the difficulty. Perhaps a preferable attitude is, where possible, to give it a broad interpretation.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, I'll take a shot at No. 43 and the questions raised by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

The rule as set out in 43 (4) would, I believe, clarify that in the event the decision of the Chairman in committee should be challenged, the challenge is put to a decision of the Assembly and not to the Speaker. The Speaker is called in to the Assembly if he is present, otherwise the chairman of the particular committee or Deputy Speaker would take the Chair and it would simply be a decision of the Assembly on report from the committee through the Chairman of the Committee on the issue.

MR. CLARK:

The follow-up to that is then, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member, what in fact constitutes a challenge? And we get down to the very nitty gritty. Is it five members, is it 15 members?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I think simply the procedure is what we got hung up on last time and I'd refer to one word in line 2 in subsection (4). It says, "In case of an appeal to the House ...", and I think it's commonly accepted this appeal is just on the part of one member, to challenge a ruling, or the motion that the Chairman do now leave the Chair, constitutes a challenge. And I draw the committee's attention to the word "shall" - "the Chairman shall leave the Chair ...". That's where we got hung up in the past. It makes it plain that this is the mandatory procedure that must be followed in dealing with the matter.

MR. CLARK:

It's nice to nod our heads, but just so we are rather clear on this, that one member can stand up and say to the Chairman of the Committee, I challenge your ruling. Then you move that the Chairman leave ...

MR. HYNDMAN:

Then he automatically leaves the Chair.

MR. CLARK:

The Chairman automatically leaves. Right.

MR. KING:

Mr. Chairman, just so we can be clear about this, and I see the Speaker is listening very clearly. It is sufficient for a single member to challenge a decision of the Chairman and to make that observation, either just to get up and say, I challenge the decision of the Chairman, or I would like to appeal the decision of the Chairman. But the committee - there still has to be a resolution then, there still has to be a motion that the committee rise and report and beg leave to sit again, because any time the committee ceases its deliberations, it has to be upon that kind of a motion.

Now I think what has grown up over years and years and years of practice is what is stated here, that as a member has the right of the individual when one person challenges the Chair for every member of the House, just as a matter of course, then the motion is made that you rise and report progress. It happens automatically when a single person appeals but it still has to be done that way.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, one of the procedures under the old rules, if you wanted to have a recorded vote, was to appeal the ruling of the Chairman even though it was very evident that everybody understood what the vote had been. That procedure brought the Speaker in and then we had a recorded vote and whoever was objecting was able to get the votes recorded in the record of Votes and Proceedings.

Now as I see it here, this does away with that altogether and so there is no way that you can get a recorded vote under the rules as presently before us.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, in the tentative committee it was exactly the opposite. It was to make it plain that the procedure was applicable and would still apply. This is exactly what it does. If you recall, Mr. Chairman, and I say, Mr. Chairman, quite literally in this case. There was some difficulty in convincing the Chairman to leave the Chair a time or two in the last few months. This is where the confusion arose and the committee felt we should include the appropriate wording from sections in Beauchesne which spells out the procedure.

So if the member appeals the Chairman's ruling or challenges, he has to report to the Speaker. The Speaker then puts the question to the House. There is an oral vote on the matter and if members want a recorded vote, they have to stand up on it.

MR. AMERONGEN:

Mr. Chairman, if I might just make a suggestion here. It seems to me that going through the motions of having the House sitting as an Assembly checking the arithmetic of the Chairman, when the House is sitting in Committee of the Whole, is just a little artificial. It seems to me that if there is a real concern about recorded votes in committee they should be specifically provided for so that they can be taken in committee and you can continue in committee with the same number of members perhaps as are required to call a recorded vote in the House.

With regard to the text of Clause (4) of Rule 43, there never was any appeal, as far as I'm aware of any parliamentary lore, from a Chairman's decision to a Speaker. It was always to the House and the first sentence of Clause (4) is simply restating what the rule is. But it doesn't specifically provide for an appeal to the House. I think perhaps Mr. Wood here could tidy up the wording a bit and if the members agree, perhaps some provision could be included specifically for a recorded vote in committee, if that is a matter of concern.

MR. YOUNG:

Just two points, Mr. Chairman, if I may. I think the committee had in mind, perhaps three.

One was that some confusion had arisen as to the method of initiating a recorded vote; confusion, I think, in terms of who was making the decision when the appeal was made - what kind of question was being put to the Assembly. I think all hon. members will recollect an instance when there was some confusion as to what the report of the committee actually was and what question then should be placed before the Assembly when the Assembly was convened. This is an attempt to clarify that.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to make one or two comments. I believe the suggestion of the hon. Speaker is very commendable. We should have, on occasion, a recorded vote in Committee of the Whole. I think this is good. It will probably resolve a lot of things without going any further.

As the hon. Speaker mentioned, there has never been an appeal to the Speaker. But I would hope that there would still be the opportunity for Mr. Speaker to give his views on a particular question, otherwise, it is just a rehash of exactly what was taking place in committee. Already in the life of this Legislature, the Speaker has been able to bring certain points from Beauchesne and other parliamentary procedures to the attention of the House, which made it much more acceptable to all members. So, while it is not an appeal to the Speaker, I hope this will not preclude the Speaker from giving his view on a matter at the time the matter is reported to him. I think this is only sensible and worthwhile.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I was on the committee and I have had second thoughts on this particular section since our meeting. I believe there should always be an appeal to the Speaker, as Mr. Taylor, the hon. Member for Drumheller touched on.

The Speaker is really the servant of the House. You may run into a situation where the member himself personally feels that he has a grievance. He wants to bring it to the attention of the Speaker and to the House. So I really believe we should have the appeal to the Speaker and to the House.

As far as votes in committee, recorded votes in committee, I am not in favour of that. You get into a situation where you are having recorded votes on everything. I think a recorded vote is a serious thing and it should take full force and effect within the House with the Speaker in the Chair.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to second some of the comments the Member for Calgary Millican just made relative to not having standing votes in committee. I think this would be a very poor deal.

One of the things I think is good about our present system of having formal debate and then committee is that there is a very definite inclination to play games with one another. I think most members - I won't say this is universal - but generally speaking, it is in the formal debate we go through this interesting, entertaining exercise that the Deputy Premier and I particularly enjoy. This is where the procedures of having the Speaker in the Chair and machinery to deal with it is proper. But I would be concerned about having standing votes in committee, because I think it would prove detrimental to the progress of business through the House. I think it would simply encourage more and more exercises of trying to get people, you know, government on record in favour of this or opposing that. It becomes a bit of a game-playing exercise. I really question that it would add anything to the decision-making process in the House, but would rather detract from it.

As far as the other point, though, that the decision of the Chairman should be appealed to the Speaker, I think this is basically unsound.

I don't think you want to put the Speaker in a position of second-guessing what the Chairman has done. The Speaker is not in the House on most occasions when these exercises are taking place and the challenge takes place. I think the basic question, the way the procedure is now, that the motion is put to the House to reconfirm the chairman's ruling, this is the way to do it. I really question the principle that we should have the Speaker second-guessing a ruling and decision of the Deputy Speaker. I think in principle it is not a desirable one, and that the question is for the House to confirm and not put the Speaker in the position of having to play God in this particular matter, particularly when he is not in the House when the exchange of views and debate is taking

place. I think this is significant so far as his responsibilities are concerned in second-guessing what the chairman has done.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, I don't think we put the Speaker in the position to second-guess what went on. All the Speaker is called back in the Chair for, is to see that all parliamentary rules are abided by. The Speaker is neutral. He doesn't get into the argument of whether it is right or wrong. It is the House that makes the final decision. It is up to the Speaker to see that everything is carried out according to parliamentary procedure. That is the position.

We are not putting the Speaker in a position where he is making the ruling. I think the idea of appealing it to the Speaker, if we had an amendment to this which said, from the Chairman's decision an appeal can be made to the Speaker and to the House - and then you can go on "in case of an appeal to the House ..." and you can carry on that section, that would take care of it.

MR. AMERONGEN:

With great respect, I think that an appeal to the Speaker from a ruling of the Chairman would be a drastic departure from parliamentary tradition and fraught with all kinds of problems. I would be very sorry to see such a thing introduced.

With regard to recorded votes in committee I think we should remember that the purpose of discussion in committee is to give detailed consideration, clause by clause, in an informal atmosphere, to the provisions of a proposed statute. If you want a recorded vote on a certain clause, it seems to me incongruous to then go into the Assembly and vote on a clause which should be dealt with in committee. In the Assembly you are dealing with the principle of the thing, and in committee you are dealing with the clauses.

I would say, rather than have a lot of artificiality where you appear to the public to be appealing the Chairman in committee on a question of arithmetic - as to what the count was of the members for and against, when it is obvious anyone can count and say what the result was - and then you have to go through the motions of appealing that ruling, that simple question of arithmetic, by going into the Assembly and back into committee again, I think the proper thing to do is to be practical and to provide for recorded votes in committee.

The same thing with regard to an appeal from the Chairman. I mean, let's just acknowledge the reality. The same members who are sitting in committee are going to be sitting when the House reassembles as an Assembly. They are going to be dealing with the appeal from the Chairman's ruling. Why shouldn't they be able to deal with it sitting in committee, instead of going through this artificiality and rigmarole, which, I am sure, doesn't do our PR a bit of good. Why don't you just have an appeal to the committee from the chairman, if that is the way you want to do it and have the whole thing done in committee.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, one question with reference to the vote in committee. What would be the procedures there? Ordinarily the bell goes, we are given so much time to get in here and then we have to vote if we are in. Would the same procedures be followed in committee?

MR. AMERONGEN:

I would think that you could go through the same procedure as you do on a division in the House. The Chairman could ring the division bells. If you wanted to inhibit standing votes in committee, perhaps what could be done is to increase the number required to call for a standing vote from the present number to say, perhaps 10, or something like this. That, in certain complexions of the House as to membership, say with a small opposition or something like that, could cause difficulty.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, what the hon. Speaker said makes real good sense. I suggest that we carry that out in this section.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, once again I want to express reservations about it and just point out to the Member for Edmonton Meadowlark that the purpose of committee isn't just to study statutes; it's the whole exercise relating to the study of the Estimates. There is far larger scope for getting into an endless procedure of having recorded votes in committee, just in the interest of this game of political one-upmanship that we indulge in here periodically.

I cannot really see that having recorded votes in committee is going to do anything other than slow down the exercise or the discussion examination of either Statutes or the Estimates. I think if you notice in the rules, we have eliminated any provision for a vote in subcommittee because we felt it was rather a futile exercise. If they have to have a recorded vote it should come into committee and it should go into the House, have the Speaker in the Chair and do it in that fashion. I think that basic procedure is sound.

I further suggest, Mr. Chairman, that an effort to arrive at a satisfactory wording on an amendment at this point in time is, in my mind, simply going to delay further progress of the rules, at least so far as the rest of the afternoon and maybe the evening is concerned. I think the principle should really be seriously examined as to the effect it will have on retarding progress through committee. It will encourage a lot of futile, I think, voting in committee of standing votes, which is really going to add nothing whatever to the decorum of the House.

I think the frequency with which those votes would take place, as far as the decorum of the House is concerned, is going to detract far more than going through the other exercise of calling the Speaker in once in a while when we've agreed to disagree on the opposite sides.

I think the procedure of having recorded votes in committee is basically not a sound one, that it will undermine the effectiveness and value of committee for an objective, non-partisan examination of legislation and government policies and study of the Estimates.

MR. KING:

Mr. Chairman, we're discussing two things here, one of which is the question of appeal from a decision of the chairman, and the other is the question of the propriety and the mechanics of standing votes or divisions in committee.

With respect to the first one, 43 (4), I would like to say that I must agree with the procedure which is suggested in the proposed Volume II; that is, appeal to the whole Assembly by coming out of committee and having a vote to sustain or otherwise the decision of the chairman of the committee.

With respect to the question of division, it's interesting now that we've had this discussion to find out exactly where the idea that divisions were not permitted in committee has arisen and the reasons for it. Because, in point of fact, 43(1) very explicitly says that, "The Standing Orders of the Assembly shall be observed in the Committees of the Whole Assembly so far as may be applicable, ..." and the only exception that is noted is as to limiting the number of times of speaking.

If that's the only exception, then where does it leave Standing Order No. 26 which says that, "A division may be called for by three members and the Ayes and Noes shall be entered upon the Votes and Proceedings"? Clause 43(1) seems to allow for it. It has been said that practice doesn't, and right now I don't know what the origin of the practice is or the reason for it.

I would suggest that in view of that fact, we could proceed with passing Standing Order 43 and then just look at the situation and the practicalities of it, because it may be that if we decide that we do want to change, it doesn't even involve amending any standing orders. It just involves taking a new direction in the Assembly ourselves.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands has really hit upon the real basis of this whole thing. I don't think it was ever intended that members should not be able to be recorded in the Committee of the Whole. To compare that with a subcommittee I think is not comparable at all. In a Committee of the Whole you are talking to the same people. The same people are making the decision as in the Assembly. There is no need for this repetition. If members are responsible, there won't be the situation outlined by the Member

for Wetaskiwin-Leduc. And surely members are responsible? If they aren't responsible, their electorate soon finds out.

I would suggest we pass this as is, and pay attention to the point raised by the Member for Edmonton Highlands.

MR. AMERONGEN:

Just one final comment which really comes originally from Mr. Graves, casting a little doubt on what the Member for Edmonton Highlands said, and that is that the decisions in committee are not recorded in the Votes and Proceedings.

[Rule No. 43 was agreed to.]

[Rules Nos. 44 through 46 were agreed to without debate.]

Rule No. 47

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I have to take exception to Rule No. 47. I just can't understand why a Chairman would be expected to sign a lie. Here we're saying he has to sign this document whether he agrees with it or not. That isn't sound. If the Chairman doesn't agree with it, why would he be forced to sign it? And that there is absolute: "... No minority report shall be made to the Assembly".

I believe there is a place for minority reports. If one member can't agree on principle in connection with some vital issue, why shouldn't the people know how he stands and why shouldn't the rest of the members of the Legislature know how he stands?

MR. KING:

Mr. Chairman, ...

MR. AMERONGEN:

With respect, the Chairman, in signing the report, does not necessarily say he agrees with it. He's merely certifying that this is the view of the majority of the members of the committee. The rule actually, as far as I understand it, embodies ancient parliamentary practice that has existed right down to the present day.

MR. KING:

I just wanted to make the point that the hon. Speaker has just made, that the signature only certifies the authenticity of what is contained in the report. It says nothing about whether or not the Chairman agrees with the report.

Also, if you look at Beauchesne - and the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View can loan you a copy - there are extensive extracts dealing with the responsibilities of a committee, and the general thrust of it is that if the House wanted to make a determination as to the result of the individual positions that are taken by individual members of the House, why, they would just do it on a resolution in the Assembly itself.

But in a committee they are concerned with the preparation of information, or the presentation of a point of view or a conclusion. They are not interested at that point in the individual opinions of the members which they can get later when that committee report is adopted by some process of the House. What they are interested in is the collective judgment of a number of their members together, which is why they want a report from a committee, rather than from an individual.

MR. TAYLOR:

In all fairness to Beauchesne, I don't agree with everything in Beauchesne. If we're going to adopt everything in Beauchesne, we don't need to go through this exercise. Let's start some new ground. It's the people outside who read the report that I'm talking about, more so than the members of the Assembly.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I think the committee can still debate it, but should be fully aware of the fact that this is exactly the same as it now stands in the rule book. It's not a change from anything insofar as the committee is concerned. As a matter of fact, it just brings to the fore that the committees in the past have not been following the rules. Every member was signing reports and it's only the Chairman who is obliged to sign them.

I don't want to stifle the debate as to the merits of the rule, but I want to make it abundantly clear that it is not a change. It's recommended by the committee. This is the way the rule basically now stands in our existing rules.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to support the hon. member, Mr. Taylor, with regard to this clause, "No minority report shall be made to the Assembly." I believe that times have changed now and there is no presumption that because four out of seven members of a committee agree to something they are necessarily right. It isn't seldom that perhaps the views of one person or a minority can receive public recognition and find themselves in our statute books.

I believe it's an antiquated kind of rule and it forces a member who doesn't agree with a committee decision to seek devious ways of getting his point across. I believe the same facility should be made for him to present his views as anyone else, to present a report as a convenience of the Legislature, to print the report and to disseminate it. Why should not a member be permitted a minority report? I know that when this party was in government there were often serious disputes by members of a committee and that minority reports had, in fact, been prepared.

So I support that view because we can't just sort of make it appear as if we all went along and somebody wrote the report and we agreed with it. I'd like to see that part struck out.

I move that in Rule No. 47, as presented here, the words "No minority reports shall be made to the Assembly" be struck out.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment. But I'm wondering if I could ask Mr. Graves whether or not he can advise us how minority reports have been dealt with in the past, or if they have to his recollection been dealt with in any way in the past? I wonder if I could just put that to him before I comment?

MR. GRAVES:

Basically the report coming in is a document from the committee and individual views aren't concerned here. It's the consensus of the committee making a submission to the Legislature and the report is tabled.

When the report comes in on a motion that it be received or be received and concurred in, then the minority views can be presented in debate. A member of a committee who holds a minority view must surely be better equipped than anybody to shoot holes in the report at that stage.

So, there's no need to adopt "devious" means for a minority report. It can be done in debate on "that the report be now received."

MR. NOTLEY:

Now, if I can follow that up, Mr. Chairman. Fair enough, if there's a motion to receive it, that's understandable and individual members can get up and make their observations on the report. What happens, however, if the report is simply tabled and there is no motion then to receive it? What happens if it's brought in just at the end of the session and it's tabled? What rights do the individuals, who don't agree with the majority position, then have to make their dissent known?

MR. GRAVES:

I think we'd get back then to the position where the private member could put a motion on the Order Paper that the report be received and this would raise it for debate.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, if I could still follow that up. Admittedly the private member could do that, but unfortunately, it then goes to private members' day and if it is toward the end of a session, the chance of it being debated is really negligible. My point is, what opportunity has an individual who dissents from a majority report have to make his dissent known if (a) there is no government motion so this thing can be debated? Does he then have to wait until a private member's resolution comes down the Order Paper? It may be three or four weeks or it may be never.

MR. GRAVES:

I think perhaps it's better to have a clearer understanding of what the report is, as has been pointed out. The Chairman is the only person to sign it and apart from the traditional practice of committees to include at the front of a resolution, the name of everybody who has been associated with compiling the report, there's no real need that anybody should ever know who was on that committee other than the members of the Legislature. I can see the problems that the members are trying to come to grips with is that a report is now in existence that does not reflect their views and has their name on the front. Maybe it's a logistics thing, to get rid of that.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I think that's the point which worries me anyway, that there should be some provision made somehow so that very shortly after the tabling of a report individual members who may not subscribe to the majority opinion of that report can make their position known. If we have to wait for three or four weeks until a private motion comes up or if it doesn't come up period, then in the public mind, the public is naturally going to know that X member was on the committee, and if that person doesn't dissent, then at least as far as the public is concerned, it will appear as if he agrees with the report.

My concern is to find some avenue so that after the tabling of a report there can be discussion soon enough so that in a relevant way individuals who don't agree with the majority can make their point of view known.

MR. KING:

I just wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, that we have to remember that with every report of a committee that is tabled in the Assembly only one of two things can happen; either all or part of it is going to be acted upon by the Legislature or the government or none of it is going to be acted upon. If none of it is acted upon, then it's not going to get any further exposure or publicity in this Assembly of the kind that is within the control of the Assembly.

A person who was a member of the committee and disagreed with the conclusions of the committee has access to the media which is how most people make their position known and can do that regardless of how the committee report is debated in the Assembly.

On the other hand, if the government decides or if the Assembly decides that they're going to proceed with all or any part of a committee report, then it has to be upon either a resolution or a bill, and the resolution or the bill is the opportunity for any and every member of the committee or the Assembly to say that either he agrees or that he disagrees with the committee report.

I don't know that it causes that much of a problem really.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, if I could just add a couple of comments to the suggestion made by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

A good example for us to consider here is the censorship special legislative committee. The report came in almost a year ago now. The thing has not been debated on the floor of the Assembly. A sizeable number of copies of that report have gone out to people across the province and, to date, no member on that committee has had the opportunity to express his point of view as far as any reservations he has on that report. When I say members, I talk in terms of people who sat on the committee.

I can recall, it wasn't very many years ago that the present Minister of Municipal Affairs introduced a minority report to the House on the whole question of municipal assessment in the province. It seems to me that in light

of the practice that's now developed here, where we don't really debate all the legislative committee reports that come in, a very good case has been made for the amendment made by the Member for Calgary Mountain View. In fact no minority reports made to the Assembly should be struck out. We then have an opportunity to present minority reports if that's the feeling of the individual.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Chairman, as a novice in this business, I find the discussion extremely interesting and important. My contribution will likely be obvious and oversimplified.

I wonder if we're not moving into a rather dangerous area of parliamentary procedure if we're to move this way in fact. When we are speaking of special committees of the Legislative Assembly or committees of the Legislature, we're looking at all-party committees whose function is to bring down a report on behalf of the Legislature and to the Legislature. What I would fear is that, regardless of the final contents of the report, it should be the consensus of the people on the committee; for example, the committee which we worked on that tabled the report with respect to compensation. There were certainly strong and divergent views, but finally we had consensus. It would be difficult to say who disagreed with what issue along the way.

The thing I would fear is that there might be an expectation by certain people in political parties inside or outside the House for people to disagree and to submit minority reports on the basis of party membership or party association. If there was this kind of risk at all I would wish to bring it out in the open.

The analogy I'm thinking of, it may not be an effective one, is when we appoint, from our department, boards of arbitration to hear labour disputes. In the short time this has been my responsibility, to the best of my recollection, we have had two unanimous awards of the board. This involves three people. We have had numerous arbitration committees and, Mr. Chairman, what happens invariably is that regardless of what they think - and sometimes I suspect they think the same way when they finally make the report - if the report appears to favour management, the Chairman and the management representative will sign the majority report and the labour representative file the minority report. If the judgment appears to favour labour, then the Chairman and the labour representative sign the majority report and the management person files a minority report.

I think that being representatives of people, when we become members of a legislative committee, we're not so much representatives of a political party as we are members who represent Albertans and have one objective, that is, to bring down a report with recommendations to the Legislature. That would be my concern.

MR. NOTLEY:

Following up on that if I can, I would like to ask both Mr. Graves and the Speaker to respond.

Accepting the arguments of the Minister of Labour, that the committee is in fact a special committee of the Legislature to study a particular subject, that committee brings in a report, perhaps it has seven members on it, four of them supporting the report and the other three opposing it. What are the ethics, then, of members who oppose the majority position making public statements outside the Legislature before the Legislature has had a chance to deal with that report?

It seems to me that if it is the property of the Legislature, is there not a question of ethics involved, that in fact we shouldn't have the right to run to the press and say, well, we differ with the majority position? Because if that right exists, then there is no problem. But I would like a response ...

MR. HENDERSON:

... [Inaudible]... question and I don't want to put words in the Speaker's mouth, but once the report is tabled it is a public document. Any member is at liberty to say anything he wants about it. You know, if he can't get it on the Order Paper inside the House, he can castigate it in any manner he feels he can get away with outside the House. It is a public document. It is just like you read it in the newspapers, so there are no restrictions on that.

But I have to express extremely strong grave reservations about any proposition to allow minority reports in legislative committees. In my mind there is one thing that makes legislative committees function. In the years I have been around here, when you go into the committee - I have yet to be on one, and some of the people I have been on with I have fought very bitterly with across the Floor of this House - but I have yet to go on a legislative committee where everyone did not set aside his partisan differences of opinion. The committee sat down to attend to the business of the people of the Province of Alberta. I think it would be absolutely disastrous to the usefulness and effectiveness of legislative committees to talk about having a minority report, because all you will do is inject the element of partisan politics into the legislative committees that we experience at times in the Legislature in formal debate. I think it would completely destroy the effectiveness of the committee, and I would have to say quite frankly, Mr. Chairman that if a resolution or an amendment [on] the proposition put forth were to carry before this Assembly, if I were sitting on the other side of the House I would be simply using caucus task forces for everything I wanted to look at and then letting everybody deal with it as a partisan issue when it came out to the floor of the House.

I suggest very sincerely to everyone, regardless of where they stand, that the whole concept of minority reports is unsound and it will basically undermine and destroy, in the final analysis, the real usefulness of the committee form of report.

I think if people on both sides of the House in principle think that something should be done about it, a far more sensible approach which would avoid these pitfalls would be to make it obligatory in the rules, when a legislative committee is set up and they report, that the report must be received in the House and there is an opportunity to debate it. That would provide the opportunity to deal with it if the House felt that something like that is required. That would be far more useful than undermining and, in my mind, I think in the long run destroying the usefulness of the legislative committee process.

As I say, in view of the precedent of caucus committees, if I sat on the other side I wouldn't be looking forward to having very many legislative committees in this House in the future.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I can't go along with that.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Taylor, if I may just - Mr. Amerongen and Mr. Ludwig. Mr. Ludwig wanted the Chair.

Fine, Mr. Taylor, please continue now.

MR. TAYLOR:

Well, I can't go along [with that], that no good comes from minority reports. It was a minority report that was first opposed to child labour. The majority was wrong, and it eventually took a few years but the minority report was the one that brought it about. It was the same with women working in coal mines. The minority isn't always wrong. Surely we have the right to hear the minority? The idea that the minority is always wrong is nonsense.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, nothing I have heard in this debate thus far has said that the contents of a minority report are necessarily wrong. My comments are addressed to the fact of undermining the legislative committee process, and that is the significance of the issue. It has nothing to do with whether the majority report is right or wrong or whether the minority report is right or wrong. It means the eventual destruction of the legislative committee process. That is the issue we are talking about.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig now ...

MR. TAYLOR:

... [Inaudible] ... years it hasn't undermined it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig now ...

MR. TAYLOR:

... [Inaudible] ... Mr. Russell was ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order. Mr. Ludwig. Order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments about remarks to the amendment. The hon. minister, Mr. Hohol, stated that there is a dangerous procedure we are entering into, the dangerous procedure of disagreeing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. LUDWIG:

... that the right of dissent is favoured, and it is an adversary system and it wasn't invented by us. It developed from day one in parliament, and the right of a person to dissent, to express a dissenting view, is encouraged and protected by the rules of the Assembly. So when you disallow a minority report you say, well, you can have your views, Tom Jones, MLA, but we don't want them here. You will have to find money to print them if you want to and maybe do a little politicking, but your views are not important. The right to disagree, the right to dissent is recognized and protected. I am surprised that the hon. ...

MR. MOORE:

Point of order. Point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Point of order.

MR. MOORE:

Point of order, Mr. Chairman. The existing rules require that we adjourn at 5:30, I believe.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. member is right and it is the first time he has been right since I have known him.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I move the committee rise and report progress and adjourn until 8:00 o'clock.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, order. We are not adjourned yet. We have to report. The motion was that the committee rise and report progress.

MR. HENDERSON:

... [Inaudible] ... we could rise and report last night ... [Inaudible].

MR. CHAIRMAN:

That was the motion. I am sorry, Mr. Henderson.

[Mr. Chairman left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the report on the House Rules, 1973, reports progress and begs leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, before we adjourn I would like to advise the House that the select committee to choose the Ombudsman will be meeting at 7:15 tonight - somewhat unusual, insofar as the motion hasn't yet been passed to establish this committee. But insofar as the Legislature is a law unto itself, the motion when proposed will read that the committee be established as of noon today. So we will regularize it in that fashion.

This evening at 8:00 o'clock we will just continue with the report of the rules committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:35 o'clock.]

\* \* \* \* \*

Tuesday Evening, October 30, 1973

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8:00 o'clock.]

ORDERS OF THE DAY

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

3. Hon. Mr. Hyndman proposed, seconded by hon. Mr. Miniely:

That, the Report of the Select Committee on Foreign Investment be received and concurred in.

[The motion was carried.]

4. Hon. Mr. Hyndman proposed, seconded by hon. Mr. Miniely:

That, the Report of the Select Committee on Regulations be received and concurred in.

[The motion was carried.]

5. Hon. Mr. Hyndman proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark:

That, a special committee be appointed, consisting of the following members, namely:

Buck  
Cookson  
Hunley  
Hyndman (Chairman)  
McCrae  
Wilson

for the purpose of inviting applications for the position of Ombudsman and to recommend to the Assembly the applicant it considers most suitable for appointment to that position;

And that, said committee report to the Third Session of the Seventeenth Alberta Legislature.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I would like to move an amendment to this motion, Mr. Speaker, mainly because the committee has already met some three-quarters of an hour ago. In order to ensure that what was done at that meeting is properly conducted business, to add an amendment so that after the word "appointed" in the third line the following words are added: "as of October 29, 1973,". That amendment is seconded by the Minister of Manpower and Labour.

The pertinent part of the motion would then read, "That a special committee be appointed, as of October 29, 1973, consisting of the following members, ...".

[The amendment was carried.]

[The motion as amended was carried.]

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Second Reading)

Bill No. 81 The Change of Name Act, 1973

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of the Environment, second reading of Bill No. 81, being The Change of Name Act, 1973.

Bill No. 88  
The Licensing of Trades and Businesses Amendment Act, 1973

MR. DOWLING:

I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation, second reading of Bill No. 88, The Licensing of Trades and Businesses Amendment Act, 1973.

MR. LUDWIG:

I would like to comment on second reading of Bill No. 88 in dealing with licensing of trades and businesses. One issue that I raised here earlier dealt with the real estate business in this province.

I would like to urge the minister to take a good look at the business. I know the realtors will agree that they have problems. Perhaps they can be solved by more strict licensing of salesmen, but I doubt whether that would be the right way to go.

I would once more like to urge that the government take a good look at the possibility of either enacting legislation that would give people an opportunity of seeking independent advice and getting a certificate of independent advice in real estate transactions before they are bound, or at least they can void an agreement they entered into unless a certificate is given, or setting up a government agency where people can go and get free advice with reference to the particular transaction they entered into.

As I stated, the real estate business is very sophisticated. It is a great business. It's a big business in terms of money. Volume of sales is very great. Homes are sold many times a day, but some people who are involved simply don't understand the business. It is a competitive business. It's a business that a lot of professional people are involved in. It is time that we took a look at this issue seriously.

We have protected people in other areas of trade by passing legislation that would protect a purchaser from perhaps a fast salesman, a door-to-door salesman, on minor transactions. If we went that far on small matters, we should take another look at real estate transactions, which sometimes involve a once in a lifetime deal, and often all the savings of the person involved. If they make a bad deal they can suffer for a great number of years during their life.

As I stated before, this is not a case where I feel someone wants to tamper with real estate. In most cases the transactions are honest, but it isn't a case of integrity, it's a case of lack of knowledge of many people who get involved. Often an elderly couple finds out too late that the value of their property is higher than they were led to believe. I'm not at all taking issue with real estate agents and salesmen, but in many cases they are anxious to earn a commission, to get the signature of the people who perhaps should be told to seek advice and to be advised as to the ramifications of the transaction they are signing. I'm sure every MLA at one time or another must have come across the problem where some elderly couple who were anxious to sell, but did not consult a relative or did not have anyone to consult and found out the morning after they signed and wished they hadn't.

The law of contract is quite sacred, nobody wants to break contracts, but sometimes it's proper to have the transaction reviewed. Often we feel the transaction was not the best for the people; they didn't know any better. Their only recourse is a lawsuit, to take court proceedings to see if they can break the contract. This is usually expensive. A lot of people don't wish to get involved. They will suffer the consequences of what they believe and will always believe to be a bad transaction. I think this comes strictly within, perhaps not entirely within, the Department of Consumer Affairs, but it's an issue in buying and selling that borders on the responsibility of the department. I'm not sure which department deals with The Real Estate Agents' Licensing Act. It used to be the Attorney General.

There is a real need to take a look at this. Anyone will find out, if he inquires, that much good can be done without, in any way, causing any harm or detriment to the real estate business itself. Most transactions, as I stated, are good, they're above board. But occasionally people, maybe in a very honest manner, will get stung and all they can do after that is wring their hands and bemoan the fact that they didn't know, they couldn't go anywhere to find out or they didn't bother, and they are stuck. So we have an obligation to look at this. I'd like to urge the minister to review this thing and perhaps come up with a recommendation.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'm a little concerned with Clause 14 (c) and subsection (2) which follows it.

It's been the practice, in many acts, to give the investigators power to seize books and records. Many times this creates a very great inconvenience to the business or the firm whose books and records are seized. Such things as seizing a register or record of accounts receivable on the twenty-eighth day of the month a registh leaves the merchant or the person concerned without very essential records.

I would like the minister to consider an amendment after (c), whatever he wishes to name it, but something to the effect that if, upon written request of the person or firm whose books or records are seized, the minister or his agent finds that they do not wish to return them, they furnish to the business photocopies of those records and books which he considers essential in the administration of his business.

[The motions were carried. Bills Nos. 81 and 88 were read a second time.]

Bill No. 90  
The Senior Citizens Benefits Act

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of the Environment, second reading of Bill No. 90. ... [Not recorded] ...

Don't worry about the sound going off momentarily, Mr. Speaker.

I'm just going to begin by expressing my appreciation to the Clerk for having caught up the second readings the way he did a moment ago.

Mr. Speaker, after the discussion we had this afternoon in committee - in regard to the length of remarks - I will not speak long in moving second reading of Bill No. 90.

There are a few remarks I want to make. I suggest to hon. members that they are very topical and the sort of thing which had been engaging our attention over this last period of months, with particular reference to the difficulties that the increases in the cost of living have brought about for people who are on fixed incomes.

In remarking upon the especial difficulties with inflation for those who have a fixed, or almost fixed income, I think that the senior citizens are the one group of people who quickly come to mind as ones where the ability to supplement income as a result of their own efforts is probably the least. The future prospects for employment are the least and therefore the potential hardship is greater in their case than in the case of other citizens.

This act, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 90, is the bill pursuant to which the government will carry out the policy, which was announced earlier in the year, in regard to supplementary monthly payments to persons who are in receipt of the guaranteed income supplement.

I might mention that the bill does not indicate precisely the amount to be paid, but, as announced in the policy statement, the amount is the sum of \$10 per month for each senior citizen.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, does not deal with the balance of the program which was announced at that time which relates to extended health care benefits, so of course I will not make further reference to it.

When we give this subject our attention from time to time, we often ask - and I have often asked - just what do the senior citizen benefits in the Province of Alberta come to. I have said I'm convinced that because of the policies of the government in the other areas - including provision of Medicare and Blue Cross service, property tax rebates and similar related programs - the overall benefit to senior citizens is at least equivalent to that in any other province.

Mr. Speaker, the test in the case of the payment of the supplemental allowance that will be provided under this bill - applying as it does only to those who receive the guaranteed income supplement - will ensure that, along with the average value of the extended health care benefits, the payment under this act, Blue Cross, Health Care, and the property tax rebate, the minimum received by an individual in the province of Alberta as a result of the combined support policies of the federal and provincial governments for senior citizens is in excess of \$200 a month. The closest minimum calculation made will be, for an individual, the sum of \$207.64.

Not wanting to become political in any sense, Mr. Speaker, I just thought I would mention in light of the occasions when people have asked me, when will Alberta be increasing the benefits to \$200? I mention that as the minimum because our policies for the support of senior citizens relates to their needs; if their needs are special, through social allowance, a program which I have not included in my calculations, of course, more can be received - the test in that case is need.

I just thought I would mention that the value of Blue Cross and Health Care Insurance could, of course, when the benefits are received, be much higher than the figures I have given the House this evening. The reason for that, of course, is the value of treatment, if it was paid for, would come to far more than the \$7.75 per month, which is all I have used in the calculation, that

being the cost of providing the premiums on a cost-free premium coverage. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I don't think anyone who had good hospitalization or had need of some additional benefits under Blue Cross or the extended health care benefits felt for a moment that the actual value, as shown in the calculations that I briefly referred to, ... is certainly a very conservative estimate of the value of these benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this is one of those bills that no member of the Assembly opposes in any way. I am not speaking to it for the purpose of persuading them to do something which they are not going to do anyway in supporting it. I did just want to use the occasion, Mr. Speaker, to indicate to hon. members that we always have our sights upon the most contemporary programs which can be provided for the senior citizens of Alberta. I am suggesting - in closing, as I did at the beginning - the evidence is that there is no program in Canada which provides a greater amount of support in the case of senior citizens. I'll declare once again the intention of this government over the years to come is that the senior citizens of this province will never be in a position second to those in any other province.

MR. DIXON:

Now Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering about the principle of a person ... what I am concerned about is a resident of Alberta, how do you define that? I was just wondering if they have to live in the province for so many days in any particular year? How are you going to define "resident of Alberta"? What yardstick are we going to use?

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder if this is the sort of thing that might come up in second reading?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this bill, the basic principle of which is to provide for increased aid to our senior citizens.

I understand that there are some 75 senior citizens' homes in Alberta, accommodating about 3,000 persons. In my constituency of Edmonton Calder there are actually 6 different establishments accommodating, if my count is correct, 467 senior citizens. These include the government built Rosslyn complex where at this time there is a total of 105 people, 21 in Lauderdale, 106 in the Kensington Court which is a large complex operated by the Lion's Club. Also, there is a recently constructed Ukrainian senior citizens' home of St. John located in the eastern side of my constituency which accommodates 50 people. This home was built with the help of a government grant. It's open for occupancy this coming Thursday. I might add that the rents there are apparently going to be \$80 a month for single accommodation and \$55 a month for double occupancy, which seems quite reasonable for such good accommodation. There are also the privately run Venta and Sherbrooke nursing homes, which presently serve 65 and 120 people respectively and in my view, all of these establishments are well-run, comfortable homes. They provide excellent accommodation for our senior folk and are establishments of which, I think, every Albertan can be proud.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there's a broad spectrum of age groups in Calder, young through old. Nevertheless, it being one of the older established areas in the city, there are many other retired people who live in their own homes and other rented accommodations.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, with the declining value of the dollar across the country, with so many people trying to live on fixed pensions, so many people who must live only on their old age security plus the guaranteed income supplement, I think you can see why I'm so interested in this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, I'm very proud actually of what our government has done for our senior citizens over the past two years. If you consider that through the premium waiver our senior citizens now receive full coverage under the Alberta Health Care Plan and the Alberta Blue Cross Plan for themselves and their dependents. Consider also that under the extended health care plan, all the residents over 65 and their dependents that are registered with the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission are eligible for optical services and materials, dental care or medical and surgical appliances.

I think as we get older and retire, most people find that they need more and more of these expensive aids in order to lead a full life. Even young fellows like myself, and I think also the minister, find that there comes a time when the smaller and smaller print that the newspapers seem to be using these days requires the use of reading glasses.

With all due respect to the hon. Member for Ponoka and the hon. Member for Clover Bar, the eyeglasses, dentures and other such items are quite costly. The hearing aids and other surgical appliances tend to be very expensive indeed. The average working citizen, I'm sure, can budget for these items and can probably afford them. But for the senior citizens living on a fixed pension, the cost of many of these items was so burdensome as to, in many cases, preclude their purchase. So the extended health care benefit program will be a major benefit for our senior citizens.

Also, we look at assessments, the new financing provisions for self-contained units constructed by the Alberta Housing Corporation, which allow for rents conceivably as low as \$32, including utilities, with operating costs shared by the federal and provincial governments. This certainly represents significant progress in this area.

Under The Property Tax Reduction Act, the renters' assistance grant of \$100 to people over 65 is certainly welcome. For senior citizen home owners the education tax refund of up to \$200 for those on ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. With respect, the Chair is having occasional difficulty establishing the relevance of the hon. member's remarks to the bill which is under discussion. It would appear that the bill does not require a general review of the situation with regard to senior citizens.

MR. CHAMBERS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll come to the point. Actually I was ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

You're bragging.

MR. CHAMBERS:

I was debating the general subject of aid to senior citizens as related to this bill. I'm so pleased with everything that's been done.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, the recently announced payment of \$10, which raises the total pension and supplement for the individual to \$189.16, and which this bill provides the means for so doing, is another item in just one more item in a solid package of benefits that has been granted by this government to our senior people.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, and just before I sit down, I'm very proud of the fact that our Premier and the Government of Alberta have assigned top priority to assisting the pioneers of our province. I want to congratulate the Minister of Health and Social Development for the many fine senior citizen's assistance programs that he has initiated. I would urge all members to support this bill.

Thank you.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 90 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 92  
The Legislative Assembly Statutes Amendment Act, 1973

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, second reading of Bill No. 92, The Legislative Assembly Statutes Amendment Act, 1973.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 92 was read a second time.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to study certain bills on the Order Paper, and the report of the Assembly Rules Committee.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of the Whole Assembly will come to order.

Bill No. 81 The Change of Name Act, 1973

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment to Bill No. 81, The Change of Name Act, it being an amendment to Section 7(2) as distributed to the hon. members.

MR. DRAIN:

It would seem in regard to Bill No. 81, Mr. Chairman, that there is one particular area of people who are not protected. I refer to the children, the young children.

As an illustration, I would cite the case of a woman who was abandoned with two children, and whose husband, from whom she finally managed to get a divorce, did not on leaving contribute in any manner towards the support of these children. Because of the position that her original husband had taken, she was unable to effect the change of name of the children.

Now I realize very well that in this particular instance you can appeal to the court and the judge may so order. Nevertheless, it is a long way around and a very expensive way. In this particular instance one of the girls was 14 and the other was 12, and I suggested that it be deferred, which it was. There is a genuine necessity for some recognition of children's rights under circumstances such as I mention, and there is not the flexibility in this act to do this.

I would request that the minister consider what I have said.

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 81, The Change of Name Act, 1973, as amended be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 88

The Licensing of Trades and Businesses Amendment Act, 1973

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

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Chairman, I move the bill be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 90  
The Senior Citizens Benefits Act

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder gave quite a good address on what we are doing for the old people. There is a case now where, say, the father is 66 and his wife is 20 years younger and father dies. Now they are asking that the widow and children come under the full hospitalization. I think, if when the father was living, because he was over 65 he received free Medicare, then surely when he dies his family should be protected.

I know the hon. minister is working on this problem. I think it is one we or the government should bend every effort to try to alleviate before we have too many more of them. This is a very hard case for MLAs to deal with, to say now that father is gone we are going to have pay the full benefit. Maybe it can be waived, but the very fact that the department asks them for these Medicare payments throws the whole thing out of proportion. I certainly don't want it to happen again, that you have to go to the minister and the minister has to write a very nice letter saying she is going to do everything she can. I would hope that the government would look at this problem and do everything they can in this area.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, I have a number of questions that I would like to ask with respect to Bill No. 90. I certainly am in favour of Bill No. 90 and I want to support it. I don't want any of my remarks to be construed that I am opposing it. I presume that the list of the people entitled to this benefit would be procured from the federal Department of National Health and Welfare, otherwise there would be no other way that we would be able to have this list.

I am wondering, are the cheques going to be mailed separately from Edmonton or are they going to be included with the guaranteed income supplement cheque? In other words, mention was made tonight by the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder that this would amount to a hundred and ... I have just forgotten the figure; it was the guaranteed income supplement plus the \$10.

AN HON. MEMBER:

\$189

MR. FRENCH:

What?

MR. CHAMBERS:

\$189.16

MR. FRENCH:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Calder mentioned the figure of \$189.16, I believe, and that would be the guaranteed income supplement plus the \$10. What I am wondering, is this going to be in the one cheque or is it going to be in two separate cheques?

Now if it is going to be in two separate cheques, I must ask the question: would it not be possible to make some arrangements to have one cheque come out and save the administration charges in processing two separate cheques from two different agencies? Possibly the department could reimburse the federal department for the Alberta contribution? I say this only for the reason of attempting to save the money.

If we could save even 10 per cent, maybe the Alberta government might consider making the \$200 if there would be, say, around \$10 administration charges or whatever it would be, maybe it wouldn't be that much. The point I am trying to make is, I think we are all interested in the senior citizens in this particular category receiving the maximum benefit that we are able to provide in a province with our resources. The only reason for making this suggestion is so that we give the maximum benefit to the senior citizens involved.

My other question is, at the present time we have a group of people, I have forgotten the number, who are receiving the old \$15 supplementary allowance which was started some years ago. I presume this will be over and above the contribution \$15; that the old supplement, as we call it, of \$15 will continue

and the \$10 will be in addition to this. I'd like some clarification on some of the points, but in making these observations, Mr. Chairman, I'm only stating that we should keep in mind that we want to provide the maximum benefit we are able to with the resources at our disposal.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, with reference to this bill, sometimes when I listen to the hon. minister and the hon. member, Mr. Chambers, it sounds like a Social Credit speech of bygone days. We were always ahead of other provinces in the help we provided to our senior citizens. As time passed by, and as inflation took its toll, our revenues improved. I believe we should move in and help them in accordance with our means. I commend the minister for this bill.

I wish to make the observation that at least one segment of our society is now on a guaranteed income. You may call it what you wish, but they are guaranteed not to fall below a certain level. I happen to favour that, except we should recognize the fact that we are moving into this area of guaranteed income. We should also be alert and ready to adjust this income upward should inflation erode the purchasing power of the money that these people live on - on the minimum that they have to live.

It would be interesting to know how many people, just 65 and over, are still active, who have businesses of their own, who may be farming, and who may even be working. Many people of 65 are still holding down jobs. Some are even judges.

It would be interesting to note that those who are guaranteed a basic income are quitting working. I believe that a guaranteed income is not a 'disincentive' to work for the average individual, and perhaps the majority.

I am making this statement again to draw attention to the fact that in the field of welfare what we have done to date has not really worked no matter what we can say. It has, if anything, done anything but work. We have had people get on welfare and we can't get them off.

I am suggesting that we should try an experiment. I believe that one is being tried in Ontario [whereby] a certain group of people would be given a guaranteed minimum income to see if they might be motivated to improve their status by working. It is all right to say that we might produce people who will become permanent charges of the government. The system might do it. Our past system has done it. We have now created that kind of situation by the welfare system.

I am saying that we have nothing to lose by experimenting and by permitting welfare recipients - even, say, on an experimental basis with 3,000 or 4,000 of them - to go to work, to see how many will find out that there is more to life than just getting a free ride. If they can pull out of debt and get some incentive to save and acquire something for themselves they will become like anybody else and they will work.

I am saying that once more, to mention Position Paper 10, the statement made that the family allowance is not a 'disincentive' to work, but welfare happens to be. It is the way we pay it out. It is the way we give it to people. Somehow they will stay and a lot of them will never move.

I would like to urge the minister to consider in the near future the possibility of an experiment to see if the guaranteed income, instead of calling it welfare, and tell them that we can't allow them to go below a certain standard. This will be a guaranteed income. You are free to work and in due course you do find out how many people actually did work and pull themselves out of the need for public support. That is the only observation I wanted to make.

I would then like to point out that once we have tried that experiment and found out that perhaps it is not a perfect solution but that it is better than what we have, then we can move to help those people who are working and who are day by day less able to meet their obligations to provide properly for their families. We can then move in and determine whether a guaranteed income is in fact a 'disincentive' or an incentive to work.

MR. BENOIT:

I have only two questions to ask of the minister, Mr. Chairman.

One has to do with 4(c). I don't quite understand it, or at least maybe I don't understand it. I would like the minister's interpretation of 4(c).

The second question is: has the minister some idea of what this will cost the province?

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, a little earlier, during second reading on the principle of the bill, I asked about the qualification of "resident of Alberta". I am sure the minister is taking it under advisement and will probably be answering it.

The other question I have is: with this \$10 raise, I was wondering if there were talks with the federal government regarding the income tax because in this \$10 raise, the \$189.16 a month for each person would put them in the \$4,500 per year bracket, which would make them all income taxable, even the senior citizens.

I was wondering if there were any negotiations, either by yourself Mr. Minister or the the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, as to the attitude the income tax people are going to take with the type of payment you are making to our senior citizens, because it may be that we may put them in a bracket where really they get little advantage of the \$10 we are giving them.

The other question is more or less a general question. What are we, as a department of social development, doing to ensure our senior citizens that they are still part of our society even if we are going to take care of all their financial needs, all their medical needs and everything else that comes along. I talk to a lot of senior citizens; they are very grateful for what is being done, but at the same time they are getting the distinct feeling that they are being cut away from general society within our province. I was wondering what plans we had, as a department, to try to reassure our senior citizens, by way of putting in programs, that they still are part of our society. There are a lot of people over 65 years of age in our province, both men and women, with a lot to offer, and I think we should take time out to reassure them that they are still part of our society and it's not just a case of putting them out to pasture because we're increasing the pensions and benefits.

Basically, Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I was wondering about this income tax issue, because this may not be as beneficial as we all hoped it would be if it's going to put a lot of these people into the income tax category where most of it will be funnelled back to the federal government; a portion, of course, going back to the province.

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Chairman, I don't know if we're going clause by clause on this particular bill, but I'd like to discuss a small problem that seems to arise in Section 7.

In subsection (2) on page 2, at the end of that subsection where it says, "... and where that person subsequently becomes a beneficiary ...". What concerns me is the fact that if there is only one benefit paid under this act, that is the \$10 per month, and that is all it's going to be, then there is no problem. But if there is going to be more than one benefit paid under the act, or the likelihood that at some time in the future there might be more than one benefit, then I would suggest that perhaps the word should be subsequently "is" a beneficiary rather than subsequently "becomes" a beneficiary. Because a person could be receiving a benefit to which he legally entitled, which would mean that he is already a beneficiary and therefore would not have to repay. I think the purpose of this particular section is to have a repayment where there is, in fact, an over-payment. He may already be entitled to one benefit under the act, and then another benefit comes along to which he is not entitled. As the act now reads, it seems to me that subsequently "becomes" a beneficiary would be a defence.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, I have one question that I wish to direct to the minister and with all due respect to the hon. gentleman from Calgary, when he stated that some of the senior citizens were, well, perhaps getting too much or we were creating certain things out of senior citizens. I wonder, Mr. Minister, what does happen to these senior citizens who are in nursing homes, in a psychiatric ward or other, where the costs are somewhere between \$240 and \$260 and their total income is just low of \$200. Where is the bill picked up? Do we not have to pick up these additional funds or find additional funds to keep them in these nursing homes?

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I just have two quick comments. The first one is, I'd like to commend the minister for bringing in the bill and making it applicable to those who are on supplement. I don't think it is at all sound to take from the have-nots to give to the haves, but I certainly think it is very, very sound to help those, particularly senior citizens, who are having a difficult time. Those with a supplement certainly aren't in any wonderful financial position in view of the cost of living today.

I think the hon. minister has made a forward stroke when this payment is made to senior citizens who receive the supplement. They've already shown that they need this additional money, and I think those are the persons to whom we should be directing our help.

The only other comment I would like to make is that I would again like to point to the hon. minister that there are others, particularly those on welfare, who are in dire straits, even more so than some of the senior citizens. Genuine welfare cases need assistance too. If they're going to raise their children with any dignity at all, there's going to have to be something done to meet the increased costs of living. I would hope that the hon. minister would be able to bring in a similar bill at an early date for those genuine cases on welfare.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

There are quite a number of detailed questions. I'll try to deal with them more or less in the order they were asked, Mr. Chairman.

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican began by discussing the meaning of resident. All I can say about that is that I know he will see what it is we are trying to achieve by using the wording we did. We wanted to make sure that the good people of Alberta weren't just used by people who were casual or occasional stayers in the province. We've had to try to say that it doesn't include a tourist, a transient or a visitor to Alberta. I know how difficult it is to say what ordinarily resident means, but that is at least a partial definition of being ordinarily resident.

The support I think that subsection has is in Section 5. The Lieutenant Governor in Council can make regulations prescribing the way the act is carried out, and I would suggest that in that area you could well come up with a set of guidelines.

I don't know that it will be necessary, but Section 5 is broad enough to allow a set of guidelines which could introduce a fairly positive means of identification of ordinary residents in Alberta. Whether it be the completion of a certain type of form, most people don't have any difficulty proving that they've lived here for a number of years, if they have. Using a test would really just be for the purpose of screening out those who possibly or apparently have not. I know the driver's license, where large percentages of people over a certain age don't have them any more, might not be a suitable way of establishing residence, but I think the point is that there can be a relatively straightforward way outlined by regulations as to how residence could be established. With all of its difficulties, we thought that was the best way of putting it.

The hon. member later raised some other matters. He asked me about the discussions we may have had with the federal government regarding tax. The only discussions that there have been would have to be called unofficial, I think, for the purpose of getting a feel for this from the federal people as to what we're doing. My understanding is that there will not be a penalty from the federal government on the \$10. Their policies can provide for a recovery by them of a certain portion of additional income. I understand we will be able to arrange with them that that not be done in the case of the \$10 payment. I would have to say we have not fully finalized that position and I would like to provide further information on it in due course.

On the question of actual income tax charges being made in respect of a person receiving \$189 a month as an individual, and some slightly different figure than exactly double that when it is a couple because then the guaranteed income supplement portion comes down a bit, I think I just have to say to the hon. member that I don't think I am able to be a tax consultant on that point tonight. I'd love to know that much about The Income Tax Act, the magic that accountants perform and things like that, but I can't really go into that. I would have to leave him with giving him credit for saying that it is a very

interesting question and we will look into it. I don't know that there is either very much we could do about it, or any assurances that I could give him on that tonight.

There is a far more important issue I think the hon. Member for Calgary Millican raised. It is not precisely in the ambit of this bill to discuss it but it is not objectionable to me to respond in part, without going into it in a large way, to the question he raised in regard to what we are doing to assure the senior citizens that they are still part of our society.

I say this to the hon. member because I know this is really one of the most important questions that can be asked in regard to senior citizens. You say, let us provide so many nursing home beds; let us provide so many auxiliary hospital beds; let us provide certain income support systems; and still, what have you got in fulfilment in the later years of life of any individual.

I think I can say, Mr. Speaker, that we are more sensitive to this, in most of society in North America, than we were a short time ago. I think in the western part of our country this sensitivity is increasing, because not long ago our population didn't really have that many aged people and our culture didn't develop responses to the special problems of the aged. I think that, rather than reciting a list of achievements, the best thing I could do is to assure the hon. member that there is a very real concern.

The sort of things that are being looked at, for example, are recreational services for our senior citizens. I think the hon. members from Calgary would know that the government substantially supported a major recreation complex there for senior citizens last year. They did the same thing in the City of Edmonton. Senior citizens programs can be developed and put forward, literally by any community group, through Preventive Social Services working through their municipality, or through other types of similar programs. There are always more and more of those programs being developed, going ahead, and I do believe that progress is being made.

We paid special attention recently to the questions of reactivation and rehabilitation of geriatric patients in institutions. I would want to claim, we have quite a number of other prospects that, over a period of time, I think we can do more than consider, and we can probably bring into effect.

I think the hon. Member for Macleod made reference to what do you do when he is 66 and she is 20 years younger and because he is over 65 there is free hospitalization and Blue Cross? When the beneficiary under that particular program passes away, what do the dependants do? The hon. member says, surely they are in a worse position than they were before. How come they can no longer tie themselves to the senior citizen who is now deceased, for the purpose of getting dependant benefits under Medicare or Blue Cross?

I would say that we did discuss that. It was a difficult thing, to decide that the dependants in those cases shouldn't have the benefit carried forward. It just didn't seem to be rational in that type of example - bearing in mind the other thing the hon. member said, which I will come to - that, under the guise of a program meant for our elderly population, a person in his forties should have this benefit for the next couple of decades.

I say that is subject to the other remark the honourable gentleman made in answering his own question, because he did say that there is a subsidy program under Medicare where in all likelihood not more than \$2.00 a month would be charged to that person because of the slashing of premium under the subsidization program. Where a need is shown, where the taxable income has dropped down, for, say, a widow and dependent, to the area of less than \$1,000 a year, if I've got my figure right - it's about that - then the cost of the Medicare coverage wouldn't be over \$2 a month in any event. So, my answer to him is that through that other program there is assistance for people who are caught in that situation.

The hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen asked a question about whether there would be one or two cheques. As I visualize it, at present the province would be sending its own cheque, that's been our intention. I don't mind saying to him that if something realistic could be worked out with the other government, then certainly we'd be glad to consider anything that would make the administrative complexities less.

In regard to those dwindling numbers of persons who are still receiving the \$15 allowance, that continues. This does not affect it in any way.

I don't think the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View covered anything that I need respond to. He expressed some remarks on guaranteed annual income.

The hon. Member for Highwood raised a question in regard to 4(c) and wondered if I knew what it meant. I do. All the honourable gentleman has to do is refer to the definitions section, twice for clarity in reading, because the word supplement is important there. This means the supplement is the amount paid under the federal act. So, we're saying in 4(c) that if the amount being paid under the federal act is being paid in another province then that means residence in another province, and therefore the person is no longer entitled to payment from Alberta.

The other important word is beneficiary. By definition, beneficiary is a person who is receiving benefit under this act. So all it means is that you don't get it both ways. I don't think anybody would object to that.

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley asked some questions about those whose costs are higher than what is provided by these various programs. I would have to say to him that I know of situations such as the ones he has in mind.

In referring to this question, where do the additional funds come from for those needy cases? There is only one answer under present legislation. It does not always prove entirely satisfactory, although I would say that in every case it does prove adequate. Through the Social Allowance Program, that type of adjustment to a senior citizen's income, as well as the income of another person who may need help, can be adjusted upward. I pointed out in covering what the benefits of the various programs are, in excess of the \$200 per month provided for senior citizens at the present time; that that is relative to that particular senior citizen. If he is in need of funds beyond the roughly \$207 that's provided, he does have access to more through the Social Allowance Program.

There was just one other item I wanted to cover, Mr. Chairman, and that was the question raised under Section 7 by the hon. Member for Stettler. I don't want to be in the position where three lawyers are quarreling over the interpretation and only two of them are present. I know what the hon. Member for Stettler is getting at. It's a very fine point, a very neat point, but I think we would be all right in putting it forward on that basis to see if there is any difficulty such as he indicates. The possibility of the advice of the Legislative Counsel did not direct itself specifically to the use of that particular word. But, in the circumstances, I'm suggesting that there is no likelihood of any great misinterpretation or harm from that section.

MR. BENOIT:

One of my questions wasn't answered and the other one ... that's okay, but I still want to work on this one that we worked on.

Is the minister saying that if they take up residence in another province then they cease to receive the benefits here? Why didn't they put it that way instead of putting it - if I may say so - in such clumsy wording. The payment of a supplement to a beneficiary, even if he is not getting his supplement in another province, he still won't get aid from this province. Well, of course, they don't get aid at all, even in this province, if they don't get a supplement. I guess that's the idea.

MR. CRAWFORD:

The idea is that you have to be a person who needs to get a guaranteed income supplement before you qualify, so it is sort of a built-in means test.

The other question the honourable gentleman did ask, I've got written down here, but I skipped over it unintentionally. It's a very short answer. The annual cost of the program is about \$9 million.

[All sections of the bill, the title and preamble were agreed to.]

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 90, The Senior Citizens Benefit Act, be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 92  
The Legislative Assembly Statutes Amendment Act, 1973

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

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 92 be reported.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress and beg leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it agreed as moved by the hon. minister?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Chairman left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the following bills: Bill Nos. 88, 90 and 92, and begs to report same. Also, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration Bill No. 81 and begs to report same with some amendments, and begs leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move the amendments be read a second time.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with third readings, beginning with Bill No. 81, I've asked unanimous leave of the House to proceed with third reading on those four bills in respect of which second reading has just been given, insofar as we are moving two stages in one day.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. Government House Leader the requested unanimous consent?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Third Reading)

[It was moved and seconded by the members indicated that the following bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried without debate.]

---

<u>No.</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Moved by</u>	<u>Seconded by</u>
57	The Disaster Services Act	Horner	Crawford
58	The Coal Conservation Act	Dickie	Warrack
59	The Occupiers' Liability Act	Ghitter	Trynchy

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, on Bill No. 62, The Alberta Uniform Building Standards Act, there is one area that wasn't covered in second reading or in committee study.

I understand the minister has studied all the submissions made to him. Perhaps he could briefly advise, in winding up or closing remarks, whether or not he has studied the situation in regard to mobile homes.

I believe the minister, Mr. Speaker, has received the submission from the Canadian Mobile Home and Travel Trailer Association, whose manufacturers in Alberta are all covered under the Canadian Standards Association regulations. I am wondering if the minister could advise as to whether or not he has studied those regulations in relation to what he proposes to do by regulation under this bill as to whether or not the manufacture of mobile homes, as we know them today under the CSA regulations, will be changed or not.

Perhaps the minister would be good enough to enlarge on that. It has just been brought to my attention that this association had made this submission and they are wondering where they stand.

DR. HOHOL:

It is a fair question, Mr. Speaker. I would not presume to suggest that I am intimately familiar with the regulations indicated by the hon. member. I am familiar with them. However, the important thing is that the mobile home industry would be subject to The Alberta Uniform Building Standards Act.

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (CONT.)  
(Third Reading)

<u>No.</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Moved by</u>	<u>Seconded by</u>
62	The Alberta Uniform Building Standards Act	Hohol	Russell
64	The Human Tissue Gift Act	Crawford	Yurko
65	The Vital Statistics Amendment Act, 1973	Crawford	Yurko
66	The Alberta Lord's Day Amendment Act, 1973	Hyndman (for Leitch)	Hohol
67	The Public Health Nurses Repeal Act	Crawford	Yurko
68	The Public Service Vehicles Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 2)	Copithorne	Foster
69	The Department of the Solicitor General Act	Hunley	Warrack
70	The Workers' Compensation Act	Hohol	Yurko
71	The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 2)	Hyndman (for Leitch)	Copithorne
72	The Department of Telephones and Utilities Act	Farran	Schmid
73	The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 3)	Hyndman (for Leitch)	Horner
74	The Alberta Government Telephones Amendment Act, 1973	Farran	Dowling

---

75	The Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 2)	Crawford	Yurko
76	The Health and Social Development Statutes Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 2)	Crawford	Yurko
77	The Mental Health Amendment Act, 1973	Crawford	Getty
78	The Nursing Homes Amendment Act, 1973	Crawford	Getty
79	The Alberta Property Tax Reduction Amendment Act, 1973	Russell	Farran
80	The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1973	Farran (for Miniely)	Peacock
81	The Change of Name Act, 1973	Crawford	Yurko
82	The Alberta Opportunity Fund Amendment Act, 1973	Peacock	Dowling
83	The Rural Gas Act	Farran	Purdy
85	The Credit Union Amendment Act, 1973	Horner	Miller, J.
86	The Municipal Taxation Amendment Act, 1973 (No. 2)	Russell	Backus
88	The Licensing of Trades and Businesses Amendment Act, 1973	Dowling	Lee
90	The Senior Citizens Benefit Act	Crawford	Chambers
92	The Legislative Assembly Statutes Amendment Act, 1973	Hyndman	Backus
Pr. 10	An Act to Incorporate Westbank Koziak Golf and Country Club		King

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Lieutenant Governor will now attend upon the Assembly.

ROYAL ASSENT

[The Lieutenant Governor entered the Legislative Assembly and took his place upon the Throne.]

MR. SPEAKER:

May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Alberta has, at its present sittings thereof, passed certain bills to which, and in the name of the said Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

CLERK:

Your Honour, following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

[The Clerk read the titles of all the above bills to which third reading had earlier been given.]

[The Lieutenant Governor indicated his assent.]

In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor doth assent to these bills.

SERGEANT AT ARMS:

Order!

[The Lieutenant Governor left the Legislative Assembly.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I had tentively intended to move the House back into committee at this time for further consideration of the report on rules but, insofar as it has come to my attention that one or two matters may require further amendment and the sections in which the amendments are proposed may require some careful study, I would say at this time that we therefore will not be proceeding back to committee at this time but, rather, will leave the matter in committee as it now stands and go back to the matter of completion of house rules in December, I would suggest the first Tuesday or the first Thursday of the session, which will commence on Monday, December 3.

Accordingly I'd ask that Government Motion No. 6 on page 2 be now called.

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (CONT.)

6. Mr. Hyndman proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Dr. Hohol:

That, the Assembly do now adjourn until 2:30 o'clock in the afternoon of Monday, December 3, 1973.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until Monday afternoon, December 3, 1973 at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 9.47 o'clock.]