

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Wednesday, November 6, 1974

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the Assembly to introduce a bill which will appear on tomorrow's Votes and Proceedings - or I should say on yesterday's Votes and Proceedings - and request unanimous consent of the House to introduce the bill today.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Bill No. 248 An Act to amend The Livestock and Livestock Products Act

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, An Act to amend The Livestock and Livestock Products Act.

The main purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to prevent the useless and senseless slaughter and waste of livestock and agricultural products for the sole purpose of gaining publicity.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 248 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the House for unanimous consent to introduce a bill. The notice does appear on the Votes and Proceedings from yesterday.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Bill No. 247 An Act to amend The Real Estate Agents' Licensing Act

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, An Act to amend The Real Estate Agents' Licensing Act.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 247 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would request the unanimous approval of the House for permission to introduce a bill without any notice.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

---

Bill No. 249 An Act to amend The Municipal Election Act

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 249, An Act to amend The Municipal Election Act.

The main purpose of this bill is to clarify and simplify the recount procedures for municipal election candidates.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 249 was introduced and read a first time.]

#### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Legislative Assembly 25 Grade 10 students from Ryley. They are accompanied by their very dedicated teacher, who is also a very prominent person in the community, Mr. Kerlee. I would ask that the students and Mr. Kerlee rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and all hon. members 40 enthusiastic and smiling students from Henry Wise Wood Senior High School in Calgary. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Buehner. They are seated in the members gallery and I would ask them to stand and be recognized.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the House a group of some 25 Grade 5 students from Windsor Park School, with their teacher, Mrs. Ray Cheba, and ask them to stand and be recognized by the House.

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to introduce the newly re-elected Mayor of Mundare, Mr. Peter Polischuk, who has been attending the school trustees convention. I would ask Mr. Polischuk to rise and be recognized.

#### TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table answers to Motion for Return No. 219.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the 1973 Annual Report of the Alberta Housing Corporation. Individual copies will be made available for all members; also supplementary information for Motion for Return No. 131.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the first annual report of The Alberta Human Rights Commission, being for the calendar year 1973. Individual copies will be made available for members of the Assembly.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report of the Agricultural Development Corporation.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the answer to Motion for Return No. 202.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report of the Alberta Automobile Insurance Board for the year 1973, which is required by statute.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

## PWA Purchase

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Premier to outline to the Assembly the reasons for not publishing in The Alberta Gazette amendments to the Consolidated Cash Investment Trust Fund passed on August 6, 1974, which were used for the purchase of PWA.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I refer the question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think, to my knowledge, there would be any reason. It's a customary practice, I believe, for amendments to regulations to be printed in The Alberta Gazette and I assume that what has happened is that it will be in the next Gazette or something like this. I am not aware of any other reason.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. Has the government taken no steps to withhold the publication of these regulations in The Alberta Gazette, having in mind that they were passed on August 6 and should have been in one of the August gazettes?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, certainly not. As far as we were concerned the regulations were passed under the authority of the amendment to The Financial Administration Act approved by all members of the Assembly, to my recollection. Certainly [there was] no reason I am aware of, other than perhaps a deadline in terms of the cut-off date when they might be printed in The Alberta Gazette. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I will look into the matter, but I would want to say unequivocally, no, to the hon. leader's question.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Is it the intention of the government to maintain the authority which it granted itself to purchase the shares of corporations under these specific regulations, and [which] was used for the PWA purchase?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like again perhaps to review the history of the situation. In the spring of 197 ... - it was either in the spring of this year or the fall of last year, an amendment to The Financial Administration Act was passed in this Legislature. During the course of debate, I recall, all hon. members shared the view that because of the substantial additional revenues the province would have, it was necessary that we should have some flexibility in investment of these funds. It was also recognized at that time by members of the Assembly - it was indicated by my colleague, the Minister of Industry and Commerce - that we would be acquiring an interest in the Interprovincial Steel and Pipe Company.

The initial amendment to The Financial Administration Act, the one which allowed the purchase of equity, was done under the authority of the British and North America insurance act which is a generally accepted guideline for the purposes of financial investment of funds on a secure basis.

The regulation which the hon. leader refers to is a more minor amendment. In itself [it] did not give the government the authority, not granted at a prior date, to purchase equity in shares and was related solely to the unique and important exception which the hon. Premier has indicated related to a specific, unique exception of Pacific Western Airlines.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Provincial Treasurer. Is it the intention of the government to keep on the books the specific regulation, passed on August 6, 1974, which was used for the purchase of PWA?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I guess I'm having some problems communicating with the hon. leader. All the amendment did was reduce the earnings period required under the British and North America insurance act from five years to three years. This facilitated the important government policy point of view, the important acquisition of Pacific Western Airlines for the future of Alberta.

I might also remind the hon. leader, Mr. Speaker, that the investment in shares of The Alberta Energy Company, which has been well discussed in this House, would be based on an earnings period of zero years. So I'm not sure I understand the import of the hon. leader's question.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the government to withdraw the order in council they passed on August 6, 1974 which gave the government the power to acquire more than 30 per cent equity shares in the company?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, subject to my other explanation, the answer would be no.

#### School Foundation Fund

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a second question to the Minister of Education. Would the Minister of Education outline to the Assembly the percentage breakdowns among elementary, junior and senior high schools of the increased foundation program grants he announced to the school trustees this week?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, that would require some calculations insofar as there are 146 school boards. But if the hon. leader has some particular information regarding a certain school board - and much of this information has to come from the student mix of a school board - I'd be happy to try to get such information to work out whatever calculations he would wish.

MR. CLARK:

Further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister then indicate to the House if the anticipated increase per pupil will be in the vicinity of 18 per cent for elementary school students?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I think that might vary in certain circumstances, Mr. Speaker. The average increase, which is an unprecedented one over the last number of years, is 15 per cent. That will depend, though, very much on the mixture of elementary, junior high and high school students a board will have. It may vary upward or downward depending on the mixture of elementary and high school students, but the total amount will be something in excess of \$47 million for 1975.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Education. Will there be special assistance for school systems such as the counties of Thorhild, Athabasca and Bonnyville; those types of jurisdictions where the student mix is such that there is a low number of increased students in elementary school and a higher percentage of students in high school, with the result that they will get considerably less than a 15 per cent across-the-board increase. Will there be special assistance for those situations under that kind of student mix?

MR. HYNDMAN:

We have always been flexible, Mr. Speaker, with regard to specially demonstrated situations of hardship in a particular school division. This plan this year is the third year of a three year plan the parameters of which were known. But we certainly are today, as we always have been, open to a representation by a particular school board which feels it is under a particular hardship, and we will certainly assist in the appropriate case.

MR. CLARK:

One further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Does the allocation among elementary, junior and senior high schools take into consideration the program in the Department of Labour, BLUE IS REWARDING, in light of the fact that a sizable portion of the high school students, hopefully, will end up in the apprenticeship programs in the province?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, it does, Mr. Speaker. Also, the special vocational teachers' bursary program, which we have reintroduced, takes that into account.

MR. GRUENWALD:

I would like to ask a further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister of Education. Will the increased finance, which was announced by the minister, apply to private schools in the province of Alberta as well?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the announcement was made solely with regard to the school foundation fund, moneys from which don't go to private schools. The other aspects of government financing will be announced later.

I might mention that this early announcement - five months ahead of the usual budget procedure - was to accommodate school boards. The other figures will be coming out with the budget.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise whether the department is giving any consideration to an inventory of all grants under the Department of Education which can be sent to the various superintendents in the province?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would think that if requests in that area were initiated by the boards of trustees, we would certainly be able to accommodate them.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### ATA - Teacher Certification

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Education. Is the government looking with favor on giving the ATA control over certification of teachers?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, this is an issue which was raised by the ATA, the Alberta School Trustees' Association and others. Suggestions have been made for modifications to the existing procedures. I have received a brief from the Alberta Teachers' Association. A number of resolutions were passed in the last two days by the ASTA, and we will be considering all those briefs. But certainly no changes of any significance would be made before full consultation and discussion with all interested groups and stakeholders in education and, indeed, with the public as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### Fourth Session - Opening Date

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this question to the hon. Premier. Is the hon. Premier able to announce the opening of the Fourth Session of the 17th Legislature at this time?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, no we are not, except to say that it will probably be quite a number of weeks earlier than usual.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary to the hon. Premier. Is the hon. Premier holding off, waiting for the announced date of the federal Progressive Conservative leadership convention?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

The hon. Member for Whitecourt followed by the hon. Member for Highwood.

#### Forest Fires

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Due to the wonderful spring-like weather we are having these past few weeks - compliments of course to the hon. minister, Dr. Horner - can the minister advise the House if we have any forest fires burning in the province at this time?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, about the only unfortunate side of the wonderful weather Dr. Horner has provided is that we did have an extended fire season, making this a very serious and expensive year for fire fighting in Alberta, having on the order of 570 fires during the fire season with more than 50,000 acres burned. So it was a serious situation. There are only two or three minor ones at the present time and we contemplate this year's activity in this area to be complete, even though we hope for still more good weather.

MR. TRYNCHY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. minister tell us if his reforestation program is keeping up to the losses through fires and natural cuttings of timber?

DR. WARRACK:

The numbers on that, Mr. Speaker, are roughly this: we have extensive timber harvesting in Alberta and we do more reforestation than the amount that is cut by timber harvesting. We are not able, at the present time, to also do the reforestation to completely compensate for large fire years such as this year. With the new forest regeneration site relieving the bottleneck on seedlings that has been our major problem, and which had never been properly planned by the prior government, we are hoping that we will not only be able to catch up, but advance the program beyond the amount that is necessary each year.

MR. TRYNCHY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise if he is considering eliminating the stumpage on fire-killed timber so it can be harvested and not left to deteriorate as is the case in some instances now?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, we did make a major adjustment on that in order to stimulate the use of this product rather than look at the possibility of it being wasted. We have, in fact, reduced the stumpage that would be charged on fire-killed timber from 50 per cent to 25 per cent of normal stumpage. It's our hope that this will aid the use of that timber rather than it being wasted.

When it's used, Mr. Speaker - I might refer to the previous supplementary - the reforestation provisions also apply.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister's short, concise answer to the first question to the Minister of Agriculture. Could the 'minister of weather' tell us how much longer we are going to have this fine weather?

MR. MOORE:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests in a brief explanation having to do with the time at which farmers are no longer required to obtain burning permits, November 1. Has that date been extended in view of the situation you described?

DR. WARRACK:

I'm not aware of a change in that particular date, Mr. Speaker. I would have to check into it and inform the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood followed by the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake.

#### Credit Unions

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Is the government giving serious consideration to the establishment of a department for credit unions as requested by the credit unions of Alberta?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the whole matter of the problems with credit unions is under review. We have upgraded the portion of the credit union section of the co-operative section of the department, and made them separate from the other areas in the co-operative branch. In an effort to upgrade the situation with regard to the credit unions, the major stumbling block, as I understand their problem at the moment, has to do with the Small Loans Act which is a federal statute and which we are hopeful will be changed to allow them more flexibility.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

#### Alberta Opportunity Fund

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Does the new announcement of the Alberta Opportunity Fund inventory financing also affect retail merchants?

MR. PEACOCK:  
No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

#### Social Assistance

MR. COOPER:  
Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Would the hon. minister tell us when the last increase in payments was made to those receiving assistance through social development?

MR. CRAWFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is referring generally to the provincial program for social assistance payments and if my memory is correct, it was in about February of this year that a new scale was struck for adults only. At that time no adjustment was made for children because the family allowance had been tripled the previous month.

MR. COOPER:  
A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is consideration being given at the present time to increasing this assistance?

MR. CRAWFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I think the position the government has taken is that a review of the level of support for people on social assistance should be done annually. So that would point, in the normal course of events, to a review within the next few months.  
I should say, Mr. Speaker, that a review of the levels of support, and of the apparent need and relationship to cost of living and the like, does not necessarily mean automatic increases.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. Member for Lethbridge West followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

#### Raymond Ammonia Plant

MR. GRUENWALD:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of the Environment. Is it the intention of the minister to hold any public hearings in Lethbridge, or in southern Alberta at any place, on the environmental impact of the proposed ammonia plant at Raymond?

MR. YURKO:  
Mr. Speaker, the proposed ammonia plant at Raymond is under review by the Energy Resources Conservation Board in regard to availability of feedstock and other matters. After the matter has been adequately handled by the board, it will then be handled adequately by the Department of the Environment with respect to its environmental consequences. A decision as to whether or not a hearing will be held will only be made after a ruling by the Energy Resources Conservation Board as to feedstock supply and other matters.

MR. GRUENWALD:  
Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Have there been any requests to the minister for such a public hearing?

MR. YURKO:  
Yes, Mr. Speaker, there have been requests. As a result, the department has informed the company that an environmental impact assessment would be required. I believe the company has, in fact, done an environmental impact assessment and I'm not sure whether or not the company has made it public. But that is a requirement prior to a hearing.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. Member for Little Bow followed by the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

#### Industrial Health Officer

MR. R. SPEAKER:  
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development, and a recheck on the questions I asked yesterday. Has the minister or his department received the resignation in writing of Dr. May, the Industrial Health officer?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, my understanding today is that the department has received the resignation.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. What were the reasons for Dr. May submitting his resignation?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if the document in which Dr. May's resignation was given included reasons, I'm not aware of them. I haven't looked at it yet.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. What steps is the minister taking to ensure that industrial health hazards are quickly located? And is one of the answers additional health officers?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on the assumption that that is a supplementary question, I'll make the policy statement the hon. member is anticipating and inform him that there is a great deal being done in the field of industrial health. Checks on various industries and the manner in which the operation of those industries affects the health of individual workers are being done on an increasing basis.

As I indicated to the House yesterday, my memory is that an increase of some 23 per cent of available manpower was put into that division in last year's Budget.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, if I may add to the discussion. In addition to the services of the Industrial Health Division of the Department of Health and Social Development, extensive industrial health safety work is done by my own department in the division of inspectional services by the Workers' Compensation Board.

In particular I should like to draw your attention, and certainly that of the Assembly, to the current study being done over a period of months by a commission on industrial and health safety. It will report on December 15 and will deal with all services of government with respect to the subject before us.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

### Greenhouse Programs

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister advise the Assembly if the greenhouse built in Wabamun by the Department of Agriculture has proven efficient?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, it has been an interesting experiment and one that may hold rather important repercussions for the province in the use of waste heat, and has some interesting applications that might also be applied in the tar sands area.

I can report to the House, Mr. Speaker, that so far the experiment at Wabamun, using the waste hot water from the plant there, has been extremely successful both as a source of heat for the greenhouse and as irrigation.

MR. PURDY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Will private greenhouse operators be encouraged to build further greenhouses in the Wabamun area?

DR. HORNER:

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, once we can get the final figures for the greenhouse operation there, that they might provide the incentive for private enterprise to establish greenhouses, not only at Wabamun but at sites of other thermal plants and other areas in which waste hot water is used.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Can he inform the House how his pilot project in the Fort McMurray area is supposed to be working?

DR. HORNER:

That's extremely early, Mr. Speaker, and I can't report on that except to say we would expect, in a review of the situation in McMurray, that farmers would take advantage of the local marketing opportunity that is going to become available there, and is available there, and will produce produce for the rapidly expanding population in that area.



DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, just for clarification. Did the hon. minister not make an announcement that they were going ahead with the project, or was he just saying they were thinking about going ahead with it?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, what I said is that we are going ahead with a project to assess the agricultural potential of any land in the area but that it is too early to make a report on it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### Social Workers Association

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. It has to do with the Alberta Association of Social Workers. My question, hon. minister is: can you inform the members of the Legislature what qualifications the Alberta Association of Social Workers must have to practise as social workers and family counsellors?

MR. SPEAKER:

I hesitate to interrupt the hon. minister, but possibly this is information which is generally available and need not take up the time of the question period.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The question arises out of some concern that many people have had, and I have given the hon. minister notice that I would be asking the question. So possibly he can answer it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The interest in the question and the notice don't necessarily set aside the rules which govern the Speaker in the question period.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, if I can ask another question. Can the hon. minister inform the House what regulating body the Alberta Association of Social Workers operates under?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Speaker, once again, the point made by Your Honour is that the information the hon. member is seeking is primarily governed by statute. Although it's true the hon. member indicated to me that he would be asking a question today relating to social work, it wasn't such that I had gone ahead and done a legal brief.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In cases where members of the association are disciplined, is this done by the association or by your department?

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member might revert to this inquiry after he has examined the legal basis under which the social workers operate.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

#### Gregg River Mine

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer and ask him whether he has had an opportunity yet to discuss with officials of the Treasury Branch whether any discussions took place between the Treasury Branch and Gregg River mines concerning that particular project?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that discussions probably have taken place. They are and, to my understanding, have been for some time a client of the treasury branches. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I would also want to reiterate that the financing the treasury branches do is an arrangement between themselves and their customers, which follows after the fact of what might be instituted in terms of government policy relative to a particular project.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification. In the light of the minister's answer on Friday that Treasury Branch policy coincides with public policy, does the government feel it is proper and consistent with that announcement that the Treasury Branch should have as a client an applicant for a major coal development while a moratorium is in existence on east slopes ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. At best the hon. member has made a representation and at worst he is asking for a matter of opinion.

MR. NOTLEY:

Well, a supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Has the government studied the implications of this kind of relationship?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I would only say this: if the hon. member is suggesting we should disallow Alberta businesses or companies from being able to approach the treasury branches for financing, this is not a view I am prepared to share or this government is prepared to share.

I think the hon. member is trying by some manner to indicate that the fact that an Alberta business is proposing to do something ... I reiterate government policy, not the treasury branches, will decide whether or not that, in fact, will proceed. The treasury branches, on the other hand, are there to assist all Alberta businesses in terms of their financial needs should their project be feasible and should it be consistent in the government's view with government policy.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Can the minister advise whether or not the cabinet has set a target date of November 30 to make a final decision on the Gregg River mine proposal?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, no.

#### Cabinet-Treasury Branch Correspondence

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Have Provincial Treasury Branch managers been instructed as to the significance of comfort letters from cabinet ministers?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I understand the hon. member's question at all.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the hon. Provincial Treasurer had the opportunity to view any comfort letters sent by cabinet ministers to Provincial Treasury Branch managers?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would have to clarify "comfort letters".

MR. WILSON:

By way of explanation then, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. It's my understanding that at times when applications for loans from treasury branches have been made, and perhaps they are borderline cases, cabinet ministers have been known to write letters encouraging the manager to approve the loans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like any specific details the hon. member might have on that because the instructions the treasury branches have from me, and they follow these instructions, is that while they might have casual informal dealings, even with MLAs relative to a constituency or a constituency business, or casual dealings with members of this side, in no way do the treasury branches make their decisions on the basis of any indication of letter or otherwise from either a minister or an MLA.

[Interjections]

## Gregg River Mine (Cont.)

MR. NOTLEY:

I wonder if I could ask one final supplementary question dealing with the Gregg River mine and ask the Minister of Mines and Minerals whether or not there has been any designation of the lease in question as security for Japanese interests to put up a \$20 million loan?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any arrangement of the nature the hon. member suggests.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

## Temporary Contract Labor

MR. WYSE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Has the provincial government a policy or is it studying the possibility of importing contract laborers to Alberta on a temporary basis?

DR. HOHOL:

No, Mr. Speaker. I have had some discussions, very few, on the initiative of some sectors of the industry and some with the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, but not in the sense of policy or a study.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Has the government any statistics indicating that the possibility of filling jobs from our own population in the near future is pretty remote?

DR. HOHOL:

"Remote" is just a bit difficult to respond to. There are certainly difficulties in the trades, in the service industry, in other sectors of our economy. We have the circumstance of 1.7 per cent unemployment two months in a row and under that circumstance obviously some shortages will occur.

We have, on several occasions, stated our policy with respect to the development of Alberta manpower to date and for the next decade, and would be happy to do it again in the proper circumstances, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Calder followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

## Oil Sands - Waterfowl Fatalities

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of the Environment. It relates to a question on Monday by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview when he stated that some 1,000 to 2,000 waterfowl and shore birds were found dead in the Syncrude lease as a result of oil pollution. I wonder if the hon. minister has had a chance to check out the facts on this.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, my department informed me that the environmental research associates who are researching this matter have estimated that approximately twenty-five to thirty birds were entrapped in the tailings pond during a period of over one year. Furthermore Syncrude categorically denied any such numbers as were indicated by the hon. member, and indicated that approximately nine birds have been found in the pond since spring.

I do want to say that it's really unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, that irresponsible remarks or statements are made in this regard.

MR. CHAMBERS:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of what the minister has just said and the fact that I think the member ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question, question.

MR. CHAMBERS:

... and in view of the fact that the Member for Spirit River-Fairview said on a TV program ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps the hon. member might make his question stand on its own two feet.

MR. CHAMBERS:

Well my preamble is very brief, Mr. Speaker, but I have to make it.

[Laughter]

It is my understanding that the member stated on TV that he received his information from Mr. Al Smith of the Canadian Wildlife Service. I wonder if the minister verified that report?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, my office did call the Canadian Wildlife Service. Mr. Smith wasn't in but we talked to his superiors. Mr. Gerry Townshend and Doug Stephen indicated that the Canadian Wildlife Service has no evidence of mortality of migratory birds in the Syncrude lease area. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to request a clarification on this matter by the federal minister.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of the controversy, is it the minister's intention now to contact Mr. Smith?

DR. HORNER:

It's your responsibility.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No question about that.

DR. PAPROSKI:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister regarding this issue. Will the hon. minister consider or advise whether this is typical of NDP misdirection?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

The hon. Member for Lethbridge ...

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Can the minister advise the Assembly when the last time was that officials of his department entered the Syncrude lease directly to investigate the questions relating to waterfowl and migratory birds?

AN HON. MEMBER:

A credibility gap.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact my officials are in constant touch with the Syncrude people. I personally have examined or been on the Syncrude lease at least twice in the last year, and I am in personal contact with Dr. Goforth on a frequent basis on environmental matters in the Syncrude lease. He keeps me advised on almost everything that goes on in the Syncrude lease from an environmental point of view.

MR. NOTLEY:

Further supplementary ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Please, in fairness to hon. members who have not yet asked their first question we should perhaps be a little circumspect about further supplementaries.

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

#### Beef Industry

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Will the minister be making any representation to Mr. Whelan with regard to an inquiry into the beef industry?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know where the hon. member has been for the last couple of weeks but we've made those representations and we'll continue to make them in the coming days.

DR. BUCK:

Are you going to do something about it?

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### Indian Right-of-Way Claims

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Highways whether he has any meetings scheduled with either Chief John Snow or officials of the Morley Reservation to deal with the unsettled right-of-way claims by the Morley Indians.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the alleged unsettled claims, perhaps the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View should converse with the former Minister of Highways and he would then understand if there are any unsettled claims.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could do better and talk to the present Minister of Highways. Are there any unsettled claims?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Maybe they're not on speaking terms.

[Interjections]

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, there are no unsettled claims to my knowledge that were incurred since the 'now' government has come to ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Are there any unsettled claims whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, between the Department of Highways and the Stoney Indian Reservation?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Now it comes out.

MR. COPITHORNE:

... don't know whether there are any unsettled claims or not. There have been no lawsuits laid against us for them anyway.

MR. LUDWIG:

Can the hon. minister ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the final supplementary on this point.

MR. LUDWIG:

Would the hon. minister discharge his responsibilities and ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please.

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

#### Government Resources Fund

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question today to the hon. the Premier and also the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In the mind of the public of Alberta there seems to be a discrepancy in the amount of money ...

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DIXON:

Yes. My question is: what is the actual amount of money held by the provincial government, either in cash or in loans, from the extra resource money or the windfall money coming in from resources?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Windfall?

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Hold it fellow.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
What's the matter with you?

MR. MINIELY:

I'm surprised, Mr. Speaker, to hear an hon. member refer to the value of Alberta resources as a windfall of the province. However, Mr. Speaker, I would have to check because the amount certainly varies from day to day. I believe it has been published and we have given a figure publicly fairly recently. But I would have to check today just exactly what it is.

MR. DIXON:

Supplementary question to the hon. minister, now that he has the gist of my remarks. I wonder if it's in the neighborhood of \$900 million?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not in the habit of discussing figures in neighborhoods.

[Laughter]

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Provincial Treasurer with respect to the moneys referred to which are being handled by the people within his department. Could the minister advise what interest rates in total the department is receiving on surplus provincial government funds?

DR. BUCK:  
PWA ...

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, the last information I had ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

ARR. You can't catch up to the ARR, Walter.

MR. MINIELY:

... the last information I had the Treasury Department was averaging a return of 10.8 per cent on the funds, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Is the hon. member asking a supplementary or starting a debate?

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker. In light of the fact that he doesn't give 'about' figures, can he give us the exact amount the resources fund is holding?

[Interjections]

Well he says he is, you know ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. It's the Chair's recollection that the hon. minister has [been] asked that question and that there is a stricture in Beauchesne against repeating questions.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the hon. Provincial Treasurer advise the House what our return is on the Alberta Resources Railroad?

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. The hon. minister was going to answer the question, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He's ruled out of order.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I answered the question. I'd indicated I would have to check the exact figure.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for ...

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, if I could ask a supplementary question ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. DIXON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wondered if the federal government had made any representation to Alberta regarding the future disposal of this surplus money, because it must be of concern to them.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I can say that the funds, in the longer term, will be handled in a manner that is in the best interest of Alberta, not on the basis of representations from the federal government.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question for clarification, Mr. Speaker. I know the hon. minister would like to answer my question honestly. ... [Interjections] ... My supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is: do I understand from the minister's answer that the federal government is not interested in this proposal and has nothing to do with the equalization payments at all?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I said that because I am sure they are interested. But I did say our decision will be based on what is in the best interest of the province of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

#### House Builders - Licensing, Bonding

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Would the hon. minister advise the stage of development the Department of Consumer Affairs has reached relative to the planned licensing and bonding of house builders in Alberta?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. It has progressed very well. We have both licensing orders well in place. We are dealing with the Automobile Retailers Association and the construction industry in Alberta as well as the Housing and Urban Development Association of Canada relative to both of them.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise if the necessary regulations will be implemented for the calendar year 1975?

MR. DOWLING:

That's very difficult to say, Mr. Speaker. It would depend entirely on whether we can reach agreement with all the organizations that I have enumerated.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the final supplementary on this topic.

MR. WILSON:

Could the hon. minister advise the stage of development of his department's planned home-owner warranty?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. That has progressed extremely well. The Housing and Urban Development Association of Canada, with our help, has decided it should have its warranty system implemented on a provincial basis. We did have some difficulty with federal intervention in this field.

On the basis of conversations with federal authorities and other provincial jurisdictions, we determined that our best route would in fact be to establish a warranty system for the province of Alberta for a number of reasons, one of them being different methods of construction, different types of material, and these types of things.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Macleod followed by the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture on the Northern Alberta Rapeseed Co-op. With the amendment of the order in council guaranteeing them \$2 million, has construction already begun - will the plant be ready for next fall?

DR. HORNER:

My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that in fact it will be ready for next fall and that construction is under way. Indeed the amendment to the order in council had to do with some legal matters that were required.

My understanding is that things are progressing and that the machinery and equipment which are required are also under way and ready to be shipped.

MR. BUCKWELL:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the \$2 million guaranteed loan the extent of the government's involvement or are there other grants besides?

DR. HORNER:

As I explained earlier, Mr. Speaker, that will depend on the number of farmers involved. I think my latest check is that there are 700 members now. They are targeting for 1,000. If they reach that, our total involvement would reach \$4 million.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Bow Valley followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

#### Suffield Block - Environmental Damage

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Has the minister received any recent information concerning the environmental damage in the Suffield Block in southeastern Alberta as a result of the military training?

MR. YURKO:

I don't know what the meaning of the word "recent" is in his mind. I haven't received anything in the last couple of weeks, or even in the last several months, but I have received some over a period of a couple of years.

MR. MANDEVILLE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister completed or undertaken any studies into trends in wildlife population and mass destruction of grassland by fire in the area?

MR. YURKO:

I think, Mr. Speaker, that question in terms of wildlife might be better addressed to the Minister of Lands and Forests.

[Interjections]

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to answer that particular part of the question, inasmuch as I have a report that the week before last, during the course of normal staff duties, some of the staff of the Department of Lands and Forests flew over the Suffield Block and



noted that a major part of the west half of the Suffield Block had been burned over, apparently by recent fires relating to the beautiful weather we have had this fall. We are looking into the matter which the hon. member brings forward.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

#### Megavitamin Therapy

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Solicitor General in her role with the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission. My question is, has there been a reduction in coverage under Alberta Health Care as it relates to the use of megavitamins?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I explained that the other day but I am glad to explain it to the hon. member again.

When an individual goes to a doctor, the initial examination is paid for routinely under Alberta Health Care. On subsequent visits, if it relates exclusively to the use of megavitamins it is not covered under Alberta Health Care. But if it relates to other illnesses for which the individual might be examined by the physician, the physician bills the Health Care Insurance Commission in the normal way.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question. I asked: has there been a reduction in coverage?

MISS HUNLEY:

Well, he can interpret it, I guess, any way he likes. I really wouldn't know unless I knew whether an individual had been consulting a physician or receiving treatment [with] megavitamins and the bill was subsequently not paid by Alberta Health Care.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the minister. Have you received any representations as to the reduction of services under this coverage?

MISS HUNLEY:

I have received representations about the value of megavitamins, Mr. Speaker, and requests that Alberta Health Care pay for every visit to a physician regardless of what it was for.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister. I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the minister could inform the House whether she has received the report she requested from the medical schools regarding megavitamin therapy?

MISS HUNLEY:

I expect that report will take some time because I want it to be very thoroughly researched. I think it's incredibly important, Mr. Speaker, that we have very good and reliable information so that we may base our decisions for the best interests of the health of our people.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

#### Bearhills Lake Dam

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of the Environment. I wonder if the minister could advise the House whether his department held hearings before the fact regarding the construction of the dam on Bearhills Lake, which is now under way, for the purpose of stabilizing water levels on that lake?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I didn't get the name of the lake.

MR. HENDERSON:

Bearhills Lake, Mr. Speaker, in the County of Wetaskiwin.

MR. YURKO:

I don't associate the name with the names I'm familiar [with]. Are you talking about Cold Lake or Driedmeat Lake?

MR. HENDERSON:

No, Mr. Speaker, it's known as Bearhills Lake and is a water stabilization project. I believe the dam is about to be constructed, or is under construction, in association probably with Ducks Unlimited.

MR. YURKO:

My recollection of the matter is that it's a small installation, if you wish. It's not a massive or a large installation. I have indicated, from the policy point of view in several instances, that where we are concerned with smaller weirs or smaller dams that don't have a regional or major affect, hearings are not held through the Environment Conservation Authority. A local meeting may, in fact, be held. I would consider that this is of this nature rather than one of major magnitude, so that hearings were in fact by-passed.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, might I just follow up with a supplementary and ask the minister: is he aware of whether hearings were held?

If I could just expedite the question, Mr. Speaker. My concern is that property owners adjoining the lake be afforded the opportunity of making representations to the government on the project before the fact.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I'll check into the details of the matter and report to the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member for Calgary Bow might ask a final question.

#### Status of Women - Wage Rates

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Could the minister advise if he has received the results of the Alberta Salary and Wage Rates Survey for 1974 prepared by the status of women information project?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I received the summary of that report.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that legislation to enforce equality in salary levels has been in the province for some time, could the minister tell us where the breakdown in enforcing this legislation is occurring?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member's question is a representation and replete with innuendo. Perhaps the minister might, in fairness, be allowed to answer it briefly.

DR. HOHOL:

With respect to this matter, there is a significant activity in the hearings of the Human Rights Commission with the management of the Royal Alexandra Hospital regarding equal pay for equal service. It will clearly have certain capability for generalizing and application and inference for other places.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, before we proceed to Orders of the Day, I beg leave to move adjournment of the Assembly to discuss a matter of urgent public importance of which notice has been given to Mr. Speaker. The authority that allows me to make this motion is Rule 29, Mr. Speaker.

The urgent matter I am concerned about, and I'm sure a lot of hon. members are concerned about, is the sudden increase in the price of milk in this province and the detrimental effect it will have on lower income families and families on fixed incomes which may be unable to meet the sudden increase in the price of milk.

I wish to move that the Assembly adjourn to debate this matter, to determine whether this government has any responsibility in this regard and whether we ought perhaps to seek a commitment from the government to determine whether it can intervene and help those families which may be very seriously affected by the increases in the price of milk in the province.

Perhaps someone might wish to question me, what reason have I to believe that milk prices are going up. I ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. As the hon. member is undoubtedly aware, this is not the time to debate the topic. The question which is now before the Assembly, in view of the hon. member having had recourse to Standing Order 29, is the question of urgency of debate. If the hon. member wishes to make further submissions on the point, I would respectfully suggest that he explain quite specifically the urgency of debate.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your ruling. It states here that I may be permitted a brief argument in favor of the motion. I believe if your interpretation is that the argument must deal strictly with urgency of the debate, then I will restrict myself to that ruling.

Generally a motion of this type is granted in the House of Commons if the mover can establish that there is a serious problem; that there is not an opportunity of debate on the issue on some other motion or some other procedure in the Legislature, and that unless we get a ruling from the Speaker that we can move the adjournment and debate this issue, that the issue will not be dealt with.

Because we have no chronicles or journals of speakers' rulings in this regard and because this motion is very seldom referred to, I would seek the indulgence of Mr. Speaker to give an indication of why I believe there is urgency, under the circumstances, and perhaps use as an analogy some situations and rulings by Mr. Speaker in the House of Commons.

The reference will be brief but I wish to indicate that it is a proper situation of an emergency under the circumstances. I'd like to refer to the Commons Journals Index 1970-72, on page 1180. This deals with a Speaker's ruling with regard to an adjournment motion by Mr. Woolliams and Mr. Burton in the House of Commons.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly I might save the hon. member some time by saying that I have read that reference.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I took the liberty of submitting these matters to you. I wish to urge your decision in my favor on the basis that the Speaker has always given the benefit of the doubt to the movers in the event of some doubt as to whether there is an emergency or a need for urgent debate. The Speaker also had taken into serious account the opportunity of debating this issue on some other motion or bill or other proceedings. I'm stating, Mr. Speaker, that the urgency of debate is established, not so much from the point of view of hon. members here, but from the concern of the people. I'm looking at the urgency from the point of view of those people who may be hit, not only by an increase in price now but the forecast increase, perhaps as high as 22 or 23 per cent over the present price and in particular before the next session is called.

So we ought not leave this as unfinished business. There is no other opportunity to debate and I urge the hon. Speaker to rule in my favor on this motion. The possibility of hardship and serious concern, unless we dispose of this idea, is grave. I also urge the hon. members to support my motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View might assist in the consideration of this matter if he would be able to tell the House somewhat definitely when this urgent matter is said to have arisen.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the urgent matter had arisen at the time I was able to obtain information from the press and information from the government that there is an increase in milk prices already, and an imminent increase by January 19. I would quote from a release which I think is reliable. It states here: "Further milk price increases forecast. 'It's entirely possible that there could be another adjustment by Jan. 19, if feed costs continue to rise,' says association president Terry Bocock." But another release that concerns me forecasts the increase of milk to 49 cents, more or less, by January 19, at a time when the federal government will remove its subsidy.

I'm stating there is an urgent concern in the minds of those people on fixed and low incomes. This matter ought to be disposed of in this session and there is no other opportunity of debating this motion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member care to tell the Assembly the date of the release to which he has just referred?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'm relying on the fact that the date I received this information and it came to my attention ... after that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member wish to disclose the date of the release?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I have not got the date of release on this item. It was in The Edmonton Journal. This one is October 31, but I did my research today and I obtained these matters today, Mr. Speaker.

So I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should get involved in a technicality as to when this may have occurred. The media had been reporting constantly that milk prices have gone up November 1, and are going up more. I think I have made a case of an urgent situation. The technicality as to whether I was right there when the ink was still wet is immaterial in this debate, Mr. Speaker.

I would urge you not to rely on a technicality. In my opinion, I am submitting that I did this as quickly as I was able to under the circumstances.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, if I may speak briefly to the question ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I don't believe debate is allowed on my motion until you have ruled whether you are going to permit this motion ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member, I am sure, is not about to debate the motion but rather the urgency of the question, which is a point of order on which, under the Standing Orders, the Speaker is permitted to hear a short amount of debate.

MR. KING:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am, of course, going to speak simply to the question of whether or not this is a matter which has been raised at the earliest possible opportunity and is, as required by Standing Order 29.7(a), a genuine emergency calling for immediate and urgent consideration.

I think the motion has been condemned out of the mouth of its mover in view of the fact he has cited a news release of October 31, and we are today at November 6 only now getting around to a consideration of whether or not it is urgent. I don't know how the hon. member opposite can have said that he has heard constant reference to this issue in the printed and the electronic media and is only now, after this constant daily repetition of the fact of the increase, getting around to introducing his motion.

But quite aside from the fact that it is my contention he is not raising it at the appropriate opportunity, I would also draw the attention of hon. members to annotation 100 in Beauchesne. I would argue as well that under annotation 100(1) the motion is out of order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make some further comments. I received official information about the increase in the price of milk in Alberta through a government release yesterday. I was not able to give you the proper two hours notice yesterday after I received this. Furthermore, I received another, I believe, government release from the publicity bureau indicating that milk will go up, and I also received that release yesterday. I feel it would certainly be unfortunate if that kind of situation were used to say, well, we're not going to do it because technically we found an out against you.

I got that information - I was listening to the news but I got this yesterday. I have it in my hands here and here is the release. It's referenced S. Barnett of the Public Utilities Board. "A further increase of one cent per quart for homogenized, 2 per cent and skim milk is necessitated by the phasing out of the consumer milk subsidy by the federal government ..."

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps it won't be necessary for the hon. member to read the remainder of the release. I think the point, insofar as it depends on that release, has been made.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to the point of order. I have in my hand a release dated October 22, if dates are important. It would seem to me the matter is the question of milk pricing which has of course been under discussion in various parliaments over the past year, and the urgency of debate escapes me.

Also, the honorable gentleman had an opportunity in the debate on the general motion. Indeed on Monday evening they had an opportunity to discuss the question of milk pricing in this province and in Canada. It would seem to me that the motion, in fact, is out of order because it doesn't fit within the ambit of Rule 29.

MR. DIXON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I believe the hon. member's motion should be accepted. It is a matter of emergency because of the number of people going to be affected by this price rise. I think that is where we should be arguing rather than the technicalities of a motion.

My understanding of an emergency debate is the broad effect it has on the people of the province. I don't think anything can have a broader effect in today's high costs than the continuing rising cost of food, and in particular the staple foods such as milk which are used by almost every person in our province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe the subject is most timely. I believe the public of Alberta is interested in knowing what this government and Legislature is going to do regarding the price of milk and the rapid increase that it has been subjected to and the fact that feed costs are going up. We can see no end to the rapid rise. So I believe it is good and timely for debate to be allowed on this particular issue.

DR. HORNER:

Monday night, why didn't you raise it?

MR. SPEAKER:

With great respect to the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, the urgency of debate can scarcely be said to depend on the time when the matter may have come to the attention of an hon. member or all hon. members. Undoubtedly, in addition to the news reports which the hon. member says have been coming out for some time, there will be further ones for the immediate future.

There is no doubt about the importance of the topic, but the question before the Assembly is whether it should be discussed exactly at this time rather than, say, yesterday or a week ago or another time. There has in fact been a debate in the nature of a Throne Speech debate on Government Motion No. 3 which has continued beyond the time when, as the Chair recalls, the news concerning this situation started to come.

The question is actually, should the other concerns of the Assembly or of the province be put aside or delayed at this time? I am sure that all hon. members recognize the importance of the matter, but it has the same continuing importance as the prices of all basic necessities.

But that's not the question. The question is whether here and now the hon. members should spend the rest of the afternoon talking about this subject. The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View knows that topics of this kind cannot end in a resolution or in legislation. Debate of this kind provides merely for an airing of the topic. Under the circumstances I am obliged to say that the motion does not qualify under the principles of this standing order, which are the same as those followed by other legislatures and parliaments which follow our tradition.

Now this does not suggest in any way that this is not a serious subject. But there is an additional point which might in itself be a complete bar to accepting this as a present emergency which should be debated in the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. As I understand it, the emergency which the hon. member refers to, if there is one, was perhaps started by an action by the Dominion government. In fact the matter has, as the hon. member may know, been raised very recently in the House of Commons in Ottawa. It is very difficult to say that under this rule an emergency which has been caused or contributed to by an action which is outside the jurisdiction of the province should be the subject of this very special kind of debate.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly bound by your ruling, but I wish to express regret that I did not have a chance to present the arguments, as I wanted the hon. members to hear [them], and I submitted certain information to Mr. Speaker ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member's post mortem is really not in order under the circumstances. I am grateful to the hon. member for having referred me to precedents in the House of Commons which are certainly a guide, although not necessarily binding. But no good would be served in spending further the time of the Assembly in dealing with a matter which has, under our Standing Orders, now been disposed of.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I wished the opportunity of convincing the hon. members that I should be given the benefit of the doubt and I wasn't given that opportunity, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member wishes to complain about the opportunity he was given to expound the question which, in the respectful opinion of the Chair, was ample, he would have to raise that under a substantive motion and not at this time.

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Third Reading)

Bill No. 80 The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1974 (No. 2)

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 80, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1974 (No. 2).

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 80 was read a third time.]

Point of Privilege  
(Order for Return No. 131)

MR. SPEAKER:

If I might just take the time of the House for another brief moment on a matter which I would have mentioned a while ago if it had not been for the question under Standing Order 29.

Hon. members may recall that shortly before the adjournment of the spring sittings, a question of privilege was raised with regard to Motion for a Return No. 131, which was passed as amended by the Assembly and made into an order for a return on the motion of the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Without going into too much detail, hon. members may recall that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs tabled a return in reply to that order, and subsequently, after discussion with the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, tabled a further return. Following that further tabling, the hon. Member for Calgary Bow raised a possible question of privilege on the question of the inadequacy, as he described it, of the two returns to the motion which were tabled.

I should say that the matter has been under study. I realise that the time that has elapsed has been long and I must confess to hon. members that, in spite of a great deal of study and a very impressive amount of research, the Chair found the question one which was very difficult to resolve since the authorities going back for a number of years under our so-called common law of parliament are not entirely consistent.

However, the hon. minister, as hon. members may have noticed this afternoon, has filed a still further supplementary return to Order for a Return No. 131, and under the circumstances it may well be unnecessary for the House or the Chair to consider the matter any further.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, in response to your statement, I would like to know what your ruling is, because if not, we will never know whether a minister has intentionally only partially filed information in response to a motion for a return, or he has done it out of ignorance, or he has done it out of a perhaps improperly worded motion for a return, or whether he just does not care to respond. If we don't know the ground rules we are working under, Mr. Speaker, it's going to be extremely difficult to introduce a motion for a return, having full confidence that if the House approves that motion for a return we are going to end up with a document or documents that are complete, unless it's declared otherwise.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that at the moment, if I understood your request to leave the ruling in abeyance, we would be in a position of not knowing whether or not, when a motion for a return is approved by the House, the minister has to supply part of the information, all of it, or [if he] can supply it in dribs and drabs or piecemeal over a long period of time. It seems to me that would not be a very healthy or helpful state of events to leave the situation in. And so, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it might be beneficial to have you complete your ruling on the matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would be glad to oblige the hon. Member for Calgary Bow but under the circumstances, not having had an opportunity to check the further return which has been filed by the hon. minister, it may well be that to rule on the matter now would be ruling on a question which may be hypothetical. As hon. members may recall, there is a passage in Beauchesne which prohibits the putting of hypothetical questions to the Chair.

Admittedly, the matter was not hypothetical until the further return was filed this afternoon. But that has now taken place and therefore it may well be that this is now a

hypothetical question or that there is in fact no question of privilege at all because of the information ultimately having been complete.

The topic is extremely important. I would suggest that if a similar situation arises in the future the occupant of the Chair at that time might be asked to deal with it, and perhaps the House itself may wish to cause a study to be made of this question which, as I say, is really extremely difficult. I say that having regard to the very capable sources of advice to which the Chair has had resort over the past while, even as late as yesterday.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, if I could say a word or two on the point of order. It seems to me the matter is two-edged. In the first place there is responsibility on the person who has prepared the order for a return to make it abundantly clear exactly what he wants. Secondly, I think there is a responsibility on the minister to whom it is addressed to ascertain prior to debate in the Legislature if that information can be secured as requested. If not, in my view the order for a return should be amended in order that the minister may then supply the information in accordance with the return. Once the return has been ordered by the Legislature it is my view that the minister then has no choice but to supply that information at the earliest possible time.

MR. SPEAKER:

I'm sure that the House will appreciate the views of the honorable and experienced Member for Drumheller and perhaps they might be taken into account if and when a further situation of this kind arises.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to study Bill No. 62.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of the Whole Assembly will come to order.

#### Bill No. 62 The Medical Profession Act, 1974

MR. CHAIRMAN:

An amendment has been circulated. Any questions or comments?  
The amendment was distributed to the members.

MR. LUDWIG:

What is the amendment.

MR. CRAWFORD:

If I could just respond in order, I believe, to satisfy the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View in respect to the proposed amendment to Section 66.

I think hon. members will note that a careful reading of Section 66 would - just rereading it now, Mr. Chairman, I believe the reference to Section 66 relates back to Section 65 in which it is stated that advertisement or statement alleging ability or willingness to diagnose or treat any human disease, illness, deformity, defect or injury shall be held to be the practice of medicine and therefore an offence under the Act.

The reason it's proposed to add subsection (3) to Section 66 then, was specifically this: it occurred to members of the committee considering the bill at the stage when printing had already been undertaken that this could even be read to go against things like advertising Aspirin and things like that - being patent medicines and so on - because of the wording of 65(a).

Therefore the suggestion was that although these restrictions in Section 65 should indeed be fairly strong, it was never intended that things which are legal under an act of the Parliament of Canada - such as The Proprietary Medicine Act, under which a lot of patent medicines are distributed without prescription and are regulated by federal

authorities - that anything done pursuant to that type of legislation should be in conflict with our own.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the hon. minister's explanation. Recently there has been a tremendous amount of advertising by the pharmaceutical association warning people about advertised drugs, their real value and the concern about apparent overuse of these advertised drugs; the fact that some of them may be useless; the fact that some of them may be harmful; the apparent failure of people to go to doctors to be advised whether they need this stuff. It's a sort of swing up to what I refer to as human frailty. They would much sooner take a chance on some drug that might help them. I'm thinking not only of Aspirin but other numerous types of drugs, cold remedies, et cetera that run into millions of dollars.

The advertising is such that it does prey upon either the gullibility of people or lack of concern about people, about what dire effects they can run into in this situation or the fact that some neighbor had cured a serious cold by swallowing some Contact C. So they all go ahead with this - Contact C was one of the drugs dealt with.

I'm concerned about the fact that the public is not protected. Perhaps we feel, well, how far can we go to protect the people? We have all kinds of legislation in areas where their health, which is very important, is not affected. We are protecting people by legislation. The expression that our books are loaded with legislation to protect the gullible from the unethical is known and we sometimes go beyond what we feel we ought to do because something unfair develops. People are being victimized, sometimes quite knowingly, or sometimes through ignorance.

I'm wondering whether it isn't time this government through some program - they have programs, educational programs - with the approval of authority of the government got out and let the people know, perhaps the students, that we have to be educated to this problem. It's a lot more serious than just what meets the eye. There have been articles written - I don't recall it in the LeDain Report - on the apparent overdependence of people on patented drugs, pharmaceutical drugs that are available. You can buy anything you like and use it and hope it doesn't put you under.

I'm wondering whether there should not be a move in this direction. The argument in some articles is that if we go into this thing, we ignore this thing, people become dependent, some gravitate to stronger drugs as time goes by and before you know it using ... Narcotics are not all that harmful when you compare what has happened to a person just using more and more of a certain type of sedative perhaps. Their health is such that they keep going down and down. I know of some personal cases where some individual gets a prescription from a doctor to use some kind of drug. He ends up by getting around the prescription. He somehow connives to get the kind of supply a doctor would never recommend.

Somewhere someone is guilty of either breaking the law or coming awfully close to it. But they're undermining the health of individuals even though the individual is an adult. They get him into a position where a person becomes dependent. I know of one case where the person passed out driving a car because that day he took 28 tablets of a kind. I think if you take 28 ordinary harmless tablets they might make you sick.

I have great reliance on the concern of the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development on these matters and that is why I make the appeal to him. We ought to take a stab with all the means we have of disseminating information. We ought at least to alert the people that you can find out, get advice for nothing.

This may not appear to be too important an issue. I don't believe we ought to lead everybody by the hand. There will be those who are going to fall by the wayside even if you lock them up. But those advertisements on the air that I saw - I was most impressed because we're all like that. We get a bout of flu or something and we start popping tablets hoping one of them works. When we get cured we don't know what did it because we took so many. So I believe it is a timely plea for maybe an educational program for this department, under some good authority, if we can help the medical profession or the pharmaceutical association to get together.

Some hon. members might wonder why I'm raising this thing now, but I have been in doctors' offices and dentists' offices where they have these advertisements. I'd be the last person to say doctors are not seriously concerned, but maybe one doctor believes that this kind of drug is good and he prescribes it. People put a lot of faith in professional people's advice, a lot more than some people care to admit. So when they feel some neighbor got a good prescription, they rely on it and they don't know what it's for.

The people in this province have not got the - well, not in this province, in this country because this was a Canada-wide and perhaps an America-wide broadcast. In fact, I believe it involved people from Europe. People somehow will consult all kinds of experts when they buy an automobile, but when it's their own body that's concerned, they will take a chance on almost anything and knowingly will continue to do this. I believe the fault is in education. The doctors ought to let us know what is done in that regard because they are showing some leadership here. But I think there is a problem and it is a problem the government can, if not eliminate, alleviate. The government can reduce the problem. It affects a lot of young people, it affects a lot of people who just don't know any better. I believe maybe not legislation, but an educational program would do the job, Mr. Chairman.



DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Chairman, if I may make ...

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I was just going to say I would like to respond to the hon. member by saying to him that I don't think there was anything he said that I would disagree with at all.

I wanted to assure him that I think the plea is timely and it's the sort of thing federal and provincial health departments do look at, have been looking at, in conjunction with the professions involved, primarily the medical profession and the pharmaceutical profession.

I share his concern and many professional people share the same concern, that in readily available medicines a lot of people for various reasons, one of which is ignorance and another of which is I suppose the hope of achieving a benefit which, with regard to pain killing or whatever, may really be attributable to something entirely different - but they just hope, because of the advertisement, that that particular product will help them. So they do go and use them.

But the assurance I wanted to give the hon. member is that we would certainly take under consideration efforts in regard to education of the public in respect to this. I can assure him that it was discussed within the last year at a federal-provincial conference. The governments represented there were not able to come up with something at that point that would be generally agreed to by all those involved. My hope is that in time that will happen.

In this amendment, however, all that is being proposed is that if the form of advertisement, which on the face of it might be barred by our act, is in fact allowed by a federal act, this amendment would do away with the conflict so long as the law remains as it is.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Chairman, if I just may make one brief comment on this. On this one occasion I certainly agree with the hon. member opposite and the comments of the hon. minister. Certainly I feel also that this is not the bill to deal with this very major and very important item that the hon. member opposite has raised. I suggest that this item may be better dealt with under Consumer Affairs where, I have suggested already on a number of occasions, labelling of ingredients of products and their associated hazards should be listed on all products.

Other areas, of course, is why a Department of Education in a school system, through public health units and other community health units in addition to the Alberta Medical Association which has taken a very strong lead in this area. But I certainly agree and concur unequivocally that this is an item of major importance that should be dealt with not only across the province but across Canada.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I was not too concerned how this came about but I now recall in watching that program on the air - it was a real good one - that the Hon. Marc Lalonde was on it. I believe he is concerned. If we have the proper people show concern, and have the ability and means of doing something about it, the reason for not doing something is not that big any more. I mean the obstacles can be overcome.

I think this is a field in which people are receptive to advice from proper authorities. I would like to recommend that we make the approach in some instances through schools. You'd be surprised how much parents finally learn from their children going to school. Maybe it isn't all good, but they learn a lot. I know that some programs, by the Department of Education, or some other department, on smoking had such a tremendous impact that I'm quite convinced a lot of people cut it off; that a lot of students shied away from it; that students urged their parents to cut out smoking. So that is one channel through which we can disseminate information quite readily. Maybe someone will object that we are, maybe, brainwashing the students. But the students in this day and age are discriminating enough to light upon those things which they feel will help them. They require perhaps some guidance and leadership other than they have at home sometimes. In some families the parents just don't know any better. They get into a rut and it becomes a way of life.

So I would like to urge the minister - I appreciate his remarks. It doesn't matter which department does it. But as in many other things an educational program will perhaps be a lot better than any kind of legislation stating that if you do this, you are going to be in real trouble. I think if you tell the average man, you're swallowing small amounts of poison and even though your body can take it eventually it will get you, most of them will take a good, hard look at this situation and stop it. But the trend in popping pills - it seems to me advertising is an enemy. There are so many things in drug stores and in magazines and on television that are advertised as though they were going to save you from all sorts of things. The odd, funny circus performances we used to have where somebody is selling an elixir of life with only maybe water and something else in it - those things were not nearly as deceiving and harmful as what we're getting now. The principle is the same. We're advertising. We're a lot more sophisticated. I used to watch - when I was a boy, I liked to hear a barker at a fair get an audience and sell some junk to people, they all went home and they took it. But that wasn't harmful. They got stuck once and maybe somebody smartened them up later on. But when it becomes a way of life that -

some of that advertising I think has the motto, we don't care about the health. It should be written at the bottom, never give a sucker an even break, because they do push this stuff and sales are tremendously high. It isn't only in the medical field.

If you go into some other fields of endeavour some medical people - not doctors, but others in the field - sell vitamins virtually by the carload. They import them and they're pushing this stuff without medical prescription. Somewhere down the line we're going to have to look into this thing. The public has to be educated. I urge this minister, who I think is very receptive to this kind of request and who certainly must be aware of what is about us, to get together perhaps with the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs - he needs an opportunity to make some impact on the people of Alberta - and the hon. Minister of Education, and maybe we could launch something that would be of benefit and perhaps would get tremendous public approval.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, there are two points I would like to have the minister's comments on.

The first one is Section 23 which sets up a special register for people who, I presume, have had no medical training or no actual training or learning in medicine. I can understand this in midwifery and even to an extent in medicine, but I find it difficult to understand why a person like that would be permitted to carry out surgery. I would like to have the comments of the hon. minister on Section 23, subsection 2.

In order to save time in getting up again, the other is Section 49; where a doctor or physician may be called before the bar of the profession and there he is not excused from incriminating himself. I always thought it was a basis of common law that no person - man or woman - could be required to incriminate himself or herself. If that is so, I am wondering why there are now going to be two sets of rules, one before the bar of the medical men and one before the bar of justice or the civil courts.

Also, if such evidence is given in a hearing before the medical association and then it does proceed to civil action outside, would there be some way of striking that off the evidence entirely, or how could the people who are acting as judges on behalf of the medical association reach a decision? Then if it proceeds to civil action the basis of that decision is not given to the civil court.

It seems to me there might well be a conflict, even though the section provides that this self-incrimination must not be used in a civil case. But if it is the same case, or arising out of the case before the judges of the association, it seems to me there could be great difficulty when it comes before a civil action. I would much rather see the same rules followed in both, where no man or woman is required to incriminate himself or herself.

I would like to have the comments of the hon. minister on that section also.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, just a few remarks to the hon. minister. My concern relates directly to the bill. A year or so ago there was quite a lot of controversy regarding the overprescribing of drugs by a number of medical practitioners within the province. I believe this is one of the things we should be giving serious consideration to in this bill.

I was wondering what efforts the particular department - I would think, of course, of medicare where they would have a better chance of catching up with these practitioners who are overprescribing drugs. I can see the danger. I don't always blame the doctor, but I can see that with the pressure on them today with all this so-called free medicare service - which really isn't free, but a lot of people think it's free. It has to be paid for. The doctors' offices are more crowded than ever. We have a much more aggressive follow-up program for patients to come in and visit the doctor.

Is the temptation getting greater today rather than to explain to Mrs. Jones or Mr. Smith that they don't really need the drug - it would take a lot of time to explain it to them and satisfy them - to say, well, I'll give them another prescription, sort of thing, rather than take the time to really explain to them the lack of necessity to take the drug. I was wondering, have we taken any action against these people? Two or three cases came to light where a certain individual was just making rounds of different doctors' offices and was coming out with the prescription he wanted. And really he was using them to satisfy his drug needs. Have they taken any disciplinary action with any of the evidence that has come forward in these cases?

DR. McCRIMMON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the Minister of Health and the medical profession on Bill 62. However, there is one section I would like some clarification on. That is the section on medical assistants, Section 26. You spoke of some of the possibilities of the needs and uses of medical assistants in your introduction on second reading, Mr. Minister. I fully agree and think they are excellent.

However, I do feel some concern over the possibility that the training of these people in certain specific categories could be detrimental to other established professions. I realize this is not the spirit or the intent of the bill but I would like some assurance that this will be carefully scrutinized and watched.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, I have another point while I am on my feet. It's regarding a court case going on in Edmonton. I was wondering, where does the practice of medicine end and the practice of marriage counselling take over? Apparently this new type of treatment some marriage counsellors are using now is more or less the laying on of hands, or an extension to what you and I would normally consider the talking over of marriage problems. This is a little off the bill but it really has a direct relationship to it because the medical practitioner could probably get away with the type of thing the marriage counsellor was attempting to do.

But I was wondering if we have any rules or regulations regarding marriage counsellors that will ask for their credentials and have an investigation as to what their practises are and whether they are complying with the intent and spirit of the rules that are set out, if there are any rules.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I think I can deal best with the points if I take them in order of the hon. members who raised them.

The hon. Member for Drumheller first asked a question about the special register. I am glad he asked that because it does not purport to allow people who are not fully trained medically to practise. What Section 23 does, when it is read in conjunction with the sections just before it, is allow for the registration of graduates of medical schools who have graduated presumably in a different jurisdiction outside Canada, and because of that do not qualify as graduates of The University of Alberta or The University of Calgary, and do not qualify as persons who have at that point passed the licentiate of the Medical Council of Canada examination. If they are in that position and they are graduates of another university, they can be registered on a special basis under the jurisdiction of the council of the college.

What is proposed, pursuant to this section, is to accommodate practitioners who may be immigrating to Canada under those circumstances but who are, I say again, actual graduates of medical schools. They can be admitted to practise, with conditions, for a period of time, in order that during that time they can take the necessary examination to be admitted to the full privileges of practice. That is what it is for.

What will happen is that by-laws pursuant to that section will be proposed by the council of the college and will be approved, in approximately the form I have just described, to deal with the matter. Prior to drafting that section I had full discussions with the representatives of the college to assure, as far as dealing with the specifics are concerned, that's the way it will be handled.

I was most interested, too, in the hon. member's reference to Section 49. Maybe a few explanations can be given there. The rule he quoted, that a person shall not be, in effect, convicted out of his own mouth, is really a principle of ancient criminal law, that a person who is accused of a crime need not testify. He may opt to have the proceedings against him presented in the court in order to bear out any accusation, but to make no response. Also, he can't be called upon to make a statement against his interests at any time prior to the proceedings. Hon. members would be familiar with a well-known rule that a warning has to be given to a person who is being accused of an offence if a statement is about to be taken.

So I put that first, if I might, in its proper perspective and then go on to say that in civil proceedings that is not so. For example, in civil proceedings any party can summon the other party to testify on his behalf if he wants to be stuck with the evidence that person will give. The reason he doesn't normally summon the opposite party to testify on his behalf, although he could do so, is that the other party will obviously just give his side of the case.

I might mention that in other types of proceedings regulated by The Alberta Evidence Act - note that we now go to the area not of parties to proceedings but of witnesses in proceedings. Witnesses, of course, can be summoned by any court, whether it's for or against their interests to appear in a particular proceeding, and do indeed have to answer questions as put to them. An example might be that if there is a civil proceeding between two parties, and the third party that we are speaking of now is a witness who should know something about the case because perhaps he was present, then he is a witness for whichever side, or both, that may want to call him as a witness who would be compellable and would have to answer questions.

Now there are the excursions that you get, too, where at a certain point the witness may indicate to the judge that he doesn't wish to answer a specific question in another proceeding because he may incriminate himself as a result of answering that question. What the judge will say then is that the person must proceed to answer the question but that he does so under the protection of the evidence act. The protection of The Alberta Evidence Act is that it limits the occasions upon which that evidence could later be used against him.

I can perhaps briefly describe the effect of that. It means in effect this: you must give the information you have to this tribunal or court but you can't have it used against you elsewhere. So the hon. member's question would be to me, once there is a record of it and it's under oath, how does that help because it exists? Well, it helps in this way. The actual record, the actual transcript of the evidence as given, is the item which cannot be used against that person. It is true that what could still happen is that as a result of that an investigator could then go out and maybe find other evidence and prove the same case against the person. But it is still so that the evidence itself could not be used against him. That is a rule that exists throughout a very large area of court

proceedings and proceedings before various tribunals, and is significantly reflected in Section 49.

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican asked about overprescribing of drugs. He asked about touch therapy - touched upon the subject if I might say so. He asked about what is done in regard to discipline of practitioners who are overprescribing.

I think what he is asking is: what agency in the province or what authority reigns over the whole question of quality of practice of a medical man, a medical person, a practitioner.

That is one of the reasons the disciplinary proceedings have been incorporated in the act so there can be, despite the privacy of the doctor-patient relationship - we are now talking about something like overprescribing - despite that privacy, a possibility of abuse, evidence of abuse, and ultimately damage could come to the patient. That is the sort of thing which, if done on a consistent basis by any practitioner, may come to the attention of fellow practitioners and may be made the subject of review of his practice.

There have been, for a long time, ways by which the quality of practice and the level of practice carried on by a particular practitioner were capable of being examined by the college. That is really the assurance that is carried on and perhaps clarified and made a little better under this act than it was under the previous Act. They can certainly regulate, without undue interference in the doctor-patient relationship, quality of practice. That is really the area that things like overprescribing for a particular patient fall into.

Although it has been noted that there have been recent newspaper articles on touch therapy, I want to pass over any reference in the newspapers to that subject by saying that I believe it is the subject of a court case and that it did not involve members of the medical profession as I read it.

However, the hon. member then raised an entirely different question and said, if it could happen as has been reported, if it did happen, then surely doctors are also in a relationship to their patient where abuses of that type could take place. The answer is again the same, that those occasions have occurred and where they are found out disciplinary proceedings are indeed taken. The previous Medical Profession Act well-equipped the College of Physicians and Surgeons to take disciplinary proceedings including going so far as to strike from the rolls of the college a practitioner who would conduct himself in that way. That power is continued under Bill 62.

I say to the hon. Member for Ponoka that the concern he expressed, that other professions not be infringed upon by jurisdiction given to the College of Physicians and Surgeons under the sections relating to professional medical assistance, is one that the committees of cabinet and caucus which considered this legislation over a period of time also directed their minds to. I would like to give him the assurance he has asked, that there is no intention pursuant to this legislation that fields of other professionals would become subject to any other profession at all.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise one point with the minister on which perhaps he could give us some clarification. That relates to doctors in the rural areas of Alberta, in the outlying areas that are not close to the urban centres where all the extensive medical facilities are available and close at hand.

It's my understanding that the College of Physicians and Surgeons restricts the degree of practice a doctor may carry out determined by the facility that is available in the area. It is my understanding that this then, of course, would lead to the competent kind of doctor moving into an area that is some distance from the urban centres because of the restriction on his ability to practise what he in fact for many years has trained himself or prepared himself to carry out.

I wonder if the hon. minister might be able to clarify the mechanism of how it is planned to facilitate the farther rural areas in the province in order that the most competent doctors are not centralized in the major urban areas because of the restriction on the degree [to which] they can extend their practice.

I would like to have some comments on that because I know it was one of the major concerns expressed to the committee when it was studying professions and occupations in relation to medical services in the outlying areas. The lack of available doctors was a major concern. It seems to me perhaps that lack is now being determined by the fact that there is a restriction on the degree of their practice. Perhaps the hon. minister would wish to comment on that area.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I can briefly comment on that and, hopefully, satisfy the concerns of the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

What is involved is that a doctor doesn't carry out any procedure of, say, escalating complexity without having facilities at his disposal that are equivalent to the procedure. To use this example, many hon. members from Edmonton will have seen on various tours that I'm sure they've been invited to, the intensive care facilities at, say, the Royal Alex Hospital. Members from other parts of the province will have seen equivalent ones perhaps in Calgary hospitals. Those are the only places in the province where those facilities exist. The question might arise: should they exist in other places also? Well if they do, not only do you have the commitment to the facility itself, but it's useless without the high degree of nursing and other back-up laboratory and equipment components to it. So you are really asking the question: outside a major centre where a facility will be

intensely used, should you commit manpower resources and the like to creating those facilities in other places too? The answer is no, you shouldn't. There would be no justification in any centre much smaller than either of these two cities to have facilities which would really not be used. Why would one recruit 24 highly specialized operating room nurses and have them backing up a facility if the call upon them came once a year? Now I use that as an extreme example, but that is what is involved in the issue. So what the College of Physicians and Surgeons has done, and what it should continue to do in my view, is say to a practitioner, the facility in which you carry on your practice is rated for this procedure and this procedure and this one, but not for the more escalated in complexity. The most complex procedures are ones you can't carry on because the facilities for them don't exist, and if the facilities for them don't exist, then of course the patient may be in danger.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, there is a section in this act that deals with discipline and a provision that on an ex parte application by the profession, they may order someone to produce documents or provide other information. The practice now is that in an ex parte application, if the other side is represented by counsel, there is a requirement on behalf of the solicitor for the applicant to give notice; that even though it's an ex parte application the other side was possibly given the opportunity to be present. It's a practice that has been recommended and is followed.

But I'm concerned whether the issue of counsel for a doctor who may be accused of malpractice or some other unprofessional conduct - has this issue been discussed? I note there is no prohibition to counsel, but has this issue been determined? Is it recognized that a person, even on the slightest charge or the slightest accusation, is allowed to be there with counsel and have full benefit of a defense? As the hon. minister explained earlier, once a person is accused - in criminal law we have certain very well-established and built-in protections, whereas some of these organizations, these societies, these professional societies have resisted this kind of protection.

As time goes by, especially during the hearings - the hearings on professions and occupations - all professions agree that this would be a good thing, that we abandon the previous procedure where they would object to counsel, to a lawyer. Has this been determined and has this been built into the legislation to provide the utmost protection for a person who may be accused of something which could well end up in a criminal court, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, as the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View was speaking, I was trying to let my eye fall upon the part of the act that ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Part 3, page 14.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Page?

MR. LUDWIG:

Page 14, that's the "discipline" page.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Right. That's where it starts. I was going to say, Mr. Chairman, that ...

MR. LUDWIG:

I was referring to Section 37(2) with regard to ex parte application, but I believe there is no real problem there.

MR. CRAWFORD:

I think, Mr. Chairman, where the application is an ex parte one, normally the other party, of course, wouldn't have counsel present. But on the appearances in the investigating committee itself, my memory is that there is the entitlement to counsel and that that is provided in a later section. Now I know the proceedings are very complex, you have the investigation chairman and you have the committees and the complaints committee. I tried to make some notes of it the other day just to be sure that it was fairly clear in my mind. One of the things I jotted down was that there was entitlement to be represented by counsel, because that was clearly going to be an important issue.

I would add this one item, Mr. Chairman. When I was discussing the drafts of this act with the counsel who acted for the college while the preparatory work was being done, he said in summary that what they were really trying to achieve in the act was a set of discipline procedures which were equivalent to those under The Legal Profession Act, because the committee, of which the hon. member was also a member, Professions and Occupations, I believe noted that those were exemplary provisions.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I must apologize to the hon. minister but I skimmed through this act rather quickly. It's a long act. It's an important act and has not really been with us long enough. But I now point to Section 44 that the minister's answer is correct, and

that's the part I was concerned about. I did not have an opportunity of studying this thing in detail because it's a fairly long act and an interesting one, and it had been brought in at a late date, Mr. Chairman.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, just a quick question with regard to acupuncture. In the registers listed here, is there a capability of registering people who are - I know the physicians as such who are acupuncturists can be registered here, but the guy who is considered - I don't really want to use the word "quack", but that's what I was inferring - is there any way of registering him or doing any kind of check through this act?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the opinion that was arrived at, based on the way in which the provisions were drafted, was that the question of acupuncture could be related to two parts of the act. One is under offences because it could be deemed to be the practice of medicine. As a result of that, a person who is not a physician could not carry out the procedure.

However, I indicated to hon. members on a previous date during this sitting that the whole question of acupuncture was one of much interest and concern. We directed our attention to the solutions found for it in other jurisdictions, and I think what we are tending toward is the very practical solution which has been brought in in British Columbia, although we have not got all the details of it yet. The situation, as I understand it - I'm sure it's this way - is that the clinic where acupuncture is performed is under the direction of a physician. So long as it's under the direction of a physician you, of course, have control over who performs the actual procedure there. The rules, I think, would be wide enough to allow people whose qualifications in acupuncture were entirely clear to work in those surroundings. That is the sort of solution I think we'll be aiming for and would hope to find.

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

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, in dealing with this bill, the question of the issue of lay people on council has been provided for. I'd like the hon. minister to explain the reason we stopped at three. I know it had to be some kind of arbitrary figure, but was not the medical profession amenable to perhaps having a more meaningful representation? I believe out of 24 we will have 3. It is merely a token representation of lay people. It is not really [so] meaningful that they could ever have any bearing on decisions.

I know the arguments were rather heavy that they are there more or less as observers. It depends on the person who is on it. They could get people who are very sympathetic with the profession and it would be quite meaningless. On the other hand, they could get people who are the kind who probe and look and would have more or less a critical approach to everything that is done, with a view to seeing whether there are any hopes of improving.

That one issue dealt with by the Committee on Professions and Occupations was an extremely important one in dealing with professions permitting lay people on their council. I'm sure the legal profession took a pretty stiff stand on this. I think they yielded as time went by. They didn't want anybody on it at one time. They talked about confidentiality and the argument was that maybe some other people can keep a confidence as [well] as a professional man.

I wondered whether there was not some resistance to this idea. Three ... it's a start, but I believe it is just a start. Perhaps these committees - if the council meets regularly and the workload is heavy - would be in some difficulty to just absorb some of the deliberations. I would have liked to have seen a higher number, perhaps half a dozen, so that if there were any kind of division, if I may use that word, any kind of difference on a vote they would have some meaningful impact on which way this thing goes, because 3 out of 24 - I believe it is 24, I may be wrong - but 3 out of 24 would have small impact.

I'd like the hon. minister to advise why this was left at that point. Where did the resistance to a larger number of lay people on council come from, if from the profession?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, just two or three quick points on that. In fairness to the representatives of the college we frequently met with, I would have to say they took no objection to involving members of the public, took no objection to the figure of three and, to my memory, no other figure was discussed.

The situation simply resolves itself to this. It seems to me the number of districts from which directors or council members are elected is about 17 in the province. We wanted to make sure, of course, that three wasn't diluted into a number of, say, 40 or 50. So although there had been no previous limit on the number of council members, we put one in. We thought 25 was a reasonable limit because there would then presumably be about 17 districts still to be represented; two representatives of the medical colleges in the province and three members of the public, and if the figure ever needed to be changed it could be from time to time.

But I think the substantial answer to the hon. member's question is that we weren't trying to go the whole distance on the first try. This is the first profession we have

made a move in with regard to involving members of the public. We regarded it as being in part something that should be tried for a period of time and thought that three was a useful number to begin with.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, in dealing with Section 26(2) of the bill as it reads, the question of "The Professional Medical Assistant Register may be divided into two parts, namely," et cetera.

Could the minister advise, what are the limits of people who could be registered under the Professional Medical Assistant Register? What are the limits on this? Is this an extension of people to be registered, who are not quite qualified doctors, who may aid in this field? What is the real purpose of this section?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, it's not meant to look after people who aren't really qualified to be doctors and are something less. It relates to people who are specifically trained for limited objectives. The term technician is often used - a technical person - a type of person who is in a support capacity or, as the term is now well-known, a paramedical capacity, or in an emergency treatment type of capacity.

The details of the scope of practice of each type of person will relate partly to the personnel who become available in the field through the various training institutions, either courses designed at the university - I began, I believe yesterday, by saying this is really a new field and one where evolution should be expected and will take place - courses designed at the institutes of technology and incorporated ultimately in by-laws, that describe the areas in which technicians of these various types can practice and the degree of training necessary for them to be admitted to practice.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. minister's answer.

In reading the section further, it provides for the appointment of say a committee of these medical assistants who are registered under this section to deal with training, registration and discipline of the so-called medical assistants.

Are we not getting into a position of conflict of jurisdiction, because I would presume that under the present set-up these people who may be registered on the medical assistance register, perhaps on a voluntary basis, will be registered under their own association. What is the situation here? Are we going to get into a position where some people who may not be too happy with their own organization may be registered under this section and, with the blessings of the council, operate in any event?

Has this been really carefully threshed out, that we will not get into a conflict of jurisdiction? These professional societies or occupation societies are quite jealous of their membership. What would the situation be with reference to Section 26(7), Mr. Chairman?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the hon. member that a lot of attention was given to that subject. The reason it is being done this way at the present time is there is no jurisdiction in existence yet under any other act for the professional medical assistants to practise at all. We had the choice of either trying to create an act, and trying to deal with that whole question all at once as a new issue, or making a beginning within certain limits we thought were appropriate at the present time to bring them into existing legislation to which they were most closely related, that is, of course, the practice of medicine.

I don't actually foresee in the future as matters develop that there would necessarily be a separate act. There could be. If not, there could certainly be changes to this part which will reflect the growth of an actual body of people who are practising in this field and will assure representation for them in the proper way. But we thought that was premature at this time.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the minister must have considered the question of an umbrella act for people who are in the medical field or related medical associations or societies as the case may be. Has this been determined, and since this is apparently a step in that direction, why did we involve people who are in the medical field to become registered, courtesy of the council? Why was an umbrella act not proposed at this time to really take care of the problem and determine it at the present time?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the government will certainly address itself to the question of an umbrella act and that sort of recommendation in relation to professions generally.

If the result is that that type of legislation comes into being, I am suggesting it would affect this and this could well change. But since that decision had not yet been taken in regard to an umbrella act or anything like that, it was thought this was the way to proceed in the meantime.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I'm aware that this decision has not been taken, but a very comprehensive report was tabled in this Legislature several months ago when this issue was discussed. There appeared to be some agreement, if not willing agreement some tolerance at least, to the idea that in an area that is becoming so involved, so costly and so far-reaching it affects the well-being of all people, perhaps an effort should have been made.

Now another problem that confronted the committee in dealing with the different professions, and that's not only the medical profession but all the professions, there appeared to be a sort of - well this permeated the whole hearings and I think with some justification, and I am not carrying any apology for the legal profession.

The question of recruitment, efforts made on behalf of the profession to get as many as possible of their profession into the field to serve the public. The layman feels we have a nice closed shop. We've got it made and it isn't all that easy, we are on the council and we'll determine how many we should let in and how many we should keep out. Some of the people who are just adverse raise these issues. Many people even in other professions, people who are learned and experienced in public service, are concerned that perhaps the professions do have a bit of a closed shop attitude. I feel that in the legal profession there has been pressure by some of the leading people in the field and in the society, and benchers, for increasing facilities to graduate more lawyers, even though it takes several years.

But the reason for a restricted enrolment in this province simply does not convince many people that we could not do better with the facilities we have. I was just told recently by someone that in Hong Kong, where they have much poorer facilities, poorer means, and [are] perhaps more crowded and less affluent, they graduate a greater number of medical doctors in a shorter time under worse conditions; doctors who come to Alberta and can pass our examinations and practice here. I am taking a position that the public is not really getting its money's worth out of the very expensive facilities. No reflection on the dean of medicine in Calgary, but the system has built-in obstacles. In situations which are urgent, where doctors work themselves to a frazzle even though they make a lot of money, a lot of them would appreciate working under less strenuous circumstances.

They get into a practice, the practice grows and then they are bound by duty to serve and they get caught in a situation where the benefit of being a professional man seems to be lost. They get caught and they work all hours of the day. Some of them have to discontinue at earlier years, as happens in many professions, because they cannot cope with the pressure. Many doctors quit. They make a lot of money in a number of years and they pack it up because it isn't worth it, after we've spent a fairly sizable fortune in graduating one of these [people].

I wonder whether anything can be done, perhaps by the minister, to influence the council that we ought to try to turn out greater numbers of doctors with our present facilities. We just mustn't be too comfortable and feel that we're affluent and we're restrictive. We're not all that restrictive; there's always room for more, even if it might take a little longer, even if lab facilities have to be extended and the number of positions of enrolment are restricted. An effort should be made by this government to expand that.

For many years we have been importing doctors. It's a good thing they came from elsewhere, otherwise we'd be the most affluent part of North America with a shortage of essential services. We got a lot of people from outside and we should be very grateful. But the time has come when we should not be raiding other provinces. They're hanging on to their own. Other countries, poor countries as it were, have supplied us with very necessary medical services.

We should be able to expand and at least graduate enough doctors and people in other medical service areas to assure service to this province. We can never tie them down and say, once you've graduated, we've spent \$30,000, \$40,000, \$50,000 on you and you're bound to stay here. We've never gone that far and I don't think we need to at the present time.

Nevertheless we can't say that we have an overabundance or an oversupply of doctors. There's a shortage. I think we could move in the direction of asking the profession itself to come up with ideas how we can recruit and increase. There would be nothing nicer, for a province like Alberta, than to be able to say that we have too many doctors. That would be something nice. I don't think they would go without. Other parts of the world attract our doctors, some go to the U.S., some go to B.C. and some go elsewhere because the climate or the advantages are a little more attractive. And so we haven't got enough doctors.

I am sure some of the hon. members here who are in the profession would state that we definitely encourage recruitment. I've yet to know one who doesn't. I've heard doctors encourage young men to get into the profession and to try to be enrolled. But there's a barrier and the barrier is endorsed by the opinion of the public: it's no use; we'll never have enough doctors because they've got a closed shop. Well those who are here might deny that they have a closed shop and I'm not stating that they do. But those who were on that Committee on Professions and Occupations know that this is the general lay view: that they can't get in. It doesn't matter how badly we need doctors, the opportunity for getting in is as inflexible as the walls of a stone building. That's how many you are going to get. We're not going to be crowded. We're not going to do any more.

That is a problem I think we have to tackle, particularly when we bring in a bill like this, which perhaps will not be tampered with again for a number of years. At least I suspect that this bill incorporated the previous legislation probably for 60 years, maybe 70.



So that now we are bringing in legislation I think this is the time to ensure that we will not only be able to take care of the needy, those who need medical attention in this province, but also perhaps the anticipated influx. If we supply some other jurisdiction with a few doctors then I think it's fair play, the turnabout is justifiable.

I would like the hon. minister to give us some indication of what the profession's attitude was when this bill was brought in with regard to recruitment, with regard to training, with regard to dispelling the view of many lay people about professions; that we've got a closed shop. Talk about unions.

It's hard in this province to enrol sufficient medical students to supply the needs of this province, and I don't think we can plead that we can't afford it. We shouldn't plead that we have not sufficient facilities, because if we haven't sufficient facilities, we have four universities. Although one is only a university in name, the framework is there.

We have an affluent province. And if we could afford to spend \$25 million on a medical school in Calgary just in the last several years, perhaps we ought to look at the budget. We ought to talk to the Minister of Advanced Education to see if we could not increase enrolment in this particular profession, which I think is one of the most vital professions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the minister if he would respond to the remarks I made.

[Interjections]

And something else, Mr. Chairman, I think I should comment that those hon. members who feel rather impatient and are shouting "question", bellowing like calves in the wilderness, don't have to stay here. They've accounted for the day and nobody has to listen. I've seen half the cabinet get out of here and get into a huddle. They have business to do. Nobody objects. But I think it ill-behooves a member to be shouting "question" all the time, except when he speaks. If somebody doesn't want to listen they know exactly what they can do. There are no rules that state you've got to sit here. As far as I am concerned I think this is the most important bill ...

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We've called the question. It has been voted on. We don't need a lecture from the hon. member.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I am amused that the hon. member became sensitive. I didn't particularly name or call him.

MR. TAYLOR:

I'm not upset. I'm going to need a doctor if you keep talking.

[Laughter]

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I'm glad the hon. member agrees with my remarks. Is there a doctor in the House?

DR. PAPROSKI:

I'm prepared to treat him on the spot.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Which spot?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Keep going, Albert, don't listen.

MR. LUDWIG:

Are you lobbying for business, Dr. Paproski?

I believe this bill is the most important bill of this session. I want to find out what some of these problems are. I believe lay people have been raising these questions. Some members here know what the problems and concerns of the people are.

We shouldn't be rushing the most important piece of legislation brought to this House in this session. I believe this is it. It's a milestone. The minister did a tremendously good job and I think the minister is capable and willing to explain. As I stated before, there appears to be a good audience. I'm sure they must be interested in this bill otherwise the minister, who in my opinion is a very capable man, would not have brought it in. It might have waited until the spring session but it didn't. We brought

it in now and let's deal with it. I'm not concerned whether anybody else is interested in knowing anything about it. Perhaps some hon. members know everything that's in it.

MR. HENDERSON:

Agreed.

[Laughter]

MR. LUDWIG:

I'm sure the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc knows pretty well everything that's in it. He had the department.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I wasn't speaking for myself.

[Laughter]

MR. LUDWIG:

Well, I was giving the hon. member the benefit of the doubt; that he perhaps knew. But I don't think all members are all that informed on this issue on a professional act that received major amendment - that they know all about it. I'm admitting there are many things I would like to know about it and it's my privilege to ask the hon. minister to explain things to us if he wishes to.

I'm sure those members who were on the Committee of Professions and Occupations would agree that the concerns I'm raising were raised by the medical profession and admitted by them. There is concern by people that the medical profession has restricted enrolment in the profession and has played a hand in sort of suppressing the number who graduate. There is the suspicion of lay people who appeared in great numbers before the committee appointed by the government to study the problem because there was a problem. There was a real problem. If there wasn't one, the committee would not have sat that long. Quite a bit of money was expended to determine the issues. I'm sure that the committee did not get the complete picture but it did a pretty good job. A recommendation was made, so now is the time to get the answers, particularly since the minister moved in this way.

Perhaps I take the minister's view that he did not really intend to go all the way, that it is more or less a trial run of amending one professional act. Maybe it's good to be cautious, but if we're going to be that cautious then let us at least know why we have not gone further.

I'd like the minister to explain whether this issue was dealt with by the doctors. Have they indicated that they will do everything they can to make a meaningful effort to recruit more students, to provide the opportunity for graduation of greater numbers of students, and to dispel the view of lay people that we cannot ever have enough doctors because the profession does not want to graduate any more.

Those of the professions who have been at that committee hearing, who attended the meetings, know that this is not just a whim or fancy of some people but is a serious concern. The same thing applies to the dental profession. When you get to where you have to wait two or three weeks for an appointment then we're not graduating enough professional people. Perhaps the minister or someone on the other side will stand up and say, we're graduating all we need, we don't need any more, we'll keep it the way it is. But those of you who have anything to do with waiting in a doctor's office know that we have not got enough doctors. This is as a good a time as any to determine whether anything will be done in this province to encourage, not only the professions, but the government, and to provide facilities to graduate more doctors, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Diachuk left the Chair.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration Bill No. 62, begs to report progress on same and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

#### ROYAL ASSENT

[His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor entered the Legislative Assembly and took his place upon the Throne.]

MR. SPEAKER:

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

CLERK:

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

- Bill 63 The Land Titles Amendment Act, 1974
- Bill 64 The Department of Public Works Amendment Act, 1974 (No. 2)
- Bill 66 The Alberta Opportunity Fund Amendment Act, 1974
- Bill 67 The Landlord and Tenant Amendment Act, 1974
- Bill 68 The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1974 (No. 2)
- Bill 69 The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1974
- Bill 70 The Trust Companies Amendment Act, 1974
- Bill 71 The Alberta Heritage Amendment Act, 1974
- Bill 72 The Health and Social Development Statutes Amendment Act, 1974
- Bill 73 The District Courts Amendment Act, 1974
- Bill 74 The Surrogate Courts Amendment Act, 1974
- Bill 75 The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1974 (No. 2)
- Bill 76 The Cancer Treatment and Prevention Amendment Act, 1974
- Bill 77 The Ophthalmic Dispensers Amendment Act, 1974
- Bill 80 The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1974 (No. 2)

[The Lieutenant-Governor indicated his assent.]

CLERK:

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

#### PROROGATION

HIS HONOUR:

Mr. Speaker, Members of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta, in bringing to a close this third session of the Seventeenth Legislative Assembly, I desire to express my appreciation of the earnest and diligent manner in which you have applied yourselves to your public duties. It is with great satisfaction that I have noted the careful attention you have given to the consideration of the various important measures which have come before you, and your steadfast zeal for the promotion of the welfare of our province.

I thank you for the provision you have made to meet the needs of the public service. The sum of money you have thus provided will be expended by my ministers in accordance with the principles of efficient and economic administration.

In relieving you of your duties and declaring the Assembly prorogued, I pray that under Divine Providence our province will achieve an increasing measure of prosperity and happiness and that an even greater future is assured for all of this nation's people.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS:

Order!

[The Lieutenant-Governor left the Legislative Assembly.]

MR. LEITCH:

It is His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor's will and pleasure that the Legislative Assembly be now prorogued, and this Assembly is accordingly prorogued.

[The Third Session of The 17th Legislature concluded at 5:18 p.m.]

