

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Friday, March 12, 1982 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

head: **PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 13****Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation  
Amendment Act, 1982**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 13, the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1982. This being a money Bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of the Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

In one sentence, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to increase by \$1.5 billion, to a ceiling of \$5.8 billion, the cumulative total amount which may be borrowed by municipalities, hospitals, and school boards through Heritage Savings Trust Fund financing, many at subsidized rates which hold down property taxes, to continue to construct such public works as hospitals, roads, recreation complexes, fire halls, museums, curling rinks, reservoirs, and schools.

[Leave granted; Bill 13 read a first time]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MRS. LeMESSURIER: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to introduce to you, and through you to members of this Assembly, adult students from the Edmonton Public School Board, Continuing Education. They are from the constituency of Edmonton Centre and are accompanied by their leader Mr. Scragg. These students represent the countries of Borneo, Chile, India, Hong Kong, Poland, and Vietnam, and the province of Quebec. I ask that the students rise and receive the very warm welcome of this Assembly.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I trust that the following students are in the gallery in spite of Edmonton chinooks, but who knows. They're not? Then we will come back to it later.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

**Prison System**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General, with regard to the escape of the prisoner Harvey Andres from the maximum security penitentiary yesterday. The people of Calgary are very concerned, because he went to Calgary after his escape, and a shoot-out followed. My question to the hon. minister is:

what steps are being taken by the RCMP to assure that all measures and actions are taken to find this person and return him to prison and in security, which is a provincial responsibility?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the RCMP and the Calgary city police will be pressing with all the effort they can in locating and returning that individual to the prison system.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of the urgency and the threat to the general community, has the hon. minister been in contact with his officials in his department, and in turn the RCMP, to assure himself and this Assembly that all actions are being taken? If not, when is the minister going to do it?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I am sure the RCMP and the Calgary city police will be doing just that.

MR. R. SPEAKER: That's not good enough. For the Solicitor General: what actions has the minister taken to assure himself? This is an urgent matter. The day before yesterday, a man was stabbed by parolees in the city of Edmonton. Has the minister taken any action on that matter that is under his jurisdiction as well?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, in both cases, the individuals were in the federal penitentiary system.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, apprehension of anyone who has committed that kind of very serious misdemeanor is the responsibility of the minister. Is the minister taking some actions? Can the minister commit to this Legislature that he will take immediate action and not just say: it's happening; I'll go back to the close, warm comfort of my office; it's not a nice day outside, so I don't think I will get too excited. Is the minister going to get excited about his responsibilities and do something today?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, the police were extremely successful with regard to the stabbing in the city of Edmonton.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question was first of all with regard to the capture of Harvey Andres. The last time, there was a shoot-out and one policeman was shot. Is the minister aware of what measures are being taken, or is the minister even aware that the situation occurred?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, as I said, the police are taking every effort to recapture that particular individual.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Will the hon. minister advise me on what information he is able to say that to this Legislature? Has he made some contacts, or is that just an assumption, to try to say: I am doing it, but I don't know. I am not satisfied with the answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER: What does the minister have to show that he has done something and can assure the House that he has made some contacts this morning?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I have no information at all to indicate that the steps are not being taken.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. minister going to take action to assure himself that those steps are taken, and will he report to the Legislature on Monday as to all steps taken as of today? Is the minister going to report to the Legislature on Monday on what he doesn't know now, as to what security steps are being taken? Will he give that commitment to the Legislature so we know

MR. SPEAKER: We are getting into a fair amount of repetition in the questions. I believe the hon. Member for Vegreville has a supplementary.

MR. R. SPEAKER: What's he getting paid for?

MR. BATIUK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the Solicitor General advise whether it is customary that any time there is a crime, it's up to him to notify the police, or do the police go on their own immediately?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what that unavoidable interruption was, but it was there.

Mr. Speaker, my further supplementary question to the Solicitor General is with regard to representation to the federal government. Will the minister consider making representation to the federal government to improve its maximum security procedures, so prisoners can't slip away from the maximum security prison through the hole in the fence, use the old trick of a dummy laying in bed, and run away with bed sheets? Could the minister assure this Assembly that he is going to make some representation to the federal government?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, representations have been made in the past, expressing concern with regard to the probationary system, parole system, particularly as it has affected Edmonton. As a result of this particular episode, I am sure further representations will be made to the federal Solicitor General.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister give this House the commitment that he will consider it an urgent matter and attempt to make that representation within the next week?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I can give consideration to that.

#### **Corporate Income Tax**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my second question is to the Provincial Treasurer, with regard to the new corporate income tax branch. What measures are being contemplated or put in place to stimulate the economy of this province, in a time of recession and high interest rates, through that corporate income tax branch? What benefits are in place for citizens of Alberta from that branch?

MR. SPEAKER: With regard to the second part of the question, I assume that deals with a matter of public knowledge. With regard to the first part, in addition to the question mark with which the hon. leader ended the question, I also have a question mark over it. However, the hon. minister may wish to reply.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, as members know, the first step of the business incentive tax program was to bring back from Ottawa to the province of Alberta, control over our own corporate tax system, to enable Alberta to make decisions here, down the road as we move ahead into the next years and decades with our own business and industrial tax situation in place. That first step, phase one, has now been taken and is running smoothly.

Phase two, which will involve an array of incentives designed to encourage upgrading and processing in the province to enable small Alberta businesses to compete in the Canadian and world market place, is being developed and will be announced in the weeks and months ahead.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Does he have any reliable studies, or have studies been done within the department, which indicate that the provincial government will be able to make tax cuts and expenditures which will provide benefits to the provincial economy that are greater than setting up the program itself? As we well recognize, that is a cost of some \$6.8 million in the budget.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. leader will contain his anticipation, he will see that when the announcements are made in the weeks and months ahead, they will be of very significant benefit down the road to the business community in this province and will certainly be much more significant than the costs.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I heard that last year, and I'm getting a little suspicious. My question was, are any concrete studies being done by the department? Can any of those studies be tabled in this Legislature following the announcements in the budget?

MR. HYNDMAN: A number of reviews have been tabled over the past three or four years, Mr. Speaker. We're now at the stage of not doing any more studies; we're at the stage of moving forward to making decisions, announcing them, and having things and initiatives which will benefit small and middle-sized businesses in this province. They will be announced in the weeks and months ahead.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I've heard that speech about moving ahead before, but nothing . . .

To the hon. Provincial Treasurer. With regard to staffing this new branch, at this point in time has the hon. minister encountered difficulties in bringing in qualified personnel, such as computer specialists, accountants, and managers? Are all employees for that corporate income tax branch in place?

MR. HYNDMAN: Basically they are in place, Mr. Speaker. This has been carried on over the last year. It takes some time to get the talented people necessary to do that properly and to make sure that the system is delivered efficiently and effectively, with the least amount of concern, cost, or paperwork for Alberta businesses. That's now in place. Of course there will be the necessity of acquiring further members for that division this year, in order to put into effect the new initiatives which will be announced down the road.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary to the Provincial Treasurer relates to the corporate tax collection system. It has come to my attention that a number of small businesses have been required, or there is a requirement in place, to report and remit their corporate tax on a monthly basis, whereas their normal practice was to remit less than that. I wonder if the Provincial Treasurer could indicate to the House whether he would be prepared to review a system whereby, for the small business man, the reporting and collection requirements could be reviewed, with a view to eliminating the extra burden that would not be of consequence in terms of actual cash revenue?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, we're always looking at ways to further streamline and simplify the system and will continue to do so. I accept with interest the submissions of the hon. member.

#### **Housing Tax Incentives**

MR. ZAOZIRNY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question on the subject of income tax incentives, to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. In light of the termination of the MURB program by the federal government, is the minister giving consideration to enhancing and enriching the provincial program, to encourage the development and creation of more rental housing here in the province of Alberta?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, there's no question that the cancellation of the MURB was probably one of the most serious adverse things the federal government has done in a long time, in terms of housing. I apologize for my voice; I have a cold. There's no question the MURB soft-cost write-offs, and so forth, created a great deal of rental housing in Canada and Alberta. It is regrettable that it was cancelled.

Yes, we are evaluating a number of different means. I refer the member to the commitment in the throne speech that Alberta would continue to support housing in a strong way for low- and middle-income Albertans, as we have in the past. I suggest that the member watch for programs on budget night.

#### **Corporate Income Tax** (continued)

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, with regard to the re-registration of companies. My understanding is that the new corporate income tax branch is requiring re-registration of a number of companies, so procedures can be put in place. I wonder if the hon. Provincial Treasurer could confirm or clarify that matter.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can respond to that question. I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition raises a matter that isn't with respect to the matter of income tax but with respect to the new Business Corporations Act, passed in this Legislature last year.

As hon. members are aware, the provisions of the Business Corporations Act require Alberta companies and those from outside the province to file continuance documents, in order to continue under the new law. The provisions are such that that opportunity exists for a period of three years following the proclamation of the Business Corporations Act, which was on February 1 this

year. So the three-year period within which those continuance documents can be filed began on February 1 this year. With respect to the fees payable to the corporate registry section of the department, no fees whatsoever are payable during the first year that continuance documents are filed. Thereafter, there will be a fee.

MR. PAHL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister could indicate a commitment to provide a self-help or do-it-yourself registration of continuance, which would provide an opportunity for small businesses, particularly, to avoid the sometimes high legal fees involved in corporate registrations.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the kit was not ready on the date the proclamation took place. The forms for continuance are in fact ready and available. The kit, which provides the additional information, should be available within the next month or two. That should cause no great difficulty, as there will be considerable time within which the directors of companies can take a look at the materials. That would be of assistance in the preparation of their continuance documents. Mr. Speaker, in further response to the question, the department reports to me that from a brief consideration of the continuance documents filed, it would seem that at least half the companies that have filed them have done so without the assistance of legal or financial help.

#### **College Programming**

MR. BORSTAD: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Because of the accumulated deficit at Grande Prairie Regional College and the necessity to cut back in order to arrive at a balanced budget, can the minister advise the Assembly if this will mean a cutback in the first- and second-year university entrance courses, and in enrolment?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, the appearance of a deficit at the Grande Prairie Regional College is of considerable concern to me and to the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower. In recognition of that, \$150,000 remaining in the service element of the department has been advanced to Grande Prairie Regional College in this current fiscal year and will be continued as part of the base funding of that institution in future years. That will help them with the elimination of the first deficit, of \$300,000, that has appeared.

The new budget has been approved for Grande Prairie Regional College, showing a balanced budget, which is the policy of the department and of this government. That is some \$600,000 less than the deficit projected by the college for the next operating year.

It is my hope that the basic courses which, in effect, founded Grande Prairie Regional College — the first- and second-year university transfer program — will continue unabated. That would be a decision of the board of governors of the institution. My understanding is that the board is taking steps to eliminate programs which had low enrolments. Those would not include the university transfer courses, which are really the very basic core of the Grande Prairie Regional College offerings.

MR. BORSTAD: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are any other colleges in the province being forced to limit enrolment or courses in any way at this time?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question directly, because there are 10 colleges. Some have quotas in various programs, relating not just to budgetary matters but to availability of space, instructors, and that type of thing. I can say that at the present time, no other colleges are reporting deficits in their operating accounts, and no other deficit budgets are being approved for other colleges in the province.

MR. BORSTAD: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister ensure that the courses that affect a person's livelihood, in order to get a job, will not be affected?

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, that question also will be determined by the board of governors, in their decision as to how they make rearrangements of the programming within the institution. I'm confident they will be very careful to eliminate programs which are perhaps not in the category of those affecting people's opportunities to advance their education for their careers, but look at other programs and some courses which, as I indicated, have low enrolments and perhaps less interest on the part of students throughout the Peace River area. Once this deficit situation is corrected, we hope the college will again be able to extend its programming. It appears to me that they had extended their programming too quickly, without sufficient financial resources available to them.

#### **Hazardous Waste Disposal**

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. In the county of Beaver, there's a problem with a hazardous waste disposal plant. As there has been a petition of 600 or better names for a plebiscite on placing that hazardous waste disposal plant in that area, could the hon. minister relate to this Assembly if he would give consideration to placing that particular plant in another area if the plebiscite wishes that to be done?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, the general procedure is to allow the local authority to negotiate with those who perhaps have a different point of view as to a hazardous waste plant. The county of Beaver has been very supportive of a plant of this nature, and dialogue is going on at the present time. It would be premature for me to comment, in a sense, on a proposal for a plebiscite, until one determines essentially what the plebiscite is about and the eventual outcome.

MR. KESLER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister relate to this Assembly why the county of Beaver was in fact chosen? It didn't appear in the four areas most suited to the plant: the county of Strathcona, the municipal district of Sturgeon, the county of Leduc, and the county of Lamont. As indicated by the investigative or Hazardous Waste Team appointed, those were prime areas for placement of the plant. Perhaps the hon. minister could tell us why the county of Beaver was chosen?

MR. COOKSON: The procedure we followed was that the waste siting committee covered the total province, using all the variable factors that would make a specific area acceptable. In that respect, they're dealing with the total province. Based on those overlays, which were finally brought together and which took into consideration

distance, location, population, and the geophysical qualities of the area, there are a number of areas in the province which meet those criteria.

Subsequently it was left to the initiative of the local authorities to approach the Department of the Environment as to the interest they would have in a plant which, by the way, will result in considerable activity in terms of construction and assessment to that particular county. A number of letters have been submitted to the department, asking us to look at further sites within their counties, which is positive. However, the county of Beaver has perhaps been in the lead in this respect, and has complied with some of Environment's requirements.

MR. KESLER: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. In a report prepared by the Hazardous Waste Team and in a letter sent to the hon. minister, it was indicated that the plant should be located no more than 100 kilometres from the city of Edmonton, due to the dangers of transportation. In light of the serious accidents which have occurred in past years with hazardous wastes, not only in Alberta but across Canada, does the hon. minister not feel that that should be of prime consideration?

MR. COOKSON: In their hearings and submissions, and based on their own recommendations to the department, the Environment Council of Alberta suggested that one should attempt to locate a site within 100 kilometres of either of the two cities, or both cities. It was a recommendation. However, one has to take into consideration not only the transportation problem but other factors. Even though we're satisfied with the recommendation on transportation considerations, and noting where the major sources of these materials are, one has to consider all the other factors before concluding a specific site location.

MR. KESLER: A supplementary question. Could the hon. minister tell the Assembly whether, once the plant is in place — whether in Beaver county or one of the other areas — there will be an agent in place to monitor the activity of the waste area?

MR. COOKSON: I think some of that discussion could perhaps be held at the time we introduce legislation on the importance of this operation, Mr. Speaker. I can say now that any plant constructed will meet our existing legislation, with regard to the Clean Water Act, the Clean Air Act, the Hazardous Chemicals Act, and the Agricultural Chemicals Act. A lot of the legislation is essentially now in place to deal with it.

MR. KESLER: One last supplementary to the hon. Minister of the Environment. First of all, will this facility be funded by government or the private sector? Once in place, will the facility continue to be operated by the private sector, or will it be a government installation, funded by taxpayers' dollars?

MR. COOKSON: The general preference of government, supported by the Environment Council of Alberta and members of the advisory committee, is that we use a combination of two things, if possible. One is that private enterprise be totally involved with the operation of the plant; however, that we have a Crown agency designed in such a way as to supervise or correlate, in a sense, between government and private enterprise in its eventual

operation. The other recommendation is that the land itself would be owned by the Crown.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, recognizing the sensitivity of locating such a plant, could the minister advise the Assembly if the process of site location within Alberta is similar to other processes in North America, where similar types of operations have been located?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, I think it has been indicated on and off in the question period, that there are more suitable ways of doing hon. members' research than in the question period. The hon. member is obviously asking the minister to summarize or select from available information around North America.

MRS. FYFE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may ask a further question. Could the minister advise what weight is given to the factor of transportation of hazardous goods in site location?

MR. COOKSON: Transportation is weighted fairly heavily, Mr. Speaker. Of course one has to remember that these materials are moving up and down throughout the province now. The Minister of Municipal Affairs has introduced the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Control Act, which will supplement the amendments we're looking toward with regard to the Hazardous Chemicals Act, so we can maximize the safety insofar as transportation is concerned.

The other factors we have used in our overlays throughout the province are also extremely important. That has to do with the geophysical situation and with the support of municipalities, and so on.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I understand they are looking at several sites in the county. Is any emphasis put on one particular site in the area, or has any consideration been given to moving the location to another area in the province that's not so heavily populated?

MR. COOKSON: Three sites are proposed for an intensive review of water tables and quality of soil. However, in a letter to me, the council of the county of Beaver has been supportive of a section located south of Viking. I think it's Section 11. That's the one we are most interested in, in terms of the substructure and the capability of the site itself, its water table, and so on.

MR. ZAOZIRNY: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Given that all hazardous waste material emanating from the city of Calgary is presently being dumped in the Forest Lawn landfill site, can the minister indicate to the Assembly the time frame by which we can expect to have a fully operational, proper hazardous waste facility in this province and, as well, whether any interim, alternate site is presently under consideration, so that the dumping in the Forest Lawn landfill site can be stopped?

MR. COOKSON: The time frame established for proposals with regard to maintenance and operation of a technical plant is March 15. So there is a time frame insofar as submission of proposals is concerned. It's pretty hard to predict the time frame on the other problems, but we would like to have something in place as quickly as possible, in terms of a site. In the interim period, we are looking at temporary storage at some of our regional

landfills throughout the province that meet our criteria in terms of water tables. Those things are going on concurrently.

### Hospital Services

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care if he would report on the status of the hospital situation in the province today, please.

MR. RUSSELL: During the question period yesterday, I indicated that I wanted to do that. This is a report I received by telephone from my department officials, as of a quarter to 10 this morning. The hospital system in Alberta is in very good shape. The nurses all reported back. The major hospitals in Calgary and Edmonton are well organized.

Specifically, the two provincial hospitals, University of Alberta and Foothills, are transferring patients and equipment that had been moved. That is taking place today, and they expect that operation to finish today. Both hospitals expect to start the back-up of surgical procedures on Monday and to have both hospitals in full operation by midweek. The Calgary General and Colonel Belcher hospitals in Calgary will be starting their backlog of surgical procedures on Monday, and all others are starting surgical procedures today. The other Edmonton hospitals are all starting up their surgical procedures on Monday. All emergency departments throughout the province are open as of today.

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. In view of the long delay in hospital operating rooms being in service, I wonder if the minister could indicate if any consideration has been given to having the operating rooms and other services in our major acute care hospitals open on the weekends, particularly this weekend. I'm referring more to the services in the hospitals that are normally closed on weekends.

MR. RUSSELL: It sounds like a very good suggestion, Mr. Speaker. That is something that would be left to the individual hospital, in each case, for their administration, medical staff, and nursing staff to work out between themselves. I don't have the answer to that today, but I will find out and report back.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Labour. Has the minister anything further to report with regard to the appointment of the arbitration tribunal?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

### Motor Vehicle Registrations

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Solicitor General. Is the policy of the treasury branches to discontinue the sale of automobile licences in future?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, some treasury branches have declined to continue the service they had previously given to the public, for the issue of motor vehicle registrations and licences. It is not across-the-board, but it has oc-

curred in some communities and in both of the two large metropolitan areas.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What would be the criteria used by the Solicitor General with regard to selecting local vendors for handling the motor vehicles branch, where the treasury branches are discontinuing handling the automobile licences?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, when a treasury branch requests that it wants to discontinue the service that has been provided, there are a number of choices. One is for the department to establish its own office, and that has been done in some cases. Alternatively a private issuer who is interested in providing the service is found.

With regard to private issuers, we're looking for an adequate capacity to take on the function; security provided for the tags; an adequate accounting system for the funds received; the ability to send personnel for training, which we require; space for parking; and space to serve the public who come in for their tags, keeping in mind that in the past there certainly has been a build-up of service required between March and April, so it is a rather hectic period when renewals of registration plates are handled. We look for people who are prepared to give that service to the public.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When this change is being made, has the minister considered some input from the town council or the local people concerned, with regard to picking out a location for a vendor for the licence plates?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I understand that the officials do seek assistance from municipal officials, where necessary. It depends on the urgency to meet the termination of the service that has been provided by the past issuer, whether it's a treasury branch or a private issuer. Because of the timing of the resignation, there have been times we have had to move rather quickly in order to provide service in a community.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I might supplement the answer, being responsible for treasury branches. One of the reasons for these modifications is that the services which customers of the treasury branches have requested in terms of a financial institution have expanded, not only in volume but in the range of comprehensive services provided. Therefore, being a financial institution wishing to provide the greatest number of services, not only in loans and savings but in all the other various services provided, the treasury branches sometimes are in the position where they simply run out of space to provide other services. As members know, treasury branches have grown from approximately \$250 million of business in 1971 to \$2.5 billion in 1982.

#### **Home Mortgage Corporation Loan**

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. I believe I am correct in that the Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation will fund, or mortgage, used houses to a limit of \$60,000 and new homes to \$73,000. Particularly in the cities of Calgary or Edmonton, I think that is a fairly low limit. I wonder if the minister is considering raising those limits at all.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, not at this time. By the way, the limit on new housing is \$74,000. It was last raised in June 1981.

The corporation observes these numbers in an ongoing way. It looks at the market, what builders are willing to build and what product they are willing to provide under those numbers. So far, there has been every indication that those numbers are adequate. As members will recognize, it is important to keep them low.

I'd like to congratulate the builders in this province for being innovative. A few years ago, people said that the numbers were too low. Then the builders got looking at it and said they could make a good, attractive product for that price. And they're doing it. I've looked at some of the most attractive housing I've ever seen, and it's coming in under those guidelines, in terms of size and price. It may mean that in many communities of Alberta, that can provide a single-family detached home, while perhaps in certain areas of Edmonton and Calgary it may mean linked townhousing. I think that is perfectly good housing, too, and I think the people of Alberta do. They're buying it.

You only have to look at the volume of production last year and the take-up, what builders did and what people bought, to recognize that those numbers worked last year, and they are working right now. At such point in time that it might be necessary to change those numbers, the corporation will evaluate that.

MR. OMAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Whether as a result of my question, I'm not sure, but I appreciate that the minister did raise some limits last year and, I think, the qualifying income to \$38,000. I can understand that builders are building and bringing on the market housing in the area of \$74,000. But with regard to the used market, with a limit of \$60,000, it seems to me that if our purpose is to encourage home ownership among young couples — I think there is perhaps a limit to the used housing market. I wonder if the minister is considering change in that particular area.

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, that's always another area of evaluation and comparison. The used market is a substantial portion. The last numbers I've seen are somewhere around 30 per cent. You like to see a bigger percentage of new housing, because new housing means new stock, in addition to supply. However, used housing obviously does provide a service to a lot of people. Regardless, the current set price seems to still be working; there is a lot of housing out there that meets that \$60,000 criterion. But again, it's evaluated from time to time.

MR. SPEAKER: We've run to the end of the allotted time, but the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway has been patiently waiting to be recognized. If the Assembly agrees, perhaps we could briefly deal with his concern.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'll refrain from the question I was going to ask and just ask a supplementary because of the time. Would the Minister of Housing and Public Works clarify whether the present range of prices applies to apartments, apartment condominiums, and townhouse condominiums, used and old, in that \$74,000 range?

MR. CHAMBERS: It's a broad range, Mr. Speaker. It could be duplexes, single-family attached, townhouses, or link houses: It covers pretty well the full spectrum.

DR. PAPROSKI: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could it also apply to mobile homes, and what is the limit there? Has that changed recently?

MR. CHAMBERS: No, Mr. Speaker. Mobile homes can apply under the program.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Moved by Mr. Crawford:

Be it resolved that the *Standing Orders* be amended as follows:

A Temporary Standing Order 8(2), effective May 28, 1979, is amended

- (a) by striking out clause (b) and substituting the following:
  - (b) When Government Designated Business is called, the Assembly shall consider any item of business that the government Whip has designated, by written notice to the Clerk prior to 12 noon on the previous Friday, from those items on the Order Paper for that Friday under Motions Other Than Government Motions, Government Bills and Orders or Government Motions, which may be followed by any other government business.
- (b) in clause (c) by striking out "Thursday" and substituting "Friday".

B Standing Order 17(1) is amended

- (a) by striking out clause (b) and substituting the following:
  - (b) for the receipt of a report or concurrence in a report, or both, that has been tabled in the Assembly, except a report from the Committee of Supply or Committee of the Whole;
- (b) in clause (j) by adding "or amendment" after "suspension";
- (c) by striking out all that portion following clause (l) and substituting the following:
  - (m) made upon routine proceedings that may be required for
    - (i) the observance of the proprieties of the Assembly and maintenance of its authority;
    - (ii) the appointment or conduct of its officers;
    - (iii) the management of its business;
    - (iv) the correctness of its records.

C Standing Order 20 is amended

- (a) in suborder (1)(b) by striking out "any resolution, clause, section, or title" and substituting "any or all of the resolutions, clauses, sections, or titles then before the Committee";
- (b) in suborder (2) by striking out "2 a.m." and substituting "12 midnight".

D Standing Order 28(a) is amended by striking out "have unlimited" and substituting "be limited to 90 minutes".

E The following is added after Standing Order 46.1:

46.2 The Select Standing Committee on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act shall report to the Assembly on the annual report of the fund no later than the third Monday in October if the Assembly is then sitting or, if the Assembly is not then sitting, on the first Monday of the next ensuing sitting.

F Standing Order 47 is renumbered as Standing Order 50.1 and

added after Standing Order 50.

G Standing Order 51 is amended

- (a) in suborder (4) by adding "but may not vote" after "the meeting";
- (b) in suborder (7) by striking out "present to" and substituting "move in".

H The following is added after Standing Order 51:

51.1(1) Committee of Supply shall be called to consider the main estimates on not more than 25 sitting days.

(2) Committee of Supply shall be called to consider the estimates and supplementary estimates, if any, of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund on not more than 12 sitting days.

(3) Any day that a subcommittee of the Committee of Supply sits constitutes a sitting day for the purposes of subsections (1) and (2).

(4) The Leader of the Opposition may, during the period when the estimates referred to in suborders (1) and (2) are under consideration by the Committee of Supply, designate, by written notice to the Clerk prior to 4 p.m. on a Thursday, one department's estimates to be considered by the committee on the following Monday.

(5) The Clerk shall cause notice of any designation pursuant to suborder (4) to be printed in the Votes and Proceedings for that Thursday.

(6) In respect of the supplementary estimates and interim supply estimates, a minister of the Crown may, with at least one day's notice, make a motion to determine

- (a) the number of days that the Committee of Supply and its subcommittees may be called, and
- (b) the dates and the number of departments' estimates that may be designated by the Leader of the Opposition for consideration by the committee,

and the question shall be decided without debate or amendment.

(7) A department's estimates may not be designated under this standing order if consideration of those estimates has been concluded or the department's estimates have been previously designated.

51.2(1) In this standing order and in standing orders 51.3 and 51.4, "normal adjournment hour" means

- (a) 5:30 p.m. if it is a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday unless an evening sitting is to be held, in which case it means 12 midnight; and
- (b) 1 p.m. if it is a Friday.

(2) If, 15 minutes before the normal adjournment hour on the last day on which estimates referred to in Standing Order 51.1 may be considered, the estimates have not all been voted upon, the Chairman shall immediately interrupt the proceedings and shall forthwith put a single question proposing the approval of all the matters not yet voted upon, which shall be decided without debate or amendment, and the committee shall forthwith rise and report.

(3) If a subcommittee has not reported to the Committee of Supply 30 minutes before the normal adjournment hour on the last day on which estimates referred to in Standing Order 51.1 may be considered, the subcommittee shall be deemed to have reported.

51.3 Committee of Supply and its subcommittees shall rise and report no later than the normal adjournment hour.

51.4(1) In this standing order, "appropriation Bill" means

- (a) a Bill introduced to appropriate sums of money contained in the estimates approved by the Committee of Supply;
- (b) a Bill for a special Act introduced pursuant to the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act.

(2) No appropriation Bill shall be advanced more than one stage on each day.

(3) If any appropriation Bill has been moved for second read-

ing on any day, Mr. Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings 15 minutes before the normal adjournment hour and put the question on every appropriation Bill then standing on the Order Paper for second reading, which shall be decided without debate or amendment.

(4) If any appropriation Bill has been considered by the Committee of the Whole on any day, the Chairman shall interrupt the proceedings 15 minutes before the normal adjournment hour and shall forthwith put a single question proposing the approval of every appropriation Bill then standing referred to the committee, which shall be decided without debate or amendment, and the committee shall forthwith rise and report.

(5) If any appropriation Bill has been moved for third reading on any day, Mr. Speaker shall interrupt the proceedings 15 minutes before the normal adjournment hour and put the question on every appropriation Bill then standing on the Order Paper for third reading, which shall be decided without debate or amendment.

I Standing Order 52(1) is struck out and the following is substituted:

52(1) The *Standing Orders* of the Assembly shall be observed in the committees of the Assembly so far as may be applicable, except that

- (a) a member may speak more than once, and
- (b) in Committee of the Whole, no member may speak for more than 30 minutes at one time.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, Motion No. 1 proposes that certain changes be made in ...

MR. R. SPEAKER: I'd like to rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to slow the exit of responsible ministers, so I'll just wait for a moment.

I'd like to refer to Chapter 1, section 9, of *Beauchesne*, in terms of content and sources of parliamentary procedure, precedent and tradition:

All rules are passed by the House by a simple majority and are altered, added to, or removed in the same way.

Mr. Speaker, the very key words I want to bring to your attention are "by custom":

By custom, changes in the Standing Orders are generally made after study and a recommendation by the Standing Committee on Procedure and Organization. There is no procedural reason why any private Member or Minister of the Crown could not introduce a motion to alter the rules and, on occasion, such as the introduction of the closure, this has been done.

Under very special kinds of circumstances, Mr. Speaker.

*Journals*, April 24, 1913, p. 508. Sessional and Special Orders are normally moved by the Government after ...

and this is very key again, Mr. Speaker, and I bring it to your attention for consideration with regard to this motion

... after consultation with the Opposition parties.

Number one, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring to your attention that in the last year, until the proroguing of the last session, which was on Monday last week, March 1— at that time, the last session was finalized. During that period of time, there was a Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, on which my hon. colleague Dr. Buck and I were members, along with 25 members of the government, Mr. Payne being the chairman. I could list the other members.

Mr. Speaker, that committee was not consulted from

mid-December until March 1, a period of time in which a very select committee of this Legislature could have studied this motion before us and could have been consulted. By custom and tradition — and that's what this House is all about, Mr. Speaker. You have made that clear to us many, many times, in terms of infringement of rules. At times when we have put pressure on the rules, when we have tried to make the rules meet our needs, you have pointed out to us very carefully that tradition and custom guide the Assembly. I want to make the point that under this rule, by not having this consultation we have violated a custom under this rule in the worst degree. To me, that is very alarming.

For other supportive information, Mr. Speaker, we look in *Erskine May*, and we find information that points out the very same point, only a little differently. *Erskine May* points out that a matter that may last the duration of a session, just the duration of a session — for your reference, Mr. Speaker, on page 210 of the document before you. I would like to point out that traditionally, if it is necessary for the rules to change for a session, and the government sees the matter as being of convenience, then the government can bring in a resolution on its own, without consultation. But if the matter of the standing order as such is to remain in place for a long period of time, for sessions thereafter, then by custom, tradition, and accepted rule, the matter comes before the committee of the Legislature and is studied. The matter is looked at so that all input is considered prior to it becoming a long-standing order of the House.

Mr. Speaker, at this time we're faced with a violation of that long-standing tradition. On that basis, I ask you either to have this resolution held for your consideration or withdrawn from the Legislature. I wish to make this point to you, Mr. Speaker. What it does — whether it's myself in opposition or government, but it affects the opposition to a greater extent — is set precedent. As we recall — and I'm sure the section is very familiar to you — *Beauchesne* says that when precedent is set in the Legislature, that is the routine or the procedure we follow in other circumstances.

Whenever rule changes occurred, it would not be a harmonious, consulting, negotiating discussion, with respect for members irrespective of their political attitudes. It would be one where the government is saying that an opposition or a minority group — whichever it may be; it may not be the total opposition. Here in this House, we have a unique circumstance. There are three one-member parties, minority groups. So if the government wished to bring down the rules on the minority groups of the Legislature, they could do so without any consultation, in a very strong-handed way. I think it would take away this right that we as elected members want to fight for: freedom of speech, non-erosion of democracy, the fact that we must have a continuation of the democratic process and, in this case, much opportunity to discuss where the public purse goes.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like you to consider this matter at this time on the basis of it being custom. I'd also like to draw to your attention, as concrete information, the procedure that was used to put our present *Standing Orders* in place. We very carefully considered the attitudes of all members in this Legislature. First of all, we had the select committee take recommendations, look at them, have discussions. The various caucuses had input. That was according to custom. Secondly, we had the rules in place, as I recall, on an interim basis. Following that, we had a formal resolution in the House to accept tried and proven



*Standing Orders.* Mr. Speaker, that was very acceptable to me as a member of the Legislature and to all members. It showed openness and respect for custom, for any minority group, and for the opposition involved in the process. But today we have a new precedent.

I think it would be very unfair if we moved ahead. We're in the early stages of a new session, Mr. Speaker. The committees will be appointed within a few days. At that time we will have a new committee in place, the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders, and Printing. I think it's an insult, to say the least, Mr. Speaker, that we don't respect the fact that we have a major, important select committee of the Legislature. We're ignoring and showing affront to it.

On the basis of that very concrete information — to me, very good reasons that we shouldn't set this precedent — we should disallow this motion at this time, or hold it and have it referred to the standing committee. After they have perused it, bring it back to the Legislature. That seems very acceptable to me. I think that would be a very open and understanding approach by the government, not an approach where they want to bring down restrictive rules in a very severe manner.

Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate that you consider that matter on the point of order. If you feel a decision cannot be made today, the matter could be held over until Monday. I would be very open to that as well. But the matter is serious, Mr. Speaker, and not to be taken lightly.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure other hon. members will wish to enter the discussion. Perhaps in fairness I should say that I hadn't thought about this motion in exactly the way the Leader of the Opposition is now discussing it. But I would respectfully suggest to the Assembly that the point he has raised is of the utmost seriousness, because it involves very basic rights in this Assembly, involves our very procedure.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I'll just make a brief comment on the point of order at this time. As I perceive what the hon. leader has raised, he's really making a representation to hon. members rather than arguing a matter of order in the strict sense. The very citation he referred to refers to the fact that when the procedure he recommends is used, it is merely a custom. Now no one wants to depreciate the value of custom, but I think it would take something stated in the very clearest terms that such a procedure was mandatory, to bring it into the class of things that must be done in that way. The only way to make it mandatory would be if that in fact appeared in the *Standing Orders* of the Assembly. Those are a few observations, Mr. Speaker. I say there is no point of order.

As to the representations the hon. leader made in some detail about how this might be proposed differently, I point out to him that there are but three substantive items in the changes, despite the length of the resolution. The resolution itself is as long as it is, because the consequential changes that must flow from the establishment of certain time limits in regard to Supply make it necessary. But the key to the matter is the time limits themselves, therefore the balance is not that substantial.

Another item which might be referred to as being of substance — and I think this is relevant to the hon. leader's submission — is another change which I had not thought of opposing, and that is the new rights the Leader of the Opposition would acquire in regard to the

designation of days for estimates. A third point which would have to be called substantive is a limitation on the previously unlimited speaking time in regard to the Premier — that would be limited to 90 minutes — and the same rule in regard to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, in raising those matters, I don't propose to begin to debate the motion itself, but simply point out to the hon. leader that the substantive matters which have been before him and all members for a week now are limited to those few points. The only other point I make is that it is not the invariable custom of this Assembly to bring in changes to the *Standing Orders* in the manner described by the hon. leader. Whatever representations he makes in that regard, and whatever logical argument he may be able to make in regard to having something along that line accepted by the Assembly as a whole, it is not in the *Standing Orders* and it is not a precedent.

The reading of the custom as declared in Citation 9 in *Beauchesne* — which is not, I repeat, part of our *Standing Orders* — has not applied at all times in this Assembly. This Assembly has in fact amended its *Standing Orders* in the past without such steps being taken. That occurred when the hon. leader was a member of the government.

MR. SPEAKER: The matter is of some very substantial concern, and I think it must be to all hon. members, including the member who has the privilege to serve in this Chair.

I must say that I would have welcomed the representation from the hon. Leader of the Opposition some time ago, especially when this motion has been on notice for some days now. And although that may be something I would have welcomed, it doesn't necessarily strike at the substance of what the hon. leader is saying.

During the time I have had the privilege of serving this parliament in this Chair, my only recollection of a similarly wide-ranging change in our procedure is that of the substantially revised *Standing Orders* which, as has been pointed out, were adopted temporarily at first, I think during the second year I was in the Chair. On that occasion, I know the matter was referred to a committee, of which I was a member.

I am not aware of any changes as wide-ranging as these having been made during the past 10 years without that procedure. I know as a matter of fact, and it's common knowledge, that that is the only time in the last 10 years that that procedure has been followed. I am aware that in the province of Quebec, for example, after perhaps a century or so of accumulations, accretions, and amendments, the *Standing Orders* were thoroughly house-cleaned and rewritten, and the changes were adopted unanimously by the Assembly. Of course that was a much more far-reaching change than what we have before us today.

As has been pointed out by the hon. Government House Leader, there is nothing contrary in our *Standing Orders* to making changes in this way. However, you might say that cuts both ways. There are no amending provisions in our *Standing Orders* either. It is a matter of real concern to me that these far-reaching changes in the *Standing Orders* apparently are about to be debated in the House where each member has the right to speak only once, and that includes the six members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, and apparently we are not to have the benefit of prior committee study of the *Standing Orders*.

I must say that I have perused them — perhaps not as thoroughly as I should, but I have gone over them several

times. I have not discovered any obvious and glaring anomalies. As I say, changes as far-reaching in their effect as these are an occasion for some very serious concerns because, as hon. members know, the very framework within which a parliament operates consists not only in the *Standing Orders* but also in customs which sometimes have equal and perhaps even greater force than *Standing Orders*.

As I say, I must express my real concern about the situation. I apologize to the Assembly for not having considered it previously in this way. I would certainly welcome the assistance of any other hon. members who might wish to make some contribution to consideration of the point raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I yield the floor to the hon. Member for Athabasca.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear from what direction that voice came. I understood the hon. member to say he was yielding the floor to the hon. Member for Athabasca.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the point of order raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the comments by you and the hon. Government House Leader, certain things have been mentioned that I think could be clarified. The hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned that the last major revision of the rules came about through the work of a select committee of this Legislature. That is so, and I was chairman of that committee at that time.

Mr. Speaker, you referred to the Quebec revision of rules and a complete housecleaning. I believe that was the procedure we followed when we undertook a complete revision of the rules for this Assembly. Of course that committee consisted of government members and members of the opposition as well. At that time, I well remember that the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, Mr. Henderson, made some very valuable contributions to the deliberations of that committee. Those are the rules we now have, which came into effect in 1975, as they were passed by this Assembly. As the hon. Leader for the Opposition has suggested, they came in on a trial basis the first year, with confirmation at a later date.

I would point out, however, that there have been a number of changes in those rules, revised by exhaustive consideration by that committee at that time. These changes that have come about were presented in this Assembly without consideration by any committee, whether it be a select committee of the Legislature or the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and were considered by this Assembly. At some time they were put in on a temporary basis and later confirmed and made part of the regular *Standing Orders*.

The point I am trying to raise this morning, Mr. Speaker, is that this procedure is really nothing unusual, and it has been done before. I expect that when the necessity arises, further rule changes to expedite the business of the Assembly in Alberta will probably come into effect in the same manner. I would also suggest that in some not too distant future, this Assembly may see fit to consider another exhaustive review of all the rules of the Assembly. In that case, perhaps the appointment of a select committee might come about and the same procedure would be followed as in 1974.

Mr. Speaker, in my estimation, we are not proceeding at this particular time in any manner that has not been done in this Assembly before. I feel that the procedure we

are suggesting should be followed today, is one that should be quite acceptable. It does not contravene any sections of *Beauchesne* and certainly any of our own rules, as you have pointed out, Mr. Speaker, because we haven't provided for any specific amending formula in our own rules. I suggest that the procedure we are following is quite in order. I believe debate should continue on the rules themselves.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could rise on the question. It's not really a point of order. There are really three points before the Assembly this morning: one, should this matter be referred to a Legislative select committee; two, do we need a period of delay to consider that question? I would argue that there is no requirement under our *Standing Orders*, or section 9 of *Beauchesne*, that matters like this be referred to committee. There is no stricture stating that is a requirement. In fact it says that a motion like this can be developed by any private member or minister of the Crown. It is a custom.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think we need to refer this question to a select committee. I say that because I suspect the whole Legislature will be considering this matter at some length a little later this afternoon, as the opposition has indicated in various news media. I think there will be an ample and thorough airing of the questions before the House. Surely that is the objective of referral of this sort of item to a select committee. I'm confident there will be a thorough airing, sponsored in part by the opposition, although the members on this side would be interested in having a thorough airing as well. Surely, given virtually unlimited time, as I'm sure the opposition will be taking all the time it can, this matter will have all the airing it possibly can. In fact I suspect that our procedures are going to become somewhat repetitious, as they were last year.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'd argue that there is no need to refer this to a select standing committee that doesn't yet exist, that the matter will be thoroughly aired by the whole Assembly. All members of the Assembly will have a chance to state their views, make their representations, and argue for amendments. It has been the stated desire of the opposition to have a very thorough airing of this matter. I'm confident that that will be given. I don't think there is any requirement for a select standing committee, nor do we need to delay this matter any further. The item has been on notice for a week. Surely that's ample time for hon. members to bring to your attention or the attention of other hon. members any concerns they have.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add other information to the point of order, not to duplicate what I've already raised in terms of section 9, *Erskine May*, and precedents of this Legislature, whereby when other major rule changes were brought into the Assembly, we went through a procedure where the committee was consulted and we had an interim period of assessment and then a finalization by motion in the House. I'd like to refer as well to our own *Standing Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta*, Standing Order No. 2, procedure in unprovided cases. Mr. Chairman, this makes very well the argument that should guide you in your decision. It says:

2. In all contingencies unprovided for, the question will be decided by Mr. Speaker and, in making his ruling, Mr. Speaker shall base his decision on the usages and precedents of this Assembly and on parliamentary tradition.

I make two points, Mr. Speaker. One, on parliamentary tradition, *Erskine May* and *Beauchesne* point out very clearly that it's custom to involve the other parties of the Legislature. Number two, the matter of precedents of this Assembly. The precedent was that when a major rule change was brought before us, the procedure I outlined a few moments ago was taken into consideration: a standing committee in place considering all matters, having all input, good consultation, and all minority groups having a viewpoint; along with that, interim time to study that and put it into practice in this Legislature; and finally, we passed a resolution which we all agreed on. As I recall, it moved very quickly through the Legislature. On those two points, Mr. Speaker, both precedents and parliamentary tradition, I feel that the matter should be handled in that manner and referred to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders, and Printing, of this Legislature.

The other point I wish to make, and one hon. member made the point earlier, is with regard to some of the changes we've made up to this point. I don't recall them, because I don't think there were any major changes of any kind. I could stand corrected, but I don't recall any major ones. The amendments before us at this time are major, Mr. Speaker, in that we say I'm limited to 90 minutes as Leader of the Opposition. I feel very unhappy about that. Hopefully I don't use unlimited time on all occasions. There were occasions in the fall session when I spoke for some 90 minutes or longer. I don't recall. But the matter was urgent, and I felt it was a way to be responsible to the general public. It doesn't happen on all occasions. In our upcoming study of the budget, it may not happen again. But if the matter is urgent enough, it could.

So I see an erosion of something very fundamental. I'd like to talk about that historically. This occurred when the opposition was six Conservatives on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker. One of the matters at that time was an attempt to change the rules to give as much latitude as we could to the opposition, so they could express themselves before the Legislature. One was an open-ended reply by the Leader of the Opposition. That was one of the considerations. The second was in terms of Bills. Flexibility was built into the process whereby a person could speak longer. At that time, because of the smallness of the opposition, the flexibility was put into place.

Now we're attempting to draw that together. The restrictions in the amendment presently before us haven't been necessary since 1905. We've worked very well in this Legislature; procedures have moved along very well. It's been very acceptable. The precedent is good there. So, Mr. Speaker, I'd like you to consider that this harsh change without following custom, tradition, or precedent shouldn't happen the way it is at this time.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad I yielded the floor earlier to more senior members of the Assembly. I would like to enter the question on the point of order from perhaps a more common-sense point of view, rather than lean hard on traditions or precedents which . . . There doesn't seem to be any. It was my understanding that surely this House makes its own rules. That is not to say it makes them without due regard for tradition and the rights and privileges of all members of the Assembly, and due regard for the responsibilities we have for our constituents. But I would take the view that, as has been mentioned, this motion has been on the Order Paper for some time, and certainly opinions should be well formed.

I'm sure that although there is a 30-minute speaking limit on a motion, a properly timed amendment will allow all hon. members to exhaust themselves further if that be the concern.

It would seem to me that the common-sense reason committees are set up, Mr. Speaker, is in fact to economize on the time of the plenary body. The government, through the Government House Leader, has shown due concern for the importance of these changes by bringing them to the full Assembly and providing a full exposure to the debate and issues in the full Assembly, rather than in a select committee of the Assembly which, as was pointed out by the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry, has not been formed yet. Mr. Speaker, on the basis that I think we govern ourselves with a full opportunity for making amendments and, I am quite sure, exhaustive debate, we should be able, given the will of the Assembly, to make our own rules and handle this precedent by moving forward with the motion.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a brief comment about the point of order, please. I don't think there's much point in reiterating the different citations referred to by various sides. However, in reference to changes to *Standing Orders*, I personally feel that the weight of the argument has to fall on Citation 9 of *Beauchesne*.

Along with the written rules of precedent and tradition, there's the matter of convention: what has gone before and the generally accepted practices in the Legislative Assembly and the House of Commons. In most regards, there has been the common courtesy of consulting beforehand with all parties when the time to change the rules of procedure comes. Inasmuch as that's a custom and inasmuch as it's been a common courtesy, I see no harm in continuing something like that, especially when one bears in mind the end result: co-operation in accomplishing the work of the Legislative Assembly. From time to time, I know consultation does go on between the different House leaders, the end result of that being co-operation.

The rules of this Assembly could be applied just like the rules of any other working situation, whereby if the people subject to the rules applied the letter of those rules, we could in fact work to rule and bring to an end all meaningful debate in this House. We're seeing a good example of that right now in the House of Commons. I would not like to see something like this progressing at the pace it is, because we run the risk of ending that consultation and co-operation we've had in the Assembly the last three years I've been here, and certainly it must have been here the years that preceded me as well.

The question of limiting the debate, especially in regard to the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition: it seems to me that if they were to speak for more than 90 minutes, it would be because they had something worth while to say. Over the fall session, we saw both the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition speak for periods which exceeded 90 minutes. I for one benefited from listening to both of them, and I would like to hear what they have to say.

I would like to ensure that not only they but their successors as well have the opportunity to express their points of view and put forth arguments as only they can because of the positions they occupy in the Assembly and in their particular parties. If any member is more suited to do that and has more access to information, it has to be one of those two. I would not like to see their

opportunity to present that to us encumbered, restrained, or constricted in any way whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I might say that I concur in the arguments put forth on this side with regard to the precedents for consultation, and add the feeling that I think it would be worth while for us as members to think in terms of not restraining ourselves in any way here today during our terms, nor stepping too quickly in changing the rules that would be binding on those who follow us in the Legislative Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KESLER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the point of order as well. Certainly I don't have the degree of background on rules, regulations, and the workings of the Legislature that many of the hon. members have, so I have to speak from a different framework. As I look around the Assembly, I see only a handful of opposition, six at this time. However, I think customs and procedures must have been established because of experiences which occurred in previous days. Perhaps those customs and procedures were established because of conditions that were not like the conditions we face here.

I foresee a time when the opposition could have a high number of representatives, that there would be maybe 25 or 30 members in the opposition. With the restrictive nature of the motion and limiting debate, I see an unfairness to MLAs who may sit in opposition at a future date. If they have concerns from their constituents which they feel they should express on such important matters as the budget and the heritage trust fund, they will be limited in that opportunity to bring forth the concerns of their constituencies. Allowing the motion before us to pass without considerable study at committee stage is an injustice to the future operations of this Legislative Assembly in properly representing the needs of all the people of this province.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment on the point of order. I am one who certainly thinks we should streamline government procedure, and procedure in all Houses in the western world. I appreciate that we do make our own rules in the House. In 1975, I was very pleased when we came up with a committee of the House and were able to have input from every member in the House, whether in opposition or in government. We had input from every single member in the House, and I thought that was excellent.

I remember that when the Provincial Treasurer brought them in he said, we'll put them in on a trial basis. Here again I thought, here's democracy working in our House so it will work very efficiently. I thought it was excellent to streamline our House in that manner.

The resolution we have indicated has been on the Order Paper for a number of days. However, when you have a resolution on the Order Paper, my experience in this House with amendments on resolutions that have not been that successful, is that it could be handled much better and more democratically if we just had each caucus represented on the committee.

We have a new Member for Olds-Didsbury, who has no input to this particular resolution unless he makes an amendment. If we had a standing committee dealing with it, he and all the rest of us could have input through the standing committee. I certainly think it would be much better.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I see these amendments as very drastic changes. They're significant changes in the opera-

tion of this House. In '75 we made some changes, but they didn't affect this House as severely as these amendments in this resolution which is going to be before the House, possibly today. I would certainly like to see us take a really good look at going back to that particular procedure of the select committee which we set up before, to deal with these types of changes we're making for the House.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might add a bit to what I said before. I think the hon. Member for Bow Valley has just made a further representation. I don't think the question before the Assembly is precisely how the matter should be dealt with, as a point of order, but whether this manner of dealing with it is appropriate. The alternatives, if there are any, are merely part of the discussion, and of course all those suggestions are heard.

Mr. Speaker, I say again that the only point I perceive the hon. leader can really be raising at this point — even though the discussion has covered a number of points — is whether or not the procedure now proposed is proper and correct; not whether there is some alternative that, for some reasons given, might have been preferable. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to deferring consideration of this motion until over the weekend, when Your Honour will have had time to give consideration to the points made.

In the course of saying that, I did want to refer Your Honour — because you, Mr. Speaker, will no doubt be doing some research on the weekend — to the citation in the 19th edition of *Erskine May*, which appears on page 210 under the heading Standing Orders. It is as follows, with reference to the standing orders:

Their chief characteristic is that they are intended to expedite the progress of business by reducing the opportunities for debate and checking its luxuriance.

What a fine choice of language, Mr. Speaker. [interjection] If, with his interjection, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is saying to me that that is too complimentary a word to use on some occasions in the Assembly, I could concur. In any event, the further part of the citation on page 210 is more than just that observation of overall general intent for what the standing orders should say. This has to do, right on point, with how standing orders are changed:

Standing orders are not safeguarded by any special procedure against amendment, repeal or suspension, whether explicitly or by an order contrary to their purport. Ordinary notice only is requisite for the necessary motion; and some standing orders have included arrangements for the suspension of their own provisions by a bare vote, without amendment or debate. The practice has recently been adopted of making Standing Orders, limited in their duration until the end of the current Parliament, for the purpose of appointing and nominating certain select committees ....

Mr. Speaker, the last point is just to conclude the paragraph, because it doesn't bear directly on the points made just prior to that; that is, that only ordinary notice is required, and there is no

special procedure against amendment, repeal or suspension, whether explicitly or by an order contrary to their purport.

In making that point, I don't suggest that nothing more need be said on it. But at this point I would indicate that, for my part, I'm quite happy if the Assembly leaves the

matter now in order that Your Honour would have time to address the arguments and further research.

MR. SPEAKER: Of course it is not for the Chair to impose any kind of procedure on the Assembly. I feel that in doing my duty, or my job, in this Chair, it's quite clear that I'm bound by the *Standing Orders*, and to the extent the *Standing Orders* don't cover situations, I'm bound by tradition, certainly the tradition of the very long standing and honorable parliamentary system we follow in this Assembly. I would leave it up to the Assembly.

The hon. Government House Leader has made a suggestion. That has not been put in the form of a motion. I think it's an expression of a certain willingness on the part of the hon. Government House Leader. If the Assembly wishes me to deal with the matter now, I'll endeavor to do so. If the Assembly prefers that it stand over until whatever day the government wishes to call the motion again, I'm in the hands of the Assembly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure where the point of order is, but I would like to indicate from this side that we would certainly like your consideration on the matter and have the matter stand over, so that the judgment made is certainly acceptable to the House. I would be open to your suggestion and the suggestion of the hon. House leader as to who should move the motion that the matter stand over until Monday.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I might indicate that in your remarks you mentioned such time as the motion might be called again by the government. It would be our intention to call it again on Monday afternoon.

I haven't had the opportunity to send the Clerk a note as to further business, but I propose that we proceed now with second readings of certain government Bills on the Order Paper. I ask that we call Bill No. 7 first.

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

**Bill 7**  
**Planning Amendment Act, 1982**

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 7 is one amendment only to the Planning Act, dealing with Section 86. Perhaps I could begin by saying that the entire Section 86 provides that the registrar of the Land Titles Office may accept for registration an instrument that has the effect of subdividing a parcel of land under certain conditions. Those conditions are outlined in Section 86, and one of them allows the registrar to provide a separate title to a parcel of land in the event that that parcel of land has been severed from its original parcel by a roadway, a canal, a railroad, a creek, or some other barrier, either man-made or natural.

In the passage of the Planning Act in 1977, that opportunity to get separate title to a piece of land severed in such a way was really not intended to be used as extensively as it has been. In recent months, I've had representations from planning commissions and municipalities throughout the province to make some amend-

ments to the Act to correct the difficult situation that presently exists.

Perhaps I could describe it this way. A railway may run through a section of land and sever a three-cornered parcel in the centre of that section, and part of a quarter section, from the balance of that quarter. As the Act presently reads, the registrar of the Land Titles Office is obligated to provide a separate title to that severed parcel, even though it has no access of any kind.

Another occasion may occur where a quarter section of land is severed by a primary highway on a hill or a curve. Again that severed parcel is in the centre of a section of land. There is no opportunity whatsoever to gain access to the primary highway, and there is no other access. The result has been that municipalities have been faced with some very difficult circumstances where people have gained separate title to land that's been severed in some way or another, then have applied for development permits, put housing on it, and have the difficult problem of no access.

Mr. Speaker, this Bill simply says that before the registrar of the Land Titles Office shall accept for registration an instrument that has the effect of subdividing a parcel of land, that person must show that he has a certificate from a development officer in a municipality or the Minister of Transportation showing there is direct and lawful means of access from that parcel of land to a public roadway. The issue is not one of preventing individuals from securing title to parcels that have been severed in this regard, but only preventing them from securing title when there is no access.

Mr. Speaker, I think that contains the principles behind the Bill. I recommend its support to members, if for no other reason than it will correct a difficult problem and is supported by all planning commissions in Alberta and most, if not all, rural municipalities.

[Motion carried; Bill 7 read a second time]

**Bill 2**  
**Legislative Offices Statutes**  
**Amendment Act, 1982**

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to move second reading of Bill No. 2, the Legislative Offices Statutes Amendment Act, 1982.

By way of explanation of this very straightforward Bill, as officers of this Assembly we have the office of the Auditor General, the office of the Chief Electoral Officer, and the office of the Ombudsman. When we established the office of Auditor General some two or three years ago, at the same time we established a Standing Committee on Legislative Offices. It is chaired by the hon. Member for Edmonton Belmont. Its function is to liaise and co-ordinate with the office of the Auditor General in terms of the expenditures of that office, the budget, and so on. It has a very effective liaison and a very good relationship.

In the preparation of the report of the select standing committee, they observed that a similar relationship with the Chief Electoral Officer and the Ombudsman would be appropriate. That was one of the major recommendations of their report of last year. Agreeing with that recommendation, the government has come up with Bill No. 2, which would require the Chief Electoral Officer and the Ombudsman to submit annually to the select standing committee an estimate of the sums required to be provided by the Legislature for the payment of salaries,

allowances, and expenses of those two officers during the ensuing fiscal year. Mr. Speaker, it's very straightforward, and I recommend the support of all members for the Bill.

[Motion carried; Bill 2 read a second time]

**Bill 3**  
**Department of Government Services**  
**Amendment Act, 1982**

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move second reading of Bill No. 3, the Department of Government Services Amendment Act, 1982.

Mr. Speaker and members of the Assembly, there are three principles in this Bill. Again, the first one is related to the report of the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices. The present Government Services Act provides a public records committee whose function is to look at all the paper accumulated in government that constitutes records, and to determine what fate that paper should have. Some of it is microfilmed, some goes to the archives, and I suppose some is destroyed. The committee meets monthly and makes that determination on a current basis.

One of the several government members on that committee had been a representative of the Auditor General. At that time he was the Provincial Auditor rather than the autonomous or independent Auditor General. Since the Auditor General is now an officer of this Assembly rather than an employee of the Treasury Department, the Standing Committee on Legislative Offices observed that it would probably be more appropriate not to have him function as a governmental employee on the committee, and recommended instead that we substitute a representative of the Provincial Treasurer on that committee.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, the first amendment is simply to delete the words "Auditor General" and substitute "Provincial Treasurer". In short, a representative of the Provincial Treasurer would now be on the public records committee and would assist in the determination of what should happen to the public records of the province.

The second principle involved in this Bill is to give the Department of Government Services, which is the service department of government, legislative authority to provide a telecommunication service for several departments of government. In short, the situation right now is that, for instance, Parks and Recreation, Solicitor General, Fish and Wildlife, and other departments of government have mobile phone operations, each of which probably has a separate network. The idea is that with the increasing sophistication of telecommunication equipment, rather than have several departments of government going in several different directions creating their own networks, none of which would be tied into a central network, it would make more sense and probably be much more prudent fiscally to have one department of government prepare a telecommunication system for all of government.

Along with members of other departments, our department has done a study on the system and is presently developing a model. Within about a year, we would hope to have in place a system of mobile phones and other very sophisticated telecommunication equipment that would allow field officers of the several departments to radio back and forth to stay in touch with one another and

have, I suppose, instant access to information in the central computer system as and when required. I should point out that there are security problems whenever you get into data exchange, and the system we are developing will assure that only appropriate users have access to given types of information.

The third amendment, Mr. Speaker, is simply to amend the size of the Government Services revolving fund and to increase it to handle the next several months' and years' needs. As members know, a number of the services provided by Government Services for other departments of government are furnished through the revolving fund process. It simply means that there is an established fund with which we buy or provide the services, and the services are then charged back to the user or program department on the basis of cost. The same cost or similar costing mechanisms would be used for the private sector. The charges are costed back to the several program departments.

Those are the three principles in the Bill, Mr. Speaker, and I urge all members to support the same.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, in second reading of Bill 3, the Department of Government Services Amendment Act, 1982, I would like to express some degree of concern for Section 13(2)(a) as amended. My concern relates to the prospect that perhaps we would be enlarging the role of government at the expense of the private sector. I note that although telecommunication services are provided by the private sector, they are also provided by a government department. My concern would relate to data processing and computer services, where a wide array of equipment and services and, in fact, supplies are available in the private sector. I'm also aware of the fact that, particularly in the computer business, all you have to wait is a bit of time and the thing you paid a good dollar for is all of a sudden obsolete; it's been replaced by something smaller, cheaper, and faster.

So, Mr. Speaker, I express a concern to the minister that perhaps a strategy or at least a caution might be that any time the Department of Government Services is considering purchasing this sort of equipment, software, and whatnot, perhaps rather than acquiring it by purchase, they look very hard at using the private sector to provide the service on a service contract, because it's very easy to spend a lot of dollars on something that becomes obsolete very quickly. In the minister's concluding remarks on Bill 3, I wonder if he might take this into consideration.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: May the minister close debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the very valid question from the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods. He has expressed a concern that in increasing the size of the revolving fund of Government Services, we may not be using the private sector to the extent he would require. I would first comment on his suggestion that the computer world is very fast changing. Each year we see new developments, and everything is smaller, faster, and I think you said lower cost. I would agree that annually and regularly there are changes in the computer hardware equipment available. They are faster; they handle things in much wider scope each year and regularly.

With the question of cost, I think costs have not been going down in the same proportion that increased user

ability has increased. On a per unit basis, the costs go down dramatically, because you can do thousands of things where you could do dozens of things before. But along with everything else, the overall cost of the machines is going upward.

Getting back to the question of whether or not we use the private or the public sector, I would like to assure the member that the size of the fund really has nothing to do with whether it's private- or public-sector purchasing. Whether we do it in-house or hire or contract someone in the outside world to do it, it is still a chargeback to the program user, based on the actual cost to the Department of Government Services.

In the area of software, which is the program development area, we almost exclusively use the private sector. A number of software firms in the province depend largely on Government Services contracting for their well-being. That concerns me to some degree, in that I don't think any organization should be overly dependent on a government contract for the health of that company.

So as widely as possible, we try to spread our software program user contracts among the several companies offering the service. There has been a tremendous growth in those types of companies in the province over the last several years. We do try to assure that we give them as much business as possible and that we spread the business as widely as we can. As I said, the moneys we spend or the charges they make are taken from the revolving fund and assessed back to the user department, based on what their costs are.

With respect to the hardware, it's a little more difficult. We do the majority of our work in-house, and that is for a very particular reason, security. It is very difficult to let an outside firm into the very confidential government records and not expect there could be breaches of privacy or whatever. So that is one major concern in determining whether certain information or a certain type of work can be done in the private sector.

For much of the work done, it is a requirement that you have access to the total information available. To try to spread the work among a number of separate firms so that some of them might have a little swatch of information there and another group a bit of information, obviously this whole thing couldn't come together in an effective way. So in terms of hardware, the bulk of the work is done in government.

One other comment on that: we contract out or tender some of the projects which can stand alone, some of the smaller ones which are totally identifiable as individual projects. It isn't a large number of dollars, but it is in the several millions. I'd only comment that some of the experience has not been as favorable as it might, in that the private sector costs, to this time, seem to have been much, much higher than equivalent government, in-house costs. Having some regard for the taxpayers' pocketbook, we have felt some responsibility to use the system that gives them the best dollar buy.

Those are three pretty good reasons why we are using largely government equipment in the hardware area. As the private-sector hardware firms or computer firms develop bigger markets, better equipment, and more clientele, I hope their competitive tendering would take them down to a very competitive level with government, so that in the future we could in fact use a large, private-sector, computer hardware business in areas where confidentiality or privacy isn't a problem and where access to the total bank of government information is also not a difficulty.

Mr. Speaker, it was a very good question. I hope the answers have responded fully to the hon. member.

[Motion carried; Bill 3 read a second time]

#### Bill 4

#### Wildlife Amendment Act, 1982

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 4, the Wildlife Amendment Act, 1982.

This Bill entails some administrative changes. One is the position of director. He's now referred to as the assistant deputy minister. It also clarifies some definitions of wildlife. This will allow for the declaration of certain animals or parts of animals as non-wildlife. An example is probably horns and feathers. Certainly in the past, if anybody had the opportunity to pick up an eagle feather, they found they were liable.

It also deletes the reference to the director, and this conforms with the change of director to assistant deputy minister. It would also permit the minister to delegate some routine approval of authority to lower-level staff. This would free a great deal of the assistant minister's time.

The proposal would also allow the minister to pay commissions to private vendors of wildlife certificates. Presently we have a system where the vendor has to pre-purchase these certificates. With the high interest rates and such, it certainly is a strain on their operation, particularly when they are doing business for the government.

As I mentioned before, the regulations allow people to hold certain parts of wildlife legally, as far as horns, headdresses, rugs, et cetera, are concerned. It also provides for the scientific use of wildlife. There are presently situations where researchers are utilizing exotic species for scientific purposes. This amendment will permit them to do these things. Examples are botulism tests on ducks and also rabies-infected animals. There is also a provision in the Act to allow the trainers of bird dogs two additional weeks of training. In the past, it went from May 1 to August 1.

There is a change in the wildlife officer. In the past, he's had difficulty getting permission to kill an animal. This was due to the fact that we've had some difficulties, as I mentioned, having it examined as far as rabies or some other disease is concerned. It would maybe endanger the species.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend that all members support this Bill.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I certainly support this Bill inasmuch as removing certain parts of animals and certain animals from the Wildlife Act, but I express reservation at adding more individuals to the bureaucracy that administers the Wildlife Act. I may be misjudging the intent of this legislation. Would the member sponsoring the Bill indicate whether this does not clearly mean that another level is added to the bureaucracy that administers the Act, or that more people won't be added because there is another level of administration? I wonder if he might clarify that point in concluding debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the hon. member have permission to close debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. If the Member for Edmonton Mill Woods was paying attention, I just mentioned the fact that the position of director is now referred to as the assistant deputy minister.

[Motion carried; Bill 4 read a second time]

#### **Bill 6**

##### **Public Lands Amendment Act, 1982**

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 6, the Public Lands Amendment Act, 1982.

The purpose of these amendments is for clarification of some definitions contained in the Act. We are also requesting more flexibility in the value placed on public or Crown land. At the present time, the value placed on it for sale purposes is based on the maximum utilization. For example, we have cases where land would be utilized for agricultural purposes, but the potential for subdivision would put a higher value on it. We request that this flexibility be given, so we could better administer to the needs of the people of the province.

We are also requesting that the unrealistic interest rate of 6 per cent, which we are presently charging on land dispositions, be removed so we can have a more realistic interest rate established on the land which is being sold. As well, to deal with the circumstances where we have a maximum grazing capacity per individual or corporation of 600 head on Crown land, we are requesting that this be removed from the Act and placed in regulations. This has become necessary because of the number of corporations and the diversity, and the need to keep track of the various shareholders and the percentage they would be entitled to, for being able to establish the number of animals that can be grazed by that corporation. Along with that, we are requesting that a disposition for industrial development list the qualifications or environmental standards which will be adhered to at the time.

Mr. Speaker, I request that members give support to these amendments.

MR. MAGEE: Mr. Speaker, I agree very much with this Bill. However, because the minister didn't make reference to it, I would like to ask: while I realize the first phrase indicates that the land may be transferred to another department, I wonder whether this applies when Crown land is sold for park purposes. Is that also embraced within this Bill? We're now launching urban parks development and various provincial parks throughout the province, and Crown land is oftentimes included in the area. I wonder if you could give a little further explanation relative to the parks programs as far as Crown land is concerned.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it agreed the hon. minister may close debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. MILLER: This is of much importance to the hon. Member for Red Deer, in view of the fact that there is some Crown land in the city of Red Deer; I believe it's referred to as the Gaetz sanctuary, is it not?

MR. MAGEE: That's correct.

MR. MILLER: We would like to be able to transfer that to the city of Red Deer for park and recreational purposes. As I mentioned, it would be at a lesser value than we would have to charge if it were for maximum use capabilities. This will enable us to turn that land over to the people of Red Deer to enjoy for a specific park and environmental purposes.

[Motion carried; Bill 6 read a second time]

#### **Bill 9**

##### **Cancer Treatment and Prevention Amendment Act, 1982**

MRS. EMBURY: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to move second reading of Bill No. 9, the Cancer Treatment and Prevention Amendment Act, 1982.

The name change to the Cancer Programs Act, which is one of the amendments in this Act, is recommended for basically the same overall purpose as the name change of the board; that is, to imply a comprehensive mandate for all that is currently understood to be involved in modern cancer care, namely prevention, screening, care of the acutely ill, and supportive care for those with chronic disease.

Further to the above, also pertinent to the change of name of the board, it is deemed preferable to spell out Alberta, rather than to use the non-specific designation of "provincial". The use of the word "hospitals" is inappropriate since, with the exception of the Cross Cancer Institute in Edmonton, the board operates a number of cancer centres in Calgary, Lethbridge, Red Deer, Peace River, and Medicine Hat, which are the focus of cancer care programs but which do not have beds or act as hospitals in the conventional sense.

The present Act states that the purpose of the board is to establish and operate provincial cancer hospitals and out-patient facilities for the diagnosis, treatment, and care of cancer patients, and cancer research. The board's authority is to be expanded to diseases that are non-cancerous but are capable of being diagnosed and treated in the same manner as cancer today. This reference applies to our most up-to-date medical technology used in the diagnosing and treatment of cancer.

Section 11 expands the types of substances the board may manufacture, purchase, or sell. This is indeed a compliment to the continued advancement in research and technology in our province. I would like to take this opportunity in the Assembly to commend the many professionals working throughout the province in this particular area. That is primarily the reason I stand before you today to ask for the amendments to this Act. We are advancing greatly with regard to the treatment and diagnosing of cancer and non-cancerous diseases.

The amendments to the Act also permit the committee to utilize the knowledge and experience of employees if the board so designates. This is a permissive type of amendment. The changes I have outlined in this Bill have the support of the Provincial Cancer Hospitals Board. I urge that all members of this Assembly support second reading of this Bill.

Thank you.

[Motion carried; Bill 9 read a second time]



**Bill 12**  
**Hydro and Electric Energy**  
**Amendment Act, 1982**

MRS. CRIPPS: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 12, the Hydro and Electric Energy Amendment Act, 1982.

There are few changes in this Bill. The first one is Section 13, changing "Minister of Energy and Natural Resources" to "Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife" in dealing with applications which involve public lands.

Secondly, subsection 3 allows the minister to delegate responsibility in routine applications, so every change or amendment in an application does not have to cross the minister's desk.

Section 18(3) adds "the Associate Minister of Public Lands and Wildlife" as a designate, and is no change in policy. Section 23(1) is a change which allows the ERCB to direct that a customer may be served in the most

economical manner. That is, if a customer lies within one franchise area and is some distance from any services of that particular franchise area but close to the services of a company that is in an adjacent franchise area, he may be connected in the most economical manner. Lastly, the requirements for public notice will be as given under the energy conservation Act and the Administrative Procedures Act.

[Motion carried; Bill 12 read a second time]

MR. CRAWFORD: I move that we call it 1 o'clock.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[At 12:22 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]

