

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, June 3, 1975

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

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

## Bill 202 The Highway Traffic Amendment Act

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, No. 202, to amend The Highway Traffic Act. When a tragedy occurs, curious sightseers rush to the scene and jam the roads and streets so the police and ambulances have difficulty getting to the site. This bill makes it an offence to so jam the arteries and police may issue tickets on such vehicles, the penalty for which should be as high as \$500 or up to six months in jail.

[Leave being granted, Bill 202 was introduced and read a first time.]

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on your behalf I would like to introduce to the Assembly 69 students accompanied by 3 teachers: Mr. J. Althouse, Mr. Frank Letain, and Mr. Dan Wrona. These students and teachers are from the St. Thomas More school in your constituency, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly at this time.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing 33 students from the Grade 5 class at St. Martin school, located in my constituency of Edmonton Parkallen. In introducing them, I want to acknowledge that they come from two constituencies: Edmonton Parkallen, and Edmonton Whitemud represented by the hon. Mr. Getty. The constituency is just across the road.

I want to congratulate the students and the teacher, Mr. Speaker, on their interest in the Legislature and its proceedings. They are in the members gallery and I would be very pleased if Mrs. Pshyk and the students would please stand and be recognized.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, the member of the federal House of Commons for the constituency of Rocky Mountain, Mr. Joe Clark, and his charming wife, Maureen. They're sitting in the members gallery. I'd ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

## Department of Labour

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce two appointments to the minister's advisory committee on workers' compensation appointed pursuant to The Workers' Compensation Act.

The advisory committee includes representatives of workers, employers, the Compensation Board, and members of the Legislative Assembly. Its duties are to review annually the amount of all compensation paid in respect of permanent disability and compensation paid to dependants.

The chairman of the committee and these particular members of the committee, Mr. Speaker, have been serving the past year. The chairman is Mr. Harry Kostyuk, executive secretary of the Alberta Federation of Labour. Other members at the present time are Mr. McLellan, the safety director of A. V. Carlson Construction Ltd.; Mr. Zorniak, chairman of the education committee of the United Steelworkers of America; and Mr. Hickson, chairman of the review committee of the Workers' Compensation Board.

The two new appointments being announced are to fill positions provided for the members of the Legislative Assembly. One government and one opposition member were appointed today by order in council. They are Mr. Tom Donnelly, the Member for Calgary Millican, and Mr. Grant Notley, the MLA for Spirit River-Fairview. They succeed Dr. Paproski, the Member for Edmonton Kingsway, and Mr. Drain, the former Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. One vacancy remains in the committee to be filled later.

## ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

## Oil Spill -- Swan Hills

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Environment. The question arises out of the break in the Federated [Pipe] Line operated by Home Oil. I'd like to ask the Minister of Environment if he could report to the House the state of the clean-up at this particular time.

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The latest report, which I got just before lunch, is that the amount estimated to have spilled so far is between 1,000 and 3,500 barrels. We'll be able to get a more accurate inventory after the clean-up has occurred, when an accurate inventory is taken. The oil spill containment and recovery device, commonly known as OSCAR, is in place three and a half miles downstream from the break. Another five and a half miles below that there's a log boom in place. Department officials consider it to be a serious spill because the oil is going directly into the watercourse. However, there are personnel from ERCB and the Department of Energy and Natural Resources present on the site.

MR. CLARK: Supplementary question to the minister. In light of the comments made by the ERCB representative on the scene that there would in fact be environmental damage, is the minister in a position to indicate to the House at this time the extent of that environmental damage?

MR. RUSSELL: No, I can't, Mr. Speaker. The challenge now, of course, is to try to contain it and get it cleaned up just as quickly as possible. In line with our department procedures we will be immediately undertaking a very accurate assessment and inventory of the damage which has been done, and then adjudicating insofar as responsibilities are concerned.

MR. CLARK: Further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Will the Department of Environment or the Energy Resources Conservation Board be carrying out the investigation into the causes of the break?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, certainly, Mr. Speaker. The interim indication of the cause of the break -- and I emphasize the word "interim" because they've asked for more time to do complete investigations -- is a soil slippage on a bank where the pipeline traversed the grade.

MR. CLARK: Will the Energy Resources Conservation Board or the department be doing the investigation?

MR. RUSSELL: Both will be involved, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question. Is it the government's intention to ask the Environment Conservation Authority to play any role in this particular matter?

MR. RUSSELL: Not the Authority, Mr. Speaker. The enforcement of legislation and matters of responsibility concerning clean-up and environmental protection are all direct functions of the department.

#### Natural Gas Marketing

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Energy and ask if he's in a position to indicate to the House when the government will be bringing in its legislation dealing with natural gas? And . . . we'll start there.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the government is considering a variety of alternatives on how the natural gas marketing legislation could be drafted. Some of the complications involved are fairly severe and, therefore, while we're targeting perhaps to have it before the House adjourns for the summer -- whenever that may happen, Mr. Speaker -- it may be necessary that the legislation not be introduced until the fall.

MR. CLARK: Supplementary question to the minister, arising out of the comments made by Mr. Minion. Is the government giving serious consideration to an approach which would pool the amount of gas sold locally in Alberta -- which would have a lower price -- the amount of gas sold in Canada, and the amount of gas exported; rather than having a pooling arrangement, and the companies involved really take an average price? Is the government giving serious consideration to this approach in light of the comments made by Mr. Minion?

MR. GETTY: I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that we are looking at a variety of alternatives. I think it's fair to say, that is one of the alternatives being considered.

The small complicating factor is, of course, the fact that part of the revenues are created at the border of Canada. In other words, they are an export charge, if you like. The federal government is working with the NEB and the Alberta government to see that the funds created by that additional export charge will flow back in the most equitable way. For our part, of course, we have the same desire. We are, though, very interested in making sure those funds flow to producers and to the people who own the gas, the people of Alberta, so they may have a percentage of those funds through the royalty system.

#### Oil Spill -- Swan Hills (continued)

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, if you would allow me to give a supplementary answer to the earlier question by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. He asked me if the Environment Conservation Authority would hold a hearing into the pipeline break. I answered no, and that is correct. However, it is possible the ERCB may hold a hearing, dependent on their initial findings.

#### Summer Employment Program

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife and ask whether the Small Business Student Opportunity Program administered by his department has been given approval by cabinet?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the program itself, under the name of STEP, and through the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, with the responsibilities for the operation of that program in my area, has in fact received approval. I might point out that some 700 applications received to this point are being reviewed.

#### PWA Annual Report

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation. When will the minister be tabling the 1974 report of Pacific Western Airlines? That's the first part of the question. Secondly, will the minister be tabling in the Assembly any interim financial reports of PWA?

DR. HORNER: In due course, Mr. Speaker.

---

PWA Operations

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. What reporting procedure has been established between the minister and the board of PWA to ensure constant monitoring of what's going on?

DR. HORNER: As I mentioned before in the House, Mr. Speaker, through the chairman of the board of directors.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. What were the primary reasons for PWA's revenue declining sharply in the last part of 1974, and early in 1975?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I doubt whether the question period is an opportunity to discuss that matter, other than to say that in the nature of air lines, the performance of PWA wasn't that bad.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. In light of this decline, what steps is the board taking to ensure that the revenue picture is better for the rest of 1975?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, as I think we've outlined in the Legislature before, our communication is through the chairman of the board. We've advised the chairman and the board of directors to operate PWA as an efficient, profitable regional air line.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that we have a revenue decline, and we do have over 90 per cent of the shares in PWA . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Question.

MR. R. SPEAKER: . . . when PWA becomes an uneconomic unit, at that point will government become more involved?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member's question is hypothetical.

MR. LOUGHEED: Better than ARR.

## Natural Gas Permits

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Energy. Have we been able to fill all applications for natural gas that have come from Canadian sources?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the normal course of events is that companies in Canada which wish to contract for Alberta natural gas do so through TransCanada Pipelines. TransCanada Pipelines then contracts for gas in Alberta. Before they can remove the gas, they have to apply to the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board to receive a permit. We have had two permits go through the Energy Resources Conservation Board hearing which have been recommended to the government for consideration at the Executive Council level. These two permits are by TransCanada Pipelines and have not been approved by the government, because we felt they had to meet two prerequisites: one, that they be clearly surplus to the needs of Albertans; and secondly, that they be sold at what we would consider fair market value in the best interest of Albertans. They have not met those two prerequisites.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary. Have the two permits been definitely declined, or are they being held pending the finding of more gas?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, they do meet the prerequisite that they are surplus to the needs of Albertans, and that is the recommendation the board carried in their report. However, in the judgment of the Executive Council, they do not meet the second prerequisite, that is, the TransCanada Pipelines contract was not at a fair market value price.

MR. TAYLOR: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the provincial cabinet holding any permits from the United States that have been approved by the federal energy board and the Alberta energy board?

MR. GETTY: The two TransCanada permits I just referred to are being held in abeyance by the Executive Council. We are not holding any others that have been approved by the National Energy Board.

---

School Financing -- Report

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Education the status of the report of the Minister's Advisory Committee on School Finance.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I see the hon. Leader of the Opposition has a copy in his hands. That report was completed, I believe, just last week or perhaps two weeks ago. It is now being distributed to such organizations as the Alberta School Trustees Association and others that are involved and interested in advising the minister on proposed financing for the next three years, commencing January 1, 1976.

Mr. Speaker, it is expected that regional seminars will be held in the early part of the fall, perhaps September, to discuss the recommendations and other suggestions for the minister's finance plan. By November a new finance plan for the ensuing three years should be available.

## School Transportation Assistance

MR. CLARK: A supplementary question to the minister. Does the minister plan to make changes in the existing formula as far as transportation is concerned, having regard for the fact that the minister's committee did not deal with that particular area?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is correct. The minister's finance committee did not deal with transportation. There is a separate study dealing with transportation of students. A new plan for the financing of transportation should be available, I would say, about the same time, in November.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the difficult circumstances a number of rural school jurisdictions find themselves in as far as transportation costs are concerned, has the minister given any consideration to moving this target date ahead or, in fact, making the transportation assistance retroactive to this particular school year?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, there is a change, of course, in the assistance given to school boards for transportation for this coming year that was announced some months ago. That was, I believe, a 12 per cent increase. Apart from that, the studies undertaken now with respect to transportation are for a new or different type of funding, or what have you, for the ensuing three years, starting January 1, 1976. Studies are not under way with respect to any change which would be retroactive.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister prepared, in consultation with the Alberta School Trustees Association, to be involved in an immediate reassessment of the problems that rural school boards are having from the standpoint of transportation, and give consideration to an adjustment this year?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the rural transportation plan being developed for announcement in the fall has taken into account the recommendations of the Alberta School Trustees Association. With respect to what's in fact taking place for this school year, this financial year, if individual boards find the department's analysis of their particular costs need readjustment, they are invited to apply. However, that won't mean the approach to financing will be any different. Perhaps there may have been certain factors not taken into account originally which have subsequently come to light that may affect certain individual boards, but this is not a universal change in the plan.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. CLARK: One last supplementary to the minister. Is the minister prepared to give earnest consideration to requests from individual boards which find themselves in a unique situation because of the existing transportation formula and the jurisdictions' unique problems, especially around the cities of Edmonton and Calgary?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm saying in certain cases the existing formula may not have been applied to all the facts. Certain new facts may have developed which require readjustment. But I would say, Mr. Speaker, that at this point no change in the formula can take place until 1976.

## Lakefront Properties

DR. BACKUS: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Environment. As a result of rumors that seem to be circulating in the north country, is it true that the Alberta government is considering expropriating all lakefront properties in Alberta?

MR. RUSSELL: Not as far as I know, Mr. Speaker.

---

School Equalization Grants

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, my question is a repetition of yesterday's question to the hon. Minister of Education concerning the announcement in the throne speech. The question is: does that announcement indicate the provincial government is moving toward last-dollar financing of education?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, as I understand the hon. member's question, this is with respect to the supplementary requisition equalization grants, a very good program developed by my predecessor, the Hon. Lou Hyndman. The purpose of that program is to provide equal opportunity for education in all parts of Alberta.

Admittedly, certain school jurisdictions are wealthier than others in terms of their base assessment. The purpose of that program would be to provide more equality in terms of a basic education. Of course, school boards would continue under the provisions of the present policy to levy such additional sums as they need for the type of education they would require, and are able to afford, within their particular local jurisdictions. By no means is this supplementary equalization grant to be mistaken for last-dollar financing in education by the provincial government.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the Minister of Education supply the Assembly with an estimate of the cost of the equalization program referred to by the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I can't offhand. I'm wondering for which period the hon. member is asking the question?

MR. SPEAKER: It would appear to be the type of question that might be eminently suited for the Order Paper.

---

AGT Annual Report

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address this question to the Minister of Utilities and Telephones. I note in the annual report of the Alberta Government Telephones service there was a 16 per cent increase in staff in 1974, and a 46 per cent decrease in operating revenue. The anticipated investment in 1975 is \$250 million, or one-third the total assets of the corporation.

My question is: does the minister anticipate there will be an upward adjustment of the rate of return, and possibly subscriber rates in the near future? Secondly, can he assure the House that this 16 per cent increase in staff will, hopefully, be curtailed?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, the question has several parts, all of them important. It is noticeable from the annual report tabled on Friday that not only are operating revenues down, but their nature is changed so there is more of a percentage on the long distance toll revenues than has normally been the case before. With respect to the financial projections, as we go forward I'm watching them very closely during 1975 to ascertain whether the possibility the hon. member mentions may indeed materialize.

With respect to the increase in the number of people, it's difficult to say whether a smaller increase might have actually cost money to the public of Alberta rather than the other way around. In any case, I would like to say to the hon. member that I note the concern he expresses and will give it some review myself.

MR. COOKSON: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has there been any conclusion to the request by the City of Edmonton for tolls out of the city?

DR. WARRACK: No, there hasn't, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, of course, I've read the Edmonton Journal in this regard and have had a couple of brief discussions on it with people from the City of Edmonton. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I would be very interested in the hon. member's view.

MR. COOKSON: Right now?

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member going to ask a question or indicate that he might express his view at some later time?

---

Petrochemical Development -- Red Deer

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Energy and ask, in light of the fact that June 6 is the deadline for submitting reports to the Energy Resources Conservation Board hearings on the petrochemical project in Red Deer, whether he is aware of any requests for extension of that deadline. Because only 16 days

were allowed to prepare reports, has the government received any requests to extend the deadline?

MR. GETTY: I have not received such a request, Mr. Speaker. However, I'll make a note to check with the Energy Resources Conservation Board to see whether they have.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister advise whether the Energy Resources Conservation Board will accept briefs after the June 6 deadline?

MR. GETTY: I'll check that at the same time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: A further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise the House of the general terms of reference for the ERCB hearings on the Red Deer petrochemical project?

MR. SPEAKER: I'll have to leave it to the minister to decide whether that question may be answered within the scope of what's permitted in the question period. It would appear that it might even be a lengthy document.

MR. GETTY: There is a notice which I do not have with me, Mr. Speaker. It is fairly detailed. However, I could perhaps just say, the widest possible scope is provided by the Energy Resources Conservation Board.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Will there be any provision in the terms of reference to assess the environmental impact of the project?

MR. SPEAKER: Surely if the hon. member isn't going to be getting the whole terms of reference in the question period, he shouldn't try to get them piecemeal.

#### Bow River Flood Studies

MR. KIDD: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Environment. I wonder if the hon. minister could comment briefly on the progress of the flood control studies on the Bow River at Canmore?

MR. RUSSELL: I couldn't without checking with the department, Mr. Speaker. But I'll be glad to do that and report back to the House.

#### PWA Annual Report (continued)

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Transportation. Has the minister reviewed the 1974 annual report of Pacific Western Airlines?

DR. HORNER: I'm in the process of doing that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. What are the reasons for delaying tabling the report in the Assembly? How long will the review take?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I'm rather surprised the honorable gentleman doesn't appreciate in any case that that report is a public document.

#### Summer Employment Program (continued)

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower and relates to the STEP program. Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering what arrangements have been made to communicate the availability of the STEP program, that is, the assistance to farmers and students employed by farmers, to business, et cetera.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, an extensive program of information to Albertans through members of the Legislative Assembly, through newspapers, through secretary-treasurers of counties and municipalities -- the usual approach of informing people through the media and through regional offices of the government throughout the province.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the minister could check to make sure all these opportunities have been followed through, inasmuch as at least one member of the Legislature hasn't obtained his documentation, and a number of his constituents are also wondering what's happened.

DP. HOHOL: I should like to respond by saying that the response to the program, which was asked about earlier in the question period, has been so complete that we had to terminate the applications. This is quite general with all the STEP programs.

I'll follow through on the application to make sure the hon. member has a second copy.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, one more supplementary, if I may. Could the minister have his department undertake an analysis to make some report to us on how much repetition there is among the applicants, and whether new applicants are being taken each year?

DR. HOHOL: I should like to respond to that, Mr. Speaker, in two ways. First, there is some degree of repetition, but by and large that's not the case by simply making sure it isn't. Secondly, we are keeping records on this, of course. During the fall session it's my intention to table an assessment and a review of the STEP program.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to pose a supplementary to the hon. Minister of Manpower to clarify this whole question of the Small Business Student Opportunity Program. Is there one program or are there, in fact, two programs, one under your department and another under the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, there are several programs. They all come under the title of the STEP, the Summer Temporary Employment Program. Under that rubric we have several programs including the small businesses program, the agricultural farm program under the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and so on. We also co-ordinate all employment programs that are federally initiated, and those of the municipalities.

The Department of Advanced Education and Manpower has the responsibility to co-ordinate, organize, and develop these programs for and within the government through transfer of funds and other kinds of initiatives. The line departments administer the several programs within the whole Summer Temporary Employment Program.

MR. NOTLEY: For further clarification, Mr. Speaker. I take it there is just one Small Business Student Opportunity Program and, further, that that program has been authorized by cabinet and funds have been made available at this point in time?

DR. HOHOL: Yes, indeed. There is one program only in the small businesses. It was approved by government, probably about two months ago. A special warrant was drawn shortly after the last session was completed, and the program is well under way. In fact, it's oversubscribed and we had to terminate it as of last night.

MR. NOTLEY: A further supplementary question. Has the hon. minister received complaints that participants under this program who would be eligible for grants and have hired students accordingly have not received funds as per the program, and have encountered some difficulty as a consequence?

DR. HOHOL: Yes, I have. It's not unusual for some programs, sometimes new and particularly when they're transferred from one department to another, to find a kind of awkwardness that may result in the kind of thing the hon. member describes. In the examination of that particular kind of circumstance we did, in fact, find one particular project, plus some additional individual people. We have taken immediate remedial approaches to it, and this will be worked out today.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Is it the government's intention to transfer this particular program from Recreation, Parks and Wildlife to Business Development and Tourism?

DR. HOHOL: It is not the intention of government, Mr. Speaker, to do that this year. It will remain in the department in which it's located at the present time. At the end of the season, and as part of the review, assessment, and evaluation for tabling in the House in the fall, and for our own use and benefit to do things as well or better, we will make the determination as to whether that program will in fact continue, whether it will remain in the department in which it is at the present time, whether it will be transferred to the department under the hon. Mr. Dowling, or, in fact, be centralized in the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower under the STEP, PEP, and the 12-month employment program.

MR. NOTLEY: A final supplementary question. Can the minister assure the House that all contracts signed by departmental officials with people under this program will, in fact, be honored -- that they will not be subject to the cutoff the minister talked about?

DR. HOHOL: Yes, Mr. Speaker. No question about that. In making reference to the cutoff last night, I really meant the decision to cut the program off was made last night. This information will be given to Albertans through the media and other initiatives. But certainly all those who have applied and are within the guidelines -- I want to be clear, it is important they are within the guidelines of the STEP -- will be honored and met. Some that are not within the guidelines may have some difficulty unless they modify their proposals and meet the guidelines.



MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I said the last was the final one, but I may have a post-final supplementary question.

Can the minister advise the Assembly the reasons for the bottleneck that seemed to develop in this program as to recipients actually receiving the money? If the cabinet voted the money some time ago, what was the bottleneck?

DR. HOHOL: I'm not that clear I'd agree there was a bottleneck. As I say, more applications were received, most of them processed, and most of the people are on the jobs. There were some dislocations, but certainly not bottlenecks in view of the fact we have more applications than money for that particular program. May I recall, Mr. Speaker, that the total amount of money for the program is \$6 million. Divided amongst six line departments of government and several Crown boards, agencies, hospital groups, and so on, no particular department had an overwhelming amount of money. So there was no bottleneck as such. There was one project and several people who had some difficulty in processing their money. This is being taken care of at the present time.

#### Northeastern Alberta Commissioner

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier and ask whether he's in a position to report to the House today as to how we will be dealing with the report of the Northeastern Alberta Commissioner?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, my preliminary research on the matter indicates some considerable question with the premise of the hon. member regarding an annual report.

The second part of his question regarding an accessibility by the northeast commissioner is something we're researching in terms of the debate on the bill. I hope to report to the House tomorrow.

#### Farm Fuels

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of perhaps the Minister of Transportation. It has to do with farm fuels, so I'm not sure whether it's the hon. Attorney General or the Minister of Transportation.

Have there been any discussions with officials with regard to removing the coloring in farm fuels?

MR. LEITCH: Not that I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker, but I would be pleased to check and report back to the House.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary. Does the hon. minister happen to have the per barrel cost of the coloring?

MR. LEITCH: I'm sure I'd be able to get it, Mr. Speaker. I'll perhaps add that to the other matter I was going to report on to the House.

#### Community Hall Improvement

MR. ZANDER: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. Will your department be continuing the [Community] Hall Improvement Program, initiated in 1974?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, at the moment we're attempting to find out exactly which community halls have not received any funds and whether that was as a result of not applying or their executive at the time not making application. If we can determine how many they are, we'll give consideration to continuing the program.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

## WRITTEN QUESTIONS

128. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question:  
What was the pupil/teacher ratio in Alberta public and separate schools for the years 1968 through 1975 in each of the following categories:  
(a) elementary,  
(b) junior high school,  
(c) senior high school,  
(d) overall average?

MR. KOZIAK: [Not recorded] 128. I have spoken to the hon. member who proposed question 128 and have suggested an amendment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't believe the first part of the hon. minister's answer or remarks came over the sound system.

MR. KOZIAK: It's on now, Mr. Speaker.

I've spoken to the hon. member who posed the question and have advised him that I propose an amendment. The question would be amended by striking out clauses (a), (b), and (c). The reason for the amendment, Mr. Speaker, is that there are teachers who teach in both elementary and junior, in both junior and senior high school, and it's impossible to break these teachers out and determine which ones teach in which particular segment of basic education.

With that amendment, I then have an answer to the question, which I'll be filing.

MR. SPEAKER: Under the circumstances, may we take the question as having been dealt with?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

133. Dr. Buck asked the government the following question:
1. (a) What was the number of full-time female employees hired by the Alberta government between:
    - (1) April 1, 1973, and March 31, 1974,
    - (2) April 1, 1974, and March 31, 1975?
  - (b) What was the number of full-time female employees released or retired or separated for any other reason from employment by the Alberta government between:
    - (1) April 1, 1973, and March 31, 1974,
    - (2) April 1, 1974, and March 31, 1975?
  - (c) For the same dates:
    - (1) How many were over 45 years of age when hired?
    - (2) How many were over 45 years of age when either released, retired, or separated from employment?
  2. Of the female employees hired in 1 above and for the same dates, how many received salaries of:
    - (a) over \$10,000 per year,
    - (b) from \$8,000 to \$10,000 per year,
    - (c) from \$6,000 to \$8,000 per year, and
    - (d) under \$6,000 per year?
  3. What was the average starting salary of full-time male employees hired by the Alberta government between:
    - (a) April 1, 1973, and March 31, 1974,
    - (b) April 1, 1974, and March 31, 1975?
  4. What was the average starting salary of full-time female employees hired by the Alberta government between:
    - (a) April 1, 1973, and March 31, 1974,
    - (b) April 1, 1974, and March 31, 1975?
141. Mr. Clark asked the government the following question:
- (1) What were the destinations of all trips taken outside of Canada in 1974 by the cabinet ministers and the deputy ministers, which were paid for from public funds?
  - (2) (a) What was the total cost of each trip?  
(b) What was the purpose of each trip?
  - (3) Who accompanied the cabinet minister or deputy minister on each trip?

MR. LEITCH: The question is acceptable, Mr. Speaker, but I take it that, because there's some possibility of ambiguity in the third part of the question, it refers only to people who accompanied the cabinet minister or deputy minister on each trip at public expense.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that amendment acceptable to the hon. member who posed the question?

142. Mr. Clark asked the government the following question:

- (1) On what dates did the advisory committees on universities and colleges meet?
- (2) How many of these meetings did the Minister of Advanced Education attend?
- (3) What was the cost to organize and carry out these meetings?
- (4) What are the recommendations of the committees?
- (5) Which of the recommendations has the government accepted?
- (6) Which of the recommendations has the government acted upon?

DP. HOHOL: We accept the question, Mr. Speaker.

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

With reference to supplementary mill rates for school purposes, as at March 31, 1975:

- (1) How many municipalities have no supplementary mill rate?
- (2) How many municipalities have a mill rate of 28 mills or more for supplementary requisitions?
- (3) How many municipalities have a mill rate under 28 mills but over 10 mills?
- (4) How many municipalities have raised their supplementary mill rate since:
  - (a) April 1, 1973,
  - (b) April 1, 1974,
  - (c) April 1, 1975?
- (5) What was the total amount of money requisitioned for school purposes during the fiscal year ending:
  - (a) March 31, 1973,
  - (b) March 31, 1975?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, may that question be held?

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Assembly agree that this question may go over to the next private members' day?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

- (1) What is the total municipal debt of all Alberta municipalities as at:
  - (a) March 31, 1974,
  - (b) March 31, 1975?
- (2) How much of this debt is self-liquidating?
- (3) How much of the total debt is owed to the provincial government?

MR. JOHNSTON: We accept the question.

148. Mr. Gitter asked the government the following question:

- (1) What is the total purchase price of the shares sold by Pacific Western Airlines in Byers Transport Ltd. to the employees of that company?
- (2) What are the terms of payment, if any, of the purchase price, and what security will be received by Pacific Western Airlines for the unpaid portion of the purchase price?
- (3) Were there any other offers to purchase either the shares or assets of Byers Transport Ltd? If so, what were the terms and conditions of these offers?

DR. HERNER: The question is acceptable, Mr. Speaker.

#### MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

134. Mr. R. Speaker proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
The dates of all meetings held between the Premier, members of cabinet, and the president and/or members of the Alberta Energy Company, with a resume of the matters discussed at each meeting.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, this motion deals with a matter which the House, prior to this sitting of the Legislature, has dealt with in the past. I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the House should not approve this motion for a return. The debate does reflect not only on this motion, but Motion for a Return 138, as well.

The reason is, Mr. Speaker, that the motion really, first, asks for something that is not in existence. That is the resume of meetings and dates. Secondly, I submit it is hardly proper that meetings the Premier might have should be listed, as to an agenda and resume, and placed before the House. He surely should be free to meet with whomever he

wishes and not have it a matter of public record in the House. I think the same argument stands for cabinet ministers.

But an additional reason, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that we have created with the Alberta Energy Company a relatively unique concept. For new members in the House, the concept has been discussed for some time in the Legislature. It was first announced by the Premier on September 18, 1973, and a policy statement was made in the House by myself and filed in the Legislature in December 1973. Then in 1974, we passed The Alberta Energy Company Act and followed that up by the appointment of the president, chief executive officer, and board of directors. The company is now operating. The Premier wrote a general letter, which could be considered part of the government's policy, to the president of the Alberta Energy Company, Mr. Mitchell, and he filed a copy of that letter in the House as well.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I'm going into this detail is that members should recall, with the unique concept, the government has taken the position that it controls the ownership of the Alberta Energy Company through holding shares on behalf of the people of Alberta, but does not become involved in the management and day to day business of the company. Rather, the company must operate within the policy statements of the government, within the context of the act, and within the good judgment of directors appointed by the government. These directors, who are Albertans and in whom the government has a great deal of confidence, have the responsibility to represent the government's interest.

This company, Mr. Speaker, is not a Crown corporation. It is a company which we hope, as a private enterprise organization, will provide an opportunity for Albertans to invest in resource developments in the province. In the policy statement we tabled in December 1973 there was some detail as to what those various resource developments might be.

It is true that, temporarily, the government is holding 100 per cent of the shares of the company. This is an interim measure. I think hon. members would agree the government should not, in this temporary situation, harm the long-term intent of the company by adopting principles which really do not fit the policy and intent when the company was created.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be in the best interests of the Legislature to continue to respect the intent of this Alberta Energy Company and the principles under which it was developed. While I'm certainly pleased to discuss, either in estimates, question period, or on other occasions, any of the policy situations regarding the company, I think on a matter of a motion for a return like this, the House should not agree to this motion.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, seldom have I heard such undiluted balderdash in this Assembly. The people of Alberta in this Assembly have tried on more than one occasion to find out what the Alberta Energy Company is doing. This is about the third time we've had this kind of speech from the former IGA manager and now the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It should be pointed out again -- also for the benefit of the new members -- that the people of Alberta have sunk \$75 million into this company by means of a special warrant.

The minister says that a letter went to the president of the company and was tabled in the Assembly. To be very candid, the letter indicated to the president of the Alberta Energy Company that the company didn't have to abide by certain aspects of the legislation. If we want the company to operate within the policy and scope of the government, we shouldn't meddle in it. We shouldn't find out what's going on.

MR. NOTLEY: Just give them the money.

MR. CLARK: Just give them the money. The government has appointed the directors, and he says that we will answer questions in the question period. We can't even find out what the president of the Alberta Energy Company is getting as a salary. The government had the audacity to tell us in this Assembly that they don't know. The rumor has been floating around that some of the employees taken on by the Alberta Energy Company are going on staff on a basis of being able to acquire a certain number of shares in the company -- from an equity standpoint. We have the minister standing in his place today telling us, we aren't going to make this information available.

To say that the Premier should be able to hold meetings with whomever he wants -- we're not objecting to whom he or any cabinet minister holds meetings with. But when we've sunk \$75 million of the taxpayers' money into this venture, surely to goodness we have the right to know in general terms what's going on. We're not asking for the minutes. We're asking for a resume of what's gone on. Pretty frankly, has the Alberta Energy Company discussed with the government this question of salaries? Have they discussed with the government the question of this organization in which we just sank \$4.5 million for drilling rigs? Has the government discussed with the Energy Company the possibility of those rigs drilling in the Suffield Block, for example? If this company isn't successful in the next few months, that will be the next thing -- we'll come along and all of a sudden those rigs will end up drilling in the Suffield Block.

To tell us that we can't have this kind of information because it's going to hinder the operation of the company is just pure malarkey. The minister gets up and says this is no Crown corporation, it's a private enterprise company. I'll bet it's the only private enterprise company in Canada that has gotten \$75 million from the government -- from any government. To say that this is a private enterprise company, that this is no Crown corporation, just does a disservice to the whole concept of private competitive enterprise

-- nothing more and nothing less. Obviously the government has decided in its wisdom, or lack of it depending upon your point of view, that we're not going to get this information.

We were told during the last session that the Energy Company shares didn't go on the market because of the condition of the market. Surely the government must have discussed that with the president and the directors. What's wrong with letting the members of the Legislature [know], who, if we had a proper budgeting apparatus two years ago, would have discussed the \$75 million before the company got it, rather than being asked to discuss it after. For the life of me I can't understand why the government is digging itself into this particular area once again. Obviously for some reason they feel that they won't make this kind of information available. Yet the president of the Alberta Energy Company, when we look at Motion for a Return 138 coming up, has made some of this information available in speaking to people in Calgary at public meetings. Yet members of the Legislature can't get the information from the government.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I certainly feel Motion for Return No. 134 is a reasonable one and should be accepted by the Assembly. The question is really quite simple, Mr. Speaker. As members of this Assembly, are we going to have some idea of what is going on with an agency, albeit a company -- nevertheless one which is funded 100 per cent at this stage by \$75 million allocated by special warrant? Are we going to have some idea of what is going on or not?

Mr. Speaker, the Assembly has a right to know the general guidelines for the operation of the Alberta Energy Company. We have a right to know, in a general sense, what the discussions are between the government and the company as to future investments. The Leader of the Opposition talked about perhaps getting into drilling in Suffield. That's one possibility. There are all sorts of other possibilities that frighten me. The Minister of Energy, just before the Legislature was recalled, talked about the Shell proposal. Are we going to get into investing in a very major way in the Shell oil sands proposal? What about the Arctic pipeline? The other day when that matter was raised in the House, Mr. Speaker, the Premier very carefully answered it in as noncommittal a way as possible. Are we talking about making an investment in one or the other or perhaps both of the Mackenzie Valley pipeline proposals?

These are the things, Mr. Speaker, which the public has a right to know, and not after the fact. It seems to me this business of accountability after the money is spent isn't good enough. This is exactly the debate which occurred a year ago in this House over Bill 55. The whole question of accountability -- whether it's going to be before decisions are made, whether we are going to have an opportunity to discuss the options, or whether we will simply have a reporting after the decisions are made, after we've bought PWA, or after we've committed \$100 million here or \$200 million there.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in Motion for Return No. 134 we are simply asking the government to honor the commitment to open government they made far and wide in this province in 1971. The minister says in his speech, oh no, this isn't a Crown corporation, it's a private company. Well, they do disservice to the concept if, in fact, they are going to set it up as a company to avoid accountability to the Legislature. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if that's the name of the game, we better revise our tack completely and insist that the Alberta Energy Company be made a Crown corporation, so we can obtain information in this Assembly and know what's going on, instead of using this type of set-up as a ruse so that the important information that ought to be available to us as members of the Assembly is kept behind closed doors.

We had the spectacle, referred to earlier, of the debate last fall on a similar motion for a return which was a very simple one asking for the salary, benefits, and stock options, if any, of the president of the Alberta Energy Company. That motion was turned down, as no doubt this motion will be turned down too. But, Mr. Speaker, in turning down this motion for a return, we are allowing the government to slam the door shut on important deliberations which affect the future of Alberta. As members of the Assembly we shouldn't be allowing the government to get away with that sort of thing.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, Motion for Return No. 134 is not an unreasonable one. It's not asking for detailed minutes of the meetings. It's not asking for information which could not easily be made available through a resume of each meeting, so at least we had some idea of the considerations of the Energy Company and the government. So, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that passing Motion for a Return No. 134 would be consistent with open government. Turning it down would be indicating pretty clearly that we don't care about making sure the business of this province is done in the open, where the public and the Legislature can see what is going on.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Motions for a Return 134 and 138, I think the point we must remember is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Although we have perhaps drifted off into 138 to some extent, perhaps it would be easier if we took them one at a time in the debate.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaking to Motion for a Return 134, I think we must remember that this is a private enterprise company and not a Crown corporation. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition would take the time to review Hansard of May 29, 1974, he will note that during committee study of this bill it was emphatically stated that the company was to operate outside direct control by the government. The guidelines were laid

down at that time. I feel it is imperative that the company and its directors have the flexibility to operate in the best interests of all Albertans.

MR. CLARK: I wonder if I could direct a question to the hon. Member for Lloydminster. Could he tell me how many other private enterprise companies have gotten \$75 million from the Alberta government?

MR. NOTLEY: One hundred per cent . . .

MR. CLARK: One hundred per cent of all their financing right now.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, in my view there is only about one item mentioned by either member of the opposition that is worthy of reply. That's the item as to whether in fact there is anything which is not available to members of the Legislature or citizens of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, this company will have an annual audit like any normal company; this company will have an annual report that will go to the shareholders like any normal company; this company will have an annual meeting like any normal company. For any member to stand up in this Legislature and say that with full external audit and all these factors, the full facts of the operation of the Alberta Energy Company will not be available to the public, is simply not credible. It simply is not credible for anyone to make that kind of comment in this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, with those being the facts: an annual audit, an annual meeting, an annual report, you can only conclude that it is the desire of the opposition not to have this company operate as a normal private operation in Alberta. That's all you can conclude. [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, I can refer to the letter. All hon. members are aware of this letter. I can refer to our commitment to the people of Alberta that this would be a private company and operate like a private company, that it was a new concept. Let me read from the letter, Mr. Speaker:

Substantial direct citizen ownership will provide added stimulus and accountability for results that are inherent in the private enterprise system. I know that you feel as I do that the Alberta Energy Company approach has a potential to act as an interface between private investors, business and government. Modern society is challenging the concept of private investment and, sometimes with justification, the behavior of corporations. It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that the Alberta Energy Company, by creating widespread ownership and corporate participation in the province, will foster better understanding between our citizens and the economic system.

Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude they don't believe in that. There is only one choice for us, and that is to vote this motion down.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two on the resolution. We are confusing government activities with private company activities. If we put an order on the Order Paper asking that we be advised of all the meetings held by the cabinet, and a resume of what they discussed at the cabinet meetings, it would obviously be refused by this government or any other government.

If we asked any other company incorporated in the province for a resume of their meetings because an MLA or a minister happened to attend it, it would obviously be refused.

When I read the act hon. members passed in this Legislature, we set the company up as an incorporated company. There wasn't anything secret about that. That incorporated company has been given all the powers it possesses by this Legislature. Consequently, I don't know why the Legislature now should be prying into what takes place at every meeting of the company, whether the Premier or a cabinet minister is there or otherwise. To do so would simply mean that any company incorporated in this province could have the same request made. It wouldn't be proper.

If the government buys shares, as we've given them authority to do in this bill in 1974, and that money is wasted and so on, the government will have to take the responsibility for that and answer to the Legislature and the people.

I can't support the motion for a return because, in my view, it's asking for the dates of all meetings, who attended the meetings, and a resume of the matters discussed at each meeting. I don't think that's our business. It's none of our business how many meetings any incorporated company of this province holds and how many they don't hold.

I think our concern is that if and when public money goes in, the government then becomes a shareholder, holding more than half the shares or a percentage of the shares -- likely more than half, we've given them the authority to do so -- the actions that come out of that, particularly if it involves government policy, then become the business of the Alberta Legislature. But the way we have set up the bill, I don't think members of the Legislature have any right to ask that we be advised of what the directors are talking about or what they are planning.

If we find, as time goes by, that the results of the directors' talks are bad for the province, and the provincial government's money and input has been in that, then, of course, the government will be responsible as a result of what has taken place. I think the government has to assume that responsibility by participating in the company. But surely we shouldn't be asking what they are planning, how they are planning it, and so on. That's none of our business.

When the policies become public, the eventual results become public business. As mentioned by the hon. Minister of Hospitals, the former Provincial Treasurer, this act does give full authority to everybody who becomes a shareholder, the access any other shareholder would have with any other incorporated company. They will have a right to attend the annual meeting. They will have a right to ask any questions they want to ask. But simply because the government has guaranteed a loan, or the government has put some money in it, doesn't make every member of the Legislature a shareholder in the company. This is what the motion is asking, that we be considered shareholders in the company and be advised step by step what the company is doing all along the way even before those matters become public. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's sound business. If I had a company the government guaranteed, I certainly wouldn't want the plans of my company being made public at the request of some member of the Legislature. In my view, it's not the business of the Legislature.

We talk about having as little government as possible, but we are continually trying to delve into the matters of companies set up to operate as private companies. It would be far better if the members of the Legislature let them go ahead and do their business and see what results. If it redounds to an increased buoyancy in this province, well and good. If the money invested brings back a good return to the people of the province, well, of course, we'll all be happy, and the government will get the credit for that. If it goes the other way, the government will have to take the lumps. That's where the government becomes public and answers to the people. But I certainly don't think we should be asking for a resume of every meeting this private company is holding. Consequently, I'm not supporting the motion for a return.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate on this particular motion for a return . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member's speech will close the debate unless there are others who indicate now that they wish to speak on the motion.

MR. R. SPEAKER: We have asked in this particular return that dates be given to us, and that resumes of matters discussed at each of these meetings be presented to us. Certainly, if there are meetings which have not been minuted, if there are meetings which have been informal, we can accept part of that. But if there have been meetings where decisions have been made with regard to policy which can be made public, I see no reason why that can't be given to us at this time.

The Minister of Hospitals indicated earlier that we will receive an annual audit in this Assembly, we will receive an annual report. All we're saying in this motion for a return is that there must be some interim information that's available, that we can have so we can discuss the matter of the Alberta Energy Company at this time and in the coming estimates. I can see no reason why an interim return cannot be filed on that basis. If,

If, as the learned former Provincial Treasurer indicated to us earlier in this session, all the information will be made available to us through those two reports, to me there is no reason that the interim information we have asked for at this point in time cannot be given. I see no reason at all, because timing and the convenience of making the report are the only significant differences. Otherwise there are none. One is requested through the legislation; the other is requested through a motion for a return, which can be stamped on and pushed aside upon the recommendation to the rest of the people sitting in this Assembly. The backbenchers are going to go along with the minister's recommendation.

Maybe it's a little bit too much work or bother to get this kind of detail for us at this point in time. I think it's important that we have this kind of interim material so we can debate the issues at hand, and so that in the estimates before us we can discuss the issue with much better information. I can see no reason why the minister at this time would refuse to give us that kind of information.

The Minister of Hospitals stood up and read from a letter sent to the company. He feels that letter is the end.

MR. CLARK: More important, the law.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The most important thing. The king has written a beautiful letter. Somebody has received it. It is the fact and always the fact.

I recall a year or two back, seeing a picture of a young Chinese university student, aged 20, 21, or 22, sitting on the edge of a sidewalk with his red book in his hand, reading it and memorizing the lines. Maybe that letter could be compared to the red book. The red book knew all and had all the answers. Nonsense. That letter can be changed. The actions of this Assembly can be changed. The minister, in his responsibility and its relationship to the Alberta Energy Company, can get the material and present it on an interim basis.

If he wants to negotiate the kind of material and the area, I see no reason why he doesn't discuss that particular issue. But the first thing he does is stand up and say, no, we made a decision. You guys are getting nothing; you don't need it. I know what it's all about. I used to have a relationship with the Alberta Energy Company through a fellow by the name of Mr. Mills; he was able to pass the information back and forth and tell us the story. But somewhere along the line somebody found that he couldn't.

MR. CLARK: Where did he work before?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Now he's somewhere else in the government. That co-ordination and liaison fell through. So what we have to return to is a relationship between Mr. Mitchell, looking after the Alberta Energy Company, and the minister. The minister, in turn, can report to us in this Assembly the information that's available and which can help us to discuss this particular issue. I can see no reason and no precedent for refusing at this particular time.

I think of this concept outlined by the minister as very, very unique. It was created by the Conservative government; we have to admit that. But a number of years ago municipalities and school boards were created in this province. In the last three to five years, we've had a slow and continuous erosion of the autonomy of those local boards. Why don't we class them as this sort of private enterprise type of concept which was talked about? [interjections] When are they going to be able to have more autonomy and have this independence of reporting, being able to hold back information?

MR. CLARK: They're elected, not appointed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: That's right. They're elected by the people, not appointed. The elected people should have more priority than some appointed people who can hide behind the legislation here. I think, Mr. Speaker, the government is being totally negligent in not presenting this information at this time. We'll accept whatever is available. We'll accept the fact, because of investments or discussions or plans that are going on, that there may be information we shouldn't have. But I see no reason why certain itemizations of policy -- itemizations of, maybe, initial expenditures, investments, areas being reviewed under the responsibility of the Alberta Energy Company -- couldn't be [made] for us so we'd know about that. I see no reason at all, Mr. Speaker. I think the government is being totally negligent in its responsibility by not giving us this information.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion defeated. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung.]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided as follows:

Against the motion:

Adair	Dowling	Hyndman	Miller	Taylor
Backus	Farran	Jamison	Miniely	Tesolin
Batiuk	Fluker	Johnston	Moore	Thompson
Bogle	Poster	Kidd	Musgreave	Topolnisky
Bradley	Getty	King	Peacock	Trynchy
Chambers	Hansen	Kroeger	Planche	Walker
Chichak	Harle	Kushner	Russell	Warrack
Cookson	Hohol	Leitch	Schmid	Webber
Crawford	Horner	Little	Schmidt	Wolstenholme
Diachuk	Horsman	Lysons	Shaben	Young
Doan	Hunley	McCrae	Stewart	Yurko
Dcnnelly	Hyland	McCrimmon	Stromberg	Zander

For the motion:

Clark	Notley	R. Speaker
Totals:	Ayes -- 3	Noes -- 60]

MR. SPEAKER: I trust that has ended the suspense.

135. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
a list of the Alberta representatives attending the federal-provincial conference in Ottawa in April 1975, including the mode and cost of transportation for each of these representatives.

[The motion was carried.]

136. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
(1) The names and positions of members of an Alberta government delegation to Sweden in January 1975.  
(2) The cost incurred for each of these members.

[The motion was carried.]

137. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:



the fees or commissions paid to National Trust Company Limited, for acting as agent on behalf of the Province of Alberta in the purchase of shares of Pacific Western Airlines.

[The motion was carried.]

138. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) The total cost of the Alberta Energy Company advertisements for its senior executive group, which appeared in several newspapers during November and December 1974.
- (2) A breakdown of the above advertising costs by newspaper.
- (3) The terms of reference and fees for the services of Feat, Marwick & Partners with regard to the advertisements and executive search functions on behalf of the Alberta Energy Company.

AN HON. MEMBER: This is different.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the principle involved is the same, and rather than have the House go through the debate again, although some members may wish to discuss it, it is a matter which is the internal day to day management of the Alberta Energy Company. We pointed out that it is not our intention to be involved in it. Therefore, we must turn down this motion as well.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a question to the minister in the debate. In debating this particular motion in the form of a question to the minister, in situations such as this, is the minister prepared to discuss with the Alberta Energy Company some of the areas where they may have the information readily available, and be willing to say, well, here it is, and we can present it to the House?

I look at the material here that we talk about with regard to advertising costs and terms of reference for hiring a group. Potentially, I don't see anything harmful in that type of information, and there may be other types of information like that. Is the door completely closed, or are there some areas where, through discussion with the Alberta Energy Company, it may be possible?. They may say as a board, here it is, take it, it doesn't matter. Is that a possibility?

MR. GETTY: [Inaudible] question to me, Mr. Speaker. There's nothing harmful in the information nor, in any of the information the member is requesting, are we worried about it harming us in any way. The principle, though, is the same. I'd be perfectly happy to discuss in estimates, or in other opportunities, the policy matters which the government has directed towards the Energy Company, and the act under which they must live within the Province of Alberta. But this is clearly not within those types of parameters. This is really the day to day operations of a company, the cost of its advertising, and so on, and is not caught up in policy matters.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, although the actual context of the motion may appear innocuous, to agree to it would be a breach of principle with far-reaching consequences.

The principle of the Alberta Energy Company is laid down in its articles, and the issue has been well debated before in the House. The whole thing is *deja vu*. It's old hat. Yes, it is stew warmed up again. It shows lack of imagination on the part of the opposition.

The company is to operate as a private company in almost every respect, a company which will give Albertans the opportunity to participate in provincial growth. It's a venture which will involve as many citizens as possible, involve them in the incentive system, recognizing that many, either through lack of knowledge or lack of access, have missed participating in the opportunities afforded by Alberta's growth in the past 30 years.

The idea is, frankly, a capitalist idea, and perhaps that's why the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview doesn't like it. Its seeds began in an excellent idea, in principle, of the former government to allow Albertans first call on the common shares of Alberta Gas Trunk Line. In that pioneer experiment, although the basic idea was excellent, there were certain errors. Some acquired more than their ration of shares, and through sale of shares at a profit, control of the company was lost by Albertans to eastern interests.

In the Alberta Energy Company it's been ensured that control will always remain in Alberta, because half the shares will be held by the province, and steps will be taken to ensure that the priority distribution of shares to Albertans will be wide and equitable. It follows the basic conservative principle, the principles of a property-owning democracy, that freedom is best ensured when the dispersion of ownership of property is as wide as possible.

But obviously, it's most important that this experiment encourages ownership by individuals rather than the Crown, which is the socialist route and the Crown corporation route being suggested today by the opposition. It's most important that it be successful. For that very reason we must have trust and faith in the excellent board of directors, prominent businessmen we've succeeded in attracting. Such entrepreneurial talent was only attracted because it was clear they wouldn't operate in the fashion of any other Crown

corporation; they would not be mere civil servants; they would be able to operate with speed and efficiency, aiming at maximizing profit to the shareholder. They wouldn't have to consider themselves as civil servants in a nationalized operation.

It's clear enough from the record that very few Crown corporations are capable of maximizing profit. The reasons are numerous, but perhaps most significant is the requirement to respond to social concerns expressed to them by politicians, and not to their shareholders in terms of the profit system.

The Alberta Energy Company is to be a successful company oriented to profit. There's no way it can be run from the floor of the Legislature, any more than you could run, say, the Pickett and Clark dairy farm in Carstairs from the floor of the Legislature.

DR. WARRACK: That's milking it.

MR. CLARK: That was resolved 10 years ago, Roy.

MR. FARRAN: There's no way it can operate if its directors are to be subject to constant second-guessing by lay politicians. Not too many politicians have shown particular skill or shrewdness in the making of money. Their talent lies in other directions.

If the board has to respond between annual shareholders' meetings, on an ad hoc basis, to such picayune questions as the cost of newspaper ads, we have to consider what would come next. Will the hon. members require a day to day accounting of the petty cash? Will they want to see the day book of the company decisions for instance?

This is a holding company. The target is to make investments in Alberta natural resource companies so as to make a profit for Albertans, in addition to the benefits Albertans get by way of employment opportunity and royalty money spent on government services. Surely it cannot be the suggestion of this House that they will question and wrangle over every investment decision made by the directors. Presumably the directors will examine many investment opportunities. They'll examine the prospects of profitability in the light of management record, capital available, future market, and operating costs. Such information, and the reasons for making an affirmative or a negative decision, must rest with the company executive. They can't operate with the thought that a number of politicians with complete access to the media and different priorities of responsibility will be forever looking over their shoulders. It just doesn't make any sense.

Accountability will come. We have directors on the board. We'll see their track records in terms of profit; we'll measure their good husbandry as directors then. If necessary, we can ask for any information at an annual shareholders' meeting.

One hopes the opposition will have enough confidence in this company to buy shares themselves. That will give them the rights of any other shareholder. One hopes that, as shareholders, they will have an interest in getting a good dividend. I suggest they don't rock the boat before it's even moving steadily through the water.

As a former businessman in a somewhat smaller enterprise, about the size of that dairy farm in Carstairs, I feel confident I wouldn't have made a success if my every move had been subject to scrutiny by city hall. I'd have gone belly-up a long time ago. So I suggest we reject the motion.

MR. NOTLEY: When the hon. Solicitor General talked about Motion 138 as being warmed-over stew, I couldn't help but feel that would be a fairly accurate assessment of his comments during this debate. Somewhere I've heard it before. One would almost think he was taking it right from the Conservative speaker's notes.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me there are a couple of points that arise in discussing Motion for a Return 138. The first is that the information asked for is, as the minister himself indicated, certainly not harmful. It seems to me the government could have accepted this with the addition of "subject to concurrence". I think it's important to note, Mr. Speaker, that this advertising is now being conducted by the Alberta Energy Company but is being paid for as a result of the special warrant, not authorized by the Legislature, authorizing \$75 million in taxpayers' money to be transferred to the Alberta Energy Company. They're not using money they've raised from shareholders. They're using money which has come as a result of a special warrant authorizing Alberta funds to be transferred to this company. Therefore, it is not unreasonable that information about the advertising: on what basis they're carrying on the advertising, who they're doing it with, what the total cost is, et cetera -- information which I have no doubt Mr. Mitchell would be quite prepared to give. Notwithstanding that, it seems to me that to try to make an issue out of this by refusing to accept it with the qualification, "subject to concurrence", is rather foolish on the part of the government and could only increase suspicion about the way in which the Alberta Energy Company is going to operate.

It seems to me that before we get into a position where the company shares go on the market, Mr. Speaker, we and the government should be doing everything possible to increase public confidence in the Alberta Energy Company. They do that by being open, certainly, about those things which aren't going to hurt anyone.

The only other comment I want to make . . . The hon. Solicitor General in his remarks said buy yourself a share, go out to the shareholders' meeting, and you'll get all the information you need. I might say I've no doubt that Mr. Mitchell will be running a very efficient operation. But I want to recount for the Legislature, Mr. Speaker, that in talking first hand to at least one of the shareholders of PWA, they found the stonewalling

that went on at the annual meeting of PWA would make Nixon and crew look like amateurs by comparison. The suggestion that, somehow, all this information will be available to shareholders is just a little unrealistic because at annual meetings of shareholders, the fact of the matter is that all the information and all the questions are not answered.

It's rather interesting, Mr. Speaker, at the annual meeting of PWA all the sensitive questions were referred back to the shareholders. [They] said, go to the owners, the Government of Alberta. We come here with a request for information and they say, go to the shareholders' meeting. We get this runaround, back and forth, and the information is kept behind closed doors.

MR. CLARK: Don't even read the annual reports.

MR. NOTLEY: That's right. That's right. They don't even read the annual reports.

So, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me Motion for a Return 138 is reasonable.

To the comment back there about selling the share: no, hon. member, I don't think the New Democratic Party will be selling its share. We'll be hanging in there for your information and well-being.

[interjections]

In any event, the motion for a return as it reads is subject to concurrence. That would be a very easy amendment, which could be proposed by the government side, clearly consistent. I don't see why the government doesn't make that amendment. We can approve it accordingly.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Leader of the Opposition close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CLARK: I only have three or four comments to make, Mr. Speaker, in concluding the debate. Obviously the government has decided it's going to turn the motion down.

It would perhaps be interesting for the new members, anyway, to go down to the legislative library and have a look at the full-page ad run all across Canada by the Alberta Energy Company. Ask yourselves how much it cost. You've all just been through an election campaign yourselves. You know what a full page in every newspaper across Canada would cost. You might ask yourselves, secondly, who put up every cent of the money. It was this Legislature. No, not this Legislature -- it was your government -- the Legislature hasn't had a chance to talk about it yet. The special warrant went through just before the last session started, so he wouldn't have to account for it during the session, so it wouldn't be part of the estimates that could have been discussed if the election hadn't been held. So just keep that in mind, hon. members, while you're rubber-stamping the government's position on this particular issue.

It would also be interesting to know if we could get the information on what kind of response we had, what kind of priority was set out in the terms of reference that went to Peat, Marwick & Partners, what kind of priority the Alberta Energy Company asked that Albertans get, as far as employment is concerned. It would be very interesting to know if there was any stipulation by the Alberta Energy Company, in the course of selecting people to take on jobs with the company. Were there priorities given to Albertans? There is no indication. Not one member in the House has stood up and indicated there was. Yet you don't want the information.

As for the comments made by the Solicitor General, I enjoy the Solicitor General. I thought he did an excellent job of reading his written script to protect a very weak position.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: He reads better.

MR. CLARK: Well, he's forgotten the start.

The last comment I'd like to make is that I don't think even the Solicitor General could go broke if he had \$75 million to start with.

[The motion was lost.]

139. Mr. Mandeville proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) The location and size of and price paid for each parcel of land purchased by the Government of Alberta in the area between Fort McMurray and Hardisty, since January 1, 1974.
- (2) The names of those people or companies from whom such land was purchased during the said period of time.
- (3) The soil classifications of each such parcel of land.
- (4) A copy of the memorandum sent by the Minister of Environment to his department ordering a termination of such purchases.

MR. CLARK: On behalf of the hon. member Mr. Mandeville I would like to move Motion for a Return 139.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion, I'd like to offer two amendments. The first, in Clause (1), I assume the hon. member means in the route of the northeast corridor. We'd like to insert the words "in the northeast Alberta corridor" after the words "by the Government of Alberta", just to clarify that and to tighten up the geography a bit. The second amendment is to strike out Clause (4) dealing with the intradepartmental memorandum.

MR. SPEAKER: If there is going to be any debate on the amendment, it would be necessary to deal with them one at a time.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[The motion as amended was carried.]

140. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
an accounting of the salary and expenses paid to the Deputy Minister of Agriculture,  
Mr. Glen Purnell, for each month from January 1, 1974, to March 31, 1975.

[The motion was carried.]

145. Dr. Buck proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
(1) The name of the program or programs through which the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation funded the testing of ski-bindings at Alberta's major ski centres during the winter of 1974-75.  
(2) The names of the persons and/or agencies receiving such grants.  
(3) The amount of each such grant.  
(4) A copy of any reports made in conjunction with such grants by those persons and/or agencies who received such grants.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Sepaker, on behalf of the hon. Member for Clover Bar I move Motion 145.

[The motion was carried.]

146. Dr. Buck proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
(1) Total number of hours logged by Lands and Forests aircraft CF-AFD (King Air) from January 1, 1973, to December 31, 1973, for transportation of  
(1) cabinet ministers and assistants,  
(2) deputy ministers and assistants.  
(2) The number of flights and hours logged for each Lands and Forests aircraft during the period of January 1, 1974, to December 31, 1974, for the purpose of transportation of:  
(1) cabinet ministers and assistants,  
(2) deputy ministers and assistants,  
(3) all other government personnel.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Member for Clover Bar I move Motion 146.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, since the hon. member who originally posed the motion was very concerned last night about the increase in civil service staff of the Government of Alberta, and since the document he requires under item (1) is before me and has been filed on March 11, 1974, item no. 608, and under item (2) the information has been filed under item no. 502 on January 24, 1975, I wonder if the hon. member cares to withdraw that motion.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have the motion held on the Order Paper until Dr. Buck returns.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that acceptable to the Assembly?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

147. Mr. R. Speaker proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
(1) The names of architectural firms and/or consultants sent by the Government of Alberta to Alberta House in London, England, since January 1, 1975.  
(2) The fees paid to each of these firms and/or consultants.

[The motion was carried.]

## MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Kushner proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government of the province to consider making representations to the Government of Canada to amend the Old Age Security Act (Canada) in such a way that a person who is handicapped to a degree which prevents earning a living shall receive a benefit equal to that payable to a person of age 65.

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, some of you may recall, in 1970, Building Standards For the Handicapped pointed out that one in every seven Canadians has a permanent physical disability. This large group of Albertans has been grossly neglected, and it's shocking to find how little effort has been made to help this helpless segment of our society. They are an invisible and silent minority, who are poor, Mr. Speaker, and in whom very few took an interest.

There is very little information available. For example, in Ontario there are 29,250 disabled single persons, 3,929 disabled married persons, 780 blind single persons, 1,010 blind married persons, 3,130 blind dependent fathers, 630 disabled mothers with dependent children; totalling 38,730. We do not have comparable statistics on those groups in Alberta. In this area of the disabled, a sweeping change is necessary not only in legislation, but is a must in the attitude of elected officials. It is hard to understand that so little effort has been made to meet this special need of the handicapped disabled.

People born handicapped through circumstances beyond their control, and those who incurred permanent disability for which they have no coverage through workmen's compensation, private insurance, or court settlements, must have an income security so they can afford housing, transportation, medical appliances, and prescriptions to maintain a general good standard of living. Improved financing of support services for the handicapped isn't necessary, but at the same time it should be set up in such a way that it will encourage the handicapped person to be a useful, self-reliant member of our society instead of being a parasite, as we are encouraging him to be under our present system.

We seem to be more concerned about those who are strong, healthy, and who make themselves heard. Nobody sees or hears too much about the handicapped, so we ignore them and put them on welfare. Mr. Speaker, those who possibly try to help themselves, and earn over \$50 a month, have their assistance cut off. So, in fact, many fear to assist themselves in any way. This, to me, sounds very strange. Mr. Speaker, a program must be developed in such a way as to give them an incentive -- an incentive of hope, encouragement to earn an income, pride, a sense of belonging, and a sense of responsibility, of being needed in our society and able to participate.

The federal government leaves most of the assistance to the handicapped up to the provinces, and rightly so. But they have these provisions: disabled person allowance -- the federal government agrees to pay no more than 50 per cent of the \$215 a month. The provinces pay the other half. The disabled war veterans are covered by war veterans allowance. A disabled pension is provided for under the Canada Pension Plan. If a person has worked no less than 5 years, and is subsequently deemed unemployable, he gets a pension of 75 per cent of his retirement pension, as well as a flat rate benefit. The handicapped group say that this is highly inadequate, Mr. Speaker.

The provinces of Quebec, B.C., and Saskatchewan have a special program to enable the disabled to cover the cost of prescriptions, orthopedic devices, and wheel chairs. British Columbia has also given the handicapped the same level of assistance as the senior citizens, a basic monthly rent of \$239.85 plus \$110 a month earning exemption. Ontario also has this program. Alberta -- we're still kicking around and are currently reviewing it. I hope we will support this motion and give the government the flexibility it needs. It will also bring Albertans into line with other provinces.

The disabled in Alberta must rely on individual social workers to determine the level of assistance. The Action Groups for the Disabled [says that] the handicapped in nursing homes and other institutions have no control over their bank accounts or pensions. It seems sad. The province should attach more priorities to enable the disabled to live self-sufficiently in apartments, or their own homes, so they can take an active role in our society. These emphases must be given.

The Alberta Health Care Insurance Act should cover wheel chairs and other devices for the physically disabled not covered by workers' compensation or social assistance. A basic social allowance cannot possibly cover special dietary needs, clothing, and specialized transportation costs. Many disabled cannot get life insurance or group insurance because they are physically disabled. Or if they can, they must contend with high premiums.

Action Groups for the Disabled recommends that the province would hold one-seventh of the transportation grants to municipalities whose transit systems are not accessible to handicapped. There seems to be no firm government policy behind the transportation support for the handicapped. The transportation systems provided for Calgary, Edmonton, Medicine Hat, and smaller centres, Red Deer, Camrose, and Lethbridge, haven't got the facilities. Edmonton now is beginning [a disabled] adult transportation system which is financed by the city, 13 hours daily, with only 5 vehicles, costing 50 cents a ride. And

the disabled must often wait from 1 to 3 hours for a ride. No employer will tolerate this kind of situation. The disabled must rely on very expensive taxi service.

The Individual's Rights Protection Act and The Alberta Bill of Rights should include the disabled as a protected class of person. The right of the minority to obtain suitable employment, to use public facilities and accommodation, rent, dwellings, or commercial units, must be protected to eliminate discrimination. Employment opportunity must be judged on qualifications and ability rather than on being disabled. In about 37 states in North America, the disabled are a protected class. It is overdue in Alberta for us to provide recognition of the special need of disabled people.

At the present time, the handicapped have no legal foundation to fight discrimination. The basic needs provided for an average citizen should be equal with the basic needs required for the physically handicapped citizens. The human bill of rights protects the average person and enables the individual to function with dignity, without discrimination.

We understand that the human bill of rights identifies the basic needs as follows: transportation, accommodation, education, employment, recreation, and participation in government. Transportation is considered a right for an average citizen, and we believe that transportation for all handicapped people should be on the same basis as for an able body -- a public utility, not a charitable [inaudible] business. Due to the various physical limitations for the physically handicapped, special transportation is required.

This service is subsidized to a great extent by some communities, but is operated as a social service. The inflationary cost of operating has forced some of those services to an increase of 75 cents a fare, one way. I'm referring to the City of Calgary, and as a matter of fact they are anticipating that further travelling restrictions may be applied. It is therefore recommended that all municipalities encourage development of this type of transportation service for the handicapped, but as a right -- a public utility, not a social service. The provincial government should reconsider the capital and operation grants available to municipalities to establish an operating service.

We further recommend that the operation of such a service have the following qualifications: compassion, understanding of passengers and knowledge of service required, respect for the staff in general, and special emphasis to be placed on the drivers and their position -- this type of operation is a very vital one -- reasonable wages to encourage dedicated men to apply and continue to work on a long-term employment basis, the initiation of a training program for drivers with medical aspects of such training program. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because in my short study, and in the information available to date, many people who are using this type of service have been hurt, and for some of them it takes a long time to recover.

In the assessment of needs and accommodation, it is considered a number two priority with emphasis placed on three areas of concern: independent housing, public or private housing; funds to be available to the handicapped so they are able to adapt to their existing homes and to their special needs; funds for landlords who will be willing to accept the physically handicapped as tenants.

We should give some kind of consideration to group housing -- dwellings to accommodate six to eight young handicapped persons, maximum care to enable them to adjust to and continue their education in a home-type environment, and to integrate them into the community. The physically handicapped can play an important decision-making role in the actual operation of this residence. Permanent resident housing for those who require minimal daily physical support care, or buildings with self-contained apartments for single or married handicapped people with trained staff available to provide assistance if and when needed, would make it possible for those handicapped groups to live in an apartment-type environment where the responsibilities pertaining to their daily activities could be shared by the residents in a central area providing a gym, physical therapy, a swimming pool, a work area, and a gift shop which could be utilized by residents and the surrounding community.

The lack of suitable accommodation forces individuals into institutional situations, destroying a family as a unit, eliminating all possibilities of personal fulfilment. For both single and married individuals, institutional living is demoralizing, providing little or no incentive and the loss of human dignity.

We therefore recommend that the three areas of housing be explored and developed in all municipalities to provide alternatives to the existing auxiliary hospitals and nursing homes. The following services are required by individuals to enable them to live in the community, services required to maintain the consumer: permanent 24-hour homemakers, part-time homemakers, heavy housework, house maintenance, Meals On Wheels, VON nursing, orderly service, drugs, dressings, medical equipment, and mobile labs. The above services are required for maintenance and rehabilitation of consumers, and therefore are not considered a social service.

The homemaker service exists but is not adequate. Services are provided on a temporary basis, with present policies restricting homemakers in providing the services required by the consumer: 24-hour long-term homemakers for individuals, trained persons who could assist or take full charge of day to day requirements, including some basic daily nursing and orderly care; and part-time homemakers, trained persons who could assist daily or biweekly.

We recommend that the training program be developed to include all areas of need, the establishment of full support units to provide the services required by the consumer, and one contact for information and services self-referral.

It is an established fact that employment and the need to be gainfully self-supporting are essential to all persons, not only in order that they become providers of the basic living necessities, but as well so that they are able to achieve independence in the social, emotional, vocational, and economical aspects of life. Bearing this in mind, it is a conviction and a fact that employment for the physically handicapped is a major need.

The employment of the physically handicapped and subsequent benefits of being employed are doubly important. Not only is there the fact of personal knowledge of achievement, but there is also recognition of equality and ability to achieve this level among fellow workers regardless of physical circumstances. Due to the lack of job opportunities, and in some cases, the age factor, many handicapped are forced to exist on a very limited budget, interned to live in isolation without contact. Those human beings are stripped of all human dignity and have become withdrawn, discouraged, and frustrated that less emphasis is placed on the disability of this group, regardless of a guaranteed income on a sliding scale according to individual needs.

There are no recreation programs available to handicapped people in the major cities of Edmonton or Calgary sponsored by the recreation department. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am strongly in favor -- and it's well overdue -- of our assisting and probably even copying or learning from some of the provinces across this nation in regard to assisting the handicapped.

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there is any question that the plight of the handicapped has the sympathy and support of all members. However, I consider it rather inappropriate to deal with the handicapped in the same act as the elderly. I believe the disabled person should be dealt with in an entirely separate act similar to the former Disabled Persons Act of 1954.

I found a great number of these people, many of them young, housed in the same nursing homes as the elderly. They had little in common. I believe they should be housed, and where necessary placed in an institution, with persons of the same age group and similar disabilities.

I certainly favor highly the idea of a pension rather than welfare. A good number of the handicapped I met in the nursing homes were on welfare, certainly a rather undignified way for them to receive their income.

However, the handicapped have varying degrees of disability and some have very minimal incomes. I think a much better approach, as some can be employed on a part-time basis, is to establish a base; that is, a minimum guaranteed income for the disabled.

We might also take a look at the aides. I believe that aides for the disabled should be entirely separate from their income. We could take a look at the lead set by B.C., Saskatchewan, and Quebec in providing aides for the handicapped without charge.

The whole area of help for the disabled is quite complex. It deserves further study, and when the study is completed, I would suggest it all be contained in one act dealing with the handicapped alone.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion before us I would first of all like to say that I agree with the intent of the motion. I feel the hon. member has certainly made a good effort. He has recognized a problem which exists in our communities and has attempted to come up with a solution.

As the hon. member from Calgary has just mentioned, it is very difficult to define the group we are discussing. Who is really a handicapped person? Who is in need of financial help, maybe emotional help as well? Who are these people? Often it's difficult to recognize that person. Is a person with a bad back a handicapped person? Is he unable to work and support his family? There are certain physical disabilities which we can see, but many we can't.

I've tried to find details and descriptions of these various groups but the information isn't readily available. Estimates of the handicapped group vary anywhere from 3 per cent of our population to 1 out of every 7 people. I feel we need more information in that area to bring about a policy that, first, we are able to administer throughout the province and, secondly, that we are able to budget for and to predict our responsibilities.

I think one of the ways we could approach this problem is to establish some type of priority system. I feel, from my own practical experience, one area we can define is that of respiratory polio victims. I understand there are somewhere around 12 or 15 people across the province in that particular category. I would like to speak of one specific example I am very, very aware of and have worked with very closely in the last 4 or 5 months.

This particular person was in a bed in the University Hospital and had been there for some 8 or 10 years. About 2 years ago a fellow came along and decided to do hospital visits. He was asked by one particular church group to do this, and he did. About 6 months later the polio victim and the male person decided they would get married. They did, and at that point she was moved into the active community, into a home. At present they are living in my constituency. He is carrying on a responsible job in the community and has an income somewhere in the vicinity of \$800 to \$1,000. But he is finding it very, very difficult to carry the extra financial responsibilities. Prior to the date of marriage, the cost of keeping this person at the University Hospital was maybe \$40 a day, whereas in the home they are renting at the present time and hope to purchase, the cost is much less. The fellow indicated to me that if they had \$200 to \$300 a month just to have

a homemaker -- a person to care for his wife during the day -- he would be able to continue his financial responsibility and continue as a normal family. He said as far as he's concerned their relationship as man and wife, the other responsibilities they have in the community, and their social activities are normal. But this is an economic problem which faces them every month and is a great difficulty. I think those are the kinds of things we have to get at in a policy such as this. To me that should be priority number one. We can define that area very, very carefully.

There are certainly people in beds across the province who do need financial help to have some feeling of independence. I think that could be a second area.

We have non-institutional people attempting to earn their own incomes -- earning part of it but living under very difficult circumstances. Maybe that's the third priority group.

There are other part-time people who are not as handicapped and can just about make it, but may need some help. They could be down the priority list a little further.

After that, there are people who are institutionalized. We have to ask the question, what responsibility do we have to them over and beyond institutional care? That's maybe the fifth area.

I feel this motion, by saying the federal government should look at it and come up with some kind of program and ensure these people have financial security, isn't quite enough. I feel we can do a lot at the provincial level and be remunerated in turn by the federal government. As a minister in this particular area, I often felt we allowed the federal government to determine our policy too much. Here is an opportunity where, if we get into the area and do the work, the federal government, as I understand, will reimburse us for a percentage of the cost.

Earlier today I was reading the communique sent to the media following the Federal-Provincial Welfare Ministers' Conference in Ottawa on April 30 and May 1. There I see a direct trend being established, and I think it is very, very good.

I noted that the federal government and the provinces agreed that new expenditures and directions would be established so money would be made available first for rehabilitation services, and secondly to support services for the aged and handicapped. So the handicapped are certainly high on the priority list for financial support from the federal government, and I'm certain from the provincial level.

Further in the notes here I see that the provinces indicated they wanted to study the matter before they made any commitment. So I think the initiative at this point rests with the province, and the province can make this decision. Through this communique, I'm sure they can receive 50 per cent reimbursement for the majority of the plan. On page 4 of the communique, the federal government said it was estimated that this would result in the federal government assuming about 70 per cent of the incremental cost of the new system.

I felt, from reading this, that the new system being talked about is financial support for programs for the handicapped. I think the time is right to take advantage of that particular offer to move ahead and establish a program for the handicapped across the province.

In that light, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move a substitute motion, or an amendment to the motion before us to place the matter at hand. So if we pass this motion, then we give direction to the minister and to government to establish a program in the province. This substitute motion moved by myself, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows:

That the motion be amended by striking out all words after the word 'Province', and by substituting therefor the words 'to set up an Alberta Assured Income Plan for handicapped persons, thus insuring a minimum monthly payment of \$255.'

Mr. Speaker, I feel that motion is in support of the intent of the federal recommendations and certainly is one we should support in this Assembly. I felt the mover and the second speaker on the motion certainly had support for this type of direction. I feel the details of a program like that could be worked out. It is not one that's impossible or complicated. With some research, with some study, we would be able to establish the priority areas as I've indicated. We will be able to go out into the communities and enable people to have financial security and not worry about where their basic food, clothing, and shelter is coming from.

We can do that with a financial plan or an assured income such as this. We then have no problems of placing handicapped people under the stigma of welfare -- that they are creatures of the state supported by the state, and people have to bow to the state and beg for any type of support they get.

This is a straight financial plan that says, if the person is in need, we will guarantee that up to this level of income the person will receive benefits. I think at this point in time, in our maturity as a province and as legislators, we can support that kind of plan. I think that is one of the ultimate programs in social responsibility whereby we give economic capability to the person, and at that point in time the person himself or herself can carry on his social and community living and take on the responsibilities he can at the community level. Knowing a number of people who have handicaps, I have confidence that they'll do their own jobs if we give them a chance. But we can't enable them to do a job if we suppress them and give them very minimal incomes and a lack of attention.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.



MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the principle of the motion presented to us by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View as well as the substitute amendment presented by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there really isn't any inconsistency in taking both positions, because the first motion, in essence, is calling upon the province to make representation to Ottawa to expand funding in his area. The second or substitute motion really seizes upon the responsibility in the province assuming that some program is being developed federally to assist in the funding of a program for disabled and handicapped people.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with most of the remarks made by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View when he moved the original resolution. Handicapped people really suffer a number of disabilities in our society. The lack of proper transportation facilities is one area he mentioned, and I think quite correctly pinpointed. The lack of an adequate income unrelated to welfare is another area he pinpointed, and I think properly so.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I was pleased to see the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View mention that in other provinces progress has been made. I understand that just after the beginning of April the Government of Saskatchewan announced a program of assistance to cities and municipalities in that province to provide transportation for physically handicapped people. Under the terms of that policy, Mr. Speaker, 75 per cent of the capital costs of acquiring equipment, buses, what have you, for the physically handicapped will be assumed by the province, 25 per cent by the local municipality. Fifty per cent of the operating costs of the program of transportation for the physically handicapped will be borne directly by the provincial Treasury.

I certainly would like to see that kind of program developed in the Province of Alberta. As the member pointed out in his introductory remarks, some minor progress has been made in the City of Edmonton, but we still have a long way to go if we are to deal with the discrimination which exists in fact as far as physically handicapped people are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the amendment we have before us is one which perhaps involves a certain amount of risk, but risk that this government and this province can well afford. The hon. Member for Little Bow mentioned that as a result of the meeting of federal and provincial ministers on April 30 and May 1, an apparent agreement had been developed to extend federal funding for programs that relate to the handicapped. Whether or not those programs would be available right away for the Province of Alberta is perhaps debatable. I would hope they would be. Mr. Speaker, whether they are or not, it seems to me that we are in a position to move into this area and pioneer, if you like.

Mr. Speaker, when one looks at the history of cost-sharing arrangements in this country, it is worth noting that it is as a result of provincial initiatives that we have developed cost-shared programs in the health and hospitalization field. Hospitalization did not originate, Mr. Speaker, with the federal government. Hospitalization originated as a result of a plan developed in the Province of Saskatchewan, then other provinces picked it up. As a result of provinces getting into the field, sufficient pressure was put on Ottawa to get involved and to pick up part of the cost. The same holds true with medicare. Ottawa moved in, not in the lead, but as a result of provinces pioneering the field, setting the precedent. As a consequence of that action at the provincial level, Ottawa finally moved in to assume its responsibility. The same, Mr. Speaker, can well be true in terms of programs for the handicapped. That is why . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. Attorney General has a point of order.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I've just been considering the wording of the proposed amendment, or substitute motion as it has been referred to by the mover. I would like to submit to the House, Mr. Speaker, that the motion is in fact a substitute motion. While it deals generally with the area of handicapped persons, it is fundamentally different from the motion that appears on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe there isn't any question that it's a substitute motion. It was submitted as a substitute motion. I am unaware of any strictures under which it would not be allowed to come up for debate, although hon. members are undoubtedly aware that in debate on the motion, anyone, including the mover of the substitute motion by way of amendment, is entitled to debate both the original motion and the substitute motion.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I take it then that the hon. Attorney General has withdrawn his point of order, because clearly it was introduced as a substitute motion.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, the point that I think bears making is that by moving into this field and extending the benefits of the Alberta assured income plan to handicapped people, it may well mean that in the short run the province will have to pick up the costs of funding that program. But it is, in my judgment, a risk that we can afford to take, because the benefits of providing that sort of financial independence to our physically handicapped in the Province of Alberta, far outweigh the risks involved to the public treasury, particularly in our present circumstances. I think it also is worth noting, too, that the point the hon. Member for Little Bow made is valid. The federal government is obviously looking at expanding its role, and it seems to me the more initiative we show at the provincial level, the more likely Ottawa is to assume its responsibility.

The resolutions we're dealing with, both the original resolution and the substitute resolution, are important and timely, Mr. Speaker, because the handicapped have for too long a time been forgotten in this province. Oh, yes, there have been some modest improvements in their lot. The modifications made to building standards in the province are certainly worth noting. But surely we can do a little better than that, Mr. Speaker. I think the point raised by the Member for Calgary Mountain View is really pretty accurate. At this point we should, through the Alberta Health Care Insurance Plan, be making such things as wheel chairs and aids available to the physically handicapped so that it's not just a case of those people on welfare receiving it, and people who aren't, not receiving it, or people receiving it through workers' compensation benefits.

Surely this is the kind of program which can be made available to the physically handicapped who are in the range of the working poor, where unfortunately many of our handicapped find themselves today. These are the people under the present ground rules, Mr. Speaker, who have very little protection, and very little assistance from government. They're the people who are trying to make their way, yet have to pick up the extreme costs of paying for their disabilities.

I well remember the meeting we had on transportation for the physically disabled. This was a meeting of the MLA/Handicapped Committee. It was impressive to hear the representation made by the physically handicapped about the problems they encounter in simply getting around, something that all the rest of us, who aren't physically handicapped, take for granted. When you have to call a taxi to go to work, and pay \$7 or \$8 to go across town to your place of employment, then at the end of the working day call a taxi to go back home, that's pretty expensive transportation.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, until very recently there has been practically no provision for transportation assistance to the physically handicapped in this province. There has been the odd example where there have been modest beginnings, but certainly nothing on a universal basis which is something, in my judgment anyway, Mr. Speaker, long overdue.

I like the spirit of the resolution. I also think that the substitute resolution strengthens rather than weakens. The original resolution was just saying in essence, let's talk to Ottawa and ask them for some more money. There's nothing wrong with that. I think that's fair ball. All provinces, and even the Province of Alberta with our surplus, should be lobbying Ottawa so that the federal government makes the kind of commitment it should to quality of life programs. But the question is, what is the best approach to make that point? I submit that by proceeding with the program in Alberta, by expanding the perimeter of the assured income program, we are going to be in a much better position to achieve the objective of the motion presented to us by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Therefore I rise to support the substitute motion, and I trust, Mr. Speaker, it will receive the support of all members of this House.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, which is not as to whether this is a substitute motion, but referring to Annotation 203 in Beauchesne as to whether the subject matter of the amendment is foreign to the spirit of the main motion. [Annotation] 203(1) says:

The law on the relevancy of amendments is that if they are on the same subject-matter with the original motion, they are admissible, but not when foreign thereto.

By the statements of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, in his remarks just before closing, he said specifically that it was on subject matter different than the subject matter of the main motion. That is, it was not on the subject matter of a representation to the Government of Canada, but rather the implementation of a program in this province.

Paragraph (5) of Annotation 203 says further: "An amendment was ruled out because it raised a new question which could only be considered on a distinct motion after notice". My argument, Mr. Speaker, is that the implementation of a plan by the Government of Alberta is distinctly different than representations to the Government of Canada, even though the reason for implementing the plan in Alberta may be similar to the reason for making a representation to the Government of Canada.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order, I'd like to make the point that, in moving the substitute motion, the emphasis was placed on the handicapped. In moving the original motion by the hon. Member for Calgary, his speech was totally directed towards his concern for the handicapped, for the people in need. I don't recall any emphasis in his speech where he said, we must run to the federal government, and enumerated many ways and approaches of putting pressure on the federal government. It was not the focal point of his speech. Nor was it the focal point of my speech in my substitute motion.

So I would ask, Mr. Speaker, to consider that in your ruling, because to me the two motions are consistent, the original and mine, and the focal point is handicapped.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, speaking very briefly on the point of order. I think the operative word in the motion of the hon. Member for Mountain View is "consider". In other words, he's not saying, make representation, or we demand representation. He's talking about considering and, as such, that is a much more expansive statement or word than just a direct order to make representation.

Just to clarify the remarks I made in my speech, Mr. Speaker, I said that the substitute motion, in fact, might make it easier for us in making representation to

Ottawa. Because if we had a plan already in place, which we were funding, as a pioneer in the area we would be in a much stronger position to make representation to the federal government so they can play their part. But the key word is "consider", and as long as that's in there, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that gives the debate very wide latitude and leeway, and I would hope you would rule it as such.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order. I disagree very strongly with the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I can't understand why he'd want to stop in midair on a particular motion. It says, "consider making representations to the Government of Canada". It doesn't say, consider -- stop -- let's dream of something else. I would suggest that both his debate on it and [that of] the other member from the opposition made it quite clear to me that they were not concerned with the original motion, but rather we're off on a different tangent altogether, Mr. Speaker.

#### Point of Order

MR. SPEAKER: Before dealing with the point of order, it would seem that perhaps the operative word might be "urge". I think the substance of the matter is whether or not the Assembly may be taken by surprise.

Hon. members undoubtedly were prepared to debate the topic of the resolution as it appeared on the Order Paper, which is to urge the government of the province to make certain representations to the Government of Canada. I would suggest that if there are any other opinions which hon. members would like to express on the point of order, they might consider that aspect of the matter.

I would also say that the debate on the motion, or on the substitute motion which is sought to be submitted to the Assembly for its approval, really does not govern the substance of the motion or make it any particular kind of motion. On the contrary, the motion should determine the direction and relevance of the debate.

So I would say, with great respect, to those hon. members who have dealt with the point of order on the basis of the debate which took place on the motions, that perhaps we could come to grips with the point of order more effectively if we were to consider whether there might be an element of surprise to hon. members now being required to debate an amendment which purports to introduce a subject matter which may or may not -- it may be a question of opinion. I would prefer that we might have some further observations from hon. members before dealing with it definitely, although it would be a pity to use up the private members' time on the question of order, to any undue extent.

There's no question at all that both the motion and the substitute motion deal with assistance for the handicapped. They are on that general topic. But that would still permit of a wide variety of manners in which the handicapped might be assisted. As I say, my concern is whether or not the Assembly might be taken by surprise by the substitute motion.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, and taking into consideration the operative words you have perhaps directed our thinking to, I'd just like to say that the substitute motion does, in fact, take us by surprise in the sense that in removing the words, "to consider" after "Province", the substitute motion directs us, in fact, to consider the expenditure of funds which the Lieutenant Governor in Council has not had the opportunity to review, whether, in fact, that would be in order to place this type of program. The substitute motion requires us to vote on a monetary situation which I think we are not prepared to deal with at this moment.

Apart from the principle of assisting the handicapped, with which principle I agree, I think the substitute motion is very clearly out of order in that regard. Had the hon. member included in his substitute motion that the province consider putting in place a plan, is something that we could consider and deal with in our debate, and perhaps even vote on favorably. But simply to give a directive that a plan be set in place which requires the expenditure of funds, I think certainly creates an element of surprise. It creates many other problems that could not have been given consideration by the members. I would say that on this point of order we should vote that the substitute motion is out of order.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, if I could summarize very briefly. My position is, referring to Annotation 203 paragraph (2) which refers to the subject matter of a motion, that the subject matter of the main motion was consideration of representation to the Government of Canada. That seems to me clearly to be the subject matter of the main motion. My argument is therefore, pursuant to paragraph (2) of 203, and also (5) of 203, that the amendment we have before us is foreign to the subject matter because it deletes altogether any reference to representations to the Government of Canada, the consideration of representations to the Government of Canada, and suggests instead that something should be done directly and immediately in this province by this government, rather than after consideration and by the route of representation to the Government of Canada. And so my argument is that the subject matter is indeed foreign to the subject matter of the main motion.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it's not often that I have the opportunity to disagree completely with the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands, but this is one of those occasions.

I would submit, following his argument, that what the motion does can be identified by reference to the verbs in the motion. The first one is to "urge"; it's a message from this Assembly to the government. That in itself is a first action. Secondly, that the government should "consider", thirdly, that it should "consider making", and fourthly, that it should "consider making" so that somebody else can "amend" to do yet a sixth action, which is so that somebody might "receive" something.

Both motions, I'm sure, deal with the basic objective of the mover, which related to the assistance to be provided to the handicapped. I submit that if it's possible to amend the motion in any way, this amendment must surely be in order.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: We're going to be using up all of the private members' time on the point of order. Perhaps we could hear from the hon. Member for Little Bow, then deal with the matter.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in order to save time, I certainly agree with the Member for Edmonton Jasper Place in that, first things first. The first thing is to urge, secondly, requesting that body to make a request to a second body, the Government of Canada, and thirdly, to discuss the action. That is the message, that's to take place. Certainly in both motions, we are urging, and I'd certainly like the Speaker to consider that.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, if I may, the point that was made by my colleague is very important, I think. If we agree that the question of subject matter relates to the use of verbs . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps we should deal with the matter now.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It would seem that if the substitute motion were adopted, it would result in action by the Government of Alberta and the expenditure of provincial funds. If the original motion were adopted, it would result in action by the Government of Canada and the expenditure of Dominion funds. It also seems to me that in fairness to the hon. member who put the matter on the Order Paper, we should proceed with the debate on the motion as it is on the Order Paper. If the hon. Member for Little Bow would like to put a substitute motion before the Assembly, it might better be put on the Order Paper on notice. In other words, having had the benefit of the observations of hon. members, and I admit it is a matter of opinion, I would have to say that the subject of the substitute motion is not sufficiently on all fours with that of the original motion to be acceptable as a substitute motion. Perhaps hon. members would now like to continue debating the original motion.

#### MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (reversion)

MR. HORSMAN: In dealing with the original motion, may I say, Mr. Speaker, that as a new member I was rather interested in the procedure that was just adopted. It certainly cut down the amount of time that was available for me to speak, if nothing else.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I hope the handicapped committee has the opportunity to read [interjections] what we've seen in the last 10 minutes [interjections] in light of the comments made by the member just now.

MR. HORSMAN: I consider this to be a very serious matter. There are two types of handicapped, Mr. Speaker, physically and mentally handicapped citizens. Of course, it is a joint federal and provincial responsibility. During the last election campaign I had the opportunity, of course, as most of you did, of going door to door and by so doing to come into personal contact with people, constituents. The handicapped, of course, who are at home, were at home. Despite the fact that on many occasions I found doors with no one home, when I found the handicapped at home, particularly during the mornings and afternoons, I was able to spend some more time with them discussing the problems they faced as handicapped citizens.

Of course, as well, I had the opportunity as most of you did of visiting members in institutions, both in nursing homes and in auxiliary hospitals. I think the difference, Mr. Speaker, could be noted -- not only the difference in attitude, but the difference in cost which I will touch on later. Those physically handicapped persons -- I'll be dealing mostly in my remarks with physically handicapped persons -- living within the family environment at home had an entirely different attitude towards life. Quite frankly, Mr.

Speaker, I was extremely impressed on many occasions at how cheerful they were considering the fact that they were indeed very seriously handicapped, in many cases confined to wheel chairs, unable to even move about except with the assistance of other family members.

On the other hand, those people in institutions appeared by and large to have abandoned hope of participating meaningfully in our society. So, Mr. Speaker, if the government in its programs, in co-operation with the Government of Canada, and perhaps following the lead in some cases of other governments at the provincial level, can do something to assist in providing home care for handicapped citizens, it will be a great step forward.

I can think of a couple of cases in particular, of course, Mr. Speaker, without naming the constituents in question. Both of these cases were gentlemen who were severely crippled, both of whom had built workshops in their homes in which they engaged in woodworking and that type of work. They were making some modest income from the work they were engaged in. I say very modest, but the important thing is that it gave them something meaningful to do, something to provide for the support of their families and their homes.

I think it is important to note as well that those who are actually living in their homes with their families are paying their way. They are paying their municipal taxes. They are paying their utilities. They are doing so on a very minimal standard of living indeed. I am hopeful, Mr. Speaker, that the level of public expenditure required by both levels of government will be raised so that these citizens will not be required to barely subsist, but that they will be allowed to live in dignity.

I think it's most important, Mr. Speaker, that we encourage the family life I've referred to. If the wife or the husband is disabled, what a tremendous testimony it is indeed to the family and to the love that exists in the family home that the other partner and the children are prepared to do all that is necessary to maintain a good standard for the handicapped person.

One point touched on earlier in this debate related to the question of going on welfare, if I can use that term. I would like to add my view to that expressed earlier today. I would prefer to see a pension provided than to require a handicapped person, through absolutely no fault of his own, to go through all the procedures and red tape involved in obtaining welfare or social assistance. I think it was regrettable that the government of the day abandoned the pension principle, both for handicapped persons and widows -- and that's a subject I hope to return to in debate at a later time -- and replaced it with the concept of social assistance or welfare. I should like to see the hon. minister reconsider this position, Mr. Speaker, so handicapped persons are not required to undergo what in many cases are humiliating experiences in regard to the question of obtaining a subsistence level.

I can refer, as well, to the situation, Mr. Speaker -- and I hope the minister will take this home care concept under consideration. One particular case involved a mother who was in advanced years and had a stroke. Her daughter, who assumed her care, could have easily taken the mother to a nursing home, or perhaps to an auxiliary hospital in this case, and had her institutionalized. Instead, she abandoned her own employment, gave up her job, to look after her mother. Now she is suffering great financial hardship because she herself has no income from employment, and all the two of them have to live on is the mother's old age pension. Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister will take this type of home care into consideration. Surely it is not equitable or just that this woman should have to give up her income entirely to look after her mother, who became handicapped because of illness.

The conduct of this particular daughter demonstrates more clearly than anything that there is, in this province, the type of family that was really the foundation of our western culture. I am extremely proud that this lady in Medicine Hat undertook this type of care. There are hundreds of other cases I'm not personally familiar with, but I've heard of. I suggest that we, as members of this Legislature, should urge the government that steps be taken very quickly to alleviate this type of hardship on the part of members of a family who care for their disabled parents or children in their home.

Mr. Speaker, there is another area, I think, that has not been touched upon and that is with regard to the question of local organizations providing work and training for handicapped persons. In Medicine Hat it is called the Rehabilitation Society Workshop. I'm sure there are similar organizations elsewhere in the province. The Rehabilitation Society Workshop is an organization with which I have become quite familiar over the years, Mr. Speaker. It is now providing services for almost 100 disabled or partially handicapped persons. I have always been impressed when I have used their services, and I've used their services both in my practice of law and certainly in political campaigns. Mr. Speaker, they have provided excellent and inexpensive service for printing and providing buttons and that type of thing. I've always been impressed with their cheerfulness and helpfulness. I would urge the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health particularly to review the proposal, which is before her department at the present time, for providing an appropriate permanent building for this particular association.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. With great respect to the present speaker, it would appear we are getting very, very far off the subject of the motion, which is to make a recommendation to the Government of Canada. The cheerfulness of the handicapped and their need for some kind of institution or program by the Province of Alberta may not be directly connected to the subject matter of the motion.

MR. HORSMAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have concluded that portion of remarks. It is getting very close to 5:30, but I did wish to add just one point I thought was of great importance relating to the question of the Alberta Committee of Action Groups for the Disabled. Those proposals provided to each new member, relating to services for the disabled in Alberta, are of very great interest indeed. I would ask each new member to read and consider the wide breadth of proposals laid before this committee and that the Legislature seriously consider taking action on them.

Mr. Speaker, I hope perhaps, if this matter comes up again, to resume my remarks on this. May I have leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, before adjourning the House, just a reminder that Subcommittees A and B will be meeting tonight: Subcommittee A considering the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, in Room 312 at 8:30 p.m.; and Subcommittee B considering the Department of Agriculture in the Carillon Room, beginning at 8:00 p.m. Tomorrow afternoon we will continue in the House in Committee of Supply with the estimates of the Department of the Attorney General, followed by the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the Assembly do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion for adjournment by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30.

[The House rose at 5:30 p.m.]