

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Friday, November 4, 1977 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 80**  
**The Alberta Labour**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 80, The Alberta Labour Amendment Act, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, by some provisions of the proposed amendments, this bill will promote the carrying out of co-ordinated province-wide bargaining in the organized construction industry in the province of Alberta. Secondly, the resolution of disputes between different trade jurisdictions among trade unions will be significantly affected in the ability of the industry to resolve those disputes within the province of Alberta, through an agency which this legislation would enable to be set up.

The other changes relate to some of the statutory provisions in regard to arbitration, the principal change being to provide for single arbitrators in the model clause within the act. Finally, changes will be made in respect to the provisions in regard to bargaining in good faith, primarily bringing those matters within the purview of the Board of Industrial Relations.

[Leave granted; Bill 80 read a first time]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of pleasure today to introduce 35 grade 6 students from the Forest Heights school in my constituency. They're here with their teacher Mr. Vlad Eshenko. They have come to the Legislature to see how laws are made. They are seated in the public gallery, and I'd ask that they stand and receive the recognition of the House.

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, it's my very great pleasure today to introduce grades 11 and 12 students from Chestermere Junior and Senior High School, 38-strong. That's the Chestermere Lake district just east of Calgary, and just west of my home hamlet of Langdon. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Don Bryan. I'd very much appreciate it if my colleagues would welcome them to the Legislature as I ask them to stand.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I'm delighted to be able to introduce to you today, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 20 grade 10 students from one of the best high schools in the city of Edmonton, namely St. Mary's on the south side. I would like to thank their teacher Mrs. Frances Lachance for accompanying her students. I would ask them to rise in the public gallery and be recognized by the Assembly.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing to you, and through you to the hon. members of the Assembly, a gentleman who has been active in my area and in the public service of this province for many years, and is now very active in senior citizens' work in Fort Saskatchewan. I'd like the hon. members to welcome Art Stelter, sitting in the public gallery.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

**Department of Education**

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a ministerial statement to make on examinations.

Mr. Speaker, concern about the standards of achievement of students in Alberta schools has been a frequent topic of public discussion and debate in the Legislature. The Speech from the Throne on February 24 of this year indicated that: "Further consideration [is being] given to the place of provincial examinations in our educational system."

Many tentative conclusions have been drawn by the public, frequently on the basis of fragmentary evidence and reports of students' marks in the United States, in other provinces of Canada, or at the post-secondary level.

In reviewing student achievement in Alberta in 1976, it was evident that hard data for public school students at the provincial level was not readily available. Mr. Speaker, the hon. members of this Legislature on October 19, 1976, requested:

That the provincial government be requested to consider the effect of the non-compulsory nature of Grade 12 departmental examinations on the quality of education in Alberta today.

The Minister's Advisory Committee on Student Achievement established in October of last year was directed, as part of its activities, to respond to this resolution. Earlier this week, a progress report on this committee's activities was provided to the hon. members. It indicated the study on grade 12 examinations has been completed.

Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, this report examined three areas: first, the current procedures used to determine final marks for grade 12 students; second, the pattern of final marks for grade 12 students and others in selected periods over the past 10 years; and third, public opinion on the effects of the changes and on desirable future procedures.

The report indicates some variation in practices in determining final marks. Frequently, the major variation is among schools within a school system.

The report indicates a pattern of nearly 50 per cent of students obtaining A and B marks in 1972. This was followed by a sharp increase, so that approximately 60 per cent were getting A and B marks in

1975. Since then, there has been a slight decrease in each of 1976 and 1977. This pattern was generally true for all grade 12 academic courses and all systems across the province.

Mr. Speaker, a survey of public opinion on what has happened and what should happen is reflected by the responses to the 10,000 questionnaires that were part of the study. The report contains a variety of opinions on the effects of dropping departmental finals. It indicates slight majority feeling that student effort has declined. There is strong agreement that the quality of education has changed in the past five years, but some division on whether the quality is better or worse. In the opinion of respondents, achievement in science and mathematics may have improved or remained constant. In English, achievement is thought to have decreased.

Further, Mr. Speaker, in the opinions of respondents, some change is needed. While there is some support for bringing back departmental examinations for part of the final mark, there are objections to reverting to the 1973 form of examinations. There are serious concerns that multiple choice examinations alone cannot adequately test the various achievements of students. There is strong agreement that final evaluation should be based on the entire year's work and not on one examination.

Mr. Speaker, the program of high school achievement tests to determine durable bench marks of provincial achievement in academic high school courses is well under way. You may recall that the results of the biology test in January of this year, and chemistry in June, reflected favorable comparable levels of achievement. Tests in mathematics and in physics are scheduled for January 11 and 12, 1978, respectively. The English test is scheduled for June 6, 1978. In the test in English we are requiring that one part consist of a major essay. The high school achievement test program will be continued, and will include testing in social studies and French in due course.

In view of the information in the report regarding variation in school and system evaluation policies, procedures, and practices, I am directing officials of my department, particularly those in the regional offices, to intensify supervision of school evaluation policies and procedures to reduce major discrepancies among systems and schools.

I am also directing the curriculum branch, consistent with policy recommendations of the Curriculum Policies Board, to continue to specify more precisely learning objectives in existing programs of study and curriculum guides for the information of students, parents, teachers, and the public. This directive is separate from our ongoing consideration of the goals of education and changes in curriculum which might follow the adoption of goals.

Mr. Speaker, these interim initiatives are being taken pending the completion of a variety of other studies under way or planned for completion by the Advisory Committee on Student Achievement by the end of 1978. The place of provincial exams in our educational system will be given further consideration as those reports have been completed and evaluated.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I beg leave to table copies of the report, and indicate that copies are being pro-

vided to each member of the Legislature.  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

#### head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

##### **Magazine Advertisement**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my first question to the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder. It's with regard to an advertisement in *Maclean's* magazine. I'd like to ask the hon. member if he could explain to the Assembly or confirm his responsibility as an unbiased watchdog with regard to the public interest and interest of this Legislature on one hand and, at the same time, express a sort of one-sided endorsement of the Syncrude policy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Order.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I would never for a moment suggest that the hon. member is a slow learner or has a weak memory, but in accordance with conventional government policy, I would refer that question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I saw such a fine-looking picture in the magazine that I felt it necessary to ask the hon. member the question. But I'd like to refer the same question then to the respective minister.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I think I agree. It's a really fine picture. It's a darned good advertisement, and the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder is serving the province really well.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. What are the general guidelines used with regard to actions such as this, as it relates to members of the Legislature or members of the government, in publicly endorsing private companies through advertisement, et cetera?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I haven't had benefit of the ad, but I can detect the note in the questions. I will look at the ad with interest, but I'm sure I would endorse what the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources has said.

As I mentioned in my remarks in this House on October 12, I think it's quite clear that we should be very pleased that the risk investors, in co-operation with three levels of government, are producing a project of immense impact, not just upon the province of Alberta but the country, and doing it within budget and on schedule. If we have a representative for this Legislative Assembly who has been a participant in that, I'm equally proud of him.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure I can also endorse the work of Syncrude very easily. But my question is just a little different from that. It is with regard to a general policy of ministers or MLAs using their picture or statements on a private ad endorsing a private company as such. It may be not only Syncrude; it may be other companies across the province, maybe new companies that come into the prov-

ince. Has the Premier a policy with regard to that particular issue?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I recall some years ago when this matter was debated in the Legislature with regard to speed reading. I recall similar questions were asked when we were on the other side of the Legislature.

The matter, though, I think is really one for the individual MLA. If he believes that in this particular case it's one which he as a member of the Assembly is prepared to endorse, then I believe that's a decision the MLA would make.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Can the Premier indicate how a member of the committee can serve as a watchdog and at the same time endorse a project? I feel that because the member on this committee is acting on behalf of Albertans and protecting their interests, to come out and outright endorse the project doesn't seem to be acting as a watchdog.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It would seem that the hon. member is not asking a question but making an argument with a question mark at the end of it.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would really think it would be very unfortunate if we had a member representing the public interests of Alberta who did not believe that this was a positive project for the people of this province and this country. That's . . . [inaudible] . . . clear.

#### **Environment Group Advertisement**

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. Member for Clover Bar yesterday, regarding the manning of telephones re an ad in the newspaper. I would like to inform him that first of all, of course, it's an MLA phone. As he well knows, all MLAs usually go back to their constituencies to discuss problems and concerns that came up in the House over that weekend. Therefore, I doubt that these telephones would be manned over the weekend.

#### **Magazine Advertisement**

*(continued)*

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the Premier with regard to the endorsement by a minister of a certain product. For example, let's say the Minister of Education publicly endorses a certain type of textbook or a certain type of desk in schools. Would that type of thing be allowed as an action of one of your ministers, Mr. Premier?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, as the member is very experienced in this particular issue, I know that he wants to continue with regard to it.

Again, I would think each of these cases is something one has to consider. There may be times when a Minister of Education would find that it is appropriate for him to endorse some aspect of activity in the provincial area of education. I think we'll leave it, as I'm sure we always have, to the good judgment of the

ministers and of the MLAs to respond from all corners of the House.

DR. BUCK: Some ministers even influence the stockmarket.

#### **Prisoners' Visiting Privileges**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask my second question of the Solicitor General. It's with regard to a policy that was enunciated in the Fort Saskatchewan Correctional Institution. The policy there is to allow special little deals for inmates so that they could be visited by newscasters and in turn make public newscasts. I wonder if this is an example of the trend of a get-tough policy, or is leniency being implemented in the Fort Saskatchewan Institution?

MR. FARRAN: Well, sir, there was no cosy little deal for a football star, as an employee of my department was reported to have stated. And if we could ever get our hands on them, which proves difficult, there will be no cosy deal for certain touch football players I'm acquainted with either. Laying hands on them has proved to be difficult in the past.

The director of provincial correctional institutions, under The Corrections Act, is obliged to find as much work as possible for inmates. Now there may be some debate on whether the media actually work, but it is certainly true that we've allowed inmates to write books, paint pictures, and study for degrees. Steady work is regarded as the most hopeful rehabilitation tool we have.

In the case to which the hon. member refers, there were no special concessions. The recording was made during the visiting hours in the normal visiting room.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister advise the Assembly whether this policy consideration would apply, say, to old quarterbacks or possibly old halfbacks? [laughter]

MR. FARRAN: As I say, it wouldn't. But we've had difficulty laying hands on those particular individuals.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Is there any truth to the rumor that before the Premier was running back punts he used to be 6 feet tall?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think it's time we turned full back to the question period . . . [laughter]

#### **Cheque Delivery — Culture**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the hon. Minister of Culture. Can the minister indicate the circumstances surrounding the disbursement of public moneys from his room in the Royal Alexandra Hospital?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, it's very simple. There happens to be a \$2 million grant which the people of Alberta provided for the building of the Citadel Theatre under the major cultural facilities program. This cheque has been long awaited and very anxious-

ly awaited by the executive director, Mr. Joe Shoctor. The cheque was issued that morning, and I was asked what to do with it. I asked Mr. Shoctor to come to the hospital to pick it up, since he really wanted to get it as soon as possible and I had to sign the letter accompanying the cheque.

DR. BUCK: Supplementary question to the minister. Did the minister have consultation with the Provincial Treasurer before this method was used in delivering the public funds? [interjections] Just hold it, just hold it. Mr. Speaker, very specifically, did the minister have consultation or did he advise the Provincial Treasurer that the cheque — public moneys — would be delivered in this manner?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite sure the hon. member would agree that whether or not a cheque is delivered personally, which in this case it was, or is sent through the post office, which is normally done, is about the same — the best and most efficient way of making sure the Citadel Theatre was able to pay its debt in order to take care of the commitments on building the Citadel Theatre.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the hon. minister, because we've had a few problems in this department. Is the Minister of Government Services . . .

DR. WARRACK: Cheap shot.

DR. BUCK: Some of you front benchers may learn something too. Is the Minister of Culture aware of The Financial Administration Act, Part 3, which states that the cheque may be mailed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, order please.

DR. BUCK . . . or delivered to the [inaudible] group . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is in effect asking the minister if he knows the law. That's not the purpose of the question period.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, has the Provincial Treasurer been in consultation with the Minister of Culture in respect to the cheque being delivered from the minister's hospital bed?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I didn't have any conversations with my colleague with respect to that delivery. But I'm quite astonished by the hon. member's questions or suggestions that the delivery of the cheque cannot be made in that way. When a cheque is signed and ready for delivery there are a number of ways in which it is delivered. Everybody in this Assembly is familiar with the delivery of a cheque at a public function of some sort, or the handing of a cheque and a letter. That's done almost every day. I'm quite astonished by this line of questioning.

DR. BUCK: You want to run it that way, that's fine.

#### Welfare Recipients

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Social Services and

Community Health. I wonder if the hon. minister could inform this Assembly if she is in fact reviewing the policy of paying people on welfare for very plush accommodation, as high as \$800 a month.

MISS HUNLEY: That's not a very specific question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to be able to answer yes, briefly. But that would then convey a false impression. It is never our intention to pay for "plush" accommodation. There are occasions when rent is higher than we like to pay — quite often, right now. We try to go by the prevailing rate in the particular district. As long as there is a very low vacancy rate we do have some difficulties, but it is a matter we are watching very carefully and attempting to handle as best we can.

If the hon. member has some specifics, I'd be delighted to have them looked into by my department.

MR. KUSHNER: A supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister inform this Assembly at this time if the welfare roll is in fact increasing or decreasing, compared with the figures last year about this time?

MISS HUNLEY: No, I can't, Mr. Speaker. I don't have the specifics on that.

MR. KUSHNER: A supplementary question. Does the minister receive this report daily, monthly, or yearly, as far as welfare increasing or decreasing is concerned?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, we have an ongoing system, and I think within the department they would perhaps have that information. Rates are higher. We are forced into greater expenditures. I would guess that the number of persons on welfare is probably increasing, particularly in single-parent families. But I don't have the specifics, as I've already told the hon. member.

MR. KUSHNER: Supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister inform this Assembly if there are any studies by other agencies on providing work rather than welfare for welfare recipients?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have that under consideration.

MR. KUSHNER: Supplementary question. Is there any date that the minister would have that information to this Assembly?

MISS HUNLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to be committed to any definite time-frame.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether the vast majority of those on welfare are unemployable due to illness, whether it be physical or mental illness.

MISS HUNLEY: A considerable number of people on social assistance, Mr. Speaker, are unemployable for various reasons. But we do have single-parent families on welfare who might be considered employable if we were able to make some accommodation. We are attempting to do that also.

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

MR. KUSHNER: Supplementary question to the minister. Does the minister in fact have any figures through her department of the various agencies that have found jobs for people who are in good health, excellent health?

MISS HUNLEY: We don't specifically have that assignment, Mr. Speaker. We do attempt to work with my colleague the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower for educational opportunities and upgrading of skills. We are also getting assistance from the federal Department of Employment and Immigration. We also have a very capable but small section, the Opportunity Corps, which deals with work for welfare, mostly in northern and isolated communities. That's doing a very effective job. So a number of programs are in place.

#### **Foster Homes**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Does the department keep an ongoing list of parents and homes for foster home use?

MISS HUNLEY: I'm not sure what type of information they keep. At the moment we have an advertising campaign on, because we are short of foster parents. So I don't think we have a waiting list of those who wish to become foster parents, Mr. Speaker, if that was the intent of the hon. member's question.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary question. Are there a number of boys and girls, then, who would be placed in foster homes if foster homes were available at this time?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: Are these boys and girls being kept in institutions at the present time, or are they crowded into other foster homes?

MISS HUNLEY: I don't have the specifics of where all the children are located. Many of them would be in institutions operated by the department. But I don't have the specific breakdown of where they are all located.

#### **Inner City Studies**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It's relative to the inner city study that we as the opposition conducted earlier this year. I wonder if the minister has taken any new initiatives relative to that study, or the other inner city studies that have occurred during the interim?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, we were of course aware of the [study] to which the hon. member refers, but there are a number of studies, and some were ongoing at that time. As well, we were attempting to integrate our own services in specific areas. There have been a number of consultations with city

officials.

One of the things we should all keep in mind is that we may be talking about a moving target, I suppose you'd call it. We don't really know, as the city develops and changes, where the inner city may be. There may be very dramatic changes in the downtown core, in which case some of the problems we are aware of, which exist there today, may no longer be down in that particular area. What I'm trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that what we now call the inner core may change substantially in the future, as these two cities change at the decision of the city administration.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister advise whether the department or her office has involvement with regard to the Greenhill study — another study designed to look at social services in the city of Edmonton — and whether her department has been requested to assist in funding?

MISS HUNLEY: No, I can't answer that, Mr. Speaker, but I'd be pleased to inquire and refresh my memory on it.

#### **Trucking Regulations**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Deputy Premier and Minister of Transportation. I sort of hesitate to bring this up because I was nearly the victim of the circumstance last night. So just a brief note, Mr. Speaker. This is to do with tarping down and chaining down loads on trucks. The incident was: a piece of wood flew off and just about gave my estate the \$100,000 or whatever it costs the taxpayers of this province. But the question is, Mr. Speaker: can the minister indicate if there's any enforcement or if there are regulations covering tarping down and binding down loads on large trucks?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, it may be a question of trying to interpret the law. But, yes, there are very stringent regulations relative to tying down and tarping. I'd suggest that if one gets into that situation, indeed the licence plate should be ascertained and that information passed on to my colleague the Solicitor General.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate if there are many offences and convictions under this section of the act?

DR. HORNER: I would have to refer that question to the Solicitor General.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, we come back again to the definition of the word "many". There's a significant number.

#### **School Testing Programs**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Education. It's with reference to the excellent statement he gave this morning regarding bench marks in high schools. Is the department also gradually going to establish bench marks for at least the end of each division — the end of division 1, the

end of division 2 — if not for the grades in those particular divisions?

MR. KOZIAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. That's an excellent question. Once we've completed the high school achievement tests, it's our intention, then, to look at going down to the junior high school program — grades 7, 8, and 9 — which would see the development of similar testing programs for those grades, and thereafter into elementary.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

#### Bill 70

#### The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act, 1977

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 70, The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act, 1977.

This act deals essentially with three items. The first is to allow the administrator of the fund to enter a judgment without proceeding to formal judgment of the court, and raising that limit from \$2,000 to \$5,000. This will enable the process to be speeded up somewhat, and costs to one or other of the parties to be maintained at the lowest possible level. The second item is to increase the maximum coverage of the fund from \$50,000 to \$100,000, consistent with other legislation currently before the House.

The third item, Mr. Speaker, is to provide for the capacity to charge interest on moneys owing to the fund. This particular initiative arises out of a debate in this Assembly about a year ago I think — certainly discussion in the question period, and I think during estimates — to reverse the policy in the legislation which currently provides that no interest may be charged. While it is not necessarily the government's intention to charge interest in all instances, because some persons simply cannot afford to pay, and we'll have to make that judgment, there is no doubt that many persons who are indebted to the fund have the capacity and the resources to pay the full balance to the fund, and should not escape paying some interest if they choose to pay it over a longer period of time.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a word or two on second reading of Bill No. 70. First of all, I'd like to commend the minister for raising the amount to \$100,000 or more, exclusive of costs. Now that we have mandatory insurance, or require public liability property damage insurance for all vehicles, some people claim we no longer need the motor vehicle accident claims legislation. I disagree with that very, very much. Human nature being what it is, there is always someone who avoids insurance or lets the insurance elapse. If there's no fund, the victim is then the one who suffers. Several years ago, before we had the unsatisfied judgment fund, which later became the motor vehicle accident claims fund, I remember the late Percy Page pointing out very definitely cases occurring in the province where people were the victims of accidents and, through no fault of

their own — it was the full responsibility of the motorist — had to become victims of welfare. The welfare department had to look after them.

There's a very definite need for this legislation, and I think it's being administered in an excellent way. By raising the fund to higher limits, we're going to be fairer with people who are victims of automobile accidents. I think that's only right. Where the judgment is secured for \$100,000 and the act only provides payment for \$50,000, it does leave a very bitter taste in the mouth of the victim, who should be getting the other \$50,000 but who has no way of collecting it. I think this is an excellent move, and in line with modern figures.

I'd also like to say a word or two in connection with the payment of interest. I think this also brings the act into a realistic posture. Many people feel: the government has lots of money, so while I owe them \$20,000 — and I can pay it and it's my responsibility — I'll leave that money invested and pay only \$1,000, enough to get by on each year, in the hope that maybe some government of the future will change this thing and I won't have to pay. I think that's a wrong attitude entirely.

If a man, through his responsibility, has caused damage to lives or property of other people, he should be paying that. If he has the capacity to pay, he should pay. If he doesn't pay and he's in that category, he should certainly be required to pay interest. He shouldn't be making money out of the money he should be paying to the victims of his own act.

Mr. Speaker, I think this brings the act up to a standard even better than it is today. In closing, I would ask the hon. minister if the act is now at the point where it is paving for itself, or if there is still an annual deficit that has to be provided out of general revenue.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to ask the hon. Attorney General one or two questions that he can answer when he closes debate. The point the hon. Member for Drumheller was making — the fact that we have compulsory automobile insurance, therefore we will have to have that coverage. Can the minister indicate to the Legislature what that will do to the premiums, especially to the driver under the age of 25? I think we have to review the entire area of the underage driver. I appreciate the fact that when these young people take driving courses, they certainly do get a reduction in their premiums. I certainly think that can be extended a little further.

I would like to indicate to both the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Attorney General that in discussions with the insurance industry they give some consideration to the possible reduction of premiums for people who take the defensive driving course of their own volition. I know that when we look at incentives to encourage people to become better drivers, positive incentives are better than the others where the insurance people come to you and say, because you haven't had any accidents you are already getting a premium reduction. The driver can't understand that line of reasoning. But if there's a definite reduction in the premium by taking the defensive driving course, I think many more people would be interested in taking it.

I'd like the [Attorney General] and the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs to address their

minds to these two areas, and give them some consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question from the hon. Member for Drumheller, my information is that the current \$3 fee will enable the fund to remain solvent for a year or so. We can't be precise in our estimates of what this shift from \$50,000 to \$100,000 will do. Obviously it will call upon a further drain from the fund. I can't predict whether that will put it into a deficit position within one, two, or three years. But there is no doubt at all that at some point down the road, I think probably within a three-year period, we'll again have to increase the fee charged to the motoring public for this fund.

With respect to all the other questions that were placed, I think those are probably more properly dealt with under Bill 72, which would follow second reading of Bill 70, because the motor vehicle accident claims fund *per se* does not deal with the problems that the hon. member has put.

[Motion carried; Bill 70 read a second time]

**Bill 72**  
**The Alberta Insurance**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 72.

Mr. Speaker, it may help hon. members if I try to indicate that there are, by my division of this bill, about four different, arbitrary classifications of amendments in the bill. The first group I would call those which have immediate and direct concern to the public. In that group I would include the increase in the minimum public liability that is required under this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, last year the Alberta Automobile Insurance Board prepared a report and in that report reflected upon the Variplan proposal of the Insurance Bureau of Canada. I believe hon. members have that report. I would like to indicate first that with respect to the increase in the minimum inclusive limits under Section A of the standard insurance policy, that section which deals with third party liability, the proposition is to increase from \$50,000 to a minimum of \$100,000 the amount which the standard policy must contain. The priority, as in the previous requirement, will be to \$95,000 for bodily injury, and to \$5,000 for property. Mr. Speaker, this is a reflection of the changing costs of accidents and, if you will, the increasing amounts in the decisions and awards of the courts.

It is anticipated it will have an effect on the insurance premium for those persons who are now at \$50,000 — in other words, for those persons who now carry the bare minimum public liability requirement — of increasing their premium by \$13 to \$14. Approximately only 13 per cent of policyholders in Alberta will be affected by this change to the full amount. In other words, approximately only 13 per

cent of policyholders presently have the bare minimum of \$50,000 of public liability.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also enriches the death benefit, increasing the funds for a funeral from \$500 to \$1,000. It increases the total disability benefits to a maximum of \$105 per week in the case of total disability, subject of course to the 80 per cent of gross weekly earnings. In terms of premium, that change in the policy will have an implication of \$5 to \$10. But those benefits will offset benefits which would otherwise occur under Section A of the insurance policy. So the net cost to individuals will be somewhat less than the maximum of \$10.

Mr. Speaker, the changes here provide for death benefits to be payable to a common-law spouse. That change aligns this piece of legislation with the principle contained in the Workers' Compensation Board legislation.

Mr. Speaker, there is a provision here which, by amendment of sections 298 and 306, will provide for insurance to third parties who are gratuitous passengers in automobiles. At the present time, the legislation under both The Highway Traffic Act and this act make it very difficult, if not impossible, for gratuitous passengers to claim. They have to show gross negligence and willful and wanton misconduct on the part of the driver of the automobile. This legislation will make it possible for those persons to have a right of claim in the event of injury in an accident.

Mr. Speaker, a second group of amendments contained in the bill are primarily of interest only to the insurance industry and the agents and insurers thereof. It will, for instance, enable an insurance agent, after two years as a representative of a single company, to represent more than one insurance company. At the present time, this is possible in terms of life insurance but not general insurance.

A number of other sections and amendments contained herein attempt to standardize Alberta legislation with legislation in the insurance industry across Canada. The principle being followed is that, on the recommendation of the Canadian Association of Superintendents of Insurance, they try to arrive at a uniform and standard wording for insurance legislation and insurance acts. Some of the amendments here are moving in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, there are some technical amendments. I would welcome questions and observations from other members. If they wish to dwell on the finer amendments in the legislation, I would deal with them in summation.

There are some amendments, I believe four in number, which attempt to remove problems in the legislation which have been detected through its operation, and which are not a change in the principle of the legislation but a change to reflect necessary amendments following court decisions or observations which legal counsel had made about the legislation.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, there are just two points I'd like to deal with. I'm rather concerned about gratuitous passengers. At the present time, if you give somebody a ride, and they want to make a claim, they have to prove gross negligence on your part as a driver. I think there's a danger in making this thing too easy, because it may simply make everybody leery of giving anybody a ride at all.

For instance, a few years ago a hunting party went up hunting moose. An accident occurred, and one chap had his best friend suing him for a very high sum of money. He was unable to prove gross negligence, but the friendship seemed to end because there was an accident which did not appear to be that driver's fault.

I'd like the hon. member to outline what checks there are to protect the driver of a vehicle in case there is an accident for which he's not at all responsible. Is it simply going to depend on a war between two lawyers in the courtroom, or is some protection given the driver? I'm not thinking only of picking up hitchhikers — although that would certainly come into the matter — but just of taking friends or a neighbor to town. I hope the situation doesn't become so easy that we have ready access for judgments for trying to do some good. I'm leery of that.

When I was representing Canada at the the opening of the Central American highway, we were travelling by bus. One of our buses — not the one I was in, but the one in front — hit a wagon, and a man was lying on the road. He looked in very, very bad condition, bleeding profusely. Everybody came running back to our bus to get the American doctor who was there for the purpose of looking after the people who were on the trip. But the doctor wouldn't even go and look at the man.

The doctor said, I'm not leaving myself open to a liability suit of \$100,000 or \$200,000; he said this was quite common in Mexico. He said, I'm sorry, I just can't come. Phone a doctor from Mexico. So for an hour the man was lying in the back of the truck; a number of us picked him up and put him in the back of the truck and covered him.

I don't know what happened to him eventually, because after a Mexican doctor arrived, we went on. But I thought it was a pretty terrible thing. As a matter of fact everybody from Canada and the U.S.A., except the doctor, was really put out that the doctor wouldn't even lend a hand because he was so fearful he would get involved in a \$100,000 or \$200,000 suit should the man have died. I hope our cases in this province don't get so easy that everybody will be afraid to give anybody else a ride in a vehicle, and do away with a lot of neighborliness.

I like the gross negligence — if you're grossly negligent when taking a neighbor or someone to town, I think you're leaving yourself open. You're asking for trouble, and you should be paying for it. But if you remove the gross negligence, what protection is there for the driver of a vehicle who is trying to do some good in helping a neighbor out?

There is one other point I'd like the hon. member to deal with; that is, this matter of insurance agents' errors and omissions. I understand from this act that insurance agents will now be required to take out insurance to cover errors and omissions that occur in their offices. If I understand this properly, I'm in favor of it. I've had at least three cases in the last two or three years where the policyholder claimed the insurance agent misunderstood and didn't put down all the coverage he wanted, and he had an accident before the actual policy arrived. In one case he was covered but not for collision. Consequently he found himself liable for the damage to the car he was using.

If an error is made — and I'm not saying the error

was made in the office; maybe it was the policyholder's — but if any insurance office, which has a lot of people writing out policies today, which records its own policies and deals with them does make an error, surely the client or policyholder shouldn't have to take the brunt. If this is doing what I think it's going to do, it shouldn't be an expensive policy for the insurance agents. But I think it is a necessary one. I think it's good if insurance offices do cover their errors and omissions with an insurance policy so that if an error is made, the client is not going to take the brunt of the loss.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get into the debate just for a few moments. First of all, in response to the issue of gross negligence, I think we have to realize that over the years perhaps the courts have had a great deal of difficulty with the concept of gross negligence. I think it would be fair to say that in many, many cases they are very much hardship cases and, like most hardship cases, they tend to create bad law. When you have a very badly injured gratuitous passenger making a claim, I think it would be fair to say that in many, many cases gross negligence is found, in order to permit recovery.

You have to examine the cases. I think one could conclude that the defense of a gratuitous passenger is less and less available. For that reason there seems perhaps to be a trend towards minimizing or even changing the law with regard to gross negligence as applied to the gratuitous passenger. I think we have to keep in mind that in fact the courts are finding ways to find gross negligence and therefore permit recovery.

With regard to the savings possible for an individual who has driver training, those savings are in fact considerable and will amount, for example, to a reduction of 44 per cent. So where you have a young driver who has taken driver training courses, the saving can be as much as \$500. What we have found, however, is that out of the almost 100,000 new drivers coming on stream each year, only a very small fraction actually take driver training.

I think a good deal of work could be done by all of us to point out to those beginning drivers the considerable savings available. As I say, the young driver's premium — and young drivers tend to be driving some of the more expensive models of cars — in many cases amounts to \$1,000 and sometimes more than that. Many of these drivers could save themselves \$500 by taking driver training. If we could get that point across, not only would we be improving driving on the road but also pointing out the great savings available. I might say that the Alberta Automobile Insurance Board has in the past issued two orders to insurers with regard to beginning drivers and has made two modifications. By and large those savings are there, they're very real, and they're very considerable.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, if I could reflect first on the last point made by the hon. Member for Drumheller, which questioned whether this contained the



capacity for insurance agents to insure themselves against errors and omissions. That is indeed what the section proposes to do. It's amendment 11 in the list of amendments.

It is a request which came to the government from the Insurance Agents' Association of Alberta for their own protection. It will apply to all insurance agents other than those who are considered captive agents. Captive agents are those who sell insurance uniquely for one company. For instance, the agents of the co-operative insurance company would be considered captive agents and wouldn't necessarily have to have that insurance. But all those who represent or function on behalf of more than one company would be required to do so.

With respect to the gratuitous passenger, I think the minister has responded to a number of questions. It seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member raised a problem of the accident victim being left on the roadway for some time. In my estimation that is more a problem of the concern members of the medical profession have with respect to their legal liability. It's a great concern in the United States; much less so in Canada.

The second issue which I thought was being raised was the problem of the relationship between the gratuitous passenger and the driver of the vehicle, and whether this legislation would tend to cause greater concern on the part of automobile drivers to have passengers and, if you will, perform a friendly, neighborly act by taking someone to town.

I believe the legislation will enable the third party — that is, the gratuitous passenger — to claim directly against the insurer without in any way having to implicate the driver of the automobile in a negligent misconduct type of situation. So from that point of view I would think it would ease the relationship between the driver and the gratuitous passenger. What it really does is put the gratuitous passenger into a position in law to claim with respect to the insurance company, the same as the driver of the other automobile. In other words, they could act directly against the insurer and would not have to demonstrate negligence.

We believe the potential for abuse will be minimal inasmuch as the insurance companies, the insurers, can protect themselves by requiring gratuitous passengers to go through court action if it seems a trumped up, manufactured, or questionable claim.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that responds to the points made by the hon. member.

[Motion carried; Bill 72 read a second time]

**Bill 76**  
**The Provincial General Hospitals**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Bill 76, I'd like to comment that having worked for a considerable period of time in the health care field, particularly examining operations of the nursing home system, has put us into contact with hospital boards faced with the escalating costs of health services. These boards were administering not only the nursing homes we were working in, but also auxiliary and active treatment hospitals.

It doesn't take very long working in that area to find

that costs incurred in the health delivery system, not only in the province but in Canada as a whole, are pretty scary. When you look at a graph, the escalation factor of doing what is being attempted goes almost straight up.

In line with that the minister is looking at ways of delivering health care to areas that haven't had it in the past, or some degree of replacement of older existing services, particularly in the isolated regions. The concept is that you could go into an area that hasn't had service previously with a facility that wouldn't be called a hospital, but would be able to do the work now being done in a hospital: the concept being a clinic with essentially extended-care beds serviced by a doctor.

The reason you have to look at this kind of thing is that when we talk about health care and hospital costs, the building of that plant is not in itself the total factor. It's what happens afterward. You can build a hospital and think you've solved the problem. But in the design and building of these hospitals you haven't finished anything, you've only started something. That has been demonstrated in a number of areas where costs, far from coming under control, really take off when the plant is built.

So an assessment is being done to see how best to deliver health care to the rural area, and this is one of the ways being approached. So it's a twofold thing: it has to do with getting the health care out there and, at the same time, trying to control the costs.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments with respect to this bill. My comments are primarily perhaps questions that I hope will give the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care the opportunity to make some remarks with respect to this bill, in answer to the queries I have.

We are in second reading on this bill and speaking on principle. In looking at the amendment under this bill, it's difficult for me to speak on principle without referring directly to the clause within the bill, because I think that has a very direct relationship to the principle.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I'm not very clear as to whether the repeal of Section 3(1.2) of Bill 76 changes the requirement or concept that the Lieutenant Governor in Council makes a decision as to the facility that might be determined to be constructed or provided in any particular area. Does this bill remove that procedural direction? Does it change the principle, as I have read the bill previously, from the amendments which were passed under Chapter 70 of 1973?

I'm really in a quandary about that particular matter. Can the minister, under his own direction, without reference to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, approve a project or direction under this program providing a facility other than a hospital, or providing a hospital which provides services other than in the normal active treatment hospital? Will this repeal create a different principle of the minister being able to make that decision without the specific requirement of approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council?

The other question with respect to the principle is: will the passage of this bill enable the department, under the Ministry of Hospitals and Medical Care, to make a decision to provide a facility which is current-

ly perhaps under the jurisdiction and responsibility of the Department of Social Services and Community Health? If it does, is there some requirement then that there must be joint consultation or approval, or a working together relationship, before the Department of Hospitals and Medical Care makes a decision to go ahead with the project? I think that is very relevant to the whole principle we have here.

I hope the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care would give some clarification at this time, in order that we are better aware of the position we must take in dealing with the sections directly when the bill comes under Committee of the Whole.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I can very readily dispose of the second point. Whatever we arrive at — which is the purpose of this amendment — will have to be worked out jointly between the two portfolios — my colleague Miss Hunley and I, through joint planning and the health and social services committee.

What we're trying to do basically — and the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation has said it well — is get away from our historic, stereotyped kind of thinking, not just in rural Alberta but throughout health care generally, that the way to treat patients is an in-hospital, in-patient kind of atmosphere.

Yet our approaches have been very rigid. If you look at some smaller communities, they would like to retain a doctor. Basically they would like to have one doctor in the community. We've been rigid in terms of not providing certain kinds of facilities for a doctor to practise out-patient kind of care, to have some kind of minimal diagnostic capacity, without building a 20-bed hospital. Historically the only approach we've had is to build a 20-bed in-patient kind of hospital and thereby encourage doctors; the thinking has been that the only way we could keep a doctor in a community was by building a 20-bed hospital. Yet all the evidence appears to indicate that what we really need to develop is, for instance, approaches to the treatment of the nursing home class patient and the auxiliary kind of care.

So we need to look at a new concept jointly that is not a hospital, more an out-patient community clinic that will also, working with the College of Physicians and Surgeons and the Alberta Medical Association, meet the needs of the local doctor in that community. The desire of the communities is to have what meets the need for the doctor to be in that community. I think some of it will frankly require education of the medical profession in some communities as well. We'll have to take a look, through Mr. Gogo's committee on the economics of care, at whether there might have to be some incentive in the fee system, that we're just not encouraging doctors to think their economic livelihood is totally dependent on putting people in the hospital overnight.

So these things fit together. But certainly, because Miss Hunley has nursing stations . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. minister please use the ordinary parliamentary form in referring to his colleagues.

MR. MINIELY: The hon. Miss Hunley. My apologies, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Community Health, et cetera.

DR. BUCK: He said it for you. You're okay.

MR. MINIELY: I think that fully answers that question, Mr. Speaker. I have to relate the earlier question to The Provincial General Hospitals Act, Section 3(1) and (2), where it reads:

- (1) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may, by order in council, establish a Provincial General Hospital in Calgary and a Provincial General Hospital in Edmonton.
- (2) The purposes and objects of a Provincial General Hospital are to provide general hospital facilities for active and chronic treatment or either in the area of the Province in and for which a Provincial General Hospital is established.

Now, the amendment repeals that. The effect would be, one, that they don't have to be called hospitals. The second effect is that they wouldn't have to be named by the Lieutenant Governor in Council either. This entire Section 3(1) and (2) is repealed.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care was referring to the 1970 legislation. My reference, and the repeal under Bill 76, is with respect to 1973 Chapter 70, The Health and Social Development Statutes Amendment Act, which encompassed in it The Provincial General Hospitals Act. Section 3(1) and (2) is a different section, which is what I referred to and which is what Bill 76 deals with. So the reference and the reply would not be accurate insofar as my remarks were concerned.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member really has me confused. The amendment, Bill 76, amends Chapter 70, *Revised Statutes of Alberta 1970*, Provincial General Hospitals Act. I'm referring to the *Revised Statutes 1970*, Provincial General Hospitals Act, and I'm applying that amendment to the current clause in that act. I believe my interpretation on that is accurate.

MRS. CHICHAK: If I may put the other question again, the hon. minister refers to Chapter 70 and he is quoting, I believe, Chapter 286, The Provincial General Hospitals Act. That is where I think the confusion arises. Therefore the remarks do not relate to the same legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: Could the question perhaps be dealt with further in committee?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't know the hon. member was going to get so technical or I'd have brought one of those green books too. I see the minister is now busy dissecting the . . . Without pro-

longing the discussion, Mr. Speaker, I will just leave it at that.

[Motion carried; Bill 76 read a second time]

**Bill 85**  
**The Social Development**  
**Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2)**

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 85, The Social Development Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2). This is a very important bill in that it increases the capacity of the department to collect maintenance payments under maintenance orders. It does this by clearly indicating that the Crown is subrogated to the rights of the beneficiary of the maintenance order and that the action can be taken on the order in the name of the Crown. It's hoped that this will assist the department to recover a higher percentage of the requirements of maintenance orders in those cases where the beneficiary of the maintenance order is receiving social assistance. Of course, it applies only in those instances where the beneficiary of the order is in fact receiving social assistance.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would indicate to the House how this particular bill applies to extraprovincial recovery of maintenance, whether it has any effect in that area.

MR. ASHTON: Well, it will also assist in those cases. Under the amendment made last spring, for the enforcement of extraprovincial orders, that procedure is facilitated. Of course, this will further facilitate the capacity of the Crown to collect maintenance in most cases where the beneficiary of the order is receiving social assistance.

[Motion carried; Bill 85 read a second time]

**Bill 86**  
**The Domestic Relations**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 86, The Domestic Relations Amendment Act, 1977. This is a very important bill. The one general principle involved — if you take a very broad principle — is that it will substantially increase the ability of people entitled to maintenance to collect the maintenance. It does this basically by strengthening and broadening the capacity of the Family Court to take steps under maintenance orders. At present, as members are probably aware, the Family Court's only remedy under the order is to commit the delinquent person to jail.

The new bill will broaden substantially the capacity of the Family Court to collect the maintenance payments. It does this in several ways. One of the major ways is expected to be the process of the continuing garnishee, in that the Family Court will be able to issue a garnishee — for example, against a husband's wages — to require that the employer pay the amount of the maintenance payments to the court.

Another way the collection capacity of the person entitled to maintenance will be increased is that under the amending legislation the Family Court

maintenance order can be filed at the Land Titles Office, even though the person liable for the payment is not in arrears. That order will sit at the Land Titles Office and will have to be dealt with each time the person who is liable under the order deals with his or her land.

Another improvement to the system of collection of maintenance payments will be that the order can also be used to attach all other types of debts owing to the person liable. Orders issued by the Family Court will take priority on a person's salary for up to three months of arrears. This will take priority over all other claims except those of other employees of the company.

The bill has various other aspects. It repeals the so-called adultery section. Hon. members may be aware that present Section 29 provides that in the case of adultery of the spouse the order can be refused. It also has a very important feature, in which some hon. members will be most interested, in that the act will now apply to both male and female. So if a male has obtained a maintenance order, this act will of course similarly increase the capacity of the male to collect from the spouse. The basic intent of the bill, of course, is the enhancement of women's rights, but it also has something in it for the men.

At this point I would like to acknowledge the contribution of the Institute of Law Research and Reform to the bill itself. They have been doing considerable work on these issues for many months, and their deliberations have been taken into account in drafting the bill.

[Motion carried; Bill 86 read a second time]

**Bill 87**  
**The Metric Conversion**  
**Statutes Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 87, being The Metric Conversion Statutes Amendment Act, 1977. The purpose of this bill is to allow the use of metric measurements in some 30 different acts of this Legislature. If members will recall, last year about this time we had the first omnibus bill in metric. It covered, as I recall, 42 pieces of legislation.

I would again point out that metric conversion is a national program initiated by the federal government in 1971. The federal government's goal of having Canada a substantially metric society by the end of 1980 was endorsed by all the provinces in 1974. Since then, Alberta has been working in close co-ordination with the federal government and all the other provinces.

I'd point out that we're not trying to be leaders in the field of metric conversion but are merely attempting to keep in step with all the other provinces, as well as the federal government, and with our largest trading partner, which is of course the United States.

A week or so ago the federal minister responsible for the Wheat Board stated that the bulk grain industry would go metric on February 1, 1978. This is a one-year delay over the original proposal, since the federal metric bill did not receive assent in time for the February 1, 1977, target date which had been proposed for the bulk grain industry. There are some amendments related to the grain industry in Bill 87.

I suppose members would be interested in the state of conversion across the line. I think metric conversion in the U.S. is progressing fairly well on schedule. President Carter has recently submitted 15 names to the Senate for confirmation as part of a 17-member U.S. metric board. The chairman of the board, Louis Polk, is well known in metric circles. He has been involved in metric conversion for a number of years through the American National Metric Council. To date the push for metric conversion in the U.S. has been from private industry, through the American National Metric Council. The U.S. metric board, the new board being formed, will co-ordinate metric conversion among private industry, the public, and federal and state governments. It's expected to provide impetus and to speed up their program. So while they may be ahead of us in some areas and behind us in others, I think the general progression to metric conversion down there is proceeding more or less according to plan.

The amendments in Bill 87 would be proclaimed in logical sequence, in order to meet the needs of those converting sectors subject to this legislation. For example, the petroleum industry has developed its plans for metric conversion commencing January 1, 1979, whereas the construction industry is commencing January 1, 1978. They're already carrying out an effective program of training and awareness through the Alberta Construction Association, HUDAC, and the Alberta Real Estate Association.

By way of interest, other 1978 target dates for industry across the country are: between January and July the textile industry will be converted to metric; on March 1 the actual registration of motor vehicles in metric will commence; and by July all charges against ships, such as port fees and seaway tolls, will be converted to metric. There are probably other items that, while not announced, are in the planning phase for implementation.

Mr. Speaker, I would conclude by saying that this is the last omnibus bill. While there are some other changes to be made, they'll be made within specific acts in the future. So essentially this bill will take care of the omnibus conversions of legislation in Alberta.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, just to make a few general comments on The Metric Conversion Statutes Amendment Act. I think the federal government has rushed this thing too fast for industries and so on to gear themselves for conversion. I think the complete conversion in Canada is supposed to be done by 1980. I can see some real problems coming up with our fabrication industries and so on. They have many of their dies set right now for various sizes, and will have to be converting to metric by 1980.

I'd like to ask a question of the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder, as sponsor of the bill. Will any of the costs be picked up by the federal government for industry that has to convert because of the push to metric?

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, I am also wondering when the hon. member . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member wish to give the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder an opportunity to answer the question?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to respond to questions now or in concluding debate, whatever they wish.

MR. GHITTER: When the hon. member closes debate, I wonder if he would explain the necessity of changing Schedule J from gigacycles per second to gigahertz, and what that means.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make an observation with regard to the metric system. From the experience I've found in the farm operation, I doubt very much if too many members of the Legislature really understand the complications we have to go through to make this conversion. I suppose it's a little late now to make my presentation, but there was one area where I think maybe we as a province could have had some input, and that's in the area of tools for handling farm equipment.

It's likely we'll probably be facing a 20-year period where we are required to use two sets of tools, the metric and the standard. It's unfortunate that we as a province, or in particular the federal government that initiated this program, didn't clearly specify to industries manufacturing tools that they use a color code or some other means of specific identification. I'm sitting out there as a practical operator. I reach into the tool box for a nine-sixteenth wrench and I find out there's a shade of difference between that and a metric nine-sixteenth, if I could still use that term. But I don't know, until I use it on the particular nut or bolt I am dealing with, that I haven't got the right box-end wrench, or whatever it is. It would have been so simple to have used a color code or some means of identification. The wording on those tools is so fine that no one can clearly make out the particular size he's dealing with. If all metric tools had been color coded — whether that would have been possible or not, I don't know; either color coded or by design — then you could very clearly and very easily pick out the kind of wrench or tool you needed to use.

MR. LYSONS: I'd like to ask the hon. member about thread sizes and how this will affect agriculture. As anyone in the farming industry appreciates, there have been eight or so different thread sizes and gauges. [interjections] I'm getting a little help here that I don't appreciate.

When we go to convert hydraulics, or a simple thing like a grease nipple, over time all our changes will eventually have to be adapted. This is a real hardship to farmers, because not only do we have to have the standard thread sizes we've been accustomed to for years, but we'll have to have the extra thread sizes, attachments, and so on, that we'll be faced with now. It's really going to be a very serious problem.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I've made some notes in my bad handwriting, which I'll try to recall as I go through.

In response to the hon. Member for Stony Plain: to

my knowledge the costs of conversion are being borne by those who convert, whether it be government or private industry. That's essentially the way it was done in Australia and Great Britain, and the way it's being done in the U.S. and here. I don't think there is really any other alternative either. Certainly it costs money. It's hard to identify exactly how much, but the expectation is that the pay-off will be there in the long run through world standardization.

I think back to a comment made in the debate last year by the hon. Member for Banff, when he said that if we had all started school under the metric system we could probably have lopped a year off our formal education up to graduation from high school. It is a much simpler system. When we look at the growth of world trading patterns, and the fact that the whole world will be on the SI version of metric, I think the payout is going to be there for everybody in the long run. We're going to suffer some short-term discomforts and added costs — there's no question about that — but I think we probably have to take the big view on it.

Gigacycles versus gigahertz: hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, we can look at that in detail in committee, if you like. But generally, hertz is the SI metric standard. So all those frequencies, rather than being expressed in cycles or gigacycles, are converted to hertz. Perhaps during committee the hon. member might even like to look at gigajoules. [laughter]

Perhaps my rural friends could assist me here, but to my knowledge there is no conversion yet of farm machinery to metric. I suppose it will occur in due course. The automotive industry of course has either converted or is well on the way to being converted.

I kind of like the recommendation or suggestion of the hon. Member for Lacombe. Certainly our local metric people will be interested in reading *Hansard* on this debate. They're involved with the national metric committee. I'm sure they'd be happy to pass that recommendation on. Color coding of wrenches would seem to me a fairly useful idea.

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking: I don't think hydraulic fittings would change. In other words, the fitting would be the same size; in due course the expression of it as a size would undoubtedly be in metric. But I would expect those types of fittings to remain actually the same size.

It's my understanding there's going to be no overnight conversion of anything. It's going to be done in logical sequence and in a manner that is going to create the least hardship for anyone.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that has satisfactorily answered any of the questions. I would be perfectly happy to cover any other details in the course of the committee study.

[Motion carried; Bill 87 read a second time]

**Bill 88**  
**The Social Care Facilities**  
**Licensing Act**

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 88, The Social Care Facilities Licensing Act. As mentioned in first reading, the main purposes are: number one, the change of name from The Welfare Homes Act, thus indicating that there are a number of types of facilities licensing. It

also makes the title a little more contemporary. Number two is to make provision for appeals to be heard by an appeal board which will be appointed each time an appeal is heard. Number three, it provides for the licensing by the municipalities that decide to make that move.

It also provides that when a licence is cancelled on 30 days' notice, that the operator shall provide the director with the names and addresses of occupants as well as the names and addresses of relations or guardians who are responsible. These are to be kept as a record by the licence holder.

I would recommend the passage of this bill, Mr. Speaker.

[Motion carried; Bill 88 read a second time]

**Bill 91**  
**The Alberta Housing**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 91, The Alberta Housing Amendment Act, 1977. This is a very straightforward bill, Mr. Speaker, in that it clarifies the responsibility of the Alberta Housing Corporation in the area of land development.

I would like to refer hon. members to a brochure, put out on April 4, 1977, on the inquiries they may have from their municipalities on the development of industrial land in their constituencies.

The intent, Mr. Speaker, is to increase the municipalities' ability to attract industry by providing industrial sites with the assistance of Alberta Housing in the assembling and servicing of industrial land.

[Motion carried; Bill 91 read a second time]

**Bill 92**  
**The Consumer and Corporate Affairs**  
**Statutes Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 92, The Consumer and Corporate Affairs Statutes Amendment Act, 1977. Mr. Speaker, I gave a fairly detailed introduction to the bill at first reading, and pointed out the number of statutes this bill proposes to deal with. Apart from that I would await any further comment.

[Motion carried; Bill 92 read a second time]

**Bill 93**  
**The Pension Statutes**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 93, The Pension Statutes Amendment Act, 1977. There are two points of principle in this bill to which I wish to address some remarks.

The first is the provision in the proposed bill which would recognize common-law spouses for purposes of pension entitlement. This proposal arises from, and is before the House because of, a recommendation by the Ombudsman in his report for the period November 1, 1975, to December 31, 1976. On page 98 of that report he refers to and reviews a case where he felt that it was inequitable that a common-law spouse not be entitled to pension benefits as is

the case under our current pension law. At the bottom of that page, he concludes his report by saying that he strongly recommends that existing provincial legislation in this regard be reconsidered.

At the time of his review of this case, he had asked whether we would review the legislation. I undertook to do that and, as a result of the review, have proposed this bill. Essentially, Mr. Speaker, it provides for the recognition of common-law spouses on essentially the same terms and conditions as they are now recognized under the Alberta workers' compensation legislation.

The second point of principle that I wish to comment on, Mr. Speaker, is that covered by the provisions of the bill relating to the calculation of the cost of purchasing pension benefits for prior service. It was clear that under the system in the existing legislation the benefit being purchased was far in excess of the price being paid for that benefit. Under the present system, for bodies with whom the provincial government has reciprocal agreements, the cost of purchasing the prior service was calculated on the salary being paid during the period for which the prior service was being purchased. In the case of those bodies with whom we did not have reciprocal agreements, the cost of the pension time being purchased was calculated on the basis of the salary being paid at the time the employee began work with the provincial government.

The proposals contained in Bill 93 provide that the cost of buying prior service with the provincial government would be calculated on the salary being paid during the period for which the service was being purchased. However, for prior service with other bodies, the cost would be calculated on the salary being paid at the time of the request to purchase that prior service. These proposed changes, Mr. Speaker, would bring the benefits being purchased much more in line with the cost of purchasing them. I urge members of the Assembly to support on second reading the principles contained in the bill.

[Motion carried; Bill 93 read a second time]

**Bill 94**  
**The Alberta Union of**  
**Provincial Employees Act**

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 94, The Alberta Union of Provincial Employees Act. Most unions in Alberta, in fact I believe all unions in Alberta save this particular one, are not registered under The Societies Act. They are associations and are required to file copies of their constitutions and by-laws with the Board of Industrial Relations, if that is the governing agency.

Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation is requested by the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees. It will make the Alberta Union like other unions, provided that concept is accepted at an annual convention of that union. It will not change the position of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees with respect to having to be certified as the representative for groups other than provincial employees for which they have to have certification before the Board of Industrial Relations. However, if the annual convention of the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees agrees with the recommendations which are obviously being

made to them by their executive, their leaders, it will enable the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees to be recognized as the bargaining agent by the Public Service Employee Relations Board without having to have a formal hearing and a break in the continuity of that representation.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this to all members of the Legislature. It is requested by the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees and, in summary, simply makes that union like other unions, and enables it to avoid having to go through the certification process which might otherwise be required before the Public Service Employee Relations Board.

[Motion carried; Bill 94 read a second time]

**Bill 96**  
**The Trust Companies**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 96, The Trust Companies Amendment Act, 1977. The basic principle of this bill is to allow Alberta-incorporated trust companies more flexibility in their investment opportunities so they can better maintain their competitiveness with trust companies carrying on business in the province of Alberta.

By way of background, Mr. Speaker, in the province of Alberta we have some 37 trust companies, of which five active trust companies are Alberta-incorporated companies and come totally under the trust companies branch of Consumer Affairs. The total assets of these five Alberta companies are some \$140 million, and it should be noted that trust companies in the province of Alberta hold depositors' funds in excess of \$1.5 billion and that these same trust companies have invested in the province of Alberta, predominantly in house mortgages, funds in excess of \$2 billion. There are basically five areas in this bill, Mr. Speaker, that allow an expansion of the opportunities for Alberta trust companies to deal with, which previously they were not allowed to do under existing legislation.

The first expands the definition of improved real estate so that trust companies can, at the original inception, mortgage and take by way of mortgage security for their loans on lands that are not as yet developed, on the understanding that these lands will be zoned lands and will come on for development in a reasonable period of time. Secondly, they are now permitted under this proposed legislation to enter into joint loans with other regulated financial institutions, such as chartered banks, trust companies, and other approved agencies as set out in the legislation. Thirdly, the types of investments in which they can become involved are now expanded, and trust companies would be permitted, under this legislation, to invest in bonds, debentures, and notes, issued and guaranteed for repayment as to principal and interest by the government of the United States, or states within the United States.

This legislation would permit Alberta trust companies to acquire incorporated companies in the United States or to set up subsidiary companies in the United States as long as they did so with their own funds and not with depositors' funds. This legislation would also permit trust companies to get involved in personal property leasing, something they cannot do at

present. This would permit them to enter into transactions of this nature, as long as the lease is for a fixed period of time, would yield a reasonable rate of return to the trust company, and would further ensure that the purchase price of the chattels would be brought back within the term of the lease to the trust company.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few other consequential amendments in the legislation. There is also the provision which would allow loans to directors of trust companies, out of trust company funds, on the security of the residence of the director on the understanding that the director and/or the spouse are residing in the property. This would permit the trust company to maintain competitiveness with other trust companies allowed to do the same thing with their directors, who are moving back and forth and who need residences.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important piece of legislation from the point of view of the trust companies, which are a very important fabric in our business community in Alberta. The whole purport of this legislation is to allow them to maintain a competitive edge with the other trust companies. I am sure we want to do whatever we can to ensure the success of our trust companies in the province of Alberta.

[Motion carried; Bill 96 read a second time]

**Bill 98**  
**The Motor Vehicle Administration**  
**Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2)**

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 98, The Motor Vehicle Administration Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2). In this bill we are dealing with further efforts to control, or at least discourage, those members of our society who, although small in number, continue to be a hazard on our highways and a problem to our law enforcement authorities. We have those who think it is clever, expedient, or perhaps rationalize in their own mind that it's economically justifiable to take out vehicle insurance merely to obtain the required pink card, and then to cancel it or fail to keep up the premiums at renewal time and still continue to utilize that card even though it is not legal at the time. Unfortunately also, Mr. Speaker, this same class of person is usually irresponsible in driving habits as well. Many of the accidents caused on our provincial highways are due to this sort of behavior. That of course places a greater financial onus on the rest of the drivers in the province, as we have witnessed in the last short while with the increase in the cost of the unsatisfied judgment fund charged through an extra fee to every registration.

Then we have another group of irresponsible persons who deal with and traffic in stolen vehicles and parts of stolen vehicles. Mr. Speaker, this once again is the type of activity that unfortunately has been increasing very, very dramatically in recent years and months. Sections of Bill 98 no doubt will bring some greater control into these types of activities. I don't think any of us in this Assembly are so naive as to believe we will ever eliminate these types of activities, but what we're doing here is something that will no doubt discourage them. That's a step in the right direction and a plus for society.

Mr. Speaker, I see the Solicitor General isn't here.

I wish he was. If in the near future we can do something along the line of what I had in Bill Pr. 225, which would take away the wheels from those who drive while intoxicated or while their licence is suspended, we will pretty well have covered the whole spectrum of what's needed, of what government can do at least, in trying to discourage this type of irresponsibility on our highways. So I urge all members to support Bill 98.

[Motion carried; Bill 98 read a second time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain bills on the Order Paper, beginning with Bill [58].

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**  
**(Committee of the Whole)**

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

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

**Bill 58**  
**The Alberta Income Tax**  
**Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2)**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

We have an amendment to this bill. Is everybody familiar with the amendment?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 58, The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2), be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 61**  
**The Farm Implement**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Chairman, to the minister: no reference is made in the definition to off-highway vehicles or snowmobiles, and I wonder if they fit within the parameters of the proposed amendments to The Farm Implement Amendment Act.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, insofar as the act before you is concerned, it would include all farm implements, including snowmobiles or whatever, that might be used totally in a farm operation. But the act provides for the exempting of certain implements, if

you want to consider them that, by way of regulation. On proclaiming the act, it is our intention at the same time to introduce regulations which would exclude a number of implements, including snowmobiles and other kinds of equipment that we don't feel should be under The Farm Implement Act.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a comment or two on Bill 61. I've tried to give this bill a bit of thought. It seems to me what we're really trying to do is establish something that's not going to serve any great function. It sounds as if it's going to do something, but the farmer — the one we're trying to help — is the guy who, in the long run, is going to be paying for it. I'd like to know just what consultation the minister has had with implement dealers, who of course I'm sure the minister would feel are going to be prejudiced in their views, and farm groups, as to: are we really going to accomplish anything with this?

I'd like to bring to the attention of the hon. members that in the years I was a trucker and involved in that industry my philosophy always was: buy the vehicle from a man you think is giving you a good deal, then take your chances worrying about if the thing is going to run or not. That seemed to work out pretty well. Whenever I ask some man to guarantee this thing is going to have parts available, that it's going to have a lot of servicing available, I know who pays for that. You know, no one had to brainwash me that someone else was going to pay for it. I was going to pay for it, or consumers as a whole were going to pay for it.

So this bill really disturbs me, Mr. Chairman, because I think the farmer is going to be paying for the solution to his own problem. So whom are we protecting? I really question the philosophy behind this, and I'd like to know how much input we've had from the implement agents association and farm groups. Did they really want this legislation? I'd be glad to hear from the minister.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, on the question, of input: the Farm Machinery Appeal Board is comprised of various individuals recommended for appointment to that board by the Prairie Equipment Manufacturers Association, by the Alberta-British Columbia Farm Equipment Dealers' Association, and representatives from various farm organizations. The entire contents of this legislation were brought forward from the request to my office of the Farm Machinery Appeal Board with respect to some of the problems that board has incurred during the course of their operation since 1972. They were well discussed by the board, which is representative of all segments of the industry. In addition to that, individuals, in terms of dealers and manufacturers, have had an opportunity to discuss many of the questions that arise here, particularly those to do with warranty.

Mr. Chairman, the only other thing I could say to the hon. member is that we're dealing with a situation where many companies manufacture machinery — and I'm thinking mainly of the large companies — which is sold in many countries of the world; in North America, the United States and Canada. A good many other jurisdictions have farm machinery legislation. I believe it's prevalent in every province in Canada and most states of the United States. It's traditionally been a situation where separate legisla-

tion has provided for, if you like, protection of the end-user of agricultural machinery with respect to the supply of parts, warranty, and so on.

If we do not move in the area of providing by legislation certain requirements in this area in Alberta, we have that existing in other provinces and perhaps states of the U.S., and so on, where farm machinery companies are required by law to provide a certain amount of parts, certain services, and certain warranties. Then we wind up with a situation where, because of the corporate nature of these companies operating on a world-wide basis, Alberta farmers may be denied that same protection simply because it isn't in our law. I don't believe Alberta farmers are going to pay all the costs. Certainly, if extended warranty is required it will be a cost to farmers in the end, if equipment manufacturers do not do something about inferior equipment. Surely, if a company produces a new model of tractor and 75 per cent of those tractors appear to have, or do have, defective components — like an engine or something — 13 months down the road, it's not unreasonable to suggest that there should be some replacement — some warranty — to provide assistance in that area.

It's not unreasonable to suggest, either, that the farm machinery manufacturers will do a much better job of making sure that that equipment comes onto the market in a manner that an individual can expect it to stand up under reasonable operating conditions for two seasons of use. It's not unreasonable to expect that they will do that if they're required by our legislation to correct the deficiencies and pay for that cost.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this legislation. When a farmer today buys equipment costing from \$20,000 to \$100,000, surely it's not asking too much for some warranty during the period. He certainly shouldn't be left high and dry if the machine happens to be a lemon, and with the prices we're paying today for farm machinery, the company should provide a period of warranty in which the farmer can be satisfied he's getting that for which he paid.

I think this legislation is excellent and long overdue. Periodically over the past several years, you ran into a farmer who had bought a piece of farm machinery that didn't do the job for which it was advertised and intended. The former Minister of Agriculture and, I believe, the present Minister of Agriculture, have endeavored to get some redress. I think the legislation puts it squarely on the line that when these companies sell machinery they realize they have to replace parts or make that machine work. I don't think that's unreasonable at all.

I also feel that when you're buying machines today, running to \$20,000, \$50,000, \$80,000, the company has the responsibility to have parts within a reasonable distance. It's like a camera I bought several years ago. Bell & Howell tells me the camera's perfectly good except the parts are no longer made. So for a \$7 part you have to throw away a \$350 camera. Just a drop in the bucket compared to what's happening in the farming industry, but it illustrates the point.

I think this legislation is long overdue, and I think it would be welcomed by the farmers of Alberta.



DR. BUCK: I just want to make one point, Mr. Chairman. I'm not against warranties, and having parts and stuff available. What I am saying is, I want to know who is going to be paying the tab. Basically the farmer's going to be picking up the tab for his own protection. The point I'm trying to make is: I wanted to know what consultation there was with the farm groups. I certainly agree that when a man has a \$40,000 or \$50,000 unit, the thing certainly should last more than two years, and he should have some recourse. But I want to know how far we go, and in the long run I think the farmer himself is probably paying for this type of protection.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 61, The Farm Implement Amendment Act, 1977, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 65**  
**The Utility Companies**  
**Income Tax Rebates Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

There is an amendment to Bill 65. Are you all familiar with the amendment?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 65, The Utility Companies Income Tax Rebates Act, 1977, be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 73**  
**The Motor Transport Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

DR. HORNER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 73, The Motor Transport Act, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 77**  
**The Natural Gas Price**  
**Administration Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. GETTY: There's an amendment, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you all familiar with the amendment?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. GETTY: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 77 be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 79**  
**The Nursing Homes**  
**Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2)**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 79, The Nursing Homes Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2), be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 78**  
**The Attorney General Statutes**  
**Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2)**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, an amendment has been circulated. I'd like to add one word on that. In the original bill we had increased the number of Supreme Court justices by one. The amendment will increase that number now by two, in order to provide the court with additional help in dealing with the cases which come before the Supreme Court of Alberta.

A number of questions were raised at second reading, to which I'd like to respond if I may. First, the hon. Member for Stony Plain had asked a question with respect to the fine provided for failure to prove public liability insurance. The question has to be answered this way, Mr. Chairman: it's a matter of enforcement through the office of the Solicitor General. He has advised me that there is a follow-up on people obtaining insurance after they pay the fine to make sure they have pink cards. If not, the licences of the offenders are removed. That matter is dealt with by that method. It really doesn't come under the terms of the act, if I may say [so], in the amendments offered today.

The other points raised by Mr. Notley related to the question of the type of offences which might be considered by Executive Council in arriving at the payment of fines on a voluntary basis. I've received a number of suggested changes related to offences under The Wildlife Act, The Weed Control Act, The Noxious Weeds Act, The Forest and Prairie Protection Act, The Litter Act, The Fuel Oil Tax Act, The Liquor Licensing Act, and The Liquor Control Act.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to many of those offences under consideration, it is apparent that there will have to be additional enabling legislation, particularly where ranges of fines or penalties are provided

in the legislation. For example, some penalty provisions in The Wildlife Act provide for a minimum fine of \$10 to a maximum of \$1,000. Obviously that type of offence cannot be made the subject of a voluntary payment. So this matter is being reviewed and researched by the Attorney General's Department at the present time. In order to implement the voluntary payment of fines proposed by the legislation, no doubt many amendments to those various acts will have to be brought forward to provide the type of penalty which can be paid by voluntary payment.

The other question related to the questions of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, some of which I answered at second reading, but [which] I would like to comment on briefly. The purpose of the amendments to The Summary Convictions Act, which we've really been dealing with, relate to the intent of the government to bring forward this type of ticket payment on a voluntary basis, without the necessity of going before the court. I think it's important to emphasize once again that it is the intention of the government to move toward decriminalization of many minor offences, and thus relieve the court of much of the administrative responsibilities now placed upon the court and the administrative system associated with the courts at the provincial court level and, by doing so, to permit the courts to deal with these minor charges in an easier manner, keeping the courtrooms clear for dealing with more serious offences. That is the whole principle behind these amendments to The Summary Convictions Act, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Chairman, I would take exception to the remark made by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff in regard to my question on insurance. The Summary Convictions Act very definitely states that the Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations. Then they go ahead to say what may be done. They have failing to produce insurance as a voluntary fine. That was passed July 1, 1977. My concern is that you have 21 days to pay that particular fine. So if the police do not impound that vehicle, in actual fact that person is driving for 21 days with no insurance before that ticket comes back to the Solicitor General's office, so he may then inform the police department to find out for sure if he has gained insurance. I think the police should use discretionary powers and maybe impound that car at the time the charge is laid, instead of allowing 21 days to pay the fine and then find out.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to my colleague the Member for Stony Plain, that wasn't the question he asked at second reading. Therefore I didn't respond to the question he raised this morning; however, I do think the point he has raised is a good one. I would refer it to the Attorney General for consideration and review. Certainly the Solicitor General is well aware of the problem the hon. member has raised and, indeed, has issued instructions to law enforcement officials in the province to make sure that people convicted of that offence are not going to be allowed to continue driving. I would suggest that the point is well made, and I will certainly take it up with the Solicitor General and the Attorney General to make sure that type of problem is alleviated in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll read you the amendment to Bill 78, The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2). The bill is amended as follows: "Section 4(2) is amended by striking out 17 and substituting 18".

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 78, The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2) be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 82**  
**The Industrial Wages**  
**Security Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, I move Bill 82, The Industrial Wages Security Amendment Act, 1977, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 83**  
**The Social Services and Community**  
**Health Statutes Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. STEWART: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 83, The Social Services and Community Health Statutes Amendment Act, 1977, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 72**  
**The Alberta Insurance**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 72, The Alberta Insurance Amendment Act, 1977, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 87**  
**The Metric Conversion**  
**Statutes Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions,

or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. HARLE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 92, The Consumer and Corporate Affairs Statutes Amendment Act, 1977, be reported.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 87, The Metric Conversion Statutes Amendment Act, 1977, be reported.

[Motion carried]

[Motion carried]

**Bill 76**  
**The Provincial General Hospitals**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Chairman, I move that The Provincial General Hospitals Amendment Act, 1977, be reported.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 93, The Pension Statutes Amendment Act, 1977, be reported.

[Motion carried]

[Motion carried]

**Bill 88**  
**The Social Care Facilities**  
**Licensing Act**

**Bill 94**  
**The Alberta Union of**  
**Provincial Employees Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 88, The Social Care Facilities Licensing Act, be reported.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 94, The Alberta Union of Provincial Employees Act, be reported.

[Motion carried]

[Motion carried]

**Bill 91**  
**The Alberta Housing**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

**Bill 96**  
**The Trust Companies**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. member what checks there are in the provision that will now permit loans to be made to directors of a trust company.

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 91, The Alberta Housing Amendment Act, 1977, be reported.

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Chairman, the checks are: first, the amount of the loan must be maintainable on the basis that it cannot be more than 75 per cent of the appraised value of the property, which is the standard requirement from the point of view of loans by trust companies. Of course the hon. member will note that under those regulations the other check is that the director must be living in the residence. It must be his place of residence or that of his spouse. So it comes under identical regulations and controls as a normal mortgage loan. I hope that answers the inquiry of the hon. member.

[Motion carried]

[Title and preamble agreed to]

**Bill 92**  
**The Consumer and Corporate Affairs**  
**Statutes Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

MR. GHITTER: I move that Bill No. 96, The Trust Companies Amendment Act, 1977, be reported.

[Motion carried]

[Motion carried]

**Bill 98**  
**The Motor Vehicle Administration**  
**Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2)**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill? There are some amendments.

MR. FARRAN: I move two amendments. One is to delete [Subsection] (1.2) from "Every Insurer" to "or being cancelled", and insert

Every insurer that sends directly to an insured a notice of renewal which is conditional upon payment of a further premium, failure to pay which will result in the policy lapsing or being cancelled, shall inform the policy holders in an attachment to the notice that

- (a) It is an offence to use or be in possession of a financial responsibility card or a copy of the financial responsibility card relating to an owner's policy that has lapsed or been cancelled,

And the second amendment is [Subsection] (1.4): after words "Any insurer" insert words "or his agent".

The purpose of the first amendment is to make it quite clear that this also applies to those companies engaging in direct billing which do not send an official cancellation of policy, but make it implicit in the notice of renewal. The second one is to make it quite clear that the obligation to provide information to the police is upon the insurer, or the insurance company, and his agent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have heard the amendment. Do you wish me to go over it again, or are you familiar with the amendment?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 98, The Motor Vehicle Administration Act, 1977, (No.2) be reported.[interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN: As amended.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 85**  
**The Social Development**  
**Amendment Act, 1977, (No.2)**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. ASHTON: I move that Bill No. 85 be reported.

**Bill 86**  
**The Domestic Relations**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. ASHTON: I move that Bill No. 86 be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 71**  
**The Nursing Assistants**  
**Registration Act**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

There is an amendment to the bill. Are you all familiar with the amendment?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, Mr. Musgreave, I move the bill be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

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

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration bills 58, 65, 77, 78, 72, 87, 76, 88, 91, 92, 93, 94, 96, and 71, and begs to report same with some amendments.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration bills 61, 73, 79, 82, 83, 98, 85, and 86, begs to report same, and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, not wanting to waste any time on this last day of the week, we would now call for third reading of bills 59, 60, 64, and 67.

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS**  
(Third Reading)

**Bill 59**  
**The Tobacco Tax**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 59, The Tobacco Tax Amendment Act, 1977.

[Motion carried; Bill 59 read a third time]

**Bill 60**  
**The Fuel Oil Tax**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 60, The Fuel Oil Tax Amendment Act, 1977.

[Motion carried; Bill 60 read a third time]

**Bill 64**  
**The Department of**  
**Business Development and Tourism**  
**Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 64, The Department of Business Development and Tourism Amendment Act, 1977, be now read a third time.

[Motion carried; Bill 64 read a third time]

**Bill 67**  
**The Department of Recreation, Parks**  
**and Wildlife Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill 67, The Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Amendment Act, 1977.

[Motion carried; Bill 67 read a third time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe yesterday afternoon I gave a broad outline of business which would probably be conducted next week. I move that we call it 1 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 Monday afternoon at 2:30.

[The House adjourned at 1 p.m.]

