

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, March 21, 1974

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

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege to bring a matter to your attention. This arises out of Hansard of Tuesday afternoon. Mr. Speaker, it leaves an inference that I did not make in this House. It says, "Dr. Horner: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend from Clover Bar may not be concerned about the cattle situation ..."

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. I would draw to the hon. member's attention the provision of the new rules which requires some notice to the Speaker of a point of privilege of this kind.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I will abide by your ruling, but the inference is left on television in this House and I would like it corrected that I did not make that statement. I did not leave that inference ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. If the hon. member would like to submit the appropriate material, I will be glad to look it over.

## PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to beg leave to present a petition. The petition, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows, and is signed by some 708 Calgarians, the majority of whom are students of Mount Royal College:

It is prayed to the Legislature that: The undersigned citizens of Calgary wish to express their great concern for the lack of funds for the Calgary Drug Information Centre. We believe the DIC is offering worthwhile and beneficial services to the Calgary community and hope that funds will be made available for its continued operation.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that attached to the petition is a telegram which I have just received advising me that another 239 signatures will be forthcoming. I've also received a communication from Winston Churchill High School in Calgary that a telegram is forthcoming with another 213 names.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 43 The Nursing Homes Amendment Act, 1974

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce today Bill No 43, being The Nursing Homes Amendment Act, 1974.

Mr. Speaker, among the substantial amendments which are included in this bill are, first of all, amendments which specify more clearly the conditions applicable to the sale or transfer of control of a nursing home. The most significant principle in these amendments is the requirement that the operator of a nursing home must be a resident of Alberta or, in the case of a corporation, at least 50 per cent of the equity shares must be owned by Albertans.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the act will permit the Alberta Hospital Services Commission ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. With great respect I believe the hon. member is going considerably beyond what is usually allowed in the introduction of a bill.

MR. YOUNG:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to identify two major principles, but let me say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that it will generally change the status of the Alberta Hospital Services Commission with respect to nursing homes by enlarging that responsibility and specifying the procedures which the commission must follow.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 43 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 43, The Nursing Homes Amendment Act, 1974 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 208 An Act to amend The Alberta Insurance Act

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being an Act to amend The Alberta Insurance Act. If passed, it would do away with discrimination because of race, age or sex in the field of automobile insurance.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 208 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Bill No. 202  
The Community Health and Social Services Centres Act

DR. PAPRCSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 202, being The Community Health and Social Services Centres Act.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to bring about community-coordinated health and social services. It will assist communities to bring about this rapid responsiveness in the area of health and social services and, finally, in concluding, Mr. Speaker, it will be a key link in the health delivery system.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is now getting into the merits.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 202 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 207, The Public Officials Disclosure Act

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce another bill, being The Public Officials Disclosure Act. This bill would require elected MLAs, officials and senior civil servants to disclose any interests in property and businesses they have - in other words, a conflict of interest bill. That's about a brief summary of what the bill is intended to do.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 207 was introduced and read a first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, 40 members of the Olds Evergreen Club who are in the public gallery. I'd like the members of the Olds Evergreen Club to rise and be recognized by the members of the Assembly in the usual manner.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague who is not present today, Mr. Jamison, the hon. Member for St. Albert, I'd like to introduce some 40 members of the No. 85 Royal Canadian Air Cadets who, I understand, are seated in both the public and the members gallery. I'd ask that they rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce to the House and to you, sir, some 55 members of a class of Grade 9 students from Mount Carmel High School in my constituency in Edmonton Parkallen. They are accompanied today by their teacher, Mr. Harris, and I'd ask them to rise and be recognized too.

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table two reports required by statute. The first is a report indicating that there are no regulations under The Coal Mines Regulation Act.

The second is a report indicating that there are no regulations under the authority of The Gas Resources Preservation Act.

Mr. Speaker, I'm also pleased to file a report of the Suffield Evaluation Committee summarizing its operations during 1973.

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report for 1972-73 of Alberta Public Works and say in doing so that the printed copy, owing to pressure on the Queen's Printer, will be available in a day or two when it will be distributed generally to the members.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table, as required by statute, the annual reports of Athabasca University, The University of Lethbridge, The University of Calgary, The University of Alberta and the Alberta Universities Commission.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the 1973 annual report of Alberta Research. Arrangements have been made for copies to be distributed to all the members of the Legislative Assembly for their information and review.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would also beg leave to table the financial statements of the Alberta Opportunity Company ending March 31, 1973.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

##### Department of Municipal Affairs

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to read the text of a letter that was mailed yesterday to all municipal clerks throughout the Province of Alberta dealing with the matter of the municipal incentive grants and the 7.5 per cent budget increase guidelines.

The government has had under review the above matter and the viewpoints expressed by Alberta citizens, municipal councils and the two municipal government associations have been carefully considered. The conclusion reached is that the 7.5 per cent Budget Increase Guideline should be removed as a qualifying factor for receipt of the Municipal Incentive Grants. This will be done, effective January 1, 1974.

The experience of the past year indicates that many municipalities have developed improved budgeting and accounting procedures as a result of the 7.5 per cent Guideline. Generally, municipalities were able to successfully show restraint in their 1973 budget increases, which in turn benefitted local taxpayers.

Now that the 7.5 per cent Guideline is being removed, the full responsibility for practising restraint, or otherwise, naturally falls to the elected municipal council. I am hopeful that these new circumstances will further encourage our councils to respect local views when considering their current budgets.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House are indeed pleased at the announcement which the Minister of Municipal Affairs has just made with regard to the removal of the 7.5 per cent guideline on municipal expenditures in Alberta. We're particularly pleased, Mr. Speaker, because that's the attitude that the members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition expressed during the last session of this Assembly when this legislation was put forward.

Also, need I remind the hon. members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that that in essence was the substance of the motion the hon. Member for Calgary Bow had on the Order Paper last fall and was on the Order Paper until Tuesday of this week. We're extremely pleased the government has seen the error of its ways, the wisdom of our advice and glad it moved in this direction.

##### Department of the Environment

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to read a short statement as a follow-up to the report I tabled yesterday on flooding. It will be very short.

The potential for spring floods in areas of the province north of Red Deer is high this year. The department report says that the situation was set up by a combination of heavy winter snowfalls, which were up to 180 per cent of normal, and autumn precipitation as high as twice the seasonal average.

The fall rains reduced the ability of the soils to absorb spring run-off.

The amount of run-off and flooding will depend to a large degree on the speed of the spring melt and whether rains accompany the thaw.

The most serious effects of a fast run-off would be along small rivers, streams and creeks which originate at low elevations.

These will melt first with run-off expected to start in mid-April.

The major rivers, with headwaters in the mountains, reach their peaks in June and July. Whether they flood depends to a large degree on the amount of rain.

The greatest flood danger is expected along the Vermilion, Paddle, Pembina and Sturgeon Rivers, Pine Creek and in the Grande Prairie, Fairview, Rycroft, Whitecourt, Coronation and Cold Lake areas. Other regions might also encounter problems.

Early spring floods are least likely in large, urban centres. Inundated land is expected to be unsettled or agricultural, along with some roads. Such floods usually only damage property such grain, feed or agricultural animals kept in low-lying areas.

A few communities with unique local conditions, such as roads or snowbanks which act as obstructions to the normal flows, might also encounter some problems.

Flooding due to ice-jams on rivers is generally unpredictable, but the towns of Peace River, Whitecourt and Fort McMurray have previously had such problems.

The Department of the Environment has initiated work to weaken the ice at Peace River by trenching and by spreading sand to absorb solar heat and speed melting.

Arrangements are being made for blasting of ice on the Peace River and the British Columbia government has agreed to investigate using the W.A.C. Bennett Dam to reduce the river's flow through the town during break-up.

Advisory meetings have been held at Peace River and Fort McMurray and another is scheduled for Whitecourt.

Beside these activities, the department is a member of a task force that was formed this week under the coordination of Alberta Disaster Services to complete contingency preparations.

Also represented on the task force are the Alberta Departments of Highways and Transport; Municipal Affairs and Agriculture; the RCMP; the Canadian Emergency Measures Organization; Canadian Forces and the Alberta Bureau of Public Affairs.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### Snow - East-Central Alberta

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier, and ask the Premier, in light of the tremendous amount of snow in east-central Alberta, has the government given serious consideration to some sort of additional financial assistance to municipal governments in east-central Alberta?

These municipal governments have now spent much over their allotted expenditure for snow removal, and in fact the money they're now spending will have to be taken away from their construction programs this summer.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I refer the question to the Deputy Premier who is responsible for the Emergency Measures Organization.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we've been in touch with the counties of Wainwright, Camrose and Wetaskiwin, and are in continuing touch with them in relation not only to the money they require, but at the moment it's essentially a lack of equipment to do the job completely. We are attempting to line up equipment for them in other parts of the province. Insofar as the money question is concerned, that will be given consideration once we get the immediate needs of the people dealt with.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is the government prepared to make the services of the Alberta Emergency Measures Organization

available where necessary to help farmers in getting feed to their cattle in this east-central portion of the Province of Alberta, where the problem is most acute at this time?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, that's exactly what I have said. The Alberta Disaster Services Agency is in touch with the reeves of each of these counties and indeed they will be making their services available to them all. They are continuing the search for equipment which is actually the essential thing at the moment - more equipment.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What heavy equipment has the disaster services organization got in relation to dealing with flooding and emergency situations of that type?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, pretty obviously the Disaster Services Agency is a coordinating agency. We do not own any heavy equipment at all, but what we can do is sometimes put together the needs and the equipment. That is what we are attempting to do today.

MR. LUDWIG:

If the hon. minister states that they have no heavy equipment, have they got any light equipment to deal with any of these problems?

AN HCN. MEMBER:

A shovel?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation with a supplementary, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview with a final supplementary.

MR. SCRENSON:

A supplementary to the Deputy Premier. Would the Deputy Premier consider visiting the area of east-central Alberta to view first-hand the grim conditions brought about by constant blizzards?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing to go anywhere if it's going to be of any help to the people who are in the area. I would point out that the hon. Member for Camrose has already reviewed the area for me personally in the last two days, but if it's necessary I, too, would go.

MR. NCTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to pose a supplementary question for clarification. Will the same assistance be available to other parts of the province, or will it be restricted at this time to east-central Alberta?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I think this government has shown over the past two and a half years that it is very conscious of the needs of its people. We have to deal with these kinds of emergencies on an emergent basis. The fact is that the worst snow conditions at the moment are in east-central Alberta, and these are the areas that have the serious situation in front of them at the moment.

#### Commonwealth Games Committee

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a second question to the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. I would like to ask the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation if it's the intention of the government to have the three cabinet ministers who are on the Commonwealth Games Committee continue to act on the games committee, or is the government going to agree with the suggestion made in a report to the games committee that politicians step down from the games committee and another group of interested Edmontonians carry off the job?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I think this would be a philosophical question since, after all, the ministers have been asked by the foundation to serve on the board. If it's a matter of work being provided by the ministers to the respective positions that they have on the board, I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that the hours I have spent around midnight working for that organization I could count by the hundreds. So can the other ministers who are part of that. Also, of course, what he just proposed is the opinion of one man who happens to have come in late and now probably is trying to get the position of chairman.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question was answered under the ministerial order by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### Oldman River Levels

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, this question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. It has to do with the problems in the Oldman River. Is the minister's intention, or his department's intention, to make a feasibility study of the three rivers dam [proposal] with a view to building it some time in the near future?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, as a result of the signing of the irrigation rehabilitation agreement with the federal government, the whole water-management program in southern Alberta is constantly being reviewed. It was recognized during the course of this review that there will be a need for additional storage of water in the Oldman River basin, and this is being looked at on a longer-term rather than on a short-term basis.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### Calgary Drug Information Centre

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the minister advise if he has personally visited the Calgary Drug Information Centre?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I can answer that by saying yes I can advise whether or not I have personally visited the Calgary Drug Information Centre.

[Laughter]

By way of supplementing the answer, Mr. Speaker, I would add that I have not.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can the hon. minister advise if he has personally inspected any surveys which were conducted regarding the operation of the Calgary Drug Information Centre?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is in existence at least one study, or evaluation, in respect to the Drug Information Centre, that was done on behalf of, if not by, the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission. I have not examined that evaluation in detail myself.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise if any government-authorized surveys were conducted on the Calgary Drug Information Centre and the results not written up or a report made as a result of the surveys?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the situation is that the government itself has caused no study or evaluation to be made but the alcoholism commission has. As to whether or not an evaluation has been prepared by them and not put into publishable form, I do not know.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise if he has received any requests, to close down the Calgary Drug Information Centre by withholding funds, other than from the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, no request has come to my attention to close it down. Of course that is not entirely a matter of whether or not the grant from the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission is paid again, as it had been in the past, although I acknowledge the relevance of that.

MR. HENDERSON:

Would the minister entertain a further study into the issue by an organization, other than the alcoholism commission, that doesn't have a specific vested interest in the issue?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a suggestion that probably should be followed, it could certainly well be followed in this case.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### Governor General's Visit

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, a short question directed to the hon. Premier. Will Canada's new Governor General be invited to visit this Legislature during his first official visit to Alberta on April 18 and 19?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that's something I'd like to take under advisement. I am not certain of the entire arrangements. I believe there is a dinner being organized which members on both sides of the House will be invited to attend and participate in, but obviously it would have to be a representative group of members.

I will give that consideration. I understand the schedule is rather tight but if it is possible to do it, I certainly will extend that [invitation]. Having said that, I am now beginning to think that there may be a protocol problem involved in such a situation, that I had better be sure of before I respond.

MR. SPEAKER:

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



Collective Bargaining Agreements

MR. STROMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. Are requests of organized employees to reopen collective bargaining agreements becoming common in Alberta?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I would respond in two ways. First I would guess that the hon. member is really referring to adjusting agreements, though the term "reopening an agreement" is commonly used.

An agreement can be opened only in two ways. First by a clause in the collective agreement that says "for certain causes", for example, under federal legislation because of changes in technology which may displace workers, or in a second case, by mutual consent of two parties to an agreement.

There has been some activity of this kind in Alberta - in most cases having to do with the government itself. Some of its Crown agencies, and in some cases, certain teacher organizations have approached school boards for a consideration of adjustment of negotiated agreements.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Work Incentive Program

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. It's a follow-up question from one I posed last fall. It's with respect to the work incentive experimental program in Manitoba.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is, has the government given any further consideration to establishing a similar kind of experimental program in the Province of Alberta?

MR. CPAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of programs that fit into either the work incentive type of area or the community employment type of area. They are progressing at the present time, within the limits that they are in operation, to my satisfaction. I refer to the Employment Opportunities Program which has resulted in probably 5,000 or 6,000 people being placed in employment during the calendar year of 1973. We have been particularly pleased with the success of the program in regard to placing women in employment.

The other program that would be of a community employment type is the Opportunity Corps Program which has special relevance to Natives. It is well known that the employment opportunities in areas - rural areas, remote areas north of the most settled part of the central part of the province - are not that great.

A work incentive program in the terms of the Manitoba experiment, which, if I'm not mistaken, is to be in Dauphin - we have not designed a program of that particular type. That was designed in collaboration between the Government of Manitoba and the federal government.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether there will be any monitoring of the Manitoba experimental program, and what mechanism would be used to monitor that program?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there would be an evaluation done in the normal course by the two governments involved and it is also customary for those evaluations, when done, to be available to all provincial governments. We would expect to receive it.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Can the minister advise whether there will be any changes in the Health and Social Development program in Alberta this coming year, dealing with the work incentive concept?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question could possibly lead to a need for a fairly extended answer. But if the minister thinks that it can be answered briefly, perhaps this might be the appropriate time.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will indeed be brief.

The answer is that I expect to be able to refer to a work incentive type of policy, if not during this session then during the months immediately following that. So that would certainly be within the period of time - I think the hon. member asked if it would be this year. The answer is that my expectation is that it would be.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question. In view of the fact that 75 per cent of the Manitoba experiment is funded by the federal government, is there any cost sharing with respect to the research that is being done on this matter in Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am not entirely sure of all the details of cost sharing between the Employment Opportunities Program and the Opportunity Corps Program. I presume, being social assistance programs, that those are cost shared.

If I could add just one thing, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the Manitoba program, since the question and the last supplementary relates directly to it. I am not yet satisfied that that sort of program is as suitable for Alberta as it is for Manitoba. Other than the well-known areas of the Native population and special reference to difficulties of those under 25, where employment opportunities are more favourable in Alberta than in any other part of Canada, we do not have an employment problem in the same sense as many other areas.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Smoky River followed by the hon. Member for Highwood.

#### Peace River Ice

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. As a result of the statement by the minister today and local concerns expressed regarding abnormal ice thicknesses on the Peace River near the Town of Peace River, will the minister be able to indicate what action, if any, is being contemplated by his department?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that has repeatedly been brought to my attention by the Minister Without Portfolio responsible for northern affairs.

Mr. Speaker, we have taken multiple action in this regard. First, in the last couple of years we have provided extensive dyking on a 50-50 cost proposition with the Town of Peace River. Secondly, we have engaged a consultant to study the matter. Right now there is an experimental program going on, whereby trenches are being dug longitudinally down the ice about six feet wide by one-half mile long by about five and one-half feet deep. They are being filled with dirt and rock so they can absorb the sun and weaken the ice. Also, we have the availability of dynamite. Necessary transportation and blasting personnel are being assured through a contract with a reliable blasting firm.

As I indicated earlier, we have been in contact with the Government of British Columbia in terms of programming releases from the Bennett Dam to bust the ice in this area in case jamming does occur.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Eastern Slopes - ECA Report

MR. BENOIT:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is also to the Minister of the Environment. Besides the proposed temporary land-use guidelines for the eastern slopes, what action does the government now plan in conjunction with the eastern slopes reports? And when?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I think this question has been answered on several occasions, and that is that the government has held in abeyance any action until such time as the final report of the Authority is released to government. It is expected that this final report will be released to government sometime towards the end of summer, perhaps August or September.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Regional Hospital Boards

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is on the subject of hospital boards. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is a timely question in that there is a conference ...

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's preamble is not necessarily required in the question period.

MR. HO LEM:

The question is directed to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the hon. minister advise the Legislature whether any consideration is being given to the proposition of regional hospital boards to govern, and have responsibility for hospitals located in rural Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it has been the consistent policy of the government to have very full regard to the essence and nature of rural communities in Alberta. They have historically, as to their hospital boards, been structured in a rather autonomous and locally-oriented way. It is the government's intention and desire that they continue in that way and not be regionalized in any sense.

MR. HC LEM:

A supplementary, to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. Concern was expressed at the hospital conference ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Would the hon. member please come directly to the question.

MR. HC LEM:

Mr. Speaker, there is a shortage being experienced by hospital boards in Alberta over the shortage of ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. If the hon. member wishes to ask a question would he please ask it outright.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. Will the minister support and encourage Alberta universities to offer courses leading to degrees in hospital administration in the near future to alleviate the difficult experience being experienced throughout Alberta?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I got the message.

MR. CLARK:

Let's have the answer.

MR. FOSTER:

I'm not personally aware, Mr. Speaker, of the shortage to which the hon. member referred. However, if there is such a shortage, I'm sure that someone in the hospital sector will be in touch with the universities or the colleges and perhaps with the program services division of the Department of Advanced Education. If at that time some university or college wishes to propose a new program that is not currently offered by any of the institutions, or even if it is, offer such a program to us, we would be very happy to look at it as quickly as possible. If there is the urgency the hon. member suggests, we'll do so even faster.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Boy, that's leadership!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### Private Members' Bills - Printing

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to any minister who may be responsible for the printing of bills, unless it is the hon. Mr. Speaker. Is there any hope that the private members' bills will be printed before they are ready to be debated, in view of the fact that we are receiving certain private members' bills late, Mr. Speaker? We received the one that's to be debated today, today. It's creating a serious problem. I wonder if any minister can clarify the situation, whether we have any hope of getting these bills in advance?

MR. SPEAKER:

I'll take the hon. member's question under consideration and try to provide him with an answer later in the day.

MR. LUDWIG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

#### Governor General's Visit (Cont.)

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may further respond to the question raised by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking with regard to the visit by the Governor General to Alberta.

Having checked with perhaps the higher authority within the chamber, I have been advised that the better position is that the situation of parliamentary procedure would lead us to the conclusion that it would not be an appropriate approach to entertaining and receiving the Governor General insofar as the Lieutenant-Governor's position as representative of Her Majesty here in this province.

But we will certainly do our best to assure that the Governor General's visit is handled in such a way as to have the maximum degree of access to the citizens and to the members.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmcntcn Calder followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell.

Suffield Block - Evaluation Wells

MR. CHAMBERS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Minister of Mines and Minerals how many evaluation wells have been drilled to date in the Suffield Block?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, the Suffield evaluation committee completed the drilling of 77 evaluation wells during the month of February. Hon. members will recall that in the Gray Report they recommended to the government that there be drilled 77 evaluation wells. All hon. members will want to know that the 77 wells that have been drilled can all be classified as successful natural gas wells.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What a gas!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmcntcn Ottewell followed by the hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

School Act - Section 90

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Education. I wish to inquire as to whether or not it is intended to proceed with the repeal of Section 90 of The School Act, as indicated by Bill No. 28 on the Order Paper?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, that section, when it was introduced by way of Bill No. 28, was on the understanding which I had that there was general agreement between the various parties interested that to repeal that section would be desired. However, it appears that agreement was not present.

Accordingly, when the bill reaches committee, it is my intention at that time to move to perhaps to one of two alternatives, either to leave existing Section 90 in the bill for this year the way it now stands or possibly to amend Section 90 if a general and essential agreement could be obtained by the interested parties by the time the bill reaches committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Taber-Warner followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

Regional Services Programs

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the minister responsible for rural development. Could the minister indicate to this House if the minister's department was involved in the selection of towns for regional services programs?

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. MILLER:

A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate if he has received representation from either MLAs or communities regarding lack of representation in their towns or constituencies?

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

No, Mr. Speaker, in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge ... I believe the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce has a supplementary answer.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, if I may give a supplementary answer to that ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Horner next.

MR. PEACOCK:

We have had some inquiries that we haven't been able to process at this time regarding certain communities that have not been covered by our regional representatives. I think I have mentioned in the House before that this whole complete regional program would be discussed at an appropriate time in the Estimates.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Universities - Academic Control

MR. GRUENWALD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Advanced Education. Is it the policy of the minister or the minister's department that control of academic programs in universities be taken away from the general faculties council and given to the boards of governors as stated by the Deputy Minister of Advanced Education while in Lethbridge on February 21?

MR. PCSTER:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the statement that the hon. member alleges was made by the Deputy Minister of Advanced Education was not, in fact, made by him. That may be the impression of the member and perhaps some people in Lethbridge.

The statement to which the member refers was a suggestion that the powers and functions and duties of the board of governors, of the general faculties council and of the senate - and for that matter, other agencies and organizations within advanced education - will all be subject to the general review - that we are proposing and have announced some time ago - of legislation. That review is currently under way and we are hoping that all institutions will respond to us this summer and that we can arrange public meetings in the fall. At that time, and in the course of the next year and a half, we intend to review the role and function, the division of powers, et cetera, a complete review, primarily of The Universities Act and The Colleges Act. To that extent, the role and function of the general faculties council may be uncertain. But it's not intended that there should be any transfer of authority or power or function from one authority to the other before a complete review has been done.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Thanks, Mr. Minister, for that clarification. Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, does the Deputy Minister of Advanced Education articulate and express the policies or the views of the Minister of Advanced Education when making speeches to universities in this province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is some basic doubt in the mind of the Chair as to whether ministers may be asked to comment on statements made outside the House and I believe the better opinion is that they may not.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Supplementary, in a slightly different vein. Will the guidelines on university budgets be removed this year then in accordance with the announcement made today, regarding municipalities, from the Minister of ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member's concern in this matter could be dealt with during the discussion of the Estimates.

I believe the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation has a supplementary answer.

Commonwealth Games Committee (Cont.)

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, as he may not know that the government of the Province of Alberta was also asked to supply a minister for the presentation in Munich to get the Commonwealth Games to Alberta.

I did so on behalf of the hon. Premier and the province, the people of Alberta, and I would like to file the remarks that I made there which concluded that, on behalf of the hon. Premier and the people of Alberta, "I invite you to bring the Commonwealth Games to Alberta to give our people the honour and pleasure of playing host to you, with a warmth ..."

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please. If the hon. minister is going to table the document, perhaps it is not necessary to read it.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to file the document and also will conclude by stating ...

MR. SPEAKER:

May I ask the hon. minister to refrain from concluding the statement, since it doesn't seem to be related to the question.

MR. SCHMID:

It's related to the question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to conclude by saying that naturally, should the Commonwealth Games Foundation ask the directors to resign, we will do so.

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The Chair is of the opinion that the hon. minister's concluding sentence was definitely related to the question.

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

Fertilizer Plants - Southern Alberta

MR. WYSE:

I'd like to direct my question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. It's regarding the proposed \$400 million chemical plant to be built in southern Alberta. Has the company or plant been guaranteed a continuous supply of gas, and has the provincial government made any kind of commitment of gas from the Suffield Block?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce may wish to supplement that, but there has been no commitment dealing with the supply of natural gas.

MR. FEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, no commitment, as far as the province is concerned.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the Minister of Agriculture had an opportunity yet to discuss person-to-person with the principals of this complex the allocation of fertilizer for the domestic market?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, surely we intimated a general policy of this government in the Legislature two or three days ago. I would anticipate that the companies involved in the manufacture of fertilizer would take notice of that policy statement and indeed contact the government.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Expo 74 - Travel Grants

MR. F. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. Has a decision been made with regard to grants available to various groups to attend Expo?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, only today I was informed that due to the bedrock not being able to be blasted, due to the foundation requirements for a bridge which is close by, we now are not having an indoor facility but only an outdoor one. Based on that decision we can now ascertain how much money is left to help cultural organizations to travel to Expo for performances there.

MR. F. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture, or the Deputy Premier. Can agricultural societies qualify for grants or loans to send potential young farmers or 4-Hers to Expo?

MR. SPEAKER:

Unless the answer to the question is concealed within the recesses of government policy, it would appear to be a question of law.

MR. F. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the question is with regard to policy. The policy would be whether the various groups in Alberta qualify for grants or not, and that would be determined directly by policy.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Answer the question.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Could he clarify for Hansard and posterity what "indoor" and "outdoor" facilities are?

[Laughter]

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to relate those outdoor facilities to the Christmas cards I'm getting. However, maybe I should also state that an indoor facility in this case would have included a movie theatre which would have shown environmental and tourist-type movies in that facility. This cannot now be done. The outdoor facility will be a stage-type of accommodation for groups which travel to Spokane to perform on behalf of the Province of Alberta and for the Spokane Exposition.



MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I feel my question was in order and would appreciate an answer from the Deputy Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Let's have an answer.

DR. HORNBER:

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the hon. member, as well as most of the people of the Province of Alberta, appreciate the aggressive manner in which my colleague, the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation, looks after these matters. I'm sure all the young people of Alberta will be looked after in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

#### Charter Air Line Fares

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. I would like to know if the minister could indicate to the House what steps his department has taken to determine whether planned air fare increases for charter air lines originating in Alberta are justified?

MR. DOWLING:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no jurisdiction over that type of thing at all in Consumer Affairs.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Well, sit down.

MR. DOWLING:

I am sure that Travel Alberta is very interested in what the fares are, particularly those for people coming to Alberta, because that's our major aim, to make certain that the people of Alberta travel Alberta and those from outside the province come and visit us.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker. A supplementary, I think the hon. minister missed my point. I asked about charters originating in Alberta, and I would like to follow this up. Could the minister indicate to us if he has met with representatives of charter air lines originating in Alberta to discuss the matter of fare increases?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, we have met with the major domestic air lines and also other charters on various matters, and fare prices are one of them. We are always concerned about the cost of increases in any fare. For example, our Skifari program that originated some year and a half ago ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. I would respectfully suggest the hon. minister is going beyond the scope of the question.

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

#### Detoxification Centre

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Is the detoxification centre operating now to full capacity?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to presume that the question relates to the detoxification centre at the Royal Alexandra Hospital in Edmonton.

MR. TAYLOR:

No, Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the detoxification centre that the department built and opened just a few months ago in the heart of the city.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Where?

MR. TAYLOR:

In Edmonton. In the heart of the city.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Oh yes, Mr. Speaker. The intoxicification recovery centre which is linked to the detoxification centre - which is hospital-based - was opened in downtown Edmonton some six or so months ago and is operating now, I believe, at about capacity.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are some being turned away at this time?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know if some are turned away. I don't think that's a very good way of putting it. In the event that there are not enough beds in the facility - I believe there are 28 beds there on a permanent basis - then the people who come are referred to alternative arrangements or put on out-patient treatments. If there is a possibility of bringing them in to that particular facility, and if that particular one is better for them than the alternatives, then those efforts are kept up.

MR. TAYLOR:

One further supplementary. Is there any thought of the government partially funding Recovery if it was reactivated to look after what some people call "the dregs" of society?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's question relates to the operation previously run by Mr. Townsend. There is no present intention, Mr. Speaker, to reactivate that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Alberta School for the Deaf - Superintendent

MR. GRUENWALD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Education. Has there been a superintendent appointed yet for the Alberta School for the Deaf?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Not yet. There is an acting superintendent at the moment, Mr. Speaker, and we are engaged in a search for a new superintendent.

MR. GRUENWALD:

A supplementary. How long has the school been without a permanent superintendent, Mr. Minister?

MR. HYNDMAN:

It is some months since there has been a permanent superintendent, Mr. Speaker, but we do want to ensure that we get the best possible person in light of what the future holds for that very important facility. So we think it is worthwhile to spend the time to get a

person who has the special capabilities demanded, before jumping into a decision of that important nature.

MR. GRUENWALD:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What is the status of the advisory committee for the school for the deaf, or is there one as yet?

MR. HYNDMAN:

There have been a number of very close contacts which were originated some months ago by the previous superintendent between the parents and those in the community of the deaf. However, I'll endeavour to get more information as to the details of the kind of advisory committees or the links with various parents that have been established.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Rural Development Study

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio responsible for rural development. I would like to know from the hon. minister what the present status is of the rural development study and when that report will be tabled in this House?

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, nearly all government departments have programs and policies that have a tremendous effect on rural development. It is ongoing and they have been tabling reports.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister indicate to us when this report will be available to the Legislature?

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

When it's finished.

DR. BUCK:

Well, "when it's finished". That could be ten years. I mean ...

MR. NCTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the hon. minister a supplementary question really following up from my honourable colleague's, and ask whether there is any time frame in his mind as to when this study will be tabled in the Legislature? Does he propose to do it this year, next year?

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, rural development, as such, is not a department.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's true!

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

As I mentioned before, the various government departments have programs and policies that affect rural Alberta and they have been tabling reports.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

First Ministers' Talks

MR. DIXON:

I'd like to direct my question to the hon. the Premier. I was wondering if the Premier would confirm to the House if Prime Minister Trudeau has been in touch with him regarding a meeting in Ottawa with all the first ministers of Canada? My question is, are the discussions going to be limited to oil pricing, or will other items, such as the constitutional problem, be discussed?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, yes, I'd be quite prepared to confirm that the meeting is being arranged by the Prime Minister. I gather the purpose of the meeting is to follow up on the luncheon we had after the first ministers' conference on energy in January in Ottawa. It would be an opportunity for the Prime Minister to review developments at that time, primarily on the oil-pricing situation and related matters, with the other eight premiers, and of course, the premiers of Saskatchewan and Alberta will be there participating in the discussion and in the review.

It is quite possible that it will include other items of discussion, but the essential purpose is to discuss the many ongoing aspects that were raised at the first ministers' conference on energy.

Alberta Crude Oil Pricing

MR. DIXON:

One final supplementary question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, will Alberta be in a position to announce the price that we are going to be asking for Alberta oil at that meeting?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not certain whether or not that will be finally resolved at that time. It is quite clear in my mind that both that matter and a number of related matters are going to be a matter of ongoing discussion over a course of many months, if not years.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could just ask one more supplemental question. In that case then, there is a possibility that the oil price question will not be settled in the next two weeks then?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, it may be that the oil price matter is, considered in terms of the short term. It may be also true that the matter of the oil price question will be with us and with the country for many months and years to come.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, will the new royalty arrangement for crude oil be dependent upon, at least a settlement for a period of time of the oil price situation, or will it be announced right away?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is "no" to the first part. To the second part, the timing of the announcement with regard to the oil royalty will be on or before the first of April.

---

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the shocking attempt to abduct Princess Anne and her husband, Captain Mark Phillips, I would respectfully request from my colleagues unanimous consent to introduce a resolution to authorize the Speaker to send a telegram to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth, to read as follows:

We, your loyal members of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Possibly we ought first to find out whether the hon. member has unanimous leave to introduce the resolution.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it he has that leave.

MR. SORENSON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We, your loyal members of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, express regret at the outrageous criminal action taken against the Princess and her husband, and we beg Your Majesty to acknowledge our expression of admiration for the courage you have demonstrated in facing this brutal and unwarranted crisis.

[Applause]

MR. SPEAKER:

I take the hon. members' applause to be an indication that the motion is carried.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, in connection with information for the House. You have always been excellent in explaining the points of rules and the orders you have given, such as you did the other day in connection with the 'anticipation' rule on the resolution moved by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Would you advise the House now if the statement by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs was not also in anticipation of the budget, and wherein lies the difference? I ask this not to be facetious, but simply so we can have your reasoning in connection with 'anticipation' in the future.

MR. SPEAKER:

I don't recall the exact text or purport of the statement that is being referred to. I will be glad to check it in Hansard. I would suggest if the hon. member feels that the rule against anticipation is being infringed upon that perhaps a point of order might be raised at the time when that occurs.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

113. Mr. Gitter proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

1. Copies of all correspondence between the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission and the Calgary Drug Information Centre during 1972, 1973, 1974.

2. Copies of all reports or studies conducted by the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission relating to the Calgary Drug Information Centre.
3. Copies of all correspondence relating to the reports or studies conducted by the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission on the Calgary Drug Information Centre.
4. Copies of minutes of all meetings held between officials of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission and the Calgary Drug Information Centre.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in respect to Motion No. 113, I would like to move that it be amended as follows: firstly, that paragraph 4 of the motion be deleted, and secondly, that at the end of the motion, the following words be added, namely, "subject to the consent of the Calgary Drug Information Centre."

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, on rising to the amendment. If I may, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with point 4 which has been amended by the hon. minister pertaining to the necessity for the copies of minutes, I would like, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of the hon. members of the Legislative Assembly the reason I believe that section 4 may be necessary from the point of view of this motion.

Mr. Speaker, I do so as a result of the great alarm which has been experienced by many citizens in the city of Calgary with respect to the decision of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission to refuse the funding for the Calgary Drug Information Centre which will result in the closing of what, in my opinion and in the opinion of many Calgarians and citizens of southern Alberta, is a necessity, a valuable service which must be maintained. In my view, Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission is arrogant, it's centralist in nature, it defeats the importance of maintaining voluntary agencies and displays a complete misunderstanding of what constitutes an efficient, human ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

The motion before the House is as to whether or not certain information is to be tabled. If the hon. member wishes to deal with the wisdom or otherwise of what has been done, it would seem to me that that might require a substantive to the motion in itself.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, the only way I can bring to the attention of the members the importance of having the minutes of these meetings so it can be then determined, is by presenting the argument behind the necessity for the minutes. The only way I can do that, Mr. Speaker, is by developing the background of this centre, what has occurred, so that the appropriateness of the entry of these minutes may be considered by all hon. members. And the only way I can do that is by bringing the background to the hon. members' attention.

MR. WILSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I whole-heartedly concur with the hon. member for Calgary Buffalo, and I think it is important that a case be made to have these minutes and correspondence tabled.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have come to a stage in the manner in which the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission is handling its affairs, that we ought to know what's going on, Mr. Speaker, and that ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. The hon. member is debating the motion and perhaps he might do that when his turn comes.

It would appear to me, with great respect, that a statement which debates the wisdom or otherwise of what has been done doesn't relate directly to the need for producing the documents. If the hon. member wishes to debate the urgency of the situation and the urgency of the need to produce the documents, I would have to agree that that would be in order.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly limit my remarks from your point of view.

In order then, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the members' attention the necessity for this documentation, I think it's very important that all members understand the nature of the organization that I am referring to.

Many members will recall in 1969 the very dramatic concern that interested parents, adults and young people had in Alberta from the point of view of the initial blasts and experiences pertaining to drug abuse that was being experienced in our communities. At that time in 1969, a University of Calgary United Church chaplain, at the request of the Interfaith Committee of the City of Calgary, called a meeting of agencies to deal with drug problems in that city. These agencies included many voluntary agencies in the city of Calgary, including the Canadian Mental Health Association, Preventive Social Services, the John Howard Society, the counselling services in Mount Royal College and SAIT, the Calgary Public School Board, the Department of Psychology, The University of Calgary Health Services and others. At that time it was decided to create a task force to determine and establish a drug centre in the city of Calgary. As a result of the activities of the Mayor of the City of Calgary and an executive committee, the Calgary Drug Information Centre was established in 1970 and has continued to operate since that date.

Since that time funding has come through basically the City of Calgary at the outset, in cooperation with the provincial government under preventive services; since then, from the division of alcoholism and now, as we know it, from the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission. Mr. Speaker, it has taken some five years for this agency to develop a very high degree of competency and credibility in our community, not to mention the expertise they have in an area of great concern to all of us.

The services provided by the Drug Information Centre from the point of view of crisis aid, from the point of view of disseminating information, from the point of view of speakers' bureaus and services, counselling, street training and, more particularly, training future volunteer workers in that organization, have been of unquestionable advantage to many less fortunate people than ourselves who encounter the ravaging pains of drug abuse.

Yet it now appears, Mr. Speaker, that if the commission is to have its way, this centre will close. All the work and effort provided by hundreds and hundreds of southern Albertans will be for naught and will come to an end.

Mr. Speaker, the necessity for obtaining the information relating to the minutes has to do, of course, with the attitude and the decision of the commission as to whether or not it is a valuable service and whether or not it indeed should be closed down. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the attitude of the commission in dealing with this problem was arrogant. And I suggest this, Mr. Speaker, on the basis that it seems to be the judgment of the commission that they can do the work better than the DIC itself ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. I must advert again to my earlier comment that the hon. member is certainly entitled to indicate the urgency and the need for producing the documents he is seeking, but when he extends the debate to debate outright the merits or otherwise of a decision that has been made, then I would again suggest that that must be done under another motion.

MR. GHITTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I also say however, Mr. Speaker, that within those very minutes will be the answers to the questions I am proposing. It is my hope, if the minutes were produced, that I would then have the opportunity, from an examination of those minutes, to determine the reasoning behind the decision. That is the relevancy, Mr. Speaker, of the argument I am intending to present. Yet I will respect your wisdom, sir, and will try to limit my point of view.

Mr. Speaker, then if I might say, the importance as to what may be contained in those minutes will come to the attention of the members from the point of view of whether or not the consideration of the commission was pinpointed as to the concerns of the community, in dealing with the Drug Information Centre. Surely, Mr. Speaker, those minutes may divulge to us whether or not the Drug Information Centre was evaluated, as was mentioned by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, in a proper way.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that those minutes should show that the preventive service provided by the commission - by the centre - is well under the normal costs of conducting such similar services in other cities. It is my opinion that those minutes, Mr. Speaker, may show the very high credibility factor which exists, from

the point of view of the on-street level, relating to that commission. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that those minutes may show as well that that service can only be properly and adequately provided at street level and by a peer group as established by the Drug Information Centre. As a result, Mr. Speaker, I think it is most vital that those minutes be provided.

I also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that within those minutes the philosophy of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission may be determined. For it seems to me that the centralist approach they have moved along to overpower a volunteer agency is one that is defeatist and not in the best keeping with the perpetuation of volunteer agencies in the Province of Alberta.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that what should be done, from the point of view of the analysis, is an examination of the minutes in the hopes that one can determine where we will obtain an efficient program relating to the services as required in the city of Calgary and indeed, southern Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, the Calgary Drug Information Centre in 1973 treated some 506 Calgarians with crisis assistance. The Calgary Drug Information Centre treated some 4,366 individuals in southern Alberta from the point of view of their obtaining information. Mr. Speaker, they were dealing again in terms of training hundreds of volunteers who went into the community.

Mr. Speaker, I won't belabour the point. I think all hon. members are well aware of the work of this very important agency and I intend to table for the members' consideration the report of the Drug Information Centre. I also intend to table, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this important amendment and this important motion, the letter of the Chief of Police of the City of Calgary, the telegram of the Mayor of the City of Calgary, the telegram of the Alberta Sexuality Education Institute, the telegram of the board of directors of the Volunteer Bureau of Calgary and letters of interested Calgarians, with respect to their views and the importance of maintaining the Calgary Drug Information Centre and the vital services it provides.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I submit that it is time the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission came forward with its philosophy and dealt with its problems in a less than arrogant way in the consideration of the problems which it must deal with.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to lend a word of support to the hon. member who has asked for this particular information. I think his point of having ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. What is now before the House is an amendment limiting the extent of the information in two ways: in the first place by striking out item 4 of the motion, and secondly by making all the remainder of the motion subject to the consent of the Calgary Drug Information Centre. That is the point which is now before the House. The merit with regard to the remainder of the information could perhaps come up after we have disposed with the amendment.

MR. HENDERSON:

I will withhold my remarks until the main motion is back with us.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two on the amendment. Generally speaking I don't favour interdepartmental memos between a minister and his staff. I think that is a dangerous situation and could well lead to staff not giving the type of answers a minister requires from his staff on vitally important issues.

However, when we come to the second - a government at arm's length - I do not place the same relevance on minutes or correspondence between branches of that service, because that is public business. It is not answering queries of the minister, it's dealing with policy that has been devised. The minister and, I think, the hon. members of the Legislature and the people generally should be able to know what that particular business is. Consequently I can see nothing wrong with minutes between a body at arm's length, such as the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, and correspondence with a branch - the Calgary Drug Information Centre. As a matter of fact I think it could well be that such information is not only relevant, but vitally important in order that the people may know what attitude is being taken to the unfortunates who are using drugs and find themselves in that position.

Consequently I would urge the hon. minister to reconsider the striking out of Section 4. In my view it is not tantamount, or not equivalent to a memorandum from departmental



officials to the minister. If this correspondence was between the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission and the minister, I would question whether or not it should be made public, even in this House. Others may disagree with me, but judging from my own experience in government, I would question that very, very much.

But I certainly could not question correspondence between the Highway Traffic Board and another Crown agency. I think that is a horse of a different colour entirely; I think this is too. I do think the philosophy, as pointed out by the hon. member from Calgary who just got through speaking, does show, should show, the philosophy behind the work of these commissions. Since they are government at arm's length, I think it is very important that we know that philosophy. I think it is very important for the government to know that philosophy too, to see if it coincides with the philosophy of the government. I think that is vitally important.

With regard to the second section of the amendment, that this would be subject to the approval of the Calgary drug information people who wrote the memos, I question this very much indeed. Surely, the elected representatives are not going to have to secure the information, to secure the approval of appointed officials to look into what is going on in that particular avenue. If that's extended to its full length, these groups could readily say even to the minister or to another minister of the government: we don't have to give you this information, we don't give our approval to giving this information. We could get to a very, very ridiculous position if we insist on the approval of appointed bodies, paid with public money, by saying whether or not they are going to let information be made public or otherwise.

I think it is up to the Legislature, up to the government to decide. If the government has reasons for not wanting this done, that's one thing. Surely it should not depend on the approval of the people who wrote the memos. They have been paid for their job and if they have done something wrong, it should be made public. If they have done excellently, it should be made public.

So I would again suggest to the hon. minister that the amendment should be reconsidered as, in my view, it is ill-advised.

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order. I haven't yet grasped the significance of the amendment, not having seen it in writing. Would the Speaker mind repeating exactly what the amendment is?

MR. SPEAKER:

The amendment is as follows:

That Motion for Return No. 113 be amended as follows:

- (1) That paragraph 4 of the motion be deleted.
- (2) That at the end of the motion, the following words be added: "subject to the consent of the Calgary Drug Information Centre".

As I understand it, that is a condition which is intended to attach to the first three items under the motion.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, may I beg the indulgence of the House to speak to the amendment? Did I lose my right to speak to the amendment when I rose?

MR. SPEAKER:

As far as the Chair is concerned, the hon. member has not spoken to the amendment.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the amendment and, I think, support the proposition put forth by the Member for Calgary Buffalo and the Member for Drumheller with a view to making the information public.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to relate to the circumstance that existed before this government came into office. It relates to the establishment of the commission. This really basically is the question of what the philosophy - the commission's - originally was conceived as, as opposed to what it may or may not have become.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, I have no personal knowledge on which to base any personal opinions as to whether the Calgary Drug Information Centre should or should not be closed. But as to the question of the amendment as it relates to philosophy - and going back to

the origins of the commission - it was found in 1969, as the Member for Calgary Buffalo pointed out, there was growing alarm and concern particularly about drug abuse which had skyrocketed within our society. It was also apparent at that time, that within the confines of the bureaucratic system, it just didn't seem to be possible to relate to the problem through the usual channels of the civil service. So the decision was reached with the idea of setting up a commission to remove the operation of trying to deal with the problem somewhat at arm's length from the government, and to release the commission from some of the bureaucracies that the civil service otherwise encountered, because it appeared that in some cases unorthodox measures might be required to really deal with the problem.

One of the main functions of the commission conceived at that time was to coordinate the services and facilities which exist within the community. It was felt that if the commission was going to fulfill its task, if it was not going to become another operating bureaucracy and try to do all things itself, it should try to utilize the services and whatnot available within the community which remain largely untapped when government directly operates programs and services itself.

I think the question of philosophy is a very important and timely one, because if the commission is to become a centralized service in which it is simply going to bring all services directly within its confines, the basic purpose and function of the commission - at least the original concept - is really being frustrated. There is really no point in having a commission. The thing might as well be back as part of the Department of Health. The suspicion, I suggest, is before us, Mr. Speaker, that the commission largely wants to take over the operation itself, simply for the sake of taking over the operation and making it part of the department.

I think the question as to whether this is really the object of the commission is really in keeping with, we might say, the consumers of these particular services. Because, if the service this organization-volunteer group has provided in the past is to be centralized, in my view the basic philosophy under which the commission was established is, to a large extent, being frustrated. I think in those circumstances the government should examine whether the philosophy of the commission was, is, or remains a valid one. And I think the correspondence which has taken place between the commission and this particular organization would be relevant information to the the question that's before the House.

In my experience, the whole field of trying to deal with government, on the side of government, with the question of drug abuse is an issue that generates more emotion and less logic than any other issue one could probably raise. And I would hope that decision-making in this regard - in this question - on the part of the commission isn't being made on that basis, but is being made on the basis of what best provides service to the people who need it. If it is six of one and half a dozen of the other, if the minutes show that the service can be just as well provided by leaving it outside the commission, in keeping with my view of what the philosophy was that underlay the establishment of the commission in the first place, the organization should be left intact and left to exist.

I think the correspondence between the commission and this organization on this issue is highly relevant. In fact, without it I don't really see how the issue can be resolved in a satisfactory manner, not in the public sense, anyhow, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in the debate on the amendment to the main motion, I would like to point out the urgency and the definite need for those minutes that it is suggested be dropped from the Motion for a Return.

Mr. Speaker, it has been alluded to that the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission engaged the services of someone to do a survey. The results of this survey were never printed or reported on. It could well be that there is some very important information in the minutes to confirm, or otherwise, the feeling that was certainly suggested that public funds were used for this survey. Certainly the survey that wasn't reported on was alleged to be highly complimentary or in favour of continuing the operation of the Calgary Drug Information Centre.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister has advised he has not had a first-hand inspection or opportunity to view the operation of the Calgary Drug Information Centre, and when we refer to the 1973 review of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission they say that they are sensitive to public opinion, right inside the propaganda that they publish. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's certainly evident from the public reaction in Calgary that the commission is not sensitive to public opinion, and so all the more reason why we need to see the minutes, Mr. Speaker, that went on between the commission and the Drug Information Centre.

Mr. Speaker, today the hon. minister, in the question period, gave a faint ray of hope that the funding may, some way or other, become available to carry on the operation of the

Calgary Drug Information Centre. In order to make sure that the drug information centre does remain open, financing has to be found some time between now and the end of the month because apparently that's when the funding will run out.

Mr. Speaker, the urgency is further impressed upon us when we consider that they carry a case load of approximately 26 people per day, 17 inside the centre and 9 on the street. Five of these are counselling contacts, Mr. Speaker. This is an increase of three to five counselling contacts within the past six months. The crisis intervention has gone down, it would indicate from this record, further proving the value of this organization, the Calgary Drug Information Centre. The rate at which it has gone down is from two cases per day to about one and a half cases per day.

MR. COOKSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is again wandering off the specific issue, as you laid it out before the Assembly.

MR. HENDERSON:

On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think the information is quite relevant to the minutes, because if the minutes support all the particular facts that have been brought forth between the commission and the body, it's obvious that the commission has been ignoring the service that the organization is providing and I think the information is relevant to the motion before the House.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, should the amendment succeed, then no member would have the opportunity to voice his views on the points now being raised by the hon. member. Consequently, I would suggest it is in order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Certainly, as someone observed the other day when we were dealing with a point of order, a doubt should be resolved in favour of broadening rather than narrowing a debate. As I understand the hon. member's argument now which has been referred to in the point of order, he is describing the nature of the institution to some extent for the purpose of indicating the urgency of getting the information with regard to such an institution. Now perhaps that's too tenuous, and maybe I'm saying something which runs contrary to the exchange with the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, but that's the way I see the direction of the debate which is now being offered by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

MR. WILSON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We will continue to try to stay on the line of the urgency and the need for getting the minutes of the meeting, because there is obviously public conflict, Mr. Speaker.

Further, in the 1973 review of the commission, they say that their role is to assume leadership "... by coordinating and supporting the activities of individuals, organizations ..." and so on. But they haven't done that in Calgary and perhaps the minutes will show why they haven't done it.

Perhaps the minutes, Mr. Speaker, will be able to point out information which obviously hasn't been made available regarding the operation of this organization. Because something must be wrong somewhere, and perhaps the clue is in the minutes, when the minister is given information by one side of the fence and public reaction is diametrically opposed to the information that seems to be being fed to the minister. So obviously we have to look at all avenues of information to try to get to the bottom of it. Mr. Speaker, the minutes could very well provide the clues that are required in this regard.

You see, Mr. Speaker, there is a paid staff of six full-time people and one half-time person in this operation. But they enjoy the services of 80 volunteers. Now it's important that we get every bit of information that is possibly available to properly weigh the merit or otherwise - and I certainly think it's otherwise - of forcing the Calgary Drug Information Centre to close down. Because here are 80 volunteers. They range all the way from teenagers to senior citizens who are playing an important role in their community and are doing an excellent job.

Further, the Calgary Drug Information Centre plays a role in helping to train police recruits and so on. There could be some reference, Mr. Speaker, in the minutes that we are trying to acquire as to what the terms of reference are between the training of police recruits and the Calgary Drug Information Centre instructors.

What about the hospitals that are presently being served, Mr. Speaker? Certainly there must have been some arrangements that would be recorded in the minutes about the hospitals and the school system which refer patients to the Calgary Drug Information Centre.

So, Mr. Speaker, it appears that somebody is panning the role of the Calgary Drug Information Centre, and certainly it is hoped that the minutes, if and when they become available, will help to clear the air.

I'd just like to refer briefly to the testimony I have had from teenagers and other young people who have served as volunteers and to hear the arguments they have in favour of the Drug Information Centre in Calgary and to hear of their involvement and so on. It could well be, Mr. Speaker, that the minutes would carry some further information in this regard from that aspect of the volunteers' support in the role of the Calgary Drug Information Centre.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried to determine who is interested in closing down the Calgary Drug Information Centre. Certainly there is no place where we can just put our finger on it, other than financing. If there is any record anywhere of any organization which has not been happy with the role played by the Calgary Drug Information Centre, it certainly isn't available now and it has not been made public, Mr. Speaker. On the contrary, many, many social organizations, as well as the different levels of government such as the school board, such as the municipality and so on, have praised the role of the Calgary Drug Information Centre.

It certainly seems strange, Mr. Speaker, when a decision is made to withhold financing from an organization like this which enjoys such tremendous community support and is endorsed by so many community organizations. So it seems, Mr. Speaker, that the minutes should certainly be made public because I'm fully confident, Mr. Speaker, that the minutes would endorse everything the public is saying today in Calgary, particularly in regard to the adequacy and the role and the tremendous service that is being offered.

The Calgary Board of Commissioners has endorsed the role of the Calgary Drug Information Centre. The Calgary Preventive Social Services would like to see it carried on. But they can't do it without additional financial assistance. When the Minister of Health and Social Development said the other day that they could finance it through Preventive Social Services, Mr. Speaker, that may well have been something that was considered and it may be recorded in the minutes.

You see, Mr. Speaker, we have to get to the bottom of the whole thing, and I don't see any reason why the minutes cannot be made available to bring out these points. So, Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the minister to reconsider the amendment about withholding the minutes. It seems to me that there are many good reasons why they should be released because I feel confident they would support the position of the vast majority of citizens in Calgary and those agencies and services which best know the role of the Calgary Drug Information Centre.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there are a few areas in the operation of the Calgary Drug Information Centre, and I would doubt it, but if there are recorded in those minutes some areas suggesting that the Drug Information Centre needs to be tightened up in its operation or needs to have a more clearly defined direction in what it is doing, or if it is becoming involved as too much of a drop-in centre rather than a crisis centre, or those kind of points, Mr. Speaker - if that's the fear, that those kinds of things would be revealed, I think the advantages would far outweigh the disadvantages, Mr. Speaker. It could very well be that the funding of the Calgary Drug Information Centre should be carried on as a joint effort between one or two of the departments of the provincial government, along with the federal government. It could well show in the minutes that applications have been made, for example, that the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation become involved as well as the Department of Health and Social Development - perhaps even other departments, Mr. Speaker.

I would urge the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development to reconsider his amending motion and certainly to do all that is possible to bring about what the majority of the people want, which is the retention of the Calgary Drug Information Centre.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow, and then the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the amendment although I agree with the Member for Calgary Buffalo that consensus in Calgary and particularly in my riding, seem to be that the Calgary Drug Information Centre is a good show.

I support the amendment because first of all we've had a rule, anyway since this government assumed office, that we do not order the production of correspondence without the consent of both sides if one side happens to be a private party. The Calgary Drug Information Centre, in effect, was a private agency, even though it received the majority of its funding directly or indirectly from government sources.

The Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission is a horse of a different colour, in that it is a commission, a government commission. It is quasi-independent, but there may be things in this correspondence that would be embarrassing to the Calgary Drug Information Centre.

This is a very delicate area, Mr. Speaker, where opinions differ widely on how to treat drug abuse. They differ all the way from those who believe that drug education only compounds the problem to those who believe in a cold turkey treatment and the iron fist, and so on.

I believe that the Calgary Drug Information Centre, Mr. Speaker, has largely operated as a crisis centre. This is what I understand from the correspondence I've had from my own constituents. The crisis centre approach does not, from the annual report of the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, appear to be one of its current programs. So there is a difference, and it may well be that the funding for the Calgary Drug Information Centre, if it is a good show, should come from preventive welfare. But it is urgent that we consider this problem. Preventive welfare projects which start with the local authority, and you would have assumed that His Worship the Mayor, and the Chief of Police, Brian Sawyer, if they thought this was worth while, might have urged that it come through the preventive welfare route. While it starts with the local authority does have to have the final consent of the Department of Health and Social Development.

So it could be that since this agency performs a slightly different function from the other it should be funded from a different source. It could be, and certainly it might well be within the rights of a commission to which we've given responsibility in this area - it could be that it doesn't approve of the Calgary Drug Information Centre's methods and therefore feels that it shouldn't be funded from out of its program. However, I don't think anyone has said that the commission has an exclusive monopoly franchise in the drug treatment area in Calgary and presumably there can be competition between two agencies.

So far as the minutes are concerned, Mr. Speaker, I think here again we're on rather dangerous ground. The minutes of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, I presume from their regular meetings, are public documents. But if they're minutes of a private meeting on such a sensitive area as drug abuse, between two agencies, I would doubt whether it would be proper to have them made public. It might cause embarrassment to large numbers of private citizens. It might cause embarrassment to the Calgary Drug Information Centre itself, in which some 800 civilian volunteers are involved, according to the Member for Calgary Bow.

Without quoting any names, I can tell you that today I received a letter from one of my constituents urging that the Calgary Drug Information Centre should be funded in some way because it had saved her life when she went into insulin shock, and she is a diabetic. She points out how these volunteers in the Calgary Drug Information Centre had enabled her to find work. It could be that this particular lady might be mentioned in the minutes of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission in their meetings with Calgary Drug Information Centre and would not want the details of her particular case to be made public.

I think formal minutes of a commission meeting are one thing; any minutes that might have been kept of bilateral meetings between two agencies are rather different. And certainly a question of correspondence between a quasi-government commission and a private agency, if they're to be tabled, we must have the consent of both sides. This is one of our basic rules and it's only fair that it should be so.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I urge members to vote for the amendment, while still maintaining that I am a supporter of the general theme of the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo that something should be done to support the Calgary Drug Information Centre.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Little Bow followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak against the amendment. I feel that the information that is required here is certainly very necessary for possibly two purposes - one, to indicate the growth of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, and secondly, and more specifically related to the amendment, to the Calgary Drug Information Centre.

I feel in referring to the minutes specifically, that there is no real evidence or any type of policy that I'm aware of whereby the minutes that we are talking about here are not minutes of open meetings or minutes that could be secured by any member of the public, or meetings that could have been attended by the public in general. So I think that certainly has to be clarified when we discuss and consider this particular amendment that is before us.

The need for these minutes, I feel, is most necessary so that we can examine three specific things with regard to the Calgary Drug Information Centre. First of all, are there any personalities in conflict between the commission or the centre? I feel that certainly that type of information could be derived and secured out of reading the minutes because that's where it most likely would be shown.

Secondly, is there a conflict of services, services that are now provided by the commission or the service that was being provided by the information centre, or any other agency which may exist in Calgary?

Thirdly, is there a philosophic conflict? And I think in this area certainly the minutes would indicate that particular thing.

Is there a tendency towards centralization by the commission? Is there a tendency towards the commission determining the types of programs, the involvement of people at the local level? If that is true, then we would require the minutes to find that direction and indication. We would be better equipped to assess the guidelines, presently and in the future, for the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, to see that those guidelines and policy that the minister gives to that commission indicate such directions that where the commission itself is not directly involved in programs, that the commission itself promotes local involvement and that the greatest number of volunteers are involved in any programs that are funded by the commission.

That's the type of information we could find from the minutes. I believe that if there is anything in the minutes that would affect a person's own personal life or future, I would be in favour of names of people or organizations being struck out of those particular minutes. I don't think it is names in particular that we may require. If there is something that may affect someone's own personal life then at the discretion of the minister along with the commission, I would be in favour of those particular things being struck out in the copy that is given to us as members of the Legislature.

In the other area where the minister is requesting, by this amendment, that all correspondence be checked with the Drug Information Centre, there may be a point in this area where some of the information we would receive should not be made public through the means of the Legislature. In that area I think the minister should reconsider the amendment that has been placed before us and come up with another possible solution whereby he can get approval from the Drug Information Centre to present certain types of information.

However, I would also say though that any type of correspondence, or copies of reports or studies, or copies of correspondence relating to reports of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission certainly would be items related to the contract between the commission and the information centre itself. Certainly that part of the program would be a program supported by public funds. As legislators and as people responsible for public funds, really in a sense I don't see where we will run into any difficulty. It is the type of information we do need to make good decisions and recommendations.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I would vote against the amendment because I certainly feel the amendment does take away from our capability as members to assess the situation before us.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Solicitor General followed by the hon. Member for Ponoka.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favour of the amendment. My concern, Mr. Speaker, is not with the specific areas of the Drug Information Centre but I have to express concern on the principle we are discussing here, and that is whether or not minutes of commissions should be made public. My concern, I believe, is analogous when I express concern on behalf of the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission.

From time to time the commission has meetings with various organizations. It is rather important that they be confidential. So I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, if we change the principle by requesting and requiring that minutes be tabled in this House, we might be starting down a road which we will regret in time to come. It's the precedent that concerns me, and whether or not this principle should be upheld. Therefore, I must ask those to vote in favour of the amendment.

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, there are two points I would like to bring out on this issue. I am in favour of the amendment although I have full sympathy with the situation in Calgary. But there are two points that worry me. One is the invasion of privacy of individuals and groups in a very touchy and sensitive area, because I think every one of us here has been on boards, commissions and so on. The minutes of meetings invariably discuss individuals, problems of individuals. In this particular case, I have no doubt, the treatment and methods of treatment, and so on, are brought out.

If the minutes are going to be brought out I don't see how you can bring out half the minutes and have them censored before you give them to the Assembly. If it is going to get the minutes I see no way but that it be all the minutes. I don't think this is going to be fair. It's a definite invasion of human rights and privacy.

I am also worried on the point the hon. minister just brought out of setting a precedent such that any minutes of any meeting of any arm of government with any group can be ordered if this is voted down. This I feel will be a definite restriction on meetings between groups and any arm of government in the future. So I'm in favour of the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the amendment. I believe the hon. member who moved the motion for a return is acting on behalf of a group of concerned citizens. I am sure if they had insisted or requested that they did not want these matters revealed that perhaps he would give it consideration. I believe, when I hear some hon. ministers standing up and defending the amendment, that perhaps they are more concerned that maybe the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission might face some embarrassment.

I sense that that is where the defence lies, and I would be very disappointed if anything is done in this Legislature to make the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission feel that it has some protection. It goes round the province saying it represents the public. They are public servants, but they also have to be aware of the fact that we can make them get their hands on the table any time. It has become a sort of group promoting its own group. I get the impression it is empire building. As long as some agency - even if it may be voluntary - that receives government funds is doing a good job, there should be no conflict. It should try to cooperate with everybody.

I am a little amazed at one hon. minister getting up and straddling both sides of the fence about as effectively as I have ever witnessed in 15 years. It's a good show, but. He says he is for the people of his constituency and then talks against it. I think we ought to expose this kind of thing. Certainly this is not one of those issues that a government can stand or fall on, and this should not be a politically-partisan issue. If a person stands for something let him stand up and speak for it, and not waffle all over the place and try to be on both sides of the fence. If you can't ...

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I don't know, am I allowed to tell him that I was speaking to the motion and he is not?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, he is not speaking to either the amendment or the motion.

MR. LUDWIG:

I didn't mention the hon. minister's name. He seems to be blushing. I wonder whether he might be the culprit I was referring to. I thought he had more sense than to volunteer ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Possibly we might return to the amendment.

MR. LUDWIG:

I'll ignore the interruption.

I would like to state that I have been in the Legislature for 15 years and I admire a person who stands up and says what he believes. Therefore I commend the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo for taking this stand. I am opposed to the amendment.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, just two or three brief observations. First of all, in dealing with this portion of the fourth part that they have asked to have deleted, I believe we are dealing with two institutions, not with personalities. The meetings are between two institutions with regard to certain matters pertaining to their relationship to one another. It isn't with personalities. Therefore I don't think there is any reason the minutes should be withheld.

In looking at the corresponding other groups, the minutes should not be any more private than these others - correspondence, reports and studies. Therefore why not leave it in with the rest of the motion.

Finally I would like to suggest because these two institutions are both funded with public funds, it is the right of the public to know what is going on, particularly when there is a problem of this nature before us.

So I would suggest that I would vote against the amendment in favour of having all four points brought in under the resolution as requested by the mover of the resolution.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, just one very short comment ...

MR. SPEAKER:

I regret to have to draw the hon. member's attention to the state of the clock.

MR. GRUENWALD:

In view of that, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

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

Bill No. 203

The Refined Petroleum Products Wholesale Prices Control Act

MR. FCSTER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I rise to gain the Speaker's ruling relative to whether or not we should be proceeding with private bills in view of the fact that the bill has not been printed, or made available to the members of the House earlier than just a few hours ago, and in which case, it seems to me, that we should proceed with the next order of business, until that bill is printed.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The bill was distributed today and we have raised objection to this type of thing. Too many times the amendments and the bills come on our desk after we come into the House, and we haven't even had a chance to read them.



However, I don't think we should start following this policy now, when we have been doing this for some time. I object to this procedure. I think we should have these bills at least two or three days before we are called upon to deal with them. But I would think that if the mover of the bill considers that the thing is all right, then I certainly would raise no objection at this time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I don't think that we can compare amendments that come in during the course of Committee of the Whole - the study of bills during that particular course - to the situation we have at hand. Unless my memory fails me, I don't recall where we have discussed and spoken to second reading of a bill on the same day it first appeared before us. Usually, the precedence has been that the bill is introduced, and shortly after the introduction, the hon. members receive copies thereof, but in my short life here I at least don't recall where second reading has proceeded on the very same day on which I have first seen the contents of the bill which is being proposed for second reading.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order. I think that we would be remiss if we did not permit the hon. member who has the bill on the Order Paper to proceed to speak on his bill. But I, as a member of this Legislature, would certainly be disappointed if someone then rising and wishing to adjourn it would be prevented from adjourning it. But as long as we are permitted to adjourn the debate, maybe a little earlier than we would on other occasions, I can see nothing wrong with the hon. member being permitted to proceed if he so wishes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. HENDERSON:

On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, bearing in mind that once a bill is spoken to it goes to the bottom of the list and it only comes up once a week, if a compromise wouldn't be to ask the hon. member if he would prefer not to speak to the bill today, but leave it at the top of the Order Paper so that it would come up again next week, and that way he could deal with it, and every member would have an opportunity of dealing with it, without it going to the bottom of the Order Paper.

MR. NOTLEY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, I am very easy on whatever decision is made here. If it is suggested that we hold it over until next week, that's fine, as long as it doesn't lose its position on the Order Paper. I think perhaps then, Mr. Speaker, that really raises the question of the mechanics of getting these bills distributed ahead of time, and just assuming that that problem is worked out, I would have no objection to holding it over, and we will have our discussion next week.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to that point of order also. I have no disagreement with what any hon. member said in this regard. We have to get along somehow when we reach a difficult situation, but I have a number of private bills, private members' bills, and so this ruling may well decide that some of my bills are not going to be debated. I would like to add this rider to our point of order; let's make up the loss of one hour in the future, because this is not the private members' fault. This is a situation that developed because printing got glutted somehow and we couldn't get the bills out. If we continue this the next time around, we will deprive the private members of an extra hour. And we haven't got that many hours. We have maybe five or six hours to debate all these bills. So I'm recommending that we allow ourselves to make up the time in debating private members' bills, by 15 minutes a day, or give ourselves two hours next Thursday. That would be fair. But this business of setting up - it is a logical argument that we don't know the bill well enough. I got [a bill] today. It is a pretty large bill and I should have an opportunity to study it. We should not be deprived of our rightful time allotted by the rules to debate our bills in their entirety. So I would like to make a stand on that issue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FCSTER:

Mr. Speaker, if you decide that this bill will not proceed today, we would be agreeable to having it keep its place on the Order Paper. With respect to the comments made by the Member for Calgary Mountain View, we would not propose moving to the next order of business, being Government Bills and Orders, instead we could move with Motion No. 1 on the Order Paper, Motions Other Than Government Motions, and proceed with that debate until 5:30.

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

MR. GRUENWALD:

On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think we are opening up a whole new can of worms if we start flouting the regulations in the way that it seems to be happening today. This has been on the Order Paper for some days, and I believe that the member who is promoting that bill should speak up.

SOME HCN. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I know of no rule - I wouldn't want to take what I'm about to say as a precedent - I know of no rule that says, before a bill is discussed it has to be distributed. I would assume that, as usual, where no time is specified it has to be a reasonable time, and whether this is a reasonable time may be a question of debate. Possibly the matter could be resolved by a member moving an appropriate motion.

MR. FCSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask for the consent of the House and move that the House move to Motion No. 1 standing on the Order Paper under Motions Other Than Government Motions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question?

Having heard ...

MR. BENOIT:

Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, if there is no seconder here, I want to say this. By doing this, we still don't allow the time that would normally be allowed for discussion of bills, because we rob one hour for bills. Now probably on another day we could have two hours - next Thursday we could have two hours for bills - but by going to the other motions at this point we lose the hour for bills and some members do want to have their bills brought up.

AN HCN. MEMBER:

That's my point. We're throwing the whole thing out ...

MR. NCTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the motion of the hon. minister. I agreed to defer it until next week because I realized it is a fairly extensive bill, and it would be somewhat unfair to the members if they had to go over it very, very quickly. But the point that has been made already about losing a private members' day is, in my judgment, a very crucial one. Therefore, I would ask the minister, when he closes debate, whether he could give us some indication as to whether or not the government would be prepared to surrender an hour of government time next week, either Monday or Tuesday night, to make up for this. Because I think really it is not a case of anyone being at fault here; I think it is a case of the Assembly deciding to postpone it because members want more time to review it, which is fair. There has been a problem with printing, which is nobody's fault, but I think that it would be extremely regrettable if we lost an hour of private members' bill time as a consequence of that. So I do ask the minister to specifically advise the Assembly as to what the government's intentions are, either the minister who moved the motion or perhaps the Government House Leader.

MR. KOZIAK:

On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, we must not lose sight of the fact that it is not, in fact, a loss of private members' time. What we are doing is continuing on with private members' day in the normal fashion.

[Interjections]

Motion No. 1 is in fact a motion other than a government motion, and so it is not a situation where the private members' day is interfered with. The interference is with one item of business under private members' business with another item of business under this same area. So that you have a resolution which is a private members' resolution taking the place of a bill which would otherwise be a private members' bill. I don't feel the government's time, under the government bills and government motions, should be interfered with in order to solve the particular problem we have today.

MR. YCUNG:

If I may, Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I would like to commend to the minister's consideration when he speaks again on this particular matter, that the House might indeed try to respect the program, or at least the amount of time that's outlined here, but in so doing, that we might assure that if at the end of one hour - if two hours happen to be set aside for Public Bills and Orders Other Than Government Orders - if at the end of that time we are still on one bill, perhaps it should drop to the Order Paper and another one be brought forward.

I would also suggest that if that is the route we plan to go, Mr. Speaker, we might revert, instead of to the first motion here, to the matter which was under discussion just prior to 4:30 p.m.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, just a few words. When this gets back to the availability of bills, I want to make an amendment to what the minister has mentioned for sending out and for contacting people. This is one thing that concerns me at this session.

But I would like to move an amendment to what the hon. minister has moved, that, further be it resolved that the time provided for private members' bills that is lost today be made up one week from today.

MR. SPEAKER:

If I understand the purport of the amendment, it would then mean that we would proceed today with discussing private members' resolutions and there would be one hour less time used for private members' resolutions next week. Instead of that, it would be used for debating bills other than government bills.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do we wish to go through the formality of putting the amendment or would the hon. minister wish to withdraw his motion with leave?

MR. FOSTER:

I will withdraw it with leave, Mr. Speaker, on the understanding that we will proceed as the amendment would read.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member leave to withdraw the motion?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

On the question as proposed by the hon. Member for Wainwright, would all those in favour please say aye.

[The motion was carried.]

## MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mrs. Chichak proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

Be it resolved that, the report of the Legislative Committee on Professions and Occupations be received and considered for implementation.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, I was beginning to think there was some sort of plot of a filibuster with regard to this particular motion, as I have been sitting here in the wings for a second afternoon hoping we might have a fair time, as I would call it fair, to debate and discuss the reports of the legislative committee.

Mr. Speaker, I take particular pleasure and pride in proposing Motion No. 1.

For the benefit of those not familiar with the events which led to the establishment of the Committee of the Legislature to review legislation, regulations and licensing of professions and occupations, it would perhaps be worth while to reflect on some of those events.

During the past number of years some very significant changes have taken place in our society that have altered the roles played by and the demands placed upon many of the institutions which have generally served well.

The knowledge explosion that has taken place over the last few decades has had a tremendous impact on our society. The new methods, approaches and techniques which have been developed as a result of this explosion have affected existing professions and occupations and have led to the creation of a host of new ones. This has particularly been evident in the health disciplines, but not exclusively so. The many new groups so created have from time to time petitioned both the former and present governments to grant to them a certain degree of autonomy and self-governing powers by way of individual statutes. It became more and more apparent that a proliferation of many professional and occupational groups was taking place, resulting in the public's inability to clearly identify the services provided by one group as distinguished from those of another which had similar services.

In addition to the above, the absence of guidelines for both those groups petitioning government for individual self-governing statutes and for government in considering such petitions has certainly left an uncertainty in procedure. Confusion in the public mind as to complaint reporting existed. In an attempt to find solutions, there was appointed a committee of the Legislature by the former government in 1970.

That first committee did not complete its review but progressed to the stage of filing with the Clerk of the Assembly the Bretten Report, being titled under the name of the researcher. That report basically categorized existing professions and occupations legislation, and identified the powers, disciplinary and licensing procedures. The Bretten Report also concluded that one group of professional and occupational parties were covered by 25 individual statutes with varying degrees of self-government. Another group of 33 statutes covered approximately 70 professions and occupations that come under what can be referred to as a government-operated licensing system. Beyond this, there are a great number of occupations that do not come under any direct type of government licensing.

In April 1972, a committee of the Legislature to continue the review of professions and occupations was again appointed. I am pleased to have had the opportunity to chair the new committee of nine members, which committee concluded its study and tabled its final report in the Legislature in 1973.

For the record, and for the purposes of my debate, I would like to say that this committee had tabled two reports with respect to its study, one being a report tabled in the Legislature in April 1973, which was referred to as the interim report of the committee, and the final report, which was tabled in December 1973.

The three categories I have referred to earlier from the Bretten Report are listed in the appendices of our interim report. I would like to say at this time the purpose of having prepared and tabled an interim report of the committee was to provide the members of the Legislature and the public some information as to the complexity of the problems under review and to convey the many proposals that were put before the committee for its consideration prior to the committee determining recommendations it would bring forward to the Legislature.

I wish to bring to your attention at this point that the interim report contains many concerns expressed, outlines many problems which both the professions and the public, as

well as government, face and what the committee considered should be the goals or objectives of legislation relating to the regulation of professions and occupations. These goals or objectives are not necessarily identified as such in the recommendations of the final report, and therefore it would be worth while to have the contents of the interim report in the forethought, along with the recommendations of the final report.

Before getting further into the main portion of my debate, I do feel it is essential to state such acknowledgements as are due. It is true that professional and occupational groups in Alberta have played a very significant role in the development of our province, and the members of these institutions have made an important contribution to our society. Very often one finds that the leaders of volunteer and benevolent organizations are members of these groups who have taken time out from their very busy schedules and donated their service to the public. Their dedication to the betterment of our communities should not and does not go unnoticed.

I wish also to stress that the study by the Committee on Professions and Occupations should in no way be interpreted as a criticism of these institutions, nor as questioning of their value or need to our society. The decision to have a review was, to some extent, a response to particular inadequacies in the existing structure within government as to standards and procedures to be followed in considering the development of self-interest groups. Also, it may be viewed as part of a general movement to establish an equitable balance between producers of services and consumers, and to assure the availability for the individual in procedure to obtain justice.

The growing evidence of inflexibility in the structure of some of the professions or occupations with regard to the development of what we might call para-professionals or subprofessions emerging from the development of new techniques, approaches, methods and many other influences must be resolved by some participation on the part of government, inasmuch as this affects our educational institutions and the courses provided.

The growing evidence of a proliferation of some professions with a multiplicity of groups providing essentially the same service petitioning government for individual self-governing powers, such powers as, usually, to license, set educational and entry standards and control over areas of practice. Control by a senior group over subordinate groups is becoming more evident. I think it is important to recognize that when a subgroup is first formed, it is understandable and acceptable that the senior group or the parent group might play an extensive role in the development of its subgroup.

However, it must be recognized that there comes a time of maturity within each and every group. And as it happens in a family of human beings where the parents will give direction and participate in the maturing of their children, there comes a time when these children must leave and fend for themselves; so it happens within the professions.

However, the parent group is not always prepared to let their fledgling, or their subgroup, continue and manage on its own. As a result frictions arise and when it involves service that is made available to the public, many problems are resultant wherein the public, in fact, suffers. There are difficulties that arise in the recognition of fair consideration in the granting of licences to individuals who make applications to earn a living in a certain chosen walk of life. Such difficulties, such as delays in granting licences, even though our courts of law have determined that the individual applicant is entitled to be granted the licence, certainly exist. So then, just to cite these few examples of problems that exist and the need for outside participation in what happens within groups who are given certain self-governing powers.

We are at a point in our society where we see the realization of the fact that it is not in the necessary nature of things that the individual consumer of goods and services must accept unquestionably what the individual is being given.

In particular reference to those professional groups who have been granted the privilege by government of varying degrees of self-governing powers, such privileges as are not granted to the public at large in the normal sense. That public, therefore, places greater demands of accountability on what they refer to as the privileged individuals or groups. More and more the general public is being critical of government assigning what it considers the transfer of responsibilities that belong to government itself, more particularly, such areas as educational standards, entrance standards, protection of fundamental rights and freedoms of individuals and the availability of services to citizens throughout the province on a fair and equitable basis and performance protection.

The committee, in its interim report, identified on page 12 of that report in summary, and in some detail between pages 13-18, some of the above and other matters that should be part of the goals or objectives in the formulation of legislation relating to the regulation of professions and occupations.

To say that government should totally control all professions and occupations to my mind would not be desirable. However, it is the responsibility of government to maintain

a framework which will provide, as far as possible, a balance between those responsibilities undertaken and authorities retained by government on the one hand and those delegated and assigned to individuals and professional and occupational associations on the other, in presenting services to the public.

It may be argued, because of the complexity and sophistication of certain services, that those and only those in the areas of such professions and occupations are capable of setting standards; both educational and in competence, determining who shall be licensed to provide such a service requiring compulsory membership; whether directly or by means of employment control, and dealing with the total matter of discipline of their colleagues.

In reflecting on the numerous submissions with respect to these many areas, both from the professions and occupations and from individuals, and in taking into consideration the many studies and reports throughout not only this country, but in other countries, I must say that I cannot totally accept the argument of the logic of total control within the groups themselves. It is only fair to recognize that in all these areas it is to be found beneficial, and in fact, essential, to have the participation of members of the respective professions or occupations, but it cannot be accurately said that this should be to their sole exclusiveness.

Again, it may be argued by the professional and occupational groups who have degrees of self-government that the public is essentially protected in that an individual always has a route to justice by having recourse to the courts.

Even here I feel compelled to make comment that in our justice, at times injustices result from certain societal attitudes or abuse on the part of those meting out decisions in our halls of justice. In fairness, without generalization I must reflect on the decision of a court in the early twentieth century that women are persons in matters of pains and penalties, but are not persons in matters of rights and privileges. It was only after some lengthy struggles by four outstanding women of Alberta that they succeeded in appealing the court decision to the British Empire, and in 1929 His Majesty's Privy Council declared that, in fact, women were persons and their legal status was then acknowledged. Again I must reflect to a more recent case, and that is the case of *Murdoch v. Murdoch* which I personally feel is an inequity in the decision to rights and privileges.

It must be remembered that those professional or occupational groups which have some degree of self-governing privileges strive for self-improvement, higher excellence in their competence for greater prestige and recognition in our societal structure. With this I have no quarrel and, in fact, I feel it is extremely desirable. But then we must relate such aspirations to the basic requirements of the public it serves in general. So if a profession or occupation aspires and continues to move up the ladder in its total structure, which includes the basic or minimal standards of both education and competence, it is not essentially true that the basic service which is required to be provided to the society it serves, is of the higher level of standard being set by the profession.

The effect the higher standard has on the public, in one area at least, is the cost of that service to the individual requiring it. The end result of the increased cost may be an inability of an individual to benefit from the service to which that individual, by way of taxes and educational support has contributed, to assure the availability of the service.

It must be recognized that there is a need for varying levels of certain services. For the protections necessary to assure the availability of services in the levels required, there must be some participation or control on the part of government to assure that the aspirations of any particular profession or occupation are in balance with the needs of their consumers.

Relating back to the cost of services provided by the various professional and occupational groups, where a group has a degree of self-governing powers and independent jurisdiction of determining the fee for services, a great deal of concern has been expressed by the public as to the cost of such services. It may be found that such criticism may not necessarily be accurate. However, we would be thinking very unrealistically if we were to take the position that such criticisms are completely unfounded.

I feel, therefore, that there needs to be some examination of such fee setting to some degree outside of the control of the group in question. The fact that some of the professional services are now covered by public funds there may be a lesser degree of attention paid to unwarranted escalation of the fee cost in such areas as they may exist. The public does not express complete satisfaction in the manner of the current procedures of having fees reviewed. The committee, therefore, expressed some concern in this regard in its report.

Another area I feel requires re-examination is with regard to complaint procedures and discipline. The current procedure in the matter of dealing with complaints and discipline

is generally in the sole and exclusive control of the profession and its membership. This does not leave the public with any feeling of satisfaction, and currently the criticism is levied that to be a judge unto oneself does not necessarily bring forth justice to those outside the realm of the exclusive group.

Although provision exists in some of the legislation permitting appeals from the decisions of the professional disciplinary committees to the courts. This immediate and direct procedure is not very often undertaken by members of the general public or indeed, from members within the professional group. There are a number of reasons for this procedure not being taken advantage of, and I would like to just cite one or two.

Initially, the cost factor of such a procedure is a number one prohibitor. Secondly, the extensive involvement in taking a matter through the court procedures perhaps is not warranted in relation to the so-called injustice experienced. Thirdly, an individual who feels himself wrongly dealt with does not necessarily wish to take his counterpart into a legal entanglement where the results may be less or more extreme than what might be desirable.

The consideration of professional groups appointing members from the general public to their disciplinary committees again raises some questions. If the selection is made by the professional or occupational group itself, a criticism therein then lies in the fact that the public again becomes suspicious that the individuals who are selected are only those who are amiable to the philosophy and procedure of the professional group. Therefore, it would appear logical that any such appointments should be made by someone other than the group itself.

There is another problem with regard to the complaint procedures area. Much of the public feels that when it has initially complained directly to the group concerned regarding its member, and if adequate or immediate steps are not taken in reviewing the complaint or an unsatisfactory handling of the complaint results, the public has no other recourse but the courts insofar as attempting to communicate to some independent body.

It is matters of this nature that have led the committee to conclude there is a need for a channelling agency to receive such complaints. Not only is there a problem with regard to experiences from the public sector, but insofar as individual members within a profession or occupation are concerned. Certainly it has been evidenced that hesitance exists on the part of members within a profession to complain to their peers.

On another area of the topic, currently the matter of membership fees imposed upon individuals providing a service within a particular profession who are employed within the same field of service but by another body of jurisdiction, are required to pay full membership fees to two bodies. And there seems to be no resolution of the problem.

It would not be a problem if such membership fees were minimal. However, such is not the case. When members of a particular profession, because of their employment under a federal jurisdiction, are required to pay full membership fees to that level of an association, it does not appear logical that those individuals should as well be required to pay full membership fees to the provincial body when the association's internal services by the provincial body are not involved, due to the employment jurisdiction.

It would appear logical to me that a minimal association fee might be respected when the qualification standards are the same within both the provincial and the federal level. Yet the provincial body, because of the powers it has been granted under its own act, has seen fit to suspend such individuals who feel that it is a financial burden to pay the full membership fees annually to both bodies. I question such actions when the fees of each party are somewhere in the area of \$50 to \$75. Consideration in such a situation to require an individual to pay perhaps an associate membership fee to the provincial body, which fee is approximately less than \$10, would have made good sense and no doubt would be acceptable to those individuals employed in the federal jurisdiction and whose rights are bargained for the federal level of the professional body.

Mr. Speaker, it appears evident to me that there needs to be a closer examination of the interpretation and application of powers in some areas of the professions. I find it regrettable that the association in question did not more carefully review the situation when a request to the association to do so was made some months ago.

On another area, it appears necessary to the committee that there should be structured some interim levels of appeal procedures, other than from the initial discipline committee area and then directly to the final court procedure. That area is covered rather broadly in the report.

I do not plan at this time to comment on the area of certification and licensing, educational standards, the need for transferability of training levels and career-building on a step-ladder basis. I believe that the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight plans to extensively cover this subject, in addition to the manner in which it was dealt with in both the interim and final reports.

The matter of accountability of professions and occupations and their organizations may be demonstrated in a number of ways. Apart from the general discussion on the whole area of rationalization of the development of professions [and] the criteria in developing standards for public protection, there are numerous ways in which this accountability may be demonstrated. Within the report, the committee chose to recommend, in addition to all the other avenues available, an accountability back to the Legislature whence any degree of self-governing powers has been granted.

There are several other areas which have been discussed in the interim and final reports and I will leave for discussion to other members of the committee, and perhaps for my remarks when debate on this resolution is being concluded, those areas that I have not touched on this afternoon.

I do wish this afternoon to make some remarks with regard to that area of the report which recommends the establishment of a professions and occupations council and which recommends that those matters which deal with amendments to existing legislation, or putting forward new legislation in relation to professions and occupations, be dealt with through the offices of one minister to the Executive Council.

I feel the establishment of a professions and occupations council is a very basic requirement if we are to achieve in government a sense of balance, as between the professions, the public and government. In order to have an effective review of requested amendments to existing legislation, or to properly assess applications for new legislation to develop effective and realistic criteria and standards for both government and the professions and occupations, to develop a degree of uniformity and continuity of interpretation and application of guidelines and criteria and to have one area of communication on the part of the public, insofar as professions and occupations are concerned.

It must be recognized that in a majority of departments within government, each department, because of the nature of the service it provides, has within it predominately members of the professions which serve that particular type of service in government. I therefore feel that we should not place upon them the added burden of assessing and recommending to their minister such matters as may be considered a conflict as to their loyalty and allegiance to their profession and of that to the public. That is not to say ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think, with all due respect, that under Rule No. 28 of the Alberta Standing Orders the hon. member has one-half hour to speak and I'm submitting that her time is up.

If Your Honour wishes me to quote the rule I'll quote the rule by which I'm making this objection.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. Unless the member had a stop-clock and can definitely determine that we started my debate back a half hour, I'm not sure the time is quite up.

MR. SPEAKER:

In fact the hon. member started to speak about a quarter to five.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then I will concede to your ruling.

MR. HINMAN:

On the point of order. May I suggest we try to get the unanimous approval of the House for the hon. member to finish her speech.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the House agree that the hon. member may continue?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.



SOME HCN. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I regret there is not unanimous consent.

I must confess at the moment with some embarrassment that I'm not completely familiar with Rule 28 and I'm not certain that it limits the member's time but I'm inclined to agree - without establishing precedent - with the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MRS. CHICHAK:

... [Inaudible] ... I pass the debate on to other members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame.

MR. LUDWIG:

With all due respect to the hon. member who just spoke, since she was reading her speech, she may table it and we will still get the whole information. I didn't want to deprive her of not telling us what she wants to do but she'll have a further opportunity as the mover.

I like the way the hcn. members, when it doesn't suit their purpose, will cry shame but rules are to be followed and unless they can show that it is in greater public interest ...

MRS. CHICHAK:

On a point of order.

MR. LUDWIG:

... that it's in greater public interest for the hon. member to speak ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please.

MRS. CHICHAK:

On the point of order. I have conceded the debate and I think that there should be the opportunity for this debate to continue and that has no relevance to the report.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

AN HCN. MEMBER:

Bad manners have nothing ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I was commenting with regard to the hissing and the grunting that was going on, not with regard to the hon. member. She's finished. Let her - I just don't want to have anybody feel ignored.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Perhaps the hon. member, if he wishes, may now continue the debate.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to proceed so without interruption from a lot of people crying "shame".

[Interjections]

If the hon. members had their own ways as to how these proceedings are conducted, Mr. Speaker, some of us would never get a chance to speak.

AN HCN. MEMBER:

He can say that again.

MR. LUDWIG:

There is a story I told you once before that when somebody hisses it's usually a goose, a snake or a fool. Let them stand up and be identified, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He's standing right now.

MR. LUDWIG:

I didn't hear that one, Mr. Speaker. Someone popped his top on the Conservative side.

MR. COOKSON:

Would the hon. member identify which one of the three he is?

MR. LUDWIG:

No, Mr. Speaker, but I'll identify the hon. member who just spoke ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please.

Would the hon. member, if he wishes, proceed with the debate.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to proceed with the debate and I'm entitled to proceed ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order. If the hon. member wishes to proceed with the debate would he then do so without further digressions.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

[Interjections]

I'm just waiting for you, Mr. Speaker, to establish order in the House, if I may.

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the Report on Professions and Occupations, I wish to state that we did a very quick review of the reports that were submitted and it appeared from our deliberations that, by and large, very few, if any, changes need to be made.

I think one of the strongest recommendations in the whole report is that of complaints procedure, which I had followed from the beginning. I concur with that recommendation. We should perhaps establish a better means of dealing with complaints by individuals against professions.

One of the disappointments of the whole committee proceedings was that a lot of the professions had quite a bit to tell us and they were given 45 minutes. We had standardized proceedings before the committee and I am of the opinion that we didn't get enough information and that this committee perhaps ought to be continued or replaced so we can do a much better job of review of the facts. Some of the professions which appeared before us were disappointed in that some individual with a private gripe would be given 45 minutes and then a profession which received three-quarters of the attention in this bill was given 45 minutes. So, by and large, I don't feel that the job is finished, Mr. Speaker.

I believe also that some of the recommendations in the report No. 2 on professions and occupations, as tabled by the committee, acknowledge some of the great work that was done in the development of the professions and that we approved of the system, as it is now, to be about the best that anyone can recommend.

I also agree with the position that was recommended by most professions before the committee that we avoid, at all cost, any imposition of any kind of a superstructure of the government; that somehow we've come a long way and therefore we should not tamper with anything unless we can improve it.

There was a tendency on the part of this committee, and something I had to resist from the beginning, that at least some on the committee were dug-in that we have to have change, and this prevailed throughout the whole hearings and deliberations, that we have to have some change but the need was not clearly established. That was a bit amusing and very time-consuming, but when the report comes out that concurrence and approval of the fact that the professions, by and large, have done a tremendous job in establishing their standards, establishing their standards of ethics and their discipline procedures and improvement of their standards of education and performance, the report does in fact, approve by and large, what has been done to date.

I'm very disappointed in the fact that we stalled for almost two years in anticipation of a different report, the application by some groups which were entitled to be given private bills to be incorporated by private bill, as professional associations. I am referring to some of the accounting groups and this had turned out to be very costly to them and not necessarily in the interests of the public.

I want to go on record, Mr. Speaker, that a clear-cut case for any major changes has not been made by this report and the committee hearings, and that it does not appear, outside of three or four minor amendments or legislation, that we need to disturb very much.

I think on the basis of appeal procedures by members of an association themselves, members of a profession, there was general consensus that, where necessary, improvements would be made, but the professions had agreed they would go along with improved appeal procedures and that the party aggrieved would have recourse to court, and would have recourse to council. This was an admission by the professions that they would go along with that.

It was very interesting that with regard to complaints against professions, most of the professions, I think almost without exception or there may have been one, would not have minded an improved complaints procedure - some type of central gathering complaints procedure that would channel or recommend to those aggrieved what their best remedy is in dealing with a complaint against a professional man. I believe this was endorsed almost unanimously. I'm just not sure whether two or three had objected.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that most of the problems we ran against in our hearings were in the area of the medical professions and health professions. There appeared to be a proliferation in this one particular field of the different groups which were performing different services, and for that reason there appeared to be a need for a different approach than there was with regard to other professions. But all in all, I think that after the second or third or fourth draft of our reports, report of the committee, we came up with perhaps a fairly acceptable report.

The question of fee structures was an item that was very much debated. Sometimes you can assess fees or set fees, but there are many instances - particularly with the legal profession - that it isn't like a can of beans you weigh, cook, wrap up and deliver and for which you can set a fee. That appeared to be a problem with some members of the committee. They wanted everything nicely weighed and cut-and-dried, and we should tell them the fee in advance. Well, no one can tell what the problem will involve or what the solution can probably be until you have checked the facts and reviewed same, and even then one can never predict the exact amount of involvement in a service that is not selling something tangible by way of commercial goods.

To that extent, Mr. Speaker, I believe the committee had some problems in assessing the situation as it ought to be, but they were satisfied that all that can be done is being done.

An item that almost bordered on, not ignorance but on sheer stubbornness, was the belief by some people and by some public that somehow the legal profession has a set basis for fees and no one dares deviate from those fees. I have been in the profession a long time and I have never had to be faced with this. I have never had anybody in the profession question my fees or tell me that I am charging too much or too little. This was an item we discussed at length, and I believe that perhaps there is more understanding now that they know that the legal profession is advised that it may set its fees as it determines under the circumstances, and they charge nothing if circumstances warrant. So we have dispelled a certain amount of ignorance on the part of some members that they mustn't jump to conclusions but get the facts. So what this committee was all about is more or less a fact-finding committee.

I was impressed with some of the personal presentations of individuals who were given a considerable amount of time, but I believe that by and large we have done a review. It was not nearly ...

MR. GHITTER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe it's 5:30.

MR. LUDWIG:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn debate?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:30 o'clock.]