

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: Thursday, October 14, 1976 2:30 p.m.

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. FLUKER: Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to introduce to you, and through you to this Assembly, some 42 Grade 8 students from the Racette Junior High School in St. Paul. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Leroux and Mr. Ouellet, parent aide Pat Foisy, and their driver Mr. Krawchuk. They are seated in the members gallery, and I would ask them to rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

**head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Anti-Inflation Program**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier and ask if there have been any discussions between the province of Alberta and the federal government with regard to the federal government pulling out of the anti-inflation program prior to the three years initially announced, I believe, a year ago last night.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, there were no such discussions.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Is it the intention of the Government of Alberta to make representation to the federal government in light of the Premier's comments yesterday concerning the economic well-being of the province, and the effects of the anti-inflation program?

MR. LOUGHEED: No, Mr. Speaker, we're not going to be making such representation. We expressed our view when we were called on Thanksgiving Day a year ago and informed as to the federal program.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the Premier. Is it the intention of the Alberta government to enter into discussions with the federal government prior to Alberta's arriving at a decision as to whether it will continue its program at the end of March 1977? What kind of consultation will take place between Alberta and Ottawa from now until the end of March?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd be doubtful whether or not there would be any such discussion, although events may alter that position.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the Premier. It flows from the question period yesterday when the Government House Leader indicated, I believe the term was, there had been no representation from groups in Alberta, pro or con, on the continuation of the program after the end of March. Can I ask . . .

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I don't believe I said that. I think I said no official communications were received from Ottawa on the matter. I believe that was the statement I made, but I'd have to check into it.

MR. CLARK: Following along the correction made by the Government House Leader, Mr. Speaker, is the Government House Leader or the Premier in a position to indicate what type of representation the Alberta government has received from Albertans on the question: should Alberta continue after March '77 or not?

MR. LOUGHEED: As I said yesterday in the House, Mr. Speaker, I think this is clearly a matter for the Members of the Legislative Assembly. We'll be anxious to hear the views of members and are prepared to continue with Motion No. 2 as long as members desire.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to either of the honorable gentlemen. Will the government outline to the Assembly what steps it plans to take in its canvassing and assessing of views of organizations and individuals in this province before arriving at a position as to whether to continue our provincial program after March '77?

MR. LOUGHEED: I can only repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that the function or role of a Member of the Legislative Assembly is to have an assessment of the constituents at large. Public groups make their views known, and of course we will take them into consideration. But the basic views we will take into consideration are those of the Members of the Legislative Assembly as discussed in this Chamber.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Would the Premier indicate what type of formal monitoring mechanisms or internal structures the government may have to make the decision to 'de-control' or control, or continue the program in March? What is happening at the present time? Is there a formal structure to look after this matter?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better formal structure than the Legislative Assembly: the decision by the government caucus, bringing the decision to this Assembly, and if necessary a division to that effect.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification. Did I understand from the answer of the hon. Premier, Mr. Speaker, that it was not anticipated that the Alberta government would be

carrying on discussions with federal authorities concerning the extension of the temporary anti-inflation measures beyond March 31?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the situation is that the Prime Minister made it quite clear to us on a number of occasions that he intended to carry on this program for some three years. We are taking him on that basis. If he has made any distinct change in his policy, no doubt he will let us know.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Bearing in mind the hon. Premier's answer, is it the intention of the Government of Alberta at this point in time to extend The Temporary Anti-Inflation Measures Act beyond March 31 to coincide with the three-year period announced by the Prime Minister a year ago?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I answered that precise question. In addition it was answered yesterday by the Government House Leader.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary to the Premier. The Government House Leader indicated prior to the opening of this session that the government would make an announcement in December. At that time can we expect an indication as to whether the controls will continue? Will there be a firm decision at that time, so we will have an indication of where the government stands prior to the spring session of the Legislature?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe I did indicate there was a possibility, perhaps even a probability, of an announcement by the government prior to the end of December of this year as to its intentions with respect to anti-inflation in the year ahead.

#### Rent Control

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has his department been doing any monitoring to see what effect rent controls are having on rent increases and on the supply of rental accommodations?

MR. NOTLEY: Graham, you're on.

MR. CLARK: You're up.

MR. NOTLEY: You're up, Graham. It's your turn.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, maybe I could just repeat my question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. As a result of rent controls, has his department been doing any monitoring of rent increases and of the supply of rental accommodations in the province?

MR. HARLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, a certain amount of monitoring is occurring. I'm not sure exactly what the hon. member might be alluding to in the form of exact statistics, because of the fact that we are only hearing about those instances where applications for approvals of increases above the 10 per cent are

actually made to the boys in the rent regulation offices.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Is the minister in a position to indicate what is happening to the construction of rental accommodations in Alberta in the past year? What does the government's monitoring indicate?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I would refer that question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, in the whole area of construction of housing accommodation we are indeed having a record year.

MR. CLARK: Rental accommodation.

MR. YURKO: Yes, rental accommodation. With respect to apartments, I happen to have the latest data released in front of me and can give the hon. member the figures as of the end of August, in terms of the number of newly completed and unoccupied row and apartments in Calgary and in Edmonton. In terms of houses and duplexes in Calgary, at the end of August there were 301 newly completed and unoccupied. There were 230 row and apartments. There were virtually zero in November of 1975, and only about three row and apartment units newly completed and unoccupied in March of this year. This has been gradually going up in Calgary from three in March, as I indicated, to 230 at the end of August. So the situation in Calgary is indeed improving rapidly.

With respect to the Edmonton situation, the newly completed and unoccupied housing units, that is housing and duplexes, hit a low in March and started to increase since March of this year. There are now 158 new and unoccupied houses in the Edmonton area. The row and apartment situation in Edmonton is still difficult. But indeed a lot of applications are coming forward at this time, and we expect the situation to improve within the next six months.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Can the minister outline to the Assembly the procedure the government is going to use in arriving at a decision as to whether it continues rent control legislation past the time of the present legislation later next year?

MR. HARLE: Well certainly, Mr. Speaker, a considerable amount of time and effort is being devoted to trying to determine what consideration should be used on that particular question. I'm sure that when adequate information is available the right decision will be made.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister, so there's no misunderstanding. Is the minister indicating to the House that the government is using no criteria now in the monitoring that will lead to a decision as to whether we continue rent controls or we don't? Are we using no criteria or guidelines for basically making the decision? Or is it a hitch pocket decision?

MR. HARLE: Certainly not, Mr. Speaker. It's a matter of gathering the statistics which are necessary in order to arrive at a decision.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to advise the house today whether or not a decision concerning the extension of The Temporary Rent Regulation Measures Act will be made simultaneously with Alberta's position vis-a-vis the anti-inflation program?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the two decisions are somewhat related.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister indicate whether he has given a directive that no charges should be laid against landlords who have increased rent over 9 per cent?

MR. HARLE: Not at all, Mr. Speaker. I think the situation alluded to by the hon. member relates to the fact that there have been several successful prosecutions under the act as a result of decisions taken by the courts in this province. I think the feeling is that the act has credibility and, as a result, that there should be no further challenges in the remaining period that the act will be in force.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. In light of the minister being a fund of information today, is he in a position to advise the Assembly of the vacancy rate for the month of August in Edmonton and Calgary?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, we are trying to establish more reliable methods of determining the vacancy rates in Edmonton and Calgary. We know the procedure which is used by the federal authorities in this regard, and we are not overly happy as to the manner in which these vacancy rates are obtained. They are at the mercy of the information supplied by a selective list of landlords. So we are attempting to put together in the department — and we are working on it feverishly — additional methods of coming out with the actual vacancy rates.

One of the more appropriate ways is to attempt to determine how many newly-completed unoccupied units there are on the market, and that is exactly why I indicated, just a few minutes ago, the figures as of the end of August. It is generally recognized that we have to have a vacancy rate in the order of 3 per cent before there is much competition within the market. That is a guide towards which we are working with some degree of dispatch through many of our programs, and indeed in collaboration with the industry in Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a supplementary question to the hon. minister. At the present time, from the hopefully reliable information the minister has been able to glean, are we anywhere close to a 3 per cent vacancy rate in either of the two major cities?

MR. YURKO: I think it would be appropriate for me to indicate, Mr. Speaker, without too much restraint on my behalf, that we are not anywhere near the vacancy rate of 3 per cent in Edmonton and Calgary, particularly in Edmonton. The situation in Calgary is changing rapidly. We are not anywhere near a 3 per cent vacancy rate in Edmonton on the basis of the data available to us.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Can the minister indicate to the Legislature if many landlords who have gone over the guidelines have been prosecuted?

DR. HARLE: Well, Mr. Speaker, there have been several prosecutions. I could find the number for the hon. member if he wishes to have it.

### Coal Gasification

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Has the coal gasification pilot project proven successful, or have results yet been obtained?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it is too early to tell clearly whether it has been successful or not. An assessment is being carried on right now on the results of the current project in the Forestburg area, and I would be pleased to advise the members of the House as soon as that assessment has been completed.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Is it the plan to keep the fires burning throughout the winter, or is there going to be a stopgap this fall?

MR. GETTY: The present plan is to cease the operation during the winter.

DR. BUCK: To the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister indicate at this time if there is any relationship, or any trend towards a relationship, of pricing the cost of the product that comes by coal gasification as compared with the tar sands product? Is there starting to be any picture that gives us an indication of the two prices?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't detected any relationship in the pricing. The coal gasification prospects are for a future potential production. As we know, the synthetic crude oil production, by the mining method at least, is now a fact, and cost can be established.

### Oil Sands Development

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. In the light of his recent discussions with the federal Minister of Energy, is the minister in a position today to advise the Assembly whether any new developments are in the wind with respect to a third oil sands plant?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Are talks presently under way between the Alberta government or the federal government and any of the companies that over the last several years had showed interest in the development of a third plant? Are there any discussions under way at the present time?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, we have had discussions with Shell Oil and the Petrofina group from time to time about potential additional plants in the oil sands. As well, the Canadian Petroleum Association and the Independent Petroleum Association have carried out discussions with the Department of Energy and Natural Resources regarding future oil sands development. But we have not had any specific detailed discussions on commercial terms in the development of a third oil sands plant.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. During the discussions held between Alberta and federal officials, was any consideration given to reducing royalties on conventional oil production, as well as federal taxation on same, to provide more money for the private industry to thereby invest in possible future oil sands projects?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the minister had an opportunity to evaluate some of the predictions in the Harries report on oil pricing, which indicates there could be a drop in international oil pricing, and the impact of that particular report on the viability of the present Syncrude project?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the report from the Harries group was provided to me by Dr. Harries. I sent it to the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission, the Energy Resources Conservation Board, and the department for their assessment, and did take an opportunity to review it myself. It is one view amongst quite a variety of views that flow to the department on future prices of oil and gas on a national and international basis, and we are considering it as a view. It conflicts with some views, coincides with others, and I think only serves to add to the view I have: that it's virtually impossible to see beyond a very short-term basis of several years the future prices for oil and gas on a national and international basis.

#### **Labor's Day of Protest**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the Premier, then the Premier may farm it out to whichever minister he sees fit. I would like to know if the hon. Premier can indicate to the House if he has an overview of what effect the day of protest has had on provincial services.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'll refer the matter to the Provincial Treasurer in his capacity of being responsible for personnel administration.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say to members of the House that I was very impressed today with the sense of responsibility the province's civil service demonstrated towards the people of Alberta. I'm pleased to report that well in excess of 90 per cent of our employees were on the job today. When one keeps in mind, Mr. Speaker, that we always have 1 or 2 per cent away on any given day for valid reasons such as illness, et cetera, it's clear that the participation by the civil service in what was a non-legal activity was very, very minimal.

Significant numbers were out in some areas, particularly in the correctional institutions in the provinces. I think it may have been as high as 50 per cent there. There were other isolated pockets in the civil service where a number of people were out, but the overall percentage was very low. In fact a number of departments reported no absence, and surprisingly enough, one or two areas reported larger than normal attendance today.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary to the hon. minister. Did the large red Communist banner have a message for the government?

#### **Rent Control** (continued)

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could supplement the answer I gave to the hon. Member for Clover Bar. One landlord was charged in Edmonton involving three charges, one in Calgary involving four charges, one in Medicine Hat involving one charge, and three in Red Deer involving eight charges. There are 13 cases presently before the courts in Calgary, Red Deer, and Edmonton.

#### **Labor's Day of Protest** (continued)

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker. Can the Provincial Treasurer indicate to the Legislature what emergency measures were taken in the correctional institutes where many of the officers were off duty today?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, a detailed answer to that could be given by the hon. Solicitor General, who is not here today. I don't want to pretend to be able to give as detailed an answer as he could. But I am aware that the RCMP were present in a number of the institutions, providing the security service that would ordinarily have been provided by correctional institute officers.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the hon. Provincial Treasurer indicate what, if any, disciplinary action will be taken against the correctional officers in the correctional institutes for walking off today?

MR. TAYLOR: Fire them.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in an answer to a question yesterday . . .

DR. BUCK: The hon. member is showing his humanism, but carry on.

MR. LEITCH: As I indicated in an answer to a question yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we will be considering whether disciplinary or legal proceedings ought to be taken. But until we have available to us all the information we need in order to come to a proper judgment, I couldn't give any answer as to whether disciplinary proceedings will be taken, and if so, what kind.

### New Hospitals

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Could the minister indicate what progress is being made with the proposed new hospital for Brooks?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to report excellent progress.

I was in the community of Brooks along with other cabinet ministers during the cabinet tour. Prior to that, my colleague Miss Hunley and I had both reported to the Brooks community that the new hospital, including the incorporation of allied and public health space, was fully ready to proceed. The plans are now being worked on jointly by the Brooks hospital board, their architects and engineers, and the officials of the Alberta Hospital Services Commission.

In short, Mr. Speaker, they should be under way and ready to go to tender in a very short time.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister be able to indicate a tentative date when construction would be started on the hospital for Brooks?

MR. MINIELY: No I can't, Mr. Speaker, because as the hon. member I'm sure would appreciate, once the approval in principle is given by the government, the planning, engineering, and design rest with the board and the administration of the hospital. So it largely relates to how fast they can move, and then examination of the detailed engineering plans, as to when they will be ready to put it to tender and ultimately commence construction.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. minister. Can the minister indicate at the same time how the new hospital in Islay is progressing, and how many beds it will have?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I believe we just recently announced the approval of the replacement facility in the case of Islay. It will be a new facility, but as with hospitals in small communities in Alberta, we have worked out with the board a replacement facility that would be more oriented to extended or longer term

care rather than acute care beds. The detailed design and plans for Islay as well are being worked out among the board administration, their design and architecture team, the architecture and engineering section of the Hospital Services Commission, and my officials. It will proceed normally to ultimate tender and construction stages, as others in the province do.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the hon. minister. Can the minister indicate the size of the community at Islay that this hospital is going into?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check the actual population figures . . .

DR. BUCK: Ninety-four.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did you ask the question?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is probably not referring at all to the surrounding area. You cannot look solely at the population of a particular town; you have to look at it on a catchment area basis. So while he has quoted a figure — I don't have it on the top of my head — the figure he has quoted is probably irrelevant to the decision in any event.

### Deerfoot Trail

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Transportation. Is the minister in any position at all to report that any progress has been made, or that any date has been arrived, at as far as construction of the Deerfoot Trail south of 17 Avenue is concerned? My reason, Mr. Speaker, is that it is causing some serious problems in my constituency as far as transportation is concerned.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to be in the position to advise the hon. member in the House that in fact we have an agreement with the city of Calgary relative to the construction of the remainder of the Deerfoot Trail, that that portion is now in the planning and design stage, and that construction will be ongoing. My information is that it will continue over the next several years.

MR. KUSHNER: A supplementary question. I don't know if I got the answer clear or not. What I was really driving at, Mr. Speaker: has the minister got any specific date that has been arrived at as to when the construction will commence?

MR. NOTLEY: Atta boy, John.

AN HON. MEMBER: In the '70s.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. member and the House will appreciate that as soon as the design and planning stages are finished, the matter will go to tender. That of course will be the responsibility of the city of Calgary. He might want to inquire of the aldermen there as to a specific starting date.

### Auto Insurance Rates

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is with regard to car insurance rates. I wonder what steps the minister or the government has taken to assess the proposed 18 per cent car insurance rate increases in Alberta.

MR. HARLE: Well, I am sure the hon. member realizes that the Alberta Automobile Insurance Board has the jurisdiction to examine the rate increase applications made by the insurance companies operating in Alberta with regard to the compulsory portion of the Alberta automobile insurance policy. That board has a duty to perform, and in carrying out that duty has approved some increases. I believe I am correct in saying that not all companies as yet have had applications approved.

Certainly one group of companies received approval of an increase of almost 18 per cent in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary. Other companies that applied received approval of an increase of 13 per cent for the cities of Edmonton and Calgary. In both cases I might say [there were] lesser amounts in the Peace River block and for the rest of the province.

On September 29 the board held a news conference at which it explained the reasons for the increases. I am sure the hon. member realizes that the board employs its own actuary to advise it with regard to the applications that are made. They explained the process through which the board arrives at the decisions it has to make.

Obviously the board pointed out that it has to consider the fact that the companies apply for increases, which I might say were larger than those approved, by considering the experience they had last year. I think one has to recall that last year no anti-inflation program was in place. It arrived at the decisions it has made on the basis of the testing by its own actuary of the information it received.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Supplementary to the minister. Has the board or the minister made a request to the insurance companies to make any special considerations, for example to fixed income groups or to people already laboring under very suppressive or high costs of shelter and food?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, that's a rather unique approach, and I suppose one would have to think about that suggestion.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A final supplementary for clarification. In this discussion the minister has given information. I would ask the minister: has he been involved in discussions with the board with regard to the rate increases or any special considerations? It seems the minister has kept himself removed from the decision-making process.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member realizes that the authority of the board is contained in a statute, and the board has a duty to perform. My contact with the board in this area has related to pointing out to them the fact that an anti-inflation program is in place and should obvious-

ly be considered. The board, I am sure, took that program into consideration. But as I say, the largest part of the decision-making process the board uses is experience in increases in repair costs and increases in hospital and medical costs last year.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, A supplementary question to the hon. minister for clarification. I understood from the minister's answer that he brought the present anti-inflation program to the attention of the board. Mr. Speaker, was any directive sent out, or was it made very clear to the Automobile Insurance Board that in view of Alberta's participation in the so-called wage and price control program, the guidelines therein should apply as an important criterion in making decisions on applications for insurance increases?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, there was no written directive, if this is what you are asking. I did, of course, convey that message in discussions with the chairman of the board.

### Treasury Report

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the Hon. Premier. It flows out of remarks made yesterday in his address to the Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the Hon. Premier whether it's the intention of the government to table the assessment prepared by the Treasury Department concerning provincial support for local government in this province compared to other provinces, and also comparative municipal spending across the country.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why that document can't be tabled. We'll make the necessary arrangements to do so.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. NOTLEY: I would like to ask leave of the House, subject to Standing Rule No. 29, to move that the Legislative Assembly adjourn to debate a matter of urgent public importance, namely the Canadian Labour Congress day of protest.

Mr. Speaker, in rising briefly to outline the reasons I'm asking leave to introduce the motion I have just cited, it seems to me there are three or four major reasons why the Assembly should take some time this afternoon to discuss what, in my judgment and the judgment of many people, is a matter of urgent public importance.

Now I know that some may suggest there is no immediate danger to life or property, but clearly, Mr. Speaker, what is occurring in Canada today — we can argue over the numbers involved. But clearly, what is happening is a matter of historical significance to this country, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, of historical significance to the province of Alberta. Therefore, I would hope that in your ruling, the definition of emergency would be sufficiently broad, not only to encompass possible danger to life or property but rather to take note of the significance of the action occurring across the

country.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose that the most obvious reason advanced for not having a debate — I'm sure some members may advance that argument — is that with Motion 2, members of the Assembly will have an opportunity to discuss matters of general significance. That is technically true, Mr. Speaker, but I would suggest that by following that route, the problem is that Motion 2 gives members an opportunity to discuss all the issues that have occurred since the Assembly recessed in May. I don't think it would be fair to members of the House, who have constituency concerns to raise, nor would it be fair to those of us who want to talk about a myriad of issues, to find that our time was so compressed that we either had to make a choice on these other matters or on the question of the labor day of protest.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the rules of the House and the reason for the emergency debate procedure is, in the first place, to facilitate reasonable discussion of matters of public importance. I would suggest to you, sir, and to other members of the House, that Motion No. 2 does not really allow that kind of latitude for members to discuss the other matters that I'm sure they want to raise as well.

The third point I would cite is whether or not there is an urgency about the matter. Well, Mr. Speaker, with half the correctional institute guards in the province off the job today, it seems to me that the argument, the *prima facie* case, can be made with some degree of urgency. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that legislative institutions must be responsive and relevant. Clearly, when thousands of workers in Alberta, and possibly hundreds of thousands of workers in Canada, are participating in a national day of protest which is unparalleled in the history of Canada, it is in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, a reason for this Assembly to take the time to debate the ramifications of that protest, and that demonstration as it relates to the province of Alberta.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think with all matters which come under Rule 29, the submissions made really relate to two related, but distinctly different, questions. The first question is whether or not the issue is a matter of significant public importance, and the second is whether there is an urgency of debate right now.

On the matter of significant public importance, Mr. Speaker, I think we would not disagree with, and are sensitive to, the importance of issues in Canada and Alberta such as control of inflation and the health of the economy. But, Mr. Speaker, having said that, on the second question, the urgency of debate now, I submit that the *prima facie* case required by rules and tradition has not been made. I submit, sir, that there is no demonstrated sudden emergency; that the proceedings which some Albertans and Canadians are involved in today have been known for some months. The hon. Provincial Treasurer mentioned that well in excess of 90 per cent of the Alberta public service are on the job. I submit that it has not been demonstrated by the submission that the conduct of the public business of the citizens of

Alberta should come to a complete halt today.

I would underline that a full and complete opportunity will be provided in debate tomorrow immediately after the question period, through the vehicle of Motion No. 2, in a matter of no more than 20 hours. I would submit that the federal act relating to this subject expires December 31, 1978, and the Alberta act does not expire until March 31, 1977, in some five and one-half months. Accordingly, Your Honour, I would suggest that, while it may well be that the issue is one of significant public importance, the hon. member has not made the required *prima facie* case of urgency for debate now.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, on the question of the debate taking place this afternoon. I would say that members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition are certainly prepared to take part in such a debate this afternoon if that is the ruling of the Assembly. But I would say to the hon. members that today focussed attention on a national problem, a problem that all of us must live with. It seems to me that all too often in this Assembly we spend our time talking, and perhaps not listening to the people we should. Though I recognize that the matter is of significant public importance, it does seem to me that the matter could well be dealt with by following the suggestion that we made previously; that is, to make it possible for a wide variety of groups to come before this Assembly so we could attempt to work out some sort of consensus in the province of Alberta.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that we are prepared to take part in the debate this afternoon if that is your ruling. But in the long run, there is a real need of urgency for this Legislature to give some leadership in developing a provincial consensus. That leadership should come from this Assembly and should start in this Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the motion, largely because of the lack of urgency. I can't see how stopping the business of this House and talking about this is going to solve one of the problems that exist. It won't make any difference in the cost of food to the people; it won't make any difference to the levy of wages in comparison to the costs the people must meet; it won't make any difference to the federal program of permitting gigantic increases in some segments and no increases in the others. It is not saying that there are no grievances or things to be corrected, but talking about them here is not going to solve them by a motion of urgency.

The solution rests in legislation and administration, and in extending guidelines to the places where they will have effect. One of the largest ones in this country is interest rates. If we're going to deal with the thing at all, then it's not simply a matter of urgency, it's a matter of fighting inflation to the point where the programs that are set out are going to do the job that was intended, so that all the people of this province and this country can have a fair chance to live and enjoy its benefits.

I think there is irresponsibility on the part of people, particularly guards and attendants, when

they walk out and leave prisoners and mental patients without assistance. If that's responsibility, I don't know what responsibility is.

I can see no urgency in this at all. I can see the necessity of taking very definite steps to change and to act on some of the guidelines that have been set in the inflationary program. A debate on inflation, I think, can be brought up — many important points will be brought up — under Resolution No. 2. I'm hoping that this government and the government at Ottawa will pay attention to the things that need correcting, but I can't see how it can be done in this type of motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Without wishing to take up too much of the time of the Assembly on this matter, I should say first that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview not only gave the required notice, but he extended the Chair the courtesy of much more than the required notice. It is very much appreciated.

The first argument made by the hon. member is to the effect that this day of protest constitutes an event of historical significance. This is not envisaged by Standing Order 29 as being a matter for debate. If the House wishes to introduce that into the rules relating to emergency debate, then of course the Standing Orders must be amended. That sort of reasoning is not available to the Chair under the present rules in dealing with the question. The re-opening of Government House or the international ombudsmen conference could both be termed events of historical significance, but they would scarcely constitute emergencies of the type which would justify setting aside the business of the House for a debate this afternoon.

Moreover, in order to qualify, it would seem to me that the subject of the motion must be one which the Government of Alberta is competent to deal with, both legally and practically. It's difficult to conceive. We must remember, from a practical point of view, that what this motion suggests as an emergency is the day of protest. That day, as we all know, is going to end tonight at midnight. It's difficult to conceive how any action by any government which might result from proposals made in the course of such a debate could result in some action that might have any substantial or significant effect at all between now and midnight tonight. By that time, the emergency, if it is one, is certainly going to be over.

If it is in fact the hon. member's real concern to deal with the issues that may have given rise to the protest, or to any other protests of which we have had several in past years, then it's certainly open to him to deal with the matter by means of a motion on the Order Paper.

And I would respectfully differ with him with regard to Government Motion No. 2. It may well be that this allows broad debate, but it's a matter of choice for hon. members, including the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, as to whether they choose to narrow their remarks to one aspect of Government Motion No. 2. There is nothing in the motion that would prevent any hon. member from debating the issue which, indirectly, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview wishes to bring

before the Assembly.

I would therefore have to say that this is not the kind of motion, nor does it disclose the kind of emergency, which would qualify under Standing Order 29.

#### head: **MOTIONS FOR RETURNS**

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

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

All contracts for the production, processing, showing, or broadcasting of film or videotape and all contracts relating to the purchase or lease of equipment used in the production, processing, showing, or broadcasting of film or videotape by ACCESS during the fiscal year 1975-76.

MR. CLARK: In moving Motion for a Return 197, the Minister of Education has discussed the matter with me. I believe it's his intention to propose an amendment, which I'm agreeable to as long as it's the same one I have here.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret that I was unable to hear what the hon. Leader of the Opposition just said.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in moving Motion for a Return 197, I simply say that the Minister of Education has discussed the contents with me. He will propose an amendment to Motion for a Return 197, and I'm basically in agreement with that amendment.

MR. KOZIAK: I've been enjoying this green light in front of me, Mr. Speaker. It keeps flickering on and off. I guess it's my turn now.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to Motion for a Return No. 197. Although the body of the amendment contains most of the original motion, I'll read the whole motion as amended for the benefit of the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Might we have copies for both sides of the House, as well as for the Clerk.

MR. KOZIAK: The motion as amended would read as follows, Mr. Speaker:

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

A list of all written contracts with a consideration of \$1,000 or greater entered into by ACCESS during the fiscal year 1975-1976 for the production, processing, showing, or broadcasting of film or videotape, or relating to the purchase or lease of equipment used in the production, processing, showing, or broadcasting of film or videotape, but excluding contracts with individual performers, researchers, writers, and musicians.

[Motion carried]

204. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return



showing:

A copy of all correspondence during the period January 1, 1972 to May 12, 1976, between the Minister of Business Development and Tourism (and, prior to March 26, the Minister of Industry and Commerce) and the following companies:

Alberta Gas Trunk Line Co. Ltd.,  
 Alberta Gas Ethylene Co. Ltd.,  
 Dow Chemical of Canada Ltd.,  
 Dome Petroleum Ltd.,

relating to the establishment of petrochemical industry in Alberta, subject to the concurrence of the companies.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the motion stand.

[Motion ordered to stand]

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave of the House to withdraw Motion for a Return 206 for rewording and resubmission later.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect, I don't believe the hon. member would require the leave of the House. But in any event, he's got it.

207. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
 That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:  
 Any employment contract between Mr. Ron Butlin and any agency of the Government of Alberta concerning his work for Sport Alberta.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment to Motion for a Return 207 by adding after the word "Alberta": "subject to the concurrence of the principals involved".

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, [inaudible] question the amendment. When the minister moves the amendment "subject to the concurrence of the principals involved", I certainly am agreeable to consulting Sport Alberta and seeking their concurrence. But I would point out that the large bulk of revenue for Sport Alberta comes from this Legislature. The particular contract which we're involved in — I believe that that gentleman should not have the opportunity to say he doesn't want his contract made public when the money is all being put up by the taxpayer.

[Motion carried]

#### head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

1. Dr. Buck proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
 Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the Government of Alberta to give consideration to adopting a policy, in co-operation with the Law Society of Alberta, of tendering a proportion of legal work which

has to be referred to lawyers outside government service.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in bringing this motion to the attention of the hon. members of the Assembly.

It always concerns me, Mr. Speaker, as a taxpayer and more important as a legislator, when we hear about designated lists, be they provincial or federal. Mr. Speaker, I would like to cite an interesting story, which has a basis in fact, about the way a certain law office in this province operated. These two gentlemen happened to be the president of the federal Progressive Conservative constituency executive and the president of the federal Liberal constituency executive.

MR. NOTLEY: The same law firm, I bet, too.

DR. BUCK: It happened to be in the same law firm and it happened to be very convenient. Because it didn't matter who happened to be the party in power in Ottawa, all the Central Mortgage and Housing contracts just happened to go through that office. Mr. Speaker, I don't think conditions such as this can lead anyone to conclude other than, possibly, you've got both sides of the street covered.

Mr. Speaker, in the resolution we have before us today, I think possibly there can be a system just a bit better than the present system, where we have so-called lawyers' lists. And I think it's only fair that we look at the question to see if we can come up with a system that will be operable and will give all members of the legal profession an opportunity to participate in government business.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I think it's only fair that I try to assist the government to keep from self-destructing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

DR. BUCK: Because we see that abuses can certainly be brought into a system where we have so-called compiled lists. In this resolution,

that the Legislative Assembly urge the Government of Alberta to give consideration to adopting a policy, in co-operation with the Law Society of Alberta, of tendering a proportion of legal work which has to be referred to lawyers outside government service.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion, the Attorney General of this province raised a few eyebrows last spring when he very flippantly answered the question about the government practice of compiling lists of legal firms who do work for various government departments and agencies. The hon. Attorney General said these lawyer lists are compiled for use by a number of government agencies, including the Alberta Housing Corporation, the Agricultural Development Corporation, and the Alberta Opportunity Company.

Mr. Speaker, my effort and our effort is to ensure that all legal firms and individual lawyers in Alberta have equal opportunity to participate in government-related work, which is in many instances, we must agree, an extremely lucrative business. As the situation now stands, these departments and agencies draw up selected lists of legal firms, and only those

people placed on the lists get the business. That's the practical application of the way it works.

Mr. Speaker, there is ample evidence that these so-called exclusive legal firms can prevent other legal firms from getting business. One follows the other. When the Attorney General and the Minister of Housing and Public Works, Mr. Yurko, told this House they were directly or indirectly involved in the selection of legal firms to do government work, they agreed they were not in the least interested in the legal firms' political affiliations. And I believe them.

MR. CRAWFORD: We didn't say it quite that way.

DR. BUCK: Because, as the hon. Attorney General knows, we are all sworn to tell the truth. So if the hon. minister said he didn't worry about the people's affiliations, well, I have to believe him.

But when we look at the lists, Mr. Speaker, there happen to be a lot of coincidences. I'm not suspicious. I don't think any political affiliations will ever enter into the list that the hon. minister compiles. But there are some very interesting coincidences.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's only fair that we review a letter sent out under the letterhead of the Department of Municipal Affairs, Office of the Minister, Legislature Building, Edmonton:

30th December, 1971.

Executive Director,  
Alberta Housing Corporation,  
11810-Kingsway Avenue,  
Edmonton, Alberta.

Dear Mr. Orysiuk,

The Government wishes to rotate the services required by the Alberta Housing Corporation insofar as legal firms throughout the Province are concerned.

The attached list deals with the legal firms the Government wishes the Alberta Housing Corporation to use in the Cities of Calgary and Edmonton. For your assistance and guidance the name of the particular partner in each firm is listed and also a suggested percentage of the annual volume of work that might be diverted to each firm.

Will you kindly see that the . . . information is distributed to the appropriate officers of the Alberta Housing Corporation at your earliest convenience.

This new list should be put into effect commencing 1st January, 1972.

Yours very truly,

D.J. Russell  
Minister of Municipal Affairs

MR. NOTLEY: He's not in his seat. I wonder why?

MR. SCHMID: He's gone to get better.

AN HON. MEMBER: He goes to the dentist today.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, there are firms listed, legitimate legal firms in this province. Just because most of them happen to be fairly prominent Conservatives

doesn't really bother me that much. [interjections] What I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. NOTLEY: Those are the Tories.

DR. BUCK: . . . to the hon. Attorney General especially, is that when the directive, and I consider it a directive, indicates what percentage of legal work these firms should have, then I think the government's going too far.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are.

MR. NOTLEY: It's bad enough to have patronage, but to direct it?

DR. HORNER: It's like tendering on false teeth.

DR. BUCK: When the hon. Deputy Premier indicates it's like tendering on false teeth, I'd like to bring to the honorable doctor's attention the fact that when professional people do work for the people of this province through different departments, there is no direction given to the patient to go to such and such a dentist, or such and such a doctor because he may be a Tory, a Liberal, Social Crediter, or an 'NDPer'.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

DR. BUCK: So there is quite a significant difference, honorable doctor and hon. Deputy Premier. What we are doing in this instance is directing a government agency that they must, or they shall — or you know, it sure would be jolly nice if you did use such and such a firm.

MR. CLARK: If you want to keep your job.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, this is public information because this is a motion for a return. Some of the names on the list are MacLeod Dixon, et al, Calgary; Crosland Berezowski & Carruthers — the directive was that they get 25 per cent of the work; Barron McBain & Green, 25 per cent; Eldon Woolliams Korman & Moore, 12.5 per cent; Walsh Harkness Pittman Young & Clark, 12.5 per cent.

As I say, it really doesn't upset me that much that these people happen to have . . . I hope everybody has political affiliations, and I'm not sure of the political affiliations of these honorable firms. But there has been a directive about what percentage that firm should get. As a taxpayer and a legislator in this province, I just find it very, very hard to accept that this is right.

MR. NOTLEY: And it's not free enterprise.

DR. BUCK: Now we have some Edmonton lawyers: Milner & Steer, 33.33 per cent; Hill & Starkman, 33.33 per cent; a gentleman by the name of Peter Savaryn, 16.67 per cent; Hansen Joyce Ross & Hustwick, 16.67 per cent. Then there's a little notation from the Attorney General, August 31: Hal Veale Brower Johnson. I think Mr. Veale may be involved in political circles. I don't know. That's his business. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Attorney General went on to say that he didn't know any Social Credit or NDP lawyers sort of led one to believe there just

could be a relationship between the party in power and the lists. Maybe the Attorney General can explain to us that there wasn't any, and I would have to believe him. But this indication that there is a direction to certain law firms, and a percentage, certainly leads one to believe there is something more than an open system to select the best law firms available to serve the people of this province.

Now I am sure that the Law Society of Alberta and the legal profession within the province would be much more comfortable with an agreement whereby at least the major portion of the legal work required by government agencies were available on some type of — not necessarily a tendering basis, but an open opportunity for all legal firms in this province to participate in government work. Mr. Speaker, that's really what we are striving for.

AN HON. MEMBER: Like the Socreds did for 35 years.

DR. BUCK: Like the Socreds did for 35 years. If there were wrongs, Mr. Speaker, two wrongs don't make a right. When the government rose to the defence when Roy Watson Agencies received government insurance, they said, well, we don't know who had the automobile insurance before Mr. Watson got it. We assume he had to be a Social Crediter. So, if it's okay to be a Social Crediter in the first instance, it's twice as okay to be a prominent Progress Conservative in the second instance.

AN HON. MEMBER: We knew it was a Socred.

DR. BUCK: Well, if the hon. member knew it was a Socred, he's one up on me, because I didn't know. But two wrongs do not make a right.

DR. HORNER: That's why you lost the leadership.

DR. BUCK: If I hadn't lost the leadership, the hon. Deputy Premier wouldn't be sitting there. I say that in all due humility.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well done, doc.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, what I am really trying to do is to prevent government, and place it in the position where there will not be any suspicion. I have tried to do my best for this government. Through my diligent lobbying, I have elevated the former Minister Without Portfolio, Mr. Dowling, to a full portfolio. I am trying my best to get Dr. Warrack out of a portfolio.

MR. NOTLEY: You and all the gas co-ops.

DR. BUCK: I think I may be making some progress, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones is practically out of the door now. If he moves any further, he won't be in the House. But, Mr. Speaker, in tendering, or in the process where we use firms other than designated ones, I think we may find that we may get a quality of work which may be as good, or better than what we are getting now, and without any shadow of a doubt about it not being a political appointment.

How do you justify to the man in the constituency or on the hustings that there is a short list of lawyers

suggested by a minister of the Crown, that these firms be used, and a certain percentage of them be used? When you go out on the hustings it's very, very difficult to look a constituent in the eye and say, look sir, everything's above board in our government, we would never suggest that such and such a legal firm be used. And you know, it's a great comfort to go out on the hustings and be able to look that person in the eye and say, we're running a clean government. We would just never think of political patronage because it's just more than a coincidence that some of our ex-football playing buddies happen to become deputy ministers. I mean, it's a coincidence. And we just don't want this to happen, when we pick legal firms.

So, Mr. Speaker, we could really draw parallels between appointing firms and political appointments. But we all know it's a political fact of life that certain friends of ours who we feel have expertise come into government service, as long as it's not abused. I think the taxpayer can go along with this, because it's just a natural inclination. But when the Attorney General says he appoints people to do government business whom he just happens to know socially, academically, or politically, and he doesn't know any others, and these people are the ones who do government business, I think there has to be a better approach.

MR. NOTLEY: Clean up the department.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, when a speech similar to this was given in the House of Commons, it was treated by the government of that day, which happened to be the Liberal government, the government of this country for most of the time . . . I think the present leader may win the next election by default, which I'm not sure will be good or bad for Canada. But the leader of the present Tory party in Ottawa, the hon. Joe Clark, was very concerned about this matter, and he was berated by the government of that day. And I'm sure I will have a few suggestions from the government indicating that this system couldn't work, that we couldn't put it out on an unbiased basis.

Mr. Speaker, I believe a system can work. I believe it's time that government tries to get a system like this to work so we do not have these so-called lists, these preferred lists, and especially that we indicate how much of this government work these different law firms should get. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I see no problem with the government, in co-operation with the Law Society of Alberta, establishing a practice where all lawyers, all legal firms in Alberta, have equal opportunity to be involved in the legal work now becoming an important part of government and government agency function. If this is done, Mr. Speaker, there can be no accusation and no hint of patronage, as there can be that doubt now.

I think that as a representative of a former government I can stand very proudly in my place. Mr. Speaker, the records have shown that the governments of the previous 35 to 40 years have been relatively clean of patronage.

MR. SCHMID: Oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Sick again, Horst?

DR. BUCK: The hon. Minister of Government Services and Culture says, oh. I would like to ask the hon. minister if, when he talks about advertising, he can indicate to this Legislature how the Bureau of Public Affairs has grown from nothing to what it is now. Then maybe we can talk about how the system is really operating.

MR. NOTLEY: At a time of restraint, too.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. minister had listened, I said in the last 40 years, which gives the present government a fair pat on the back. But what I'm trying to tell the government is, let's make sure that the next three years of their tenure, which may be their last, may keep the citizens of Alberta proud of the record of government in the lack of patronage.

So, Mr. Speaker, I welcome hon. members on both sides of the House to give this their fair consideration. But most important, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the learned members of the legal profession like the honorable gentleman from Calgary-Buffalo with his usual eloquent, well thought-out speech. I'm sure he can add to our debate. Because, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to this Legislature, to the government, to the legal profession, but most important, to the taxpayer of this province.

I thank you for your indulgence.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to respond to the resolution of the Member for Clover Bar. If tendering means bidding, I can only draw from my own business experience and offer a few remarks on that basis.

If you're bidding tangible items where there is a precise specification of items to be tendered, you have the ability to compare bids objectively, and there is a certain ease with which potential tenderers can be isolated. As well, Mr. Speaker, there's an ease with which these candidates can be contacted once they have been isolated.

Intangible items and services, on the other hand, are rarely subject to tender. The selection is usually based on talent. The best talent usually gravitates toward the maximum market geographically, so it can maximize earnings. How would the rural legal firms in my learned colleague's mind be contacted and evaluated?

DR. BUCK: They pass the bar exams.

MR. PLANCHE: Specialization or proprietary patents can indicate selection as a possible candidate. In the case of legal firms, this in turn would tend to more firmly concentrate the source of legal help in fewer hands.

Finally, selection is based on previous use and trust. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that will remain forever is the tendency for people to do business with those they know and trust. In the broad area of professions tendering, I have no expertise. But I can hardly imagine dentists bidding on services to individuals or groups. Can you imagine looking in everyone's mouth prior to bidding? Mr. Speaker, would the dentist charge for that initial look into everybody's mouth prior to bidding? Would surgeons make a preliminary incision and then bid?

In conclusion, I submit the resolution is frivolous,

Mr. Speaker, and I think the time of this House can be better spent with problems that Alberta has in abundance. I encourage all the members to vote it down.

Thank you.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words with respect to this motion. Particularly after a recess of four and a half months, the opposition feels it is of such great importance that they make it the number one priority in this debate today.

I am left to wonder if the hon. Member for Clover Bar realizes that the legal profession is composed of many different fields with distinguished people specializing within them. When you require a professional advisor, whether a doctor, a lawyer, a dentist, or an accountant, what do you look for? You look for a person who is competent, who has the ability to do the job. You look at where he is located. If we tendered, I can see that the large city firms would have a distinct advantage over the rural firms. I feel it is imperative — that the relationship between the client and the lawyer requires a tremendous amount of confidentiality and mutual trust.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is incumbent upon the government to hire the person or firm most capable of representing the people of this province. It would be a sad day for Albertans if we accepted the lowest tender bid without due regard for the ability of the law firm or the lawyer.

With this in mind, I would suggest that this motion is ill-conceived, and I would ask that all members totally reject it.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I am looking forward to this motion, and couldn't let the opportunity pass without making one or two observations.

I am a little surprised that only one member of the opposition has chosen to speak on what has apparently captured the interest and attention of the opposition so much that it is a designated motion for today. I agree with the hon. Member for Lloydminster that this is so important to them that one of them would speak, and moreover that it would be the first designated motion of the fall session. I am flattered by that. I think it's a very important subject, and I'm grateful we're discussing it this afternoon. But I don't know that it falls into the category of a matter of major public interest or concern. The three to the left obviously don't think so. I shouldn't say that.

I was about to say that I seldom agree with the mover of the motion, but that's really not true. I find I agree with him fairly often, and I certainly agree with his objective. So I congratulate him for bringing forward the motion, even though the solution he proposes is not, in my judgment, very practical.

Mr. Speaker, I read his objective to be that he wants to involve more lawyers in working for the Crown in those areas where we engage outside counsel. I think his expression is that he wants to provide an equal opportunity to participate in legal work for lawyers. I think that's an objective I could certainly support — in fact, do support.

If it's not obvious to the legal profession now, I issue this public invitation to them: if they want to participate in doing work for the Crown in some areas — and this is somewhat foreign to the nature of

lawyers — I invite them to contact me, and let me know, and I'd be very happy to consider it. I might say that many of them do. Certainly they're not reluctant to contact my office directly when they are concerned about certain appointments to the provincial court. In that area, I invite any member of the public to examine the appointments — these are full-time paid positions — to the provincial court that I have made since taking this responsibility, and my predecessor in office. If the political persuasion is important to you, examine if you will the political persuasion of these people. I think I can stand the test of anyone's light on that subject.

Perhaps I should hasten to correct the record, Mr. Speaker. My honorable colleague opposite suggested that I was saying that political considerations were not involved. Fortunately, I was happy to hear him subsequently reply that he did acknowledge that I had referred to my association with members of my profession, based partly on a political association. That's a very clear and obvious situation, and a very honest statement. So political considerations, while not primary, are certainly involved. I wouldn't want anyone to get the impression that I had denied that to be the case.

The hon. member opposite moving the motion made something of the fact that in one instance at least — and I am not aware of this personally, I have not had occasion to do so — a certain percentage of legal work was to be assigned to certain people. On the face of it, that would appear to be an undesirable way of allocating work between and among individuals and firms. However, I think you have to examine the natural propensity of an individual, a Crown corporation, or a government department. The natural inclination is to start dealing with a lawyer, enter into a very happy relationship with that individual because it is a good working relationship, and continue working with that lawyer. You will find — and there is evidence of this — that instead of spreading the work around to many professionals who are able to do the specific work involved, often what a government department, an agency, or a corporation did in the past was to concentrate all their support and work on one, two, or at least a very small number.

Our objective is the objective of the mover of the motion, Mr. Speaker: to broaden the participation by qualified members of the profession in doing work for the Crown. I suggest you broaden that by indicating to those who are involved in allocating the work that you want it shared around. One of the mechanisms for sharing is by indicating that you want a percentage of work allocated.

If you want some proof in the pudding, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest you can very easily examine records of this House and discover situations in the very recent past where certain agencies assigned almost all their legal work to a very narrow number of individuals. That is not the objective of this government. It is not my objective as Attorney General, nor is it the objective of any minister responsible for those corporations involved in assigning this work. Perhaps if we can find some other way than using a percentage allocation, we will be happy to do so.

The other comment the mover of the motion suggested was that he wants us to find a new system of allocating work. I don't object to that. That's a

laudable objective. But he has not really suggested the new system, unless the system as evidenced by his resolution is the tendering system. Now, I am willing and anxious to consider new systems. But I suggest, for a few reasons, why a tendering system, as has already been indicated in the House, is not the most practical.

First of all, let's examine the reasons for tendering. Presumably the reason for tendering is an attempt to get the best possible price. Well, price alone does not recommend any service. Those who consider price alone sometimes buy far less than they think they're getting. Price surely does not recommend any service. For those who may be concerned about price, some agencies establish their own fees and indicate to the profession: this is our fee. In many cases, it's less than what individual practitioners can make working for other clients. That's one thing I would say about price.

The second thing is that if any citizens, and I include the Crown in that, are ever unhappy with the fee charged by a lawyer, we are entitled to go to the clerk of the court and have that clerk set the fee. That's it, to assure we get the best possible price. I think that is a privilege that exists between the legal profession and its clients which doesn't, to my knowledge, exist between any other profession and the clients or patients of the other profession. That's an important distinction that exists in the legal community that I think is well worth maintaining. That option is open to the Crown as well.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution is impractical, for among other reasons it suggests that we seek the co-operation of the Law Society in moving toward a tendering system. I haven't discussed this question of tendering with the benchers of the Law Society, although I had a brief chat with the president of the Law Society about it. I can't speak for the profession, but I don't have much doubt that the Law Society would find this an unacceptable procedure. I think they are anxious that clients, including the Crown, receive the best service they can possibly acquire.

But I don't think they would see tendering as the most successful mechanism of either getting the work into more hands or maintaining the quality of work that is essential, that I think we as government are entitled to claim, in the same way a citizen or a private business is entitled to claim top quality professional services. In short, Mr. Speaker, the government should be able to be treated in these circumstances like any citizen or any private business. The affairs of the government are no less important.

Without taking up too much time of the House, I would suggest that the government is entitled to approach the selection of certain professional services in the same way that I as a citizen or a business person approach the selection of professional services, whether they are dentist, doctor, or lawyer services. In looking at that, price is a factor, but it certainly isn't an overwhelming consideration. Ability, experience, quality of work, convenience and access to the professional, the personality, the way one gets along with these people — in short, all the many subjective factors that are wrapped up in confidence have far more to do with the selection of a professional to provide services to me as a citizen or to government than price alone.

One of the other reasons I think this resolution is perhaps impractical as a system, suggested by the mover, is that it suggests that a proportion of legal work — which I assume to mean a percentage of the Crown work — be referred. I would not want to have imposed on me, Mr. Speaker, a system that required me to assign a certain percentage of criminal work to those who happened to bid for it. I take great pride in selecting agents of my office to enforce the criminal law and other laws of this province, and I want to be sure that they are certain types of individuals with certain kinds of capacities and expertise. I for one, having personal responsibility for that as a law officer of the Crown, would not be prepared to see agents of the Attorney General assigned on some proportional or percentage basis to all comers.

For example, I would be very upset if I felt I had to select on a tender basis those individuals who were going to advise the Government of Alberta on constitutional questions. We have just come through a rather interesting and important discussion with respect to the patriation of our Constitution. You may be sure that this government has had to obtain constitutional advice on some of those important questions. I simply cannot imagine the consequences of having to go by tender, or on a percentage basis, [with] those who might be interested in giving us advice. That is a very, very narrow discipline in the law, and one in which I must insist on reserving the opportunity to go out and select who, in my judgment and the judgment of my officials, are the best men and women to advise us, not only in Alberta but in this country; and we've done so.

I would not want to go to a tendering process or take a percentage of those who bid when the Crown has to seek outside counsel, as we do from time to time, on very significant litigation matters. Let's face it. Not everyone is interested. Not everyone is able to handle those kinds of cases.

So, Mr. Speaker, while tendering has some immediate appeal for those who want to broaden the system, or for those who want to introduce greater equity in the system of the Crown employing outside counsel; while at first blush that appears logical and desirable, I suggest to you that it is subject to many shortcomings and pitfalls which would probably result in a detrimental effect on the independence of the legal profession and, secondly, would perhaps result in the provincial government, like any other private citizen, getting less quality than we are entitled to.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say there are ways of dealing with the situation to avoid some of the negative aspects that the mover has suggested. I think one of those ways is to broaden the participation by men and women of the profession who have a special expertise in some areas of the law, and I am attempting to do that. At the moment, I'm in that process and will be continuing it.

I invite all members of this House, and I invite members of the profession who feel they have a special expertise, to approach me. We'll be happy to assess it and review whether or not we're prepared to call on their services at some time in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. member close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in rising to close the debate, I would like to indicate to the hon. Attorney General that our quarrel is not in the areas where we require great legal expertise. I think it goes without saying that nobody in this province would want someone other than an expert in constitutional affairs to advise us on constitutional affairs. I don't think we ever have to worry about anybody calling the Attorney General on that. I think we all know we would want the best information we could get.

But Mr. Speaker, when we go through Motion for a Return 173: law firm A — names don't really matter that much, it's the principle we're worried about — service supplied, foreclosure. Now, Mr. hon. Attorney General and Mr. Speaker, let's face it, even an articling student can go through that mechanism.

MR. FOSTER: No, that's not true.

DR. BUCK: Registration fee, Mr. Speaker — an articling student can certainly do that. We don't require any high-powered law firm to do that. And you go through this, Mr. Speaker: land assembly and development, legal fee for purchase of staff house — just how much legal expertise are we requiring?

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

We're not requiring a \$500 an hour legal firm to do this kind of work. All we're asking is that a proportion of this be made available without any indication that there may be political patronage. That's what we're asking for, Mr. Deputy Speaker. How did that grab you, Merv?

So what we're really asking for is that a law firm be selected through some other mechanism than we are presently using, because I make the accusation that that could be considered patronage. For people who are uninformed, it could be considered patronage. It's the people out in civvy street who do not want to place this government under suspicion. As I say, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I am trying to do them a favor so that they will come up with a better system than they are presently using.

Mr. Speaker, in the tendering system we are looking at price alone. But what is creeping into this government is a restriction to that tendering system, because we are seeing more and more invitational tendering by this government. How is the government going to defend that position?

And there is room in the tendering system for invitational tendering. If a contractor builds 23 miles of road between Edmonton and Ponoka, and maybe another mile and a half of road is needed to connect with an intersecting road, it's only right that the contractor who was on that job be given the opportunity to do that mile and a half of road. Nobody from High Level is going to bid on a mile and a half of road and think he can compete with a contractor who is on that site. There is room for invitational tendering.

But, Mr. Speaker, when we let a contract as large as the one where we're building the hangar, and we need that so quickly and so desperately that it goes to invitational tender, I think that's wrong, just as wrong as when we have lists of lawyers presented and the agency says, these are the lawyers and this is the

percentage. That is wrong, and nobody on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker, has indicated to me that it is not wrong.

MR. GHITTER: Are you serious?

DR. BUCK: Hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, I am serious. I am serious because there is just too much correlation between these lists and some of the people associated on these lists.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the record a very interesting headline and a very interesting story. I think it bears repeating because it really shows us that certain things can creep into this type of system of selecting legal firms. And it does concern me. It comes out of one of the local newspapers, a very prominent local newspaper, April 20, 1976, the *Edmonton Journal*. Headline: "P.C. 'wet nurse' in early years now heads Party. I think the hon. members of the caucus should be reminded of this.

"Peter Savaryn and the Alberta Progressive Conservative party have come a long way since 1956." That's a very valid statement.

I don't know the honorable gentleman. I assume he's a good man. If we use his services, he's got to be a good man.

That was the year Mr. Savaryn, a rookie lawyer fresh out of law school first became involved with the Progressive Conservative party in Alberta, an infant political organization struggling to grow out of its diapers.

Now, 20 years later, the Party is a healthy, powerful organization in which Mr. Savaryn plays an important part.

Earlier this month the 49 year old Edmonton lawyer was elected president of the Provincial Progressive Conservative Association at the Party's annual convention in Calgary.

For Mr. Savaryn, the Convention was not so much a personal triumph as it was a triumph for democracy. That ideal for some may seem a tired philosophical statement second only to embracing motherhood as one of the all-time good things to stand for. But to Mr. Savaryn, it is important.

"I am a lawyer first and politics is my most important hobby. My greatest love is politics. It is the highest form of public service, and without such service there is no hope — democracy will quickly come to an end."

Mr. Savaryn was born in the Ukraine, in 1926 where democracy, he said, was only theory. He left his homeland at age 16. A man with a keen interest in history, Mr. Savaryn paraphrased an ancient Roman orator to underscore his point.

"Cato said that some will try to tell you that politics is dirty and you should wash your hands of it. But he told them not to listen, for what they were telling you is to remain poor, ignorant, and exploited."

In 1950, he came to Alberta and within six years had met a few friends who were laying the ground floor for the Progressive Conservative party in Alberta.

"There were very, very few people in the party at that time (1956). It was, in fact, very grim. There was no organization, no membership or candidates willing to run. There were no funds.

The Party was just nonexistent. Yet we had high hopes. We knew someone was going to step in for the Socreds. They were at an end. The natural substitute was, we felt, the Progressive Conservative Party".

"It wasn't until 10 years later that the Party showed signs of revitalization. Along came a young ambitious lawyer who "was willing to give up a future in law and work full-time within the Party". The young lawyer was Peter Loughheed, who combined with circumstances to lead the Party out of its doldrums and into power four years later," said Mr. Savaryn.

He said the biggest task facing the Progressive Conservative Association during the coming year is to help the government decide on the future of the Heritage Trust Fund through a series of policy seminars on the matter.

I throw my interjection in: never mind the Legislature.

"The Fund is the greatest proposition before the government", says Mr. Savaryn. "There is no precedent anywhere in the world for it. We have to be cautious with it, both present and future."

Mr. Savaryn, fluent in five languages, graduated from the University of Alberta in law . . .

MR. GHITTER: On a point of order, if I may. We are all very happy to hear selected readings from the *Edmonton Journal*. But it was always my understanding in this House that if a person wishes to table something for the edification of the membership here, all he does is table it, and we'll read it if we like. But if the hon. member merely feels that we should spend our valuable time hearing him read hearsay from the *Edmonton Journal*, I would respectfully disagree, and would suggest that he enter the debate and leave it at that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo doesn't like to hear what I am saying, and doesn't like to hear what I'm reading. I have only one more sentence left so you may get that, hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo.

Mr. Savaryn, fluent in five languages, graduated from the U of A in law in 1956 and was admitted to the Alberta Bar one year later.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think in this particular circumstance, if you would refer to your material rather than read the whole of it. I think you know the rules of the House in this respect.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'm finished with the quotation. But the point I'm trying to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the honorable gentleman, who is a believer in democracy — and I say that's great, we need people involved in politics. But at the same time, when this prominent gentleman of some political persuasion happens to be doing government work, then we should go to a tendering system, because it's right here in the Alberta Housing Corporation list of solicitors that the honorable gentleman is doing work.

Now there's nothing wrong with that, not a thing

wrong with that, Mr. Speaker. If this firm were selected for some special expertise, we the taxpayers of Alberta would go along with that and welcome it. But when that particular law firm happens to be one of those that have been indicated by the minister. . .

MR. YURKO: What was the date [inaudible]?

DR. BUCK: The date? Do you want to read it? This one, Mr. Speaker, just happens to be the name of each legal firm engaged by the Alberta Housing Corporation during the fiscal years of 1974, 1975, and 1976, which happens to be quite recent. Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works, the letter was . . . The point is, Mr. Speaker, the directive was sent out. I'll find it for the honorable gentleman. The point, Mr. Speaker, is that we cannot just wash over this easily, because what happens is that one thing can certainly lead to another. I still haven't found the letter.

To refresh the memory of the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works, this was written by Mr. Russell, at that time Minister of Municipal Affairs, to the director . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Here he is, coming in.

DR. BUCK: . . . on December 30, 1971. Quite obviously, that policy hasn't changed, because we're doing business with some of these firms. So the next time we request a motion for a return, if the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works will give us a list of firms that the company is doing business with. And we have them here.

But the very important point, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not asking for great experts in any field. This is run-of-the-mill legal work in most instances, and every firm in Alberta, regardless of political affiliation, should have an opportunity to render its service to the people of Alberta. That is the important point, not some prescribed lawyers' list that has been presented by some cabinet minister. That is the important point, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. government members have not indicated to me that they are thinking of changing that system. Mr. Speaker, I say it is a wrong system. It has a tendency to lead to patronage, and therefore would leave the government, in the eyes of the people, under a cloud of suspicion. So I ask the hon. government members to support the resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion defeated]

#### head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

2. Mr. Taylor proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That the classification of films now known as "Family Entertainment" be changed to "General".

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Schmid]

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to commend the hon. Member for Drumheller for the

timely resolution regarding the classification of films now known as "Family Entertainment" to be changed to "General". At the same time, however, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I would like to add that we have a classification system across Canada which includes the term "Restricted Adult". This term is used in all provinces except Quebec. The terms "General" and "Restricted Adult", Mr. Speaker, would therefore be the correct terms to use in the province of Alberta. Two other terms are presently being used in this province which probably should also be adjusted to the words used in other provinces.

I would therefore like to have the resolution of the hon. Member for Drumheller amended to delete all words after the word "films", and to replace them with the words: "be reviewed with a view to determining the feasibility of using the same classification nomenclature in Alberta as is used in other Canadian provinces".

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, as the mover of the motion, I accept this amendment. I think it will do very much what we wanted the original motion to do.

[Motion carried]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 4:30.

[Motion carried]

#### head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT ORDERS** (Second Reading)

#### Bill 204 An Act to Amend The Alberta Health Care Insurance Act

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In rising to move second reading of Bill 204, I look around and say with a certain amount of regret that I don't see the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway in his place. I say that because the basic purpose of this bill was to eliminate second billing on the part of the medical profession, and I very much looked forward to his comments in view of his strong views on the subject. However, as I look on the other side, I see that we have the hon. Deputy Premier, the hon. Member for Grande Prairie, and the hon. Member for Macleod, so I'm sure we'll be able to undertake a debate on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, to begin, the basic premise on which Bill 204 is based is the philosophy contained in the Hall commission report. The report, as hon. members will recall, was commissioned by the former Conservative government of Mr. Diefenbaker. The commission evaluated medical care, not only throughout this country but did considerable travelling in other parts of the world, the United States, and in 1964 came in with a major set of recommendations. It was on the basis of many of those recommendations, as well as the action of the government of Saskatchewan in 1962, that much of the current medicare legislation is now on the statute books of the land.

Basic to the Hall commission philosophy, Mr.



Speaker, was the proposition that there is in fact a right to health, that the best that modern medicine can supply should be equally available to every citizen, but that people should pay for that coverage through as equitable a method as possible: in other words, equality of access to modern medicine. But the price tag should be removed.

The basic problem with second billing — and I just want to take a moment to clarify this question of second billing, at least as I see it — is that it acts as a deterrent. It is, if you like, an unwritten deterrent fee. Mr. Speaker, I would have to say, in honesty, that the majority of members of the medical profession in this province probably do not second bill. I think that has to be said in fairness to the medical profession, because it is very easy to jump to the conclusion that the vast majority of medical practitioners are second billing when, in fact, the information I've been able to obtain would indicate that while a minority are, the majority are not.

Mr. Speaker, dealing with the question of Bill 204, the basic argument for eliminating second billing is that the fee structure should be negotiated between the medical profession and the Alberta Health Care Commission. Once that structure is set, the fee should be paid, and that's it. There would be no second billing to the patient.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is a very important point to keep in mind if we recognize health as a basic right. If second billing occurs, even if a notice is posted in the doctor's office, it is invariably going to deter certain people from either going to that doctor or, perhaps, obtaining the medical assistance they require.

For just a moment this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, let me review the debate that occurred in our neighboring province of Saskatchewan where deterrent fees were introduced. Perhaps we might start at the beginning. In 1962, members will recall that there was a doctors' strike, when the Government of Saskatchewan at that time introduced the first medicare legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I raise that today deliberately, because there are many people in Alberta and throughout the country who are very much opposed to labor's national day of protest. They say it's a breach of contract and an illegal strike.

Mr. Speaker, in 1962 in the province of Saskatchewan, there was no question about the doctors' strike being illegal. But fortunately for Saskatchewan and fortunately for the country, the Premier of the province at that time had the wisdom to keep a cool head, and to say to many of those within the party that he happened to head, the CCF, that they should not zero in on prosecution, but should recognize that what was taking place in 1962 was in fact a political strike, and that the issues had to be settled with the right thoughtful assessment and careful evaluation. What took place several weeks later, Mr. Speaker, as members may recall, was the Saskatoon agreement. On the basis of the Saskatoon agreement, doctors went back to work and the Saskatchewan medicare plan became law, and a reality that eventually spread to the rest of the country.

I say that because there are some today who would urge reprisals against those who participated in the day of protest. I would simply use this opportunity to say, the cool head is just as important today in

dealing with the day of protest as it was 14 years ago in Saskatchewan in dealing with the doctors' strike.

Now, Mr. Speaker, moving on to what happened in Saskatchewan in 1968, the Liberal government of Ross Thatcher brought in a form of deterrent fees, additional fees charged by the doctors. The purpose of the deterrent system, Mr. Speaker, was to reduce the number of people using the medicare system.

In 1971, when the Government of Saskatchewan changed hands, a summer session of the Legislature was held, and Bill No. 4 was introduced. The purpose of Bill No. 4 was to eliminate second billing. I won't go over all the discussion that took place on this bill. But it seems to me that the basic arguments presented at that time apply today in the province of Alberta.

Deterrent fees, whatever you call them — call them second billing if you like — have a tendency to tax those who have a legitimate need for services. And the people who bear the heaviest weight are persons of low income. An interesting point with deterrent fees that was discovered as a result of the three-year experience in the province of Saskatchewan is that in the first several years, they tended to act as a force to discourage people from seeking medical help. Mr. Speaker, that's the last thing we should be doing. One of the basic arguments presented in the Hall commission report in 1964, one of the strongest reasons for a national health system, was the emphasis that could be put on preventive rather than curative medicine, after the fact, after people have become seriously ill.

Mr. Speaker, the irony occurred in the last of the three years, because while for several years there was a slowdown in the utilization of the medicare system in the province of Saskatchewan, that was a bottled-up slowdown, which in the third year increased by more than the average increase before the deterrent fees were implemented. Almost, Mr. Speaker, like the inevitable consequence of having wage and price controls: once you take them off, you have pent-up frustrations which boil overboard, and you then have recurring inflation.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we found that while it tended to inhibit the utilization of the system in Saskatchewan for several years, in actual fact, what occurred in the third year was an increase. But the increase was paid by the sick, by the people who needed the assistance. Mr. Speaker, I think that is totally wrong.

I know there are many people who would oppose the basic philosophy of Bill No. 204 in this Legislature, but I suggest that those who do, go back and consider the very compelling arguments that were advanced in the whole debate on health care in this country during the 1960s. It seems to me, whether one accepts the principle of Bill No. 204 or not, it is really a variation of whether you feel that health is a right or a privilege. If it's a privilege, then indeed one may have to pay the additional cost, the second bill of a better practitioner. But if it is a right, Mr. Speaker, that service should be available to everyone.

Let me just conclude my remarks by saying that I do not perceive this bill as a sly effort to attack the income of the medical profession. As far as I'm concerned, the way in which we must properly deal with income for the medical profession, as I mentioned before, is to have periodic negotiations between the commission and the profession to set the

schedule of fees. But I don't think it is proper or correct, Mr. Speaker, to have back-door supplements to the income of medical practitioners.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I commend Bill No. 204 to the members of the Legislature as a bill which is consistent with the philosophy that health is a right of every citizen.

MR. GOGO: I welcome the opportunity of participating in the debate on Bill No. 204 and taking quite the opposite view of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

It seems to be a day that the professionals are under attack. Not only will it go down as a national day of protest in Canada, but the day that we attempted to attack two of the, shall we say, historically ethical, wealthiest professions in the nation.

Earlier in the year it seems there were many stories going around about the medical profession. A common one, for example, was: why does a surgeon operate so early in the morning? And the answer tended to be: so that he could get to the bank before it closed.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has consistently mentioned doctors, medical profession, and physicians while moving an amendment to The Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission Act, which does not in any way spell out specifically that we are talking about physicians. The act is very specific when it talks about practitioners. If I may, it says: "any physician, dental surgeon, optometrist, chiropractor, podiatrist, osteopath ..." and on. So I don't think we are being quite fair in trying to zero in on one element of that profession, that is the practitioner under the health care insurance act.

The hon. member also mentioned, and I was very interested to learn of the famous doctors' strike in Saskatchewan back in '62 before either one of us was in this office. The only encouraging thing about that strike of the doctors in Saskatchewan in 1962 was that the death rate went down while the doctors were on strike. I don't know what that really tells us. I suggest there is a message there somewhere.

I think in fairness, Mr. Speaker, that we should look at the situation today. We see, for example, that in the last five years — five years ago every person in Alberta went to a doctor four times a year. That's every third month. Just last year we see he's gone to the doctor 50 per cent more often. He now goes every second month. Perhaps that tells us something about the health of the individual. The pleasant part of going to a doctor where we are encouraged to come back — I don't know. We see also where, five years ago, roughly 20,000 doctors' claims reached medicare every working day; that is now 50,000. Obviously this House is going to have to address itself to doing something about the \$200 million we pay out each year in health delivery costs from the fee-for-service side alone. That's not, my purpose, Mr. Speaker, for being on my feet.

Traditionally, I think we should recognize that the Robin Hood principle is applied to the medical profession, where they in their judgment decided to perhaps rob the rich to help the poor. I think that was their business. We as legislators have forced the doctors to come under health delivery schemes. One should not be so naive as to think that because we call it the Health Care Insurance Commission it should be

similar to other types of insurance. In other types of insurance we have deterrents. We have things called deductibility. I don't think they are necessarily applicable to health delivery. However, I don't think it should cloud the issue as to whether the practitioner has that right — let's be honest, we use the term "extra bill". We don't call it second billing; we don't call it third billing; we don't call it supplementary income. We call it extra billing. So we'll call a spade a spade.

I think we must recognize that in the act the physician and practitioner has had that right, by statute, to levy an extra charge. However, the procedure is very clear-cut. Perhaps this is what has motivated the editorial comment by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and indeed Bill No. 204, the fact that the act has not perhaps been followed the way the legislators intended. The act is very clear in saying that no physician or practitioner in the province of Alberta may have his nurse or attendant inform a patient that there's an extra charge involved, and feel the right to collect. No practitioner in Alberta may put a sign on his wall and thereby extract an extra fee from a patient. The act is very clear, and it states that prior to that service being delivered, the physician or the practitioner must personally inform the patient of the extra charge, and only after agreement by the patient will a practitioner proceed. That's very clear.

Early in the year we had many editorials, and perhaps the best sounding board as to the experience of extra billing was the Alberta Health Care Commission. Early in January about a hundred letters per working day were arriving protesting the extra billing. The minister at that time said in the Assembly that he had tended to encourage the profession to be responsible.

What's happened since? Since then the doctors' union ... They call it the AMA, but to avoid any confusion with the motor people we'll call it the union. Its president sent out letters to its members — and 85 per cent of all physicians in Alberta, not all but most of them, are members of that association — indicating the procedure for extra billing. To me that was a very positive act for a body that chooses to be responsible in policing its members. It said to its members, look, this is how this procedure is to be followed. Shortly thereafter the police force of the physicians in this province, the College of Physicians and Surgeons under the Registrar, Dr. Reese, also sent out a letter which indicated the procedure to the practitioners in the province.

I'm talking only about the physicians' side, Mr. Speaker, not the practitioners' side, of which we have the chiropractors, the podiatrists, the osteopaths, and so on. We're talking only about one element, and that's the physicians. Where the College indicates that because of many complaints, would they adhere to the health commission act in their extra billing ... As a matter of fact they even go on, and I quote:

Patients must not be subjected to undue duress as may be the case when informed of extra-billing after admission to hospital or on the way to the operating room.

What was the result of that? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the result was some very positive response by some very ethical people in the profession. And based on the past month leading up to today, there

have been six or fewer complaints, and some weeks none at all, about extra billing in the province. So I suggest that the profession has responded in a positive way. They're not naive. They know they're under attack. They know that when their union negotiates with the Health Care Insurance Commission for a fee schedule, although they retain the right to extra bill, it is only a right and a right that must be exercised responsibly.

I suggest also, Mr. Speaker, we should bear in mind that of all the provinces of Canada, the province of Alberta is the only one that does not allow the practising physicians the prerogative to opt out. I was surprised to hear the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview neglect to mention the chiropractors, the optometrists, or the podiatrists.

AN HON. MEMBER: The dentist.

MR. GOGO: I think the dentist has had his day in court. As a matter of fact, I don't mean to imply that "dentists" is synonymous with "court", even though they were both discussed here less than an hour ago.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's very significant that we in Alberta are unique in that we do not allow the practising physician to opt out. I suggest we bear that in mind when considering Bill 204.

In summary, I would simply like to mention that I took the opportunity of going to my constituents, those with a vested interest, namely the doctors — I had no response from the chiropractors — and asking for their opinions. I had some very interesting responses, and I quote from one:

I have never extra-billed a patient in the [long time] that I have been in practise in this province but I feel that the removal of my privilege to extra-bill is an infringement of my rights as a professional person and would prove quite unacceptable.

And there are half a dozen. One clinic has got 18. I see they're all well-written, because they all managed to get something in here.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is fair on the one hand, and I'm trying to be fair to him, in trying to allude to us in this Assembly and indeed the people of Alberta — because we know there's not much of them here but there's some of them up there; it'll be all over — that the physicians in Alberta are not responsible. I suggest they're very responsible. I suggest they're ethical and loyal, and I do not believe there is unusual extra billing in this province. Indeed, if one is to go by the responses coming into the paying source, the Health Care Insurance Commission, it is almost non-existent. I would therefore recommend to my colleagues in this House that we vote against Bill 204.

Thank you.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on Bill 204. I'd like to point out to members of the House that I'm not a paid lobbyist on behalf of the medical profession. But I would like to suggest that the doctors and patients in our society meet to do two things: first of all, help the patient back to good health, and secondly, allow the doctor to practise his profession.

This profession of healing the sick is achieved by a

huge investment of public funds in university buildings, facilities, and teachers. It also represents an investment of several years of study and work by the doctor. Then when he graduates, to practise in Alberta he is required to be guided by a schedule of fees established by the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission. What is not known to many people, Mr. Speaker, is that the commission will sometimes refuse to pay for services that are contracted at these agreed rates between the doctor and his patient. To offset this, some doctors do engage in extra billing of their patients. But as the hon. Member for Lethbridge West pointed out, they are required to advise their patients that they will extra bill before they provide the service.

Mr. Speaker, the AMA is very concerned at the arbitrary interference by bureaucrats of the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission, and they indicate that they would prefer to let the patients haggle with the bureaucrats rather than have the doctors do it. If we support this bill, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it would be lowering health care in our country. High salaries, better working conditions, lower income tax, and a respect for the profession exist in the United States. As a result of this, we are losing many of our doctors to the United States.

If we continue to harass the medical profession in our province and in our country, which is implicit in Bill C-2 of the federal government, we're going to force the exodus of more doctors from Canada. This bill, in effect, would prevent them from establishing fees. Then you would have doctors asking people for testimonials as to the quality of their work, and you would have ads by some of the members of this Assembly saying what outstanding medical men they are as well as politicians.

Mr. Speaker, in Canada the health costs of our gross national product amount to 7.3 per cent. I agree that Ottawa is concerned that the national health program is costing too much money, and so is education. But Mr. Speaker, both of these are services that any productive society must have. We must have health and we must have educated people. Many statistics are available to indicate that the doctors' position in our society vis-a-vis health service workers or union workers is falling. Of course they don't have strong unions to back up claims for large increases in salary. However, the training and availability of medical personnel is not declining, and all of us know of dedicated physicians who have continued to work in our country and have not made economics their chief concern.

But Mr. Speaker, the young doctors are not of this breed. They are not willing to accept the long hours of 50-, 60-, or 70-hour work weeks. They are not willing to accept the vilification by ill-informed and usually self-appointed critics. They are not willing to accept the harassment of their families and the absence from their families. What they will do is leave our country because they can band together in such areas as California, Texas, or Oklahoma. They can go to work for companies that will guarantee them a good salary, low hours, and excellent working conditions.

In Houston there is an American medical institute that came to Canada, as of April of this year, it has interviewed over 500 doctors. Sixty-five of them have agreed to go to the United States to set up solo

practices near 51 hospitals owned by this American medical institution. They are giving these doctors a six-month guarantee of income, interest-free loans to set up a new practice, and contributions to moving expenses. It's obvious that some of our younger doctors are attracted by these: greater income, lower income taxes, and freedom from government controls.

Mr. Speaker, I think what we need is a more positive approach by government, which must bear in mind that the main purpose of doctors is to minister to the sick. We shouldn't be putting more controls on them. We should try to involve the members of the public and the doctors in providing Canadians with the best possible health care system.

Now if this motion is passed, Mr. Speaker, we are in effect saying to patients, regardless of whether the service is justified and regardless of the judgment of the doctor providing the service, that this service has to be provided at a fixed fee. No ethical medical practitioner, as the hon. Members for Spirit River-Fairview and Lethbridge West pointed out, extra bills the handicapped, the socially deprived, or the elderly. The whole profession is aware that if there were unjustified extra billing, this government would certainly move against them to prevent the exploitation of the sick.

All of us should be conscious of the fact that extra billing is restricted to \$2,400 a year under the AIB regulations. But what a lot of us forget is that doctors must provide pensions for their old age. They must provide their own health and life insurance. In other words, they must provide benefits that are provided in union agreements or in government services as a normal way of life. Quite frequently these extra benefits run 20 to 30 per cent of a gross salary of many people. If you add an extra \$5,000 to a salary of a clerk making \$15,000 a year, he is coming out at \$20,000, which is quite a bit more than many doctors earn in their first years of practice.

We should also bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that because of their long training period, they are faced with fewer years of earning. They are subjected to great stress diseases such as heart disease and ulcers, and many of them die at an early age. This is partly because of the terrible hours, and because of the tough job they have of making life and death decisions under very difficult circumstances.

Any thinking Canadian who studies the level of services delivered to us by our medical profession would agree that compared to many parts of the United States, our health service in Canada is a bargain. I'm glad to see, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview agrees that the majority of our medical profession do not extra bill. But here we have another example of a sledge hammer being used to kill a fly. Regrettably, I would say there are some who perhaps should not extra bill as they do. But why kill an effective system in which 95 per cent of the doctors are providing a good service and not exploiting anyone?

I also agree with the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that health is a right and not a privilege. But I'd like to know who the people pushing this billing are. You have them in Calgary — groups called Health before wealth, and Union for Social Justice. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if these are people with a cause, or are they martyrs looking

for a cause? Or are they perhaps people who have not yet decided to join the work force and are living on the avails of government handouts to in effect destroy or deride one of the most important segments of our society, our medical profession?

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would strongly urge the Assembly to turn this bill down, because while I agree that the intent of the concern regarding the 5 per cent is a valid one, this is just another socialistic way of destroying our society by a heavy-handed method of trying to control the medical profession.

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, this bill to disband the right of doctors to extra bill, as my colleague has just said, has not only been conceived by our socialist opposition, but has also been fertilized by a New Democratic egg. In the New Democratic Party reasoning, that growing egg, in its embryonic division, seems doomed to an early miscarriage if a wee bit of capitalism is not eradicated from the socialist gestational womb.

AN HON. MEMBER: You'll have to read that one, Graham.

DR. WALKER: That's hard to get at.

The socialists have for a long time told a great ghost story about socialized medicine, which sounds like paradise, except that the real ghosts are avarice and envy, misconceived and misdirected democracy, and an overbearing philosophy similar to that which has dealt its death blows to British medicine and is now clamoring at the already open doors of Canadian society.

Socialist ideology has been founded on distaste and distrust of the free enterprise system — a system which for hundreds of years has fostered and improved the medical profession to its present status of being given the highest accord of any profession, with more advances in science, skill, and integrity than any other organized group in the world for the benefit of all mankind.

AN HON. MEMBER: Almost as good as lawyers.

DR. WALKER: Wait until I get to the lawyers.

Socialism would have us now rip away this last vestige of competing free market in Alberta medicine, which recognized increased work and extra training, extra experience, and extra ability. It would substitute for that a mediocrity of poorly paid, poorly trained, and probably poorly motivated and poorly governed physicians, who would work 40 hours a week, punch a time clock, and ultimately cost the patient and the taxpayer treble what it does now. The socialists see in the extra billing practice of doctors a threat to this smooth and efficient operation of a public health service.

Our politicians might strive with all their might to do away with opportunities which are in any way remunerative, regardless of how much time or what is required to create the knowledge, experience, and know-how inherent in such remuneration. Are we going to conscript every doctor in Alberta into a self-perpetuating civil service democracy which will run its dogmatic course at any price — even the price of a patient's free choice of going to a doctor, and the free choice of a patient by a doctor? Are we going to

remove the personalized relationship of doctor and patient, even though that patient may have to pay a little extra for it, and substitute an all-encompassing health scheme with no options, no incentives for hard work or excellence, but requiring twice or three times as many personnel to work on a 40-hour week with more interest in their spare time and hobbies than they have in their sick patients?

In talking about the legal profession earlier, the Attorney General said price alone does not recommend any service. It is interesting to note that while few lawyers die well, few doctors live well.

AN HON. MEMBER: Try that again, John.

DR. WALKER: That's right. Few lawyers die well and few doctors live well. Is there something wrong with that?

AN HON. MEMBER: What does it mean?

AN HON. MEMBER: You're going to the wrong doctor.

AN HON. MEMBER: No you're not.

AN HON. MEMBER: I think your lawyer's that way.

DR. WALKER: I am like the people in the letters to the hon. Member for Lethbridge West. I have never extra billed, and I don't intend to. But I'll certainly fight for the right to extra bill.

Alberta Health Care Insurance was not intended to guarantee free medical services to the people of Alberta. It was put there to provide a level of insurance benefits. From 1970 to 1974, average weekly wages and salaries across Canada rose 44 per cent. The average Alberta Health Care Insurance payment rose 5.2 per cent. Most workers receive fringe benefits, as the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight has said, whereas doctors have to provide their own fringe benefits. The length of training required for a doctor is a minimum of eight years, and often the working life of those physicians is much shorter.

The maximum fee I could find in the Alberta Health Care schedule, as approved also by the medical profession, was for open heart surgery: \$882 for total care of the open heart patient — pre-operatively, operatively, and post-operatively. Compare that with a dentist's bill for \$1,200 to straighten your kid's teeth. He doesn't even risk your life or anything.

DR. BUCK: It takes more than 15 minutes . . . John.

DR. WALKER: If you do a heart operation in 15 minutes, you'll be doing pretty well.

Maternity benefits: here the charge is \$145; in the United States the fee is anywhere between \$500 and \$3,000. No wonder they are going to the United States. A student I had with me recently says his class *in toto* from the University of Western Ontario is leaving for the United States. I reiterate that no ethical physician would make provision of necessary medical services contingent on the payment of his extra billing, nor would he allow it to impose a hardship of any kind on his patient.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview referred to the so-called strike in Saskatchewan. That was not a strike. It was a switch of services. A doctor from Estevan worked in Lucky Lake, and vice versa. Services were continued in Saskatchewan, and they were never without medical services during the whole dispute. To me a strike is withdrawing services, not going and filling in for your fellow man in another place.

A course such as our socialist friends would have us take simply drives the patient into the hands of medical charlatans such as the chiropractors, osteopaths, and all that. Some of these are already thriving pretty well under our socialized services. But I still believe there's a place in Alberta for a mature individual to accept some personal responsibility for himself and his family. And if it costs him a little out of his pocket instead of through his taxes, I feel sure he'll probably be a much better person for it. He's not being asked to pay the crippling hospital and medical expenses he would in our neighbor state to the south, nor is any person who is unable to pay ever refused full and proper treatment because of that inability. This, of course, has been a long-time requirement, and it is considered unethical for any physician to refuse services because of money in any emergency or where they are required.

I would appeal to every member of this Legislature to support this last bastion of free enterprise in medicine by defeating this ill-conceived bill, not only for the good of our patients and the medical profession in general but for the good of all the citizens of this province whose backbone has been, and I hope will be, free enterprise.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few remarks in closing the debate, I'd like to thank the three hon. members who participated in the debate this afternoon. Let me say first of all that I could agree with many of the comments made by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West and the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight. I'm sure that will set them back in the caucus for some time, but they may in fact overcome it if they work diligently enough.

However, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take just a moment or two to look at some of the suggestions put forward by the hon. Member for Macleod, whom I must congratulate on a very sophisticated address. His introductory remarks were indeed very interesting. However, some of the points he made could stand some challenge.

For example, Mr. Speaker, we should clearly point out — and I attempted to do this when I introduced the bill, but let me do it again especially for the hon. Member for Macleod — that the major basis for socialized medicine in Canada, medicare, or whatever you want to call it, it was fought very bitterly, and came really from two sources. One was the struggle in Saskatchewan, which led to the Saskatchewan legislation. But an equally important aspect was the Hall commission report.

I would say to members of the House that when one looks at the credentials of Mr. Justice Hall, he is

not noted as a socialist. Yet he is probably the architect of modern health care in this country. When the Hall commission report was tabled in 1964, I well remember it being branded as the worst kind of excesses in socialized medicine, taking away free choice, doing away with the bastion of free enterprise in medicare, et cetera. But, Mr. Speaker, the Hall commission report came from a very distinguished judge in this country and was commissioned by a Tory government.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, if one recollects Canadian history — I'm sure the Deputy Premier will enjoy this — when one recalls that the CBC got its start under R.B. Bennett, some curious socialist things come from Tory governments on occasion. [interjections] I beg your pardon? Anyway, I'm sure the Deputy Premier is happy with the CBC these days.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to conclude by making one comment about the doctors' strike in Saskatchewan. The hon. Member for Macleod was not totally accurate when he suggested that it was just a switching of services. Emergency services were retained, but in actual fact it was a withdrawal of normal services throughout the province of Saskatchewan. Emergency services were retained by the Saskatchewan college of physicians, but normal services were withdrawn. I raised that item simply to make the observation that it was a political strike, and I did that in the context of what has occurred today.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks by saying that the basic issue is still whether or not we feel health care should be a right. I'm not suggesting that the majority of the medical profession are not totally ethical. I'm not suggesting that the majority of the medical profession are second billing. I think that extra billing, as all members have said in this debate, is relatively limited. But I do suggest that additional billing acts as a deterrent to those who would, in fact, freely choose one practitioner or another.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

I believe it acts as a deterrent, Mr. Speaker, because it violates the principle that health care should be a right. It's my submission to the Assembly that the proposal contained in Bill No. 204, which has been legislation in our neighboring province for the last five years, is consistent with the Hall commission report, consistent with the philosophy of medicare, and merits the support of members of the House at this time.

[Motion lost]

**Bill 206**  
**An Act to Amend**  
**The Highway Traffic Act, 1975**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in moving

second reading of Bill No. 206. My remarks on this bill are going to be very short for two reasons. Number one, no extensive explanation is required. Number two, only 15 minutes remain in today's session. Possibly we can create another record, another first for Alberta, where we've dealt with two resolutions in one day, and two bills. One

clause is simply added to Section 96 of The Highway Traffic Act. This one clause makes it an offence to park a vehicle or stop a vehicle under conditions enumerated. Just so we'll have the background, Section 96 reads in part:

Unless required or permitted by this Act or by a traffic control device or in compliance with the directions of a peace officer, or to avoid conflict with other traffic, a driver shall not stop or park his vehicle . . .

Then it gives a number of cases. A few of these are: "on a sidewalk or boulevard". That's an offence. "On a crosswalk or on any part of a crosswalk". That's an offence. "Within an intersection other than immediately next to the curb in a T'-intersection". That's an offence. "Within 15 feet of any fire hydrant, or when the hydrant is not located at the curb, within 15 feet of the point on the curb nearest the hydrant". That's an offence. "Within 5 feet of an access to a garage, private road or driveway, or a vehicle crossway over a sidewalk". In other words, certain things are listed that it should be obvious to any driver would inconvenience others greatly if a vehicle were permitted to park there.

Almost every week in this province we have accidents, fires, explosions; and the curious seem to flock to these places. A few months ago I was driving on the highway between Calgary and Edmonton. I saw a great mass of people at the intersection of the road south of Ponoka where 2 and 2A separate. Looking over, I slowed up and heard the RCMP say to two or three people who had stopped their vehicles, "Do you have any business here? If not, I'd appreciate it if you would keep moving." The congestion was getting so bad that it would have been difficult for an ambulance to get in there.

Perhaps one of the serious cases in this province was when the explosion took place in Calgary. Hundreds of cars gathered, to the point where the fire engines and doctors couldn't even get to the site. They were delayed, and they were frustrated in trying to carry out their duties.

So this amendment is designed to make it an offence to park or stop at or near an explosion, fire, et cetera, and is designed to keep curious sightseers from hampering police and rescue parties from doing their jobs. It simply adds to Section 96 to make it an offence. If I could read the first part again:

Unless required or permitted by this Act or by a traffic control device or in compliance with the directions of a peace officer, or to avoid conflict with other traffic, a driver shall not stop or park his vehicle . . .

Then it will be:

at or near the site of any fire, explosion, accident or other such incident, where such stopping or parking would obstruct traffic or hinder the work of police, fire, ambulance or rescue officers or volunteers.

I think it's a straightforward amendment. The offence, if committed, would come under the general penalties of the act, Section 148(1), which are very fair. They could go from \$1 to \$500, depending on the seriousness of the offence.

Had the police in Calgary the authority to do so set out in definite words like these, had an officer simply walked along and put a tag on every one of those cars that were stopped for no other reason than curiosity, I

think it would have been a tremendous lesson to people all over the province not to try to get to something for a curious purpose and in so doing obstruct rescue officers, ambulances, and so on from getting to the scene of the accident.

I move second reading of this amendment. I ask each hon. member of the Legislature to view it on its own merits, and I hope it will be accepted by all members of the Legislature.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, having regard to Bill 206 and the fact that it is straightforward and a reasonable amendment, the government is willing to accept it in principle and vote for passage at second reading.

[Motion carried; Bill 206 read a second time]

**Bill 212**  
**An Act to Amend**  
**The Fuel Oil Licensing Act**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, depending on the hon. member's wishes, I wonder if he would like to call it 5:30 and have Bill No. 212 remain at the top of the

Order Paper. On the other hand, the Assembly would have no objection if he wished to proceed with the very few minutes now.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was just going to move that we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the Assembly do now adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

[The House rose at 5:21 p.m.]

