

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Monday, March 6th, 1972

(The House met at 2:30 pm.)

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

INTRODUCTION OF A NEW MEMBER

MR. SPEAKER:

The Clerk of this Assembly has received notice of the election of a member to the Assembly, and will read it to the House.

CLERK:

"Clerk of the Legislative Assembly in the Province of Alberta. This is to certify that by virtue of the Writ of Election, dated the 7th day of January, 1972, issued by His Honour the Lieutenant Governor in Council and addressed to Richard Carl Fritz in the electoral division of Stettler, for the election of a member to represent the said electoral division in the Legislative Assembly in the room of Jack Robertson, by reason of whose death, since his election as representative to the said electoral division of Stettler, the seat has been vacant. Graham L. Harle has been returned as duly elected to represent the electoral division of Stettler as appears by the return to the said Writ of Election which is now lodged of record in my office. Signed W. H. MacDonald, Clerk of the Executive Council."

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to present to you and through you to the members of the Legislative Assembly Mr. Graham Harle, Member Elect for the electoral division of Stettler. He has taken and subscribed on the Roll the oath required by law and now claims his right to take his seat. I have the distinct pleasure in presenting him to you and to the members, knowing full well from my own acquaintance and knowledge of Mr. Harle that he will serve his constituents very well indeed.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House would like to join with the hon. Leader of the Government and the members on that side of the House in extending our congratulations to the Member Elect for the constituency of Stettler, and to welcome him here to the House. I would have to say of course, in all honesty, that we did not try to assist you in coming to the House, but now that the democratic process has been exercised and you are here, we sincerely welcome you and look forward to working with you.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is an honour to welcome you on behalf of all of us to this Chamber to join with all the members of this Assembly in deliberating

3-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

the concerns and affairs of the people of this province. In true parliamentary fashion, you will be given every opportunity to present your views, and those of your constituents, so that you may serve according to the highest principles of parliamentary democracy. I invite you to take your seat as a member of this Legislature.

MR. HARLE:

I consider it an honour to represent the Stettler constituency. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

#### FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I hereby table Sessional Paper No. 13, requested by statutory authority.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, concern was expressed yesterday with respect to a report done by the Montreal Engineering Company in connection with the Bow River Flood study problem I beg leave to table today a copy of this report, and also, Mr. Speaker, to correct a statement that I made during the question period yesterday in connection with this matter. In being questioned as to who engaged Montreal Engineering to do this study, I replied that the City of Calgary did. I want to correct that statement and suggest that it was a joint authorization by the previous government of the Province of Alberta and the City of Calgary, this study being commissioned on January 26, 1970.

#### QUESTION PERIOD

##### Moir Report

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. Would the hon. minister advise the House what has happened to the Moir Committee report into non-Canadian influence in Alberta post-secondary institutions?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I understand the question to be the whereabouts of the Moir Committee report. I only wish, Mr. Speaker, that I had the information that I could answer that question for the hon. member. I might say, however, that I am meeting today at five thirty with Mr. Moir, and presumably one or two people on his committee, to discuss this with them. This is a meeting that they have requested following my request to them that I get this report, and I'll be able to report to the House further at that time.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister tell the House if the government has any intention of implementing the interim report of the Moir Committee to prevent further misuse of the tax exemptions?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to acknowledge that there is a certain misuse of tax exemptions, but in response to the hon. member's question, I think it only fair and reasonable that we have an opportunity of reviewing the report before we then determine what our next course of action will be.

March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-3

Swann Report

MR. GRUENWALD:

I'd like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier. Could the Premier tell us the cost of the Swann report?

MR. LOUGHEED:

I call upon the government House Leader to respond to that question.

MR. HYNDMAN:

My recollection is that the cost was \$1,500 for services rendered and some expenses, which I believe are in the neighbourhood of \$900.

Hansard

MR. WILSON:

I'd like to address a question to the hon. Premier. Honourable Sir, is it proposed that Hansard will be printed by the Queen's Printer here in the Legislative Building?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that matter is the subject of a government motion which I presume will be dealt with today, and I think that would be the appropriate time for that information to be provided.

A.G.T. -- Edmonton Telephones Dispute

MR. LUDWIG:

I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. A press report indicates that Edmonton Telephones was permitted to service communities in outlying districts of Edmonton, I believe three in number, if not more. I'd like to ask the hon. minister whether there is an agreement between AGT and ET in writing, on this issue, and also, if he could comment as to the anticipated loss of revenue in this arrangement by way of subscription revenues to AGT.

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question. Firstly, the areas that were agreed to be serviced by Edmonton Telephones were those that were in the mediation report that was tabled by Alec Lester on December 1st. Now, in considering who should service those areas, the members of that committee stated that in the interim, in order to provide service on an ongoing basis, that Edmonton Telephones should be allowed to service Mill Woods and Ascot Park, and also Kaskitayo pending final settlement of the whole report itself. With respect to the loss of revenue, I'd like to suggest that this is one area in which AGT is not making revenue, is not earning income sufficient to repay the capital expenditure; and that for some time it is not expected that there would be a return or any profit made on providing service in those three areas. The whole question, Mr. Speaker, is provision of service to those residents until the final negotiation of the settlement.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I asked whether there was a written agreement as to the arrangements under the circumstance, and I would like to add, did the hon. minister approve the arrangement?

3-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite certain whether or not there was a written agreement. Yes, there was a written agreement going from my office to the office of the Mayor, and subsequently that letter was tabled at a council meeting early in January.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like the hon. minister to undertake to file the agreement, and he didn't answer me whether he approved the agreement as minister, and I would now like to add another question. Is he intending to set up any study to determine the feasibility of buying out Edmonton Telephones by the Alberta Government Telephones?

MR. WERRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't recall his first question, but I'll answer it anyway. But I don't recall him asking it. With respect to who shall provide service in the three areas: Kaskitayo, Mill Woods and Ascot Park, this was a subject of consultation between the Mayor and myself; and subsequently, the committee itself agreed -- that is the two parties to the further mediation committee being the three members from City Council and three members from the Executive Council -- they agreed that in the interim Edmonton Telephones should service that area and subsequently the committee did agree and a letter went to City Council accordingly.

With respect to whether or not an offer will be made, this matter will be an Executive Council decision as to whether or not an offer will be made to Edmonton Telephones to purchase their equipment, and at this point in time the Cabinet has not dealt with the subject matter, nor have there been any studies or feasibility studies undertaken to determine what the amount would be, provided such an offer were to be made.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, to help the hon. minister out, I'd like to repeat that I wanted to know whether he approved the arrangement. We're dealing with public funds, AGT, a Crown corporation, entering into an agreement. And I want that question answered if he can answer it, and I will add one more now (hope he remembers). Did you support ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. I wonder if it wouldn't be more expeditious if the hon. member might ask the questions one at a time.

MR. WERRY:

I have a question, Mr. Speaker. I, as the minister responsible for AGT, did approve it, but only as a result of both mediation committees, or both sides to the mediation committee, insisting or agreeing that in the interim, service be provided by Edmonton Telephones. And in compliance with that committee's request, I sent the formal letter over to the Mayor.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I take it from the answer that the hon. minister approved the arrangement. I just wanted to make it clear. And the other question is, Mr. Speaker, to either the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities or anyone else who may wish to answer it, did the hon. minister approve the undertaking by the Premier to permit expansion of Edmonton Telephones to its natural boundaries? In other words, taking away areas which are serviced by AGT? ... and while you are answering that question, it's the same question ...

March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-5

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. LOUGHEED:

I recall it was Friday, March 3rd that that very same question was asked, and the answer was given; that is the purpose of the Question Period, to provide information.

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, the hon. member is putting hypothetical questions; he can take whatever he wants out of the replies that I give to him.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the hypothetical question to a hypothetical promise made by the hon. Premier to the hon. minister: did he approve the stand taken by his hon. Leader to permit Edmonton Telephones to expand into the territories presently serviced by AGT? It's a simple question that isn't hypothetical, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. I believe the hon. member has now put this question twice, and I believe that under the rules the hon. minister is not obliged to answer except to the extent that he wishes. The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

Senior Citizen's Accomodation

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. How many senior citizen's homes have been built in the City of Calgary and its environs within the last five years?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to respond to that, given the opportunity to do the necessary research. I have no doubt that a comparison between the last five year period and the next five year period will be one that will be of interest to the House, and will bear a more agreeable relationship between what the demand is and what the supply is than over the last five. But I don't have the information on the tip of my tongue, so I will provide it in due course.

Moir Report (cont.)

MR. CLARK:

I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education with regard to the meeting he is holding this afternoon at 5:30 in his office. If the Moir Committee is not going to have its report in your hands shortly, would you request the committee to present to you, and you in turn to the Legislature, the tables which in fact they now have on the question of non-Canadian influence on post-secondary education in Alberta.

MR. FOSTER:

I am happy to hear the hon. member's remarks. I will take them into consideration. Thank you.

3-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

Touche, Ross Report

MR. TAYLOR:

I would like to address a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Do you consider that the people of Alberta received value from the \$20,000 expended for the Touche, Ross report?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, the report as I indicated on Friday will be tabled in due course. I think the report at that time will answer the hon. member's question.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, is there any information in the Touche, Ross report that was not available from the Provincial Auditor?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, again I will say that the report, as I indicated, will be tabled for the information of all members of the Legislature. Comments will be appropriate at that time; at this time I do not believe comments are appropriate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek - Crowsnest.

Hospital Financing -- Reserve Lands

MR. DRAIN:

I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Health if it is the intention of the government to negotiate a more equitable arrangement in regard to supplementary requisitions for hospital areas where they have Indian Reserves.

MR. CRAWFORD:

I thank the hon. member for giving me notice earlier today of his intention to ask this question. The situation is that discussions continue with the Federal Government concerning some contribution to the hospital financing program of Reserve lands where they are situated within a particular hospital district. The amount involved, experience has shown, is not large, and it presents no particular problem at this time as the amount during the last year was under \$30,000 for the entire province.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, the next question; would the hon. Minister agree that this could in the future conceivably represent a considerable cost, and further, would the hon. minister then consider an equalization grant to supplement supplementary requisitions for the municipal bodies in this particular circumstance?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the question of whether or not it is necessary to arrive at a special arrangement for equalization, which is not the case at the present time, will depend on keeping in close touch with the situation to see if the financial implications over the coming years change in any great way, as the hon. member suggests they might. If they do, well then certainly every regard will be had to that.

March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-7

Mrs. Leeferink (dec'd)

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. In light of his answer to me on the Leeferink tragedy, that the handling of the removal of children from Mrs. Leeferink may have been one of the factors that contributed to her death; the question is, Mr. Speaker, were any directives issued by the minister or anyone in his department as to future handling of matters of this nature?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, no specific directions as to similar instances have been issued as a result of the Leeferink case.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

Brazeau Dam Cleanup

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Minister of Lands & Forests regarding the Brazeau Dam, a two point question. First question - how much money has the government of Alberta expended on the cost of the clean-up since the area was flooded?

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder if the hon. member would ask the questions one at a time?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, this is an important question regarding the clean-up that has been necessary on the Brazeau Dam and this is a detailed matter on which I would be most happy to provide information for the hon. Member for Drayton Valley, as it is in his constituency.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would he also give us the amount of work - was it done on an hourly basis, was it done on a contract basis or how were the contracts handled and to whom were they awarded?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would be most happy to provide that additional information as well. I might, while I have the opportunity, add that part of the priority employment program undertaken by the new administration was in that area and that considerable clean-up was accomplished this winter in just that area of the Brazeau Dam and the surrounding area.

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

Agricultural Land Assessments

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the government received a report from the

3-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

Agrabusiness firm with respect to the ratio assessment between arable land and pasture land?

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes.

MR. FRENCH:

Is the government prepared to table this report?

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question, is it the intention of the government to set up a committee of members of the Legislature to study this report?

MR. RUSSELL:

No, just a task force. Mr. Speaker, we just received the report a matter of days ago. It was gone over very briefly in a discussion with Mr. Sibbald and with some senior civil servants in the employ of the government, and with myself and my Deputy Minister. It's our intention, as soon as an adequate number of copies can be provided, to table the report for all members of the Legislature and then we will proceed according to their wishes.

#### Dehorning of Cattle

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Will the hon. minister explain the reason for rescinding Alberta Regulation 274/57 under the Horned Cattle Purchase Act?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, that's pretty clear, it's a matter of government policy.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the gouged cow. Is this government policy and would this regulation be enforced if necessary?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member will have ample opportunity to give his views to this Legislature in regard to the horn tax on cattle. We, in this party, gave our views a number of years ago in relation to the horn tax on cattle and we followed up with the removal of that tax as soon as we possibly could.

MR. BUCKWELL:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, would the minister consider a brief from the Humane Society in order against your brief?

DR. HORNER:

We would be appreciative of any briefs that could be provided to us on any of these matters and including a brief from the hon. gentleman if he would like to provide one.



March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-9

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, another question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Will the government be making public a policy decision on the Tradition and Transition report, and when?

DR. HORNER:

Shortly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, another supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Since the money was used from the horned cattle for research, is the government going to supply a similar amount of money from public revenue to carry out the research?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has been in this Legislature long enough to know that this is a budgetary question and will be divulged when the budget is tabled in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary-McCall.

Department of Telephones and Utilities

MR. HO-LEM:

I would like to direct this point to the hon. the Premier. I understand that a new department will be established, namely the Department of Telephones and Utilities. I wonder when this may be completed, and secondly, will this require an addition to the Cabinet?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, as far as the matter is concerned, it is the intention of the government to present a bill during the course of this sitting which will deal specifically with the matter that the hon. member has enquired about, and during the course of the debate, I am sure those questions will be raised and I am sure answered.

Mobile Homes -- Assessment and Taxation

MR. PURDY:

I have a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. In regard to mobile homes assessment and taxation, is it true that people who now reside in this type of dwelling, under legislation that was passed last year, have no right of appeal of their taxation or assessment?

MR. RUSSELL:

Members who were sitting here during the last session of the Legislature will recall that amendments were brought into the appropriate Acts whereby mobile homes would be put on as equitable a basis as possible with the standard kinds of homes, insofar as assessment and taxation are concerned, and also with respect to the receiving of the Homeowner's Tax Discount. We have discovered in instituting the new system, approved by the last Legislature, that it allows no recourse for appeal of assessment and we intend to take corrective measures during this year.

3-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

MR. NOTLEY:

A question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Is any thought being given to changing the depreciation timetable in computing the license fee? A depreciation table of 40 years in my judgment leaves a completely incorrect assessment base.

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is under continuing review. When the schedule was first drawn up during the latter months of the past year for gazetting before the end of the calendar year, we first submitted the proposed schedule to the two Mobile Homeowner's Associations that we knew existed within the province, as well as a couple of the major manufacturers. After receiving their comments, some adjustments were made and we then put the schedule in for this first year to see how it will work.

MR. NOTLEY:

Question, Mr. Speaker. Has any consideration been given by the government to the problem of mobile home monthly rentals? In some cases they are completely exorbitant. Moreover, has any consideration been given to making funds available to municipalities to assemble land for publicly operated mobile homes to inject some competition into the mobile home park situation?

MR. RUSSELL:

In answer to the first question, Mr. Speaker, not all of the monthly costs, as members are aware, are within the control of the government, particularly in the case of mobile homeowners who rent stalls in privately owned parks, and make some provision for their utilities, and also in making private arrangements for financing for the purchase of the units. Insofar as the second part of the question is concerned, that matter is under consideration, insofar as amending legislation is concerned.

#### Non-Payment of Taxes

MR. HO LEM:

In regard to homeowners, the act in respect to this, will there be changes in the act so that we can prevent these people from being jailed for non-payment of taxes?

MR. RUSSELL:

If the hon. member will contain his patience for a few weeks, the necessary legislation will be brought in for his perusal.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright and then the hon. Member for St. Albert.

#### Dehorning of Cattle (cont.)

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture with regard to the Horned Cattle Trust Fund; did he receive a recommendation from the Cattle Commission relative to this?

DR. HORNER:

I received recommendations in relation to this matter from the Cattle Commission, from the Western Stock Growers, from a number of interested farmers and from a great variety of people throughout the industry.

March 6th 1972

ALPERTA HANSAED

3-11

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister make these available to the members of the Assembly?

DR. HORNER:

I see nothing wrong with that, Mr. Speaker.

Athabasca University

MR. JAMISON:

I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Advanced Education if he would give the Assembly the present status of the Athabasca University.

MR. FOSTER:

It's a matter of public record now that Athabasca University, as proposed by the former administration, is under review by this government for what we feel are some good and valid reasons, and for reasons with which I think the other members on the opposite side of the House have concurred. Obviously, we're concerned about the financial involvement of a fourth university in this province and we're attempting to assess the need for another university in Alberta at this time. I think in fairness to the House, Mr. Speaker, I should say that we have not arrived at a position on Athabasca. It has not yet been discussed in the Executive Council, but I expect it would be so in the course of the next six weeks to two months, at which time I'll be happy to report further to this House. Thank you.

MR. JAMISON:

Rumour has it that possibly the site may be changed. Is there any truth to this, hon. Minister of Advanced Education?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not normally inclined to respond to rumours that I'm told are floating around. I'm sure there are a great many rumours. I have said publicly and I will say again, and do say now in this House, that the matter of location of Athabasca University is not a matter of issue or a part of the review at the present time.

DR. BUCK:

...a rumoured university at Red Deer in preference to the one at St. Albert?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill I believe was on his feet.

Dehorning of Cattle (cont.)

MR. FARRAN:

Did the money that was derived from the Horn Tax go to the research for which it was intended, and I presume that it was into the breeding of poll cattle, and into measuring the amount of shrink and damage caused to cattle by the dehorning process. The question is simple enough - what happened to the money? Did it all go to the research for which it was intended?

3-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

DR. HORNER:

I would intend at a later date to table with the Legislature a full statement in regard to whatever funds were expended from the Horn Tax.

Federal Agreement re Property Taxes

MR. DIXON:

The hon. Premier, an agreement has been made recently between the Province of Ontario and the federal government regarding income tax as it affects write-offs for property taxes and tenants' rents. I was wondering if your government, Mr. Premier, was going to take action in order that the Alberta tenants and property owners could be eligible for a credit against their income taxes to compensate on municipal taxes and rent for the 1972 year?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that is a matter that is under active review by our administration, and particularly the concern with regard to renters and the situation of property taxation. In addition to that, we have a task force that is chaired by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill which is actively examining the whole area of the impact of property taxation, and I do believe that we should be in a position in the course of the near future to make some observation of a further nature on that subject.

Government Task Forces

MR. HENDERSON:

We are now running an open government. Will the minutes of the meeting of the task forces or caucus committees that the government has set up be available to members of this Assembly?

MR. LOUGHEED:

We hope that they will, but we will give the matter some further consideration.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood.

Fall Session

MR. BENOIT:

My question is addressed to the hon. Premier. Is it the government's intention to set the date for the proposed fall session during this session, so that hon. members who have other commitments will have some idea of when the fall session would be held?

MR. LOUGHEED:

That is a matter on which we would welcome views from all members with regard to an appropriate time for a fall sitting. We have looked at the various times that are involved and we can see a natural squeeze between the difficulty of assuring that it comes after harvest throughout the whole province, and at the same time takes into consideration a large number of important annual association meetings that affect matters in the province, and, of course, the Christmas season. So we would welcome views from both sides of the House as to what would be an appropriate time, with the hope that we would be talking about a period of about four weeks maximum.

March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-13

Oil and Gas Royalties

MR. NOTLEY:

I would like to address this question to the hon. Premier. In view of the Speech from the Throne which noted that your government is going to bring in position papers on important issues, and in view of the fact of the over-riding importance of the royalty review that will take place this year, when may this Legislature expect a position paper on the question of royalties?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would think this position paper would come towards the latter stages of the regular session that we have now commenced. We would hope that there would be a period of one week minimum, and hopefully more than that, between the time of the presentation of that position paper and the public hearing, and would be targeting for about a three week notice period. But it would be towards the latter stages of this session.

Education Costs -- Property Taxes

MR. LUDWIG:

I would like to direct a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. At what stage is the government study with relation to the intention of the government to transfer education costs from property taxes? How far advanced is this study?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, we have had interim reports from Roy Farran's task force committee. In addition, there are things going on in the interim with respect to this and the Department of Treasury. I can't report further than that at this time.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is it the intention of the government through the hon. minister's department to issue a position paper or a white paper on taxation on the issue?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question, I would like to say that in this particular session we have no intention of doing that. Certainly, in the future our government will be examining the various methods of provincial taxation. We have indicated that we're concerned that citizens are paying taxes on ability-to-pay. There is a considerable amount of study which must go into this. We are doing so, but we won't be able to report at this session.

Highways Inspection Service

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Highways. Are there plans underway to move the Inspection Service Branch from Stettler to Red Deer?

MR. COPITHORNE:

The answer is no.

3-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

Grid Road Program

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pose a question to the hon. Minister of Highways. I thought he was going to be neglected there. I would like to know, in view of the fact that the present government is going to carry on with the excellent grid road program set up by the previous government, if the industrial road between Elk Point and the salt plant in Lindbergh will be carried out this year?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, in due course the hon. member will have his answer.

Alberta Provincial-Municipal Fiscal Commission

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs by asking him to outline for the Assembly the consultation there was between the presidents of the two major municipal organizations in the province prior to the announcement of the phasing out of the Alberta Provincial Municipal Fiscal Commission.

MR. RUSSELL:

There was no consultation at all. This was a government decision taken as quickly as we could after attaining office.

MR. CLARK:

So there was absolutely no consultation between the two presidents and yourself?

MR. RUSSELL:

. . . of government policy if there is a difference between the two sides of the House I can accept that, but we prefer to carry out that work with elected representatives rather than an appointed paid commission.

Government Task Forces (cont.)

MR. HENDERSON:

On that particular question, if public money is being used by the Conservative party for those particular exercises, surely the minutes of those meetings can be made available to this House.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer that question. There is no question that there are public funds being used to cover the expenses and subsistence of government MLA task forces because this is a government of 48 members, and all of the members of this government participate in the formulation of our policy and it is clearly a matter of government policy formulation. It is a team of 48 members.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Premier. Do you believe in the equality of members in this Legislature?

March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-15

MR. LOUGHEED:

I surely do, Mr. Speaker, and I also believe in the importance of government members being fully involved in formulation of government policy.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary to the hon. Premier. If you believe in the equality of members, why are you making second class citizens out of those who happen to differ from your views, who sit on the other side of the House?

MR. SPEAKER:

May I just say that the question period will be ending at 3:22.

MR. HENDERSON:

A question to the hon. Premier, as to whether the minutes of these caucus committees, when operations are being financed by public funds, are going to be made available to the members of the Assembly. That is the question I ask, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LOUGHEED:

The answer is no. They are considered in the same way as minutes of the Executive Council would be considered.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, may I have an answer to the question I have asked?

MR. SPEAKER:

No, you may not.

Red Deer River Aeration Experiment

MR. HENDERSON:

I would like to ask the hon. Minister of the Environment if he could advise the members of this House as to the status of the river water irrigation scheme on the Red Deer River. Is it operational? If so, is it living up to its expectations?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for giving me the opportunity of making a short speech. I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this government inherited many areas of neglect from the previous government, and one really serious area was the pollution in the Red Deer River. Perennially, this river was very badly polluted and the oxygen levels dropped to the order of one to two parts per million, and in order to attempt to correct this problem, the previous government, as a dying gasp, hit upon an experiment called the U-Tube Experiment.

They commissioned funds, virtually in their last week in power, to in fact, instigate the U-Tube Experiment on the Red Deer River, without too much thought or pre-planning. And this is an area that I inherited with the department that I took over. This particular U-Tube Experiment is not intended in any way to solve the massive problems of pollution in the Red Deer River. It is simply an experiment to determine if oxygen can be added to the river, to the water, by virtue of injecting air under pressure.

The experiment to date, during the course of implementation, ran into some difficulties in connection with blasting rock. The first contractor who was engaged quit, and the second one was engaged. My latest report on the matter was that the experiment would go into

3-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

operation this last weekend. I have received no report on the matter to date, but I want to re-emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that it is strictly an experiment, and at that, perhaps an ill-conceived experiment.

Automobile Insurance Rates

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Attorney General. Has the watchdog committee, set up under The Insurance Act, approved the rates for the compulsory package of automobile insurance which will commence on April 1st of this year?

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

When these rates are approved, will they be tabled in the Legislature?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the committee does not approve of the rates; it has the power to set them or to alter them, and I will take into consideration requests about tabling them in the Legislature.

MR. TAYLOR:

Does the hon. Attorney General have any idea when these will become public? Obviously, the insurance companies have to have time, and the people should know in advance. Would these rates be established by April 1st?

MR. LEITCH:

Rates, Mr. Speaker, are filed by the insurance companies and are in the course of being established. I can't answer him as to whether they are all as of this time filed. It will be very shortly.

Village Lake Louise

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the hon. Minister of Industry? Does the hon. minister still favour the Village Lake Louise development in the Banff National Park as he indicated he did last month?

MR. PFACOCK:

I want to thank the hon. gentleman for giving me the opportunity to rise to my feet. I thought I was kind of outside this team. The opinions that I expressed in the Calgary Herald, or through the Calgary Herald, are my own personal opinions.

Government Task Forces (Cont.)

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address another question to the hon. Premier. Since the hon. Premier agrees with the equality of members, and has introduced the Bill of Rights in the House, is he prepared to give the members in the opposition equal rights with the members on the government side?



March 6th 1972

ALBEPITA HANSARD

3-17

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have clearly answered that with regard to the matter of government policy. The government policy will be formulated by all members of the government side, and not merely by the Executive Council, and for that reason it is our intention, on a strictly expense and subsistence basis, to involve the members on this side of the House in the preparation and the formulation of government policy matters, and for that reason, that is going to be the position that this government will take.

There will however, be clearly opportunity for full and adequate participation in a number of matters through the various select Legislative Committees, of which six were announced in the Speech from the Throne, which I believe the provisions in the Legislative Assembly Act deal with in relation to some compensation and indemnity. The hon. member can be fully assured that insofar as indemnification is concerned, insofar as any sort of salary arrangements are concerned, all members will be treated in an entirely equal manner. But when it comes to the formulation of government policy, this government will formulate that policy by assuring that all members of this government who sit here take a full part in it, in accordance with parliamentary tradition.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, then does open government mean open only for the government members, and not for the rest of the province?

MR. HENDERSON:

As a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, since the Premier has stated the views of this government, on what basis does he decide whether one of these committees should be a Legislative Committee or one of his political caucus committees? Because he is treating them both the same -- he makes a farce of the Legislative Committee, Mr. Speaker. So would the hon. Premier please outline to the House the basis on which he makes a decision. Does he refer a matter to a political committee of the Conservative Party, a caucus committee, or does he refer it to a Legislative Committee? I can see no distinction here as to how he does it.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an excellent matter for debate and we look forward to it at a more appropriate time than the question period. Because of the fact that I said something, I sense that the members on the other side of the House regret for very obvious reasons their failure to involve the members on their side in policy formulation over the 36 years that they were the government.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, neither the Social Credit government nor any other government in Canada ever had the audacity and arrogance to pay their own caucus committee.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

Deputy Ministers' Salary Increases

MR. ZANDER:

I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer whether he can say yes or no to the question that after the past government had been voted out of office, that a raise was given to the Deputy Ministers, and how much?

3-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question. It is true that at a Cabinet meeting when the former government was in office they approved increases to Deputy Ministers. It was after, I believe, the September 9th Cabinet meeting. It was after the election of August 30th.

DR. BUCK:

It was given to the ministers without portfolio at that time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. I believe we have run out of the allotted time according to the rules.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Election of a Deputy Speaker

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Getty, that Mr. Diachuk, the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly, be appointed Deputy Speaker of this Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER:

Moved by the hon. Minister of Education, seconded by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, that the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly, Mr. Diachuk, be named or elected the Deputy Speaker of this Assembly. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I declare the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly, Mr. W.W. Diachuk to be elected Deputy Speaker of this Assembly.

If I might just interject, I should perhaps express a word of welcome to Mr. Diachuk and to express my appreciation to the House for having elected him as Deputy Speaker.

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, we would request that Motion No. 1 be held over. The notice of motion is provided in our rules and regulations in order to give all members a chance to know what the motion is, the contents of it, in order to prepare debate. We received the Votes and Proceedings at noon today and consequently, have not had proper opportunity to peruse these. We would, therefore, request that the debate be held over until Wednesday. If the government, in its wisdom, decides to go ahead with the debate, we would then request that at least we be permitted to adjourn the debate following the presentation of the debate by the mover and the seconder.

March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-19

MR. KING:

If I may be permitted to speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker. The rules of the Assembly clearly provide in Section 36 that the rule regarding notice shall not apply to the times of meeting or adjournment of the Assembly. It further provides that notice shall be taken as it has been printed in the Votes and Proceedings of the Assembly, which, when printed for Thursday afternoon, March 2nd, provided such notice and were available to the hon. members of the Assembly from the Clerk's office at 3:30 on Friday afternoon.

MR. TAYLOR:

If that were the case, we'd have no case at all. We did not receive them, however, until noon today. Consequently, we have had no time to prepare for this debate.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I believe it should be stated, however, that the House was deemed to have sat last Friday until 5:30, and the Votes and Proceedings were available before 5:30. However, insofar as the hon. House Leader opposite has indicated that it is a matter of some urgency and importance to his side, we would be prepared to let these four resolutions stand until Wednesday.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

May I ask the House whether it is the intention that the agreement which has just been reached should apply to all of these motions, or merely to the first one?

MR. HYNDMAN:

It would apply to all four, Mr. Speaker, subject to some situations which may change the government's view in setting business, but all four at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR:

I would like to thank you and all hon. members of the government for conceding to this request.

#### THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me check. I am not sure whether I am able to come through if I speak to this microphone, and I am a little bothered trying to use this one, so I would like to use this one, if I may. Am I coming through on this one, Mr. Speaker?

3-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder if the hon. Leader of the Opposition might pause just a moment while we check that. I think it is an important thing.

MR. STROM:

Is it all right, Mr. Speaker, if I just remain standing? Does it sound like I am coming in now? I would hate to think that any hon. members would be missing the important words that I would like to say.

MR. SPEAKER:

I might mention that we have had them all rechecked today and they were all working.

MR. STROM:

It has been brought to my attention that I wasn't coming through previously when I rose to welcome the hon. Member for Stettler, so I thought I would check it and again I am not sure whether I am coming through or not.

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder, would the Leader of the Opposition like to say something or scratch his mike to make sure it is being recorded up there?

MR. STROM:

Fine, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to say that I welcome the opportunity to take part in the Throne Speech debate. Testing one. . .two. . .one. . .two. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to demonstrate that I am a very tolerant man at all times, and this certainly gives me the opportunity.

On a point of order, is this what you are asking up there?

MR. SPEAKER:

I would like to express my regrets to the House for this and my gratitude for the hon. member giving up his right of speech for the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for permitting me to move to another place so that I can get the advantage of the public address system. I want to say again that I, of course, welcome the opportunity to take part in the Throne Speech debate today.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I congratulate you, sir, on your election to high office. I was very happy to have the opportunity of seconding the motion of the hon. leader on the government side and we certainly wish you well in your responsibilities. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that there will be times when you will find your job rather lonesome. You will find yourself sitting there alone being faced with having to make decisions that may at times be a little difficult. I have to say I appreciate that there are some new arrangements that have been made and I note, of course, that the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly and the Assistant Clerk, are now seated very close to you where they can provide information to you when necessary, which, of course, I hope will not be too often. But I can suggest that if at any time you should happen to get into some difficulty, my hon. colleague, the hon. Member for Calgary Millican who has had a number of years of experience will, I am sure, be very happy to give you some unsolicited advice on problems that you may face.

March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-21

I noted, Mr. Speaker, that you suggested on opening day, upon taking your position, that there were times when you might lose your head, but I want to say to you that we on this side will make sure that you will never, at any time, stand in danger of losing your life.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to make it very clear to yourself and the hon. members of this Assembly that it is our intention to co-operate with you in providing proper decorum in the House and, of course, enable you to conduct the business of the Assembly in an orderly manner. I couldn't help but notice, of course, the very acceptable innovation that has been brought into the Legislature for this session. I suppose that it might be fair to assume that it is as a result of the representation made by the Women's Lib Society within our province. I refer, of course, to the bringing into the Legislature of Page Girls, and I must say very sincerely, that I concur in this innovation. I think it is an excellent one, and it adds something to the House.

I cannot help though, at this time, but issue a warning to the young men and suggest that if they do not remain on their toes they may well find themselves on the outside looking in. I don't know which one of the girls it was that said at the conclusion of Friday's sitting -- that -- I asked her how she liked her new work and she said, "Well, you know I am just so nervous that I hardly know what I am doing." Well, if it is any consolation to her, sir, I can say that there are members that have arrived in the House and have found themselves in like positions. I have to confess today that even after a number of years in the Legislature, I find it one of the most difficult places that I have undertaken to speak. I don't know why, because I find that the members are very receptive to everything that I say, but nevertheless, that is the way it happens to be.

Now I certainly want to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne for their well delivered speeches, and I noted one fact that stood out, and that was they didn't use their allotted time, and I suggest that this may well set the tone for shorter speeches; and if it does, I for one cannot quarrel with that idea either. I think maybe that it is something that we might all take note of.

Even though my personal responsibilities in this House have changed from time to time over the years, I am happy and proud to have continuously served the constituents of Cypress since my first election. I am very pleased for the continued confidence that they have placed in me by returning me as their member. I have to say, of course, that as their elected representative I expect to present the views on behalf of my constituency in all matters concerning their area, and of course I expect the government to recognize me as their spokesman. I have to say too that my colleagues would expect to be recognized as spokesman for their constituencies as well.

Mr. Speaker, I accept without question the democratic choice of the electorate, but I must point out to you, sir, that even though there are more representatives on the other side of the House, that we on this side represent the greater percentage of the voters.

Now I want to say too, Mr. Speaker, in fairness to the Leader of the government that I noted with a great deal of satisfaction and gratification that the hon. Premier, upon taking office, recognized and gave credit to the Social Credit party under the leadership of Mr. Aberhart, Mr. Manning, and myself, for the tremendous growth and development of our province during the period of time that we served in office, and I appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that I would be remiss in my duty, and I would be unfair, if I did not at this time pay tribute to my colleagues who have served with me on the Executive Council, and also

3-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

to people who served before us on executive councils of the past, for the work that they have done. I am sure, and I speak at least for our group that I have been privileged to work with, that they gave of their time and talents and strength beyond the call of duty to serve the people of this province, and I am sure that this is recognized. Of course we certainly expect that this will be a situation that will continue to prevail in our province.

Oftentimes, I say this after a few years of experience, oftentimes we find that the public do not really recognize the sacrifice that is made by those who serve in elected office, but even more noteworthy is the fact that those who serve on executive councils are often called upon to make sacrifices to their families and to their personal desires that are not fully appreciated by the general public, and so we certainly owe much to those who give of their time to serve in positions of high office.

I would like to also express my appreciation and thanks to a dedicated and a loyal Civil Service who are serving this province well. I become a little concerned when I hear suggestions made as to the overstaffing, and let's be perfectly fair, I think that we can find areas of overstaffing in all business, and government is no exception. But we must recognize that it is very difficult, I say very difficult, to make comparisons as to what is happening in one province as compared to what is happening in another. And I fear that an unfair comparison is often being made when we suggest that we in this province are maybe being overstaffed. I want to make it very clear that as far as I am concerned I consider that we have an excellent service and will continue to have excellent service from the civil servants of this province.

Our province has moved forward with people and government working together. The Social Credit party, during its term of office, supported policies and programs that provided a favourable economic climate that encouraged and promoted development, making Alberta one of the leading growth provinces in Canada. Our record of honesty and integrity speaks for itself, and is a record of which every Albertan can be proud.

In Alberta, as in all other provinces, we suffered a slow-down in our growth rate during the last couple of years, because of the inflationary controls placed on our economy by federal fiscal and monetary policies. Recovery has been slower than expected because of slowness in finalizing decisions in The Federal Taxation Act and other policy matters that are of prime concern in decision making for business and management. The reason for lack of decision and delays is supposedly to provide time for public opinions to be registered but I have to say that the uncertainties created have a very unsettling effect on the plans of business and management for the future, and this view was confirmed, Mr. Speaker, by the president of the Alberta Chamber of Commerce in a statement that he made not long ago.

I noted another senior executive recently stated that in the last three to four years, senior officials of his company spent as much time, or more, in the analysis of highly questionable legislation as they had in endeavouring to run the company. I say that this has created a situation that has not been good, and we have felt the effects of it in the Province of Alberta, as well as in other provinces of Canada.

But it leads me then to say this, that it becomes very important that governments provide clear indications of positions that are taken and will be taken in relation to the operation of the private sector. Now, I could point out a number of illustrations, but I just want to make one, and it was alluded to in the Question Period, Mr. Speaker. Take the matter of concern at the present time in the matter of a final decision on royalties. I want to make it very

March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-23

clear that we on this side of the House welcome and support public hearings, and we would simply urge that the public hearings be held as soon as possible, and following the public hearings, that a final decision be made at the earliest possible date so that the industry might know and be able to plan accordingly. I think it's fair to say that over the years, stability has been a key word in Alberta's development, and we must maintain this position to the best of our ability.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the greatest problem facing all Canadians and the Canadian economy is the built-in, guaranteed inflation and the endless spiral of wages, strikes and prices. Now, I'm not singling out labour first for any particular reason, but I suggest that labour in its negotiations tries to negotiate or to provide protection against the anticipated increases that they face as a result of the inflationary spiral. Managers in business are no exception. They, in turn, try to protect themselves by adding an extra boost to a legitimate raise, as a hedge against anticipated increases. And so we have a continuous vicious spiral, leaving its aftermath of problems. It is very clear that we have a case of inflation psychology that has taken control at the present time. I can't help but recall that over a year ago, I suggested that Canada should give consideration to some measure of price control. I think many will recall that every political leader of a party in this province scoffed at the idea, and said that it wouldn't work, and I began to wonder if my thinking had any merit whatsoever. And then, of course, since that time, the president of the United States has imposed controls. In our country, the federal government attempted to control inflation by old out-dated orthodox methods, only to find very quickly that the cure was worse than the problem. I say again that inflationary pressures are increasing and will continue to create problems.

Mr. Speaker, all of the help programs provided for people on fixed incomes, for our farmers and other low income groups, are well nigh meaningless unless we bring under control the inflation problem. Under these circumstances, it is impossible to borrow in order to put yourself in a position of continuing prosperity. My own experience as a farmer clearly indicates that the cost-price squeeze continues unabated. Farm help programs are merely bypassing the main issue and though they may give temporary relief, which I'm certainly not arguing at this point in time, I simply state that they will not solve the problem. And it will be a continuing recurring problem that will face us. I say, without fear of contradiction, that there is no pot of gold at the end of the rainbow of solutions that are presently being offered.

We are looking forward to hearing at an early date what the government is going to do. Let me make it very clear, I am not at this moment suggesting that the ability to resolve or solve rests with the provincial government. I want to be totally fair. But what I am saying - I would expect the government to place this item as a high priority item in their discussions with the federal government. I consider it so important that this must be one of the high priority items. I note that the Speech from the Throne states that a new Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs will be established to ensure that Alberta's relationships with the federal government and with other provincial governments are improved. First, I want to assure the members of this Legislature that I have no real disagreement as to whether it's an agency or a department, although I personally feel that it could be just as effective as an agency with the Premier having primary responsibility. But what surprises me is that the legal representative that we had in our Ottawa office has returned to Alberta, and that presently the office is staffed by only two stenographers. Now this, Mr. Speaker, does not provide adequate service at the very centre of our country. I urge the government to immediately do something about this situation. I appreciate the desire to make assessments. I don't argue with that

3-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

right. But let's not create a vacuum in the interim period. I say that we need capable individuals to be in our Ottawa office in order that we may be kept informed. It is my understanding that there are closed-door discussions on constitutional reform. I don't know whether this is a correct piece of information, but nevertheless, it is information that is coming to us. I say that if we had a competent person in our Ottawa office that he could keep in constant touch on these matters and report to the government.

While speaking on constitutional matters, I would like to say that we on this side of the Legislature are deeply interested in knowing the government's position on constitutional reform. I would welcome an early position paper. Even though the subject has been laid to rest for a certain time I cannot feel that it will continue to be set aside, but that it eventually will be raised again for future discussion. And so we would certainly like to know the government's position.

We are extremely concerned in regard to the government's stand on cost-shared agreements, particularly when we read in our local papers that our government has asked the federal government to provide the dollars and that the provincial government will determine and administer the program. I have to say that I believe this position is wrong in principle and I'm also sure that the federal government will not give serious and favourable consideration to such a proposal. There's just no way in my mind that this will be considered. I would certainly go along, and this was a position that we took consistently, that the federal government get out of joint programs, but that instead of giving us the dollars they had been responsible for collecting, that they set aside areas in which we have taxing authority so that we can get the money to operate our own programs.

I believe in the face of rapidly escalating costs in shared cost programs that it becomes most important that the group spending the money also be responsible for its collection. Cost-shared programs, and I say this to my own criticism too, Mr. Speaker, in certainly wanting to be fair, cost-shared programs have carried us down the path of least resistance. By default, we have moved closer to the welfare state. Due to the financial pressure being placed on governments, they have been forced into accepting programs that they didn't want and I believe the federal government appreciated that costs are getting out of hand. But I think we have to say too, that it is largely because of the method in which they were implemented.

I think that Ottawa must come to the realization that we are a regional country. The exact boundaries of our divisions may vary in the minds of some people, but the point that I want to make is that each region may require unique programs and solutions to fit the regional differences.

We in this province have always taken the position that Canada needs to maintain basic minimum standards in our basic services such as education, health, welfare, and there are others, of course, that may fall into that category. But we think that there should definitely be more flexibility in establishing the solutions and the programs that better fit the desires and needs of regions. I believe that we should strive to reverse the trend and where necessary - and this I think is a key point - that we provide the financial capabilities for individuals to make decisions for themselves.

During the past number of years our society has undergone a change in attitudes whereby individuals are losing their concern for costs, simply because they personally are no longer responsible for the bill. I would like to expand on that point at a later date.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I note that the Throne Speech deals with the introduction of a Bill of Rights. It was mentioned as the number one



March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-25

-----

item in the priority list. I want to assure you that I acknowledge that rights must always be maintained and protected, but in our desire to spell out our rights, I think that we tend to forget what our responsibilities are as good citizens. If more people accepted their responsibilities to their country and to their fellow man there would be less need of emphasis on rights. Of course, we have the famous statement that has so often been referred to, by the late President John Kennedy, who said, "Ask not what my country can do for me, but what can I do for my country."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say very carefully that we have witnessed a mockery of The Bill of Rights and open government already in this session when it was stated by the government that it was Cabinet that would propose the submissions on The Bill of Rights, and not the Legislature. Surely, something as fundamental as a Bill of Rights should be openly examined before all the members of this Legislature. I would certainly hope that the government will reconsider the statement that has been made and that we will follow the procedure of having submissions made to this Assembly, permitting any group, any individual, who may wish to make representation to us, to come in and present their views.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on page 5 and item 6, I read this: "Among the new cabinet committees, is a cabinet committee on metropolitan affairs to work in conjunction with the administrations of the Cities of Edmonton and Calgary, to attempt to offset some of the problems and difficulties apparent in metropolitan centres in North America. The committee consists of six members of the Executive Council." In that item, Mr. Speaker, I see no indication of acknowledgment of any basic problems of the cities. Surely the government must admit that it has just as much responsibility to the cities as it has to the rural areas. Let us consider a few of the problems the cities are facing at the present time. The key to the major contributing factor to urban problems is the present rapid growth, which has been encouraged and promoted by unprecedented industrial development in Alberta. The provincial government, notwithstanding the municipal jurisdiction, has responsibilities to assist in finding answers to the problems.

I would like to list some of the problems that I believe are very evident: provision of new utilities and expansion of existing facilities; transportation; airports; highways; freeways; rapid transit; social services; leisure time and recreation programs and facilities. We can think of libraries, parks, ice arenas, culture workshops. Of course, there is the ever present problem of pollution control, and of course, the list continues to grow. In my view, setting up a cabinet committee to talk doesn't answer the problem. Is this to be a new direction? In no way can I interpret the establishment of a \$50 million Opportunity Fund Act for other areas as a serious attempt to reverse the continued growth of our large urban areas.

To me it was very interesting to find when we had our first meeting with the mayors of our ten cities that we came to a quick realization that any consideration of the future of our urban areas must also include a consideration of rural problems. That is why we established our Committee on Urbanization, so that we might get the total picture as it exists, and by getting input by everyone concerned, would then be able to provide solutions based on total information. It seems to me the only conclusion that I can draw is that there is a principle being applied of divide and conquer.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate the following general policies that we would like to see the Lougheed government pursue. First of all, the cornerstone of all policy must be the recognition that the individual is the most important element in society, but attached to his rights must be an understanding and acceptance of his responsibilities. We believe that the government

3-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

must accept the principle that in certain cases it will be necessary to provide the financial capabilities for an individual to make decisions for himself. Albertans are citizens of Canada, and Canadians first, and therefore we have a responsibility to Canadians, regardless of where they live in Canada. Having said that, I make no apologies, Mr. Speaker, for suggesting that this point need not necessarily be lost when presenting a strong Alberta position in Ottawa. Oftentimes it has been misinterpreted and it has been suggested that we are not concerned about other areas of Canada. I say that this is just not so. We recognize we are Canadians, and Canadians first. The principle I have just stated, if applied when dealing with Ottawa, must also be applied, of course, when the provincial government is dealing with municipal administrations. While agreeing that long range and short term planning is essential, this should not become a rationalization for doing nothing at the present.

Lastly, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, we support a statement I believe has been made, or implied, that new programs will be financed out of existing sources of revenue, and I think it is rather important in looking at programs that we, of course, also give consideration as to what their cost will be down the road.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having said at the outset that I went along with the idea of shorter speeches, I simply want to say here that I have tried to deal with just a few points I feel are of concern to this side of the House, and I want to assure the Leader of the Government that we are here to exercise our responsibility as an Opposition, as I have heard him expound on many occasions. I am not going to repeat it. He knows the road just as well as I do. We are going to try to carry it out to the best of our ability. I want to suggest that we do not want to be obstructionists, we still have the interest of this great province of ours at heart and we want to do what's right for it.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to stand in my place and suggest that things are not so good in "good old Alberta," as I used to hear periodically, because I believe as I have stated, that we have gone through a period of slow-down in our growth, but that we are in fact moving into a position of speeding up the development and growth of our province. All I can say in closing is that I believe we have left a very excellent foundation from which to continue the good work that we expect to see done for this great province of ours. Thank you very much.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the main motion in favour of the Speech from the Throne, like the hon. Leader of the Opposition. After the tone of his speech I would like to say that although I've had differences in the past with him, some of them pretty bitter -- bitter is the wrong word -- pretty hard differences, there has never been any acrimony in Alberta politics and I respect him as a man, even if I think he is misguided as a politician. Quite obviously, from his speech in favour of the Speech from the Throne, we have a huge area of common ground. We all agree that it is perhaps wrong that we have to spend Alberta dollars to obtain our fair share of Canada's GNP or federal funds. I think most of us agree that some sort of a brake has to be applied to spiralling wages, some sort of control on prices, something to arrest inflation. The trouble in this old world, as it has always been, is greed. And the trouble, of course, has been the lack of resolution on the part of government, and their failure to give a lead to private employers.

Now the statesman-like tone, I might say, of the Leader of the Opposition's speech was not entirely matched by some of the questions from his supporters. All I can say is -- in the same tone as the hon. Leader of the Opposition -- if they would just be patient, we

March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-27

understand their desire to correct all the errors of omission and commission of the past 36 years as soon as possible, and this we will do. I mean that is why the government must be commended for setting the stage in a methodical manner, and in allotting immediate priority to the areas of crying need.

I am sure that the hon. members of the opposition will not quarrel with the need for action on the five fronts of priority revealed in the Speech from the Throne.

I particularly applaud the humanitarian concern of this government. It has placed as a top priority for action, justice to the most cruelly treated people in our society -- the senior citizens, the mentally ill, and the handicapped. Its concern for the family farm and for the desertion of our vast rural areas is also long overdue, but nothing demonstrates the human feeling of the Premier and his cabinet for common justice so much as these positive steps for senior citizens. These steps properly follow on the heels of a Bill of Rights which is designed to ensure justice for all citizens. Significantly they come first on the top of a vast four year program. The Bill of Rights prohibits discrimination, I understand, on grounds of age, and yet this Canada of ours, which prides itself on being a young country, has been particularly harsh toward the aged.

of all colours and stripes are fond of crying sympathy for those on fixed incomes who are squeezed by inflation. But the most clearly defined group in this category consists of pensioners, and the public concern until now has not been translated into actual relief. On a federal level, old age pensions sometimes edge upward at a miniscule rate of about 2% a year, while inflation gobbles up their slender incomes at a rate about 6% or even 7%. While the federal supplementary allowance creeps up, the provincial allowance goes down, so that the net effect is even worse than it sounds. Even the faithful of one of the parties never ceasing to hope for an extra stipend of \$25 a month, began to wonder if the unlikely fulfillment of this promise would yield him the value of a package of cigarettes.

In my constituency of Calgary North Hill, close to the area where the late William Aberhart taught school, on some avenues two out of three homes are occupied by senior citizens. Many of them live alone, struggling to exist on a pittance of \$135 a month. They endeavour to maintain the home in which they invested their life savings, to maintain it despite heavy property taxes, high utility rates and exorbitant maintenance costs.

If it were not for Meals on Wheels many of them would live on bread and tea. They can't go into senior citizens' homes because the waiting lists are too long. None was built in Calgary for the last five years. I stand to be corrected when I get a return from the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, but I believe none was built during the last five years.

Sometimes the old timers yield to the unequal struggle and are forced out of their homes to eke out their last days in some dingy room or basement suite, at rents they can ill afford. There has even been some policy -- which I think is really unjust -- by housing authorities not to build public housing units for single people, and therefore, to deny them subsidized housing units. You know, where rents are subsidized for a percentage of income, and then to deny them to the most needy of all, the lonely senior citizens.

These people, they seldom whimper or cry about injustice. They are not the type. They saw this province through some good times, through very hard times, from the beginning. They would rather die than beg. And I regret to say that many of the younger generation who could well help them are too bound up in their own selfish

3-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

-----

interests to even offer assistance when it is not solicited. Even five bucks a month would make a difference of night and day in some cases. I have seen old widows of over 70 sweeping snow off sidewalks, mowing lawns, clipping hedges. During the election when I was canvassing door to door, Calgary was hit by a hurricane force gale, the first in its history. Many shingles and tiles were blown off roofs. A young man could have repaired most of this damage in 15 minutes, maybe an hour or so. But to an old age pensioner it was a major disaster. No roofing firm would charge less than \$50 for a single repair.

I do commend this government for the most worthwhile, in my opinion, of the winter works programs in my city, and that has been the subsidizing of repairs to homes of senior citizens.

So, here we have the real poor. I will give you a few statistics to emphasize my point. There are some 120,000 senior citizens in this province, of whom 58% are on the guaranteed income supplement, and therefore, live on about \$135 a month. About 20% of them are married. Of this total as many as 55,117 are eligible for the homeowner's allowance, and of these, 37% are on guaranteed income supplement. Only a small percentage of senior citizens are in senior citizens' homes, or nursing homes, probably because of the shortage of accommodation, at least in part. There are only 3,500 in citizens' lodges; about 5,000 in nursing homes, and 2,000 in auxiliary hospitals. So you see that the huge majority, 83,000 out of the 120,000 total, are living in their own homes. A survey in Calgary showed that 34% of these pensioners were living alone. Some 51% were households of two persons and 71% of them lived in detached dwellings.

According to the 1971 edition of Taxation Statistics 1969, from Statistics Canada, the average total income of Alberta pensioners was \$3,280 a year. And that was for those filing returns. There were probably some below that media who didn't even file a return. So I applaud this government's decision to forgive Medicare premiums to senior citizens.

About the basic plan and the optional plan relating to drugs, the high cost of drugs is yet another burden these people have to bear, and from the statistics I have given you, you will see why the imposition of a means test was not worth the cost and the inconvenience. There are very, very few wealthy senior citizens.

I also congratulate the hon. Minister of Highways on following through with a similar gesture towards old age pensioners. If their health is good, why should they have to suffer the indignity of a driver's test year after year?

Is it proper, for instance, to force these pioneers on very limited incomes, to educate two or even three generations? This is another question this government intends to answer. Mr. Speaker, of course it's not. I believe that justice will be served by the Loughheed government. It will all be done in good time. Sometimes, I confess, I am impatient like my hon. colleagues across the Floor. But I must recognize that it is too much to expect that everything that was done in 36 years can be corrected in five months.

I hope and expect that all these other things will be coming -- the relief of education tax on the property owner, more contracts for nursing homes, more accommodation for senior citizens at a rent they can afford. I believe both the former government and the local government of the City of Calgary have pulled a tremendous bloomer in building a high-rise apartment block to accommodate senior citizens in the downtown area of Calgary under terms which will mean that these senior citizens will be required to pay \$80 or \$90 a month in rent. On \$135 a month they won't have much left for food.

March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-29

-----

In my city we have taken some steps to assist the senior citizens on a local government level. We have given senior citizens passes on buses; we have promoted Golden Age Clubs. This government, I believe, is moving in a direction that has long been needed in Canada. So while I congratulate the hon. Leader of the Opposition for the tone of his speech, I must say that I congratulate even more the members of the Cabinet on this side of the House for the most constructive Speech from the Throne we have had in many years.

MR. NOTLEY:

I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker. I am sure that during this session of the Legislature you will fulfill your duties with great ability and distinction.

I enter this debate, proud to be the representative of the Spirit River-Fairview constituency, and I recall a statement made by a very famous Alberta parliamentarian, the late William Irvine, when he made his first speech in the House of Commons in Ottawa some 50 years ago. He was elected to the House of Commons as an Independent Labour party representative, along with Mr. J. S. Woodworth from Winnipeg. When Mr. Irvine got up to make his maiden speech he pointed out that he and Mr. Woodworth were the two representatives of the Independent Labour party, and he went on to say, "Mr. Woodworth is the leader and I am the party". Well, I find myself being able to go just one step further than Mr. Irvine today, and while some members in the press gallery occasionally wonder how I am going to get motions seconded, I must point out that there are advantages to being a singular member, because I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that I represent the only really unified caucus presently sitting in the Legislature.

As I listened to the Speech from the Throne, I could not help but be impressed with the fact that it could just as easily have been written by the former government. In general, the Speech contains nothing for the cities, little for the unemployed. It ignores the desperate financial plight of our municipalities and it contains precious little to challenge the imagination of our young.

In this House, where 74 of the members represent one philosophical view, and I represent another, I am here to challenge some of the basic assumptions, not to quibble over administrative details, but to question the direction. Perhaps I should begin by discussing the role of government itself. In 1967 the former premier of this province tabled the White Paper on Human Resource Development. In that White Paper there was a very thorough discussion of that government's philosophy of government, a discussion which won the support of the two traditional parties in this province at that time.

Now, the White Paper of 1967 outlines the Conservative perspective of government; that government should leave the major initiatives to the private sector, that it should only move when private initiative fails, that it should be passive, not active; that it should react when necessary, not necessarily lead -- in short, that government should be a repairman for the private sector rather than the primary instrument in forging economic and social justice.

It is the difference between a passive philosophy of government and an activist view of government that distinguishes today's Conservative from today's Socialist. It is a more subtle, but I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, a profoundly more important difference than the classic debate over ownership itself, for today's Socialist knows the need of a private sector based on the small business and family farms, and today's Conservative is ready to acknowledge the need for at least some public ownership. But it is a critical issue of where and when public intervention, whether government should plan ahead or anticipate problems, or simply react

3-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

when disaster strikes; whether one backs public ownership with pride or backs into public ownership only when unavoidable.

In my view, passive government is bound to fail despite the sincerity of its advocates. It is bound to fail because of its limited philosophical perspective, and whether this government or the former government, as long as that philosophy of government is carried on we will always be dealing with sluggish efforts on housing, but only after housing becomes a critical problem. We will introduce meagre programs in agriculture but only after thousands of farmers have been forced off their land. We will raise token efforts to deal with the problem of foreign ownership, but only after the basic resources are almost completely foreign controlled. There will be timid proposals on environmental controls, but again, only after oil spills, strip-mining and industrial pollution get out of hand. There will be belated promises to deal with mental health, but more than a quarter of a century after our sister province of Saskatchewan began mental health reforms. Now these, Mr. Speaker, are not indictments of one administration, but rather they measure the failure of a total philosophy of government, a philosophy which confuses fence sitting for leadership.

It is my view, Mr. Speaker, that Alberta used the terminology in the Speech from the Throne, in this contemporary age that we live in, that Alberta needs an activist government. Let me examine in more detail some of the areas discussed in the Speech from the Throne. Considerable attention is given to the preservation of rural life, and let me say that I was pleased to see that there will be greater accent on farm marketing and extended farm credit, but let me caution what those of us from agricultural constituencies know all too well -- that easier credit to the farm sector is by no means the only answer.

In the area of farm marketing I must confess that I was rather surprised on Friday that the government refused to debate the Opposition's proposal that we look at the grain shipment situation. I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that by contrast the Saskatchewan Legislature has already passed an emergency resolution --

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I would point out to the hon. member that that was not the position of the government on Friday in relation to the motion for an emergency debate, in spite of the fact that it may have been interpreted in that manner by other members of this Legislature. The question on Friday was whether or not there was an opportunity to debate, and I must congratulate the hon. member for taking that opportunity at the earliest time.

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The government said in their view there was no need for the debate. We all heard it, it's in the transcript.

MR. NOTLEY:

To carry on with the point that I was making. By contrast Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Legislature has already passed an emergency resolution on this very same question. A resolution, Mr. Speaker, which I would point out to the hon. members across the floor, was introduced by the government, and as a consequence of that resolution both the Minister of Agriculture and the Attorney General were sent on a fact finding trip to the West Coast.

Mr. Speaker, if we're going to look at preserving the family farm in Alberta, while there can be some emphasis on increased marketing possibilities and easier credit, we have to look at the

March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-31

-----

cost price equation and essentially if we are going to deal with the price structure most of us realize that this requires federal leadership and federal action.

But there are many things, Mr. Speaker, that the province can do on the cost side of the cost-price equation. For example, let's look at power rates in the province. For many years we have been the only province west of New Brunswick with private power, and as a consequence power rates in the province are higher than elsewhere in Canada. The cost of installing power on farms, according to the Mead Report, a report commissioned by the Association of Rural Electrification Associations in the province, shows Alberta much higher than the national average, considerably more costly than the neighbouring Province of Saskatchewan, and more than twice the cost of Manitoba.

In my own constituency I had occasion to deal with a case just before Christmas, of a rural electrification association which attempted to get the costs from the utility company servicing that area, the cost of tapping into an existing rural line to bring another subscriber into that rural electrification association; the quote they were given by the company was \$1,035. Now they asked for information from the company. The information was not forthcoming, so I took it upon myself to contact Manitoba Hydro and Saskatchewan Power to find out what their cost would be for providing exactly the same kind of service. The figures I got back showed that in Manitoba it would cost \$535, in Saskatchewan \$389. The point that I think I want to make here, Mr. Speaker, is that in 1948 the farm people of this province were promised power at cost, and surely power at cost deals as well, or should deal, with the cost of installing power. Have we got power costs? Mr. Speaker, I suggest we don't. I suggest what we have in the rural areas is very costly power indeed, and I am sorry that the Speech from the Throne did not contain any proposal or even for that matter, to act upon the promise made by the Conservative Party during the election campaign, that power at cost would be guaranteed once they assumed office.

Another important area of farm cost, is the cost of transferring land from one generation of farmers to another. We all know the dreadful circumstances that many young farmers find themselves in when they have to pay principal and interest rates which are so staggering that many just simply can't afford to make ends meet. Our neighbouring Province of Saskatchewan is considering a proposal which I think in the public interest of Alberta farmers, we should at least examine, and that's their Land Bank Proposal, a proposal which, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, has been endorsed by the farm organizations in the Province of Saskatchewan. Public hearings were held throughout Saskatchewan before the Legislature opened. Public hearings that attracted some 13,000 residents to come out and hear the government's proposals. I would like to inform the members of the Assembly that at an early opportunity I intend to introduce a motion asking that a special legislative committee examine the concept of the land bank.

Still another area of farm costs is the whole question of farm machinery costs. We have a Farm Machinery Act, Mr. Speaker, in Alberta which is totally inadequate -- a Farm Machinery Act which must be overhauled at the earliest possible time. Moreover, action must be taken to lower the total costs of farm machinery, and again this is an area where we should be working very closely with our two sister provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

And finally, one other area of cost, Mr. Speaker, that concerns rural people is the cost of education which, as we all know, is heavily borne by the property tax. It's unfortunate that the government has decided to postpone action on this vital issue until 1973. Unfortunate, especially from the rural point of view, because

3-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

of the fact that rural people pay almost twice as much of their net income in property tax as compared to urban dwellers.

Mr. Speaker, if we're going to deal effectively with preserving rural life there is one additional area that must be examined too. The family farm is threatened in this province, threatened by the expansion of great corporations, threatened by vertical integration, threatened by horizontal integration, and again I'm sorry to see as I read the Speech from the Throne that there are no proposals anywhere to bring legislation that would prohibit profit farming from competing with the bonafide farmers. Such legislation is not radical or new. Many of the American states, the Dakotas in particular, have had legislation of this nature on the Statute Book since the years of the New Deal forty years ago.

But as I read this Speech, while I'm concerned about its inadequate response to the rural problem, there is a glaring omission which is perhaps even more disturbing. That is that there is no mention of the plight of those Albertans who do not share in the general prosperity of our province. In 1968, the Economic Council of Canada released its Report on Poverty. That Report constituted a searing indictment of a smug, indifferent, and complacent society, a society which permits 27% of its members to live at or beneath the poverty level. And in Alberta we've got our own report commissioned by the Human Resources Research Council -- a report on the two major metropolitan areas in this province -- which shows that the trend during the last decade is for the 'haves' to get progressively more and the 'have-nots' to get progressively less. In Alberta it appears, at least according to this Report, that the old adage that the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer is true.

Now while I acknowledge the government's decision to remove the Medicare premiums for senior citizens, and I support that decision, it would be foolish and it would be wrong to suggest that that is anything like the beginning of a meaningful attack on the desperate poverty that persists everywhere in this province. Plans that have been introduced to date to deal with poverty both in Alberta and in Canada have been dreadfully organized and in most cases they have constituted a cruel hoax. Plans like DREE, for example, the Lesser Slave Lake special development area -- with the major beneficiary of this program that was designed to help the "have not" people in this part of Alberta, the major beneficiary of this program to date is a giant Procter and Gamble corporation, a multi-national corporation, that last year had a gross income which equalled the combined budgets of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia.

We have loopholes in our taxation legislation which, as the real Poverty Report points out, shows that low income people actually pay a higher percentage of their net income in taxes, in one way or another, than do high income people.

We've had various provincial schemes -- provincial schemes which have employed more civil servants but which have done precious little to deal with the real problems of poverty. I noticed that great emphasis was placed by the government in their Speech from the Throne on The Human Rights Act, and as far as it goes I assure the government that I'm prepared to support it in this Legislature. But it does not go far enough, it does not recognize that in a modern society man should have basic economic rights, too. This was recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It was recognized by Franklin Roosevelt 40 years ago when he talked about his four freedoms, and one of those four freedoms was freedom from want. Yet nowhere in this legislation, nowhere in this proposed legislation is there any recognition at all that there are inalienable economic rights that should be basically part of any meaningful Bill of Rights.



March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-33

Too often, Mr. Speaker, the efforts of government to date to deal with the problem of poverty have been based on the old trickle-down theory that as the rich get richer, by some magic formula the poor will benefit. Well, as the Human Resources Research Council report, tabled just before Christmas, points out, "it ain't necessarily so." It is only when we are prepared to commit our resources to a basic redistribution of income and power that we will begin to meaningfully combat poverty, not only in this province but throughout Canada.

There are other areas, too, where in my judgment it's time to question some of the basic assumptions that have guided government policy for a long time. Let me deal with the question of natural gas export. Last November, this government bitterly attacked the National Energy Board decision for refusing the export of an additional 2.7 trillion cubic feet of natural gas to the United States. The argument, of course, has always been that the more natural gas we export the more we will stimulate new reserves. For a while this kind of an approach seemed to work; for a while our oil reserves were growing; for a while our natural gas reserves were growing; for a while it seemed that this approach was the right one, that it held the key to an ever buoyant petroleum industry. But, Mr. Speaker, there is growing evidence today that refutes the wisdom of such a policy. The annual report of the Energy Resources Conservation Board points out that in 1968 this province had 44 years' supply of natural gas. Last year it had dwindled to 28 years' supply. This is why it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we must change our emphasis from one of exploration for export to the proposal made by the manager of the Manitoba Hydro, who argues that we must establish a gas bank in Canada to make sure that we have sufficient reserves of cheap natural gas for our own uses in the years that lie ahead.

In addition, I want to say something about the reserves that have not been discovered, because for many years we've been led to believe, largely by our petroleum industry, that we didn't need to worry about existing reserves, that there were practically unlimited reserves that hadn't been discovered. Well to date, the argument hasn't been proved one way or another, but there are many reputable people in the industry, many reputable people at the university level in the Department of Chemical Engineering, professional people in this field, who are now questioning just what the ultimate reserves of our province and our country really are. The point that I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that if we really want to develop in this province an economy which is based on viable job-producing secondary industries, the 'export first' approach is no longer the answer.

What we must be prepared to do is, firstly, let's get what the market will bear, and it will, in my judgment, bear considerably more than we are presently collecting. But as we discover new fields of natural gas, let us take a close look at the Cass-Beggs proposal. Let us make sure that in 20, 25 or 30 years we are not in the unfortunate position of still honouring export commitments of cheap natural gas to the United States on the one hand, while we have to turn on the other hand to expensive substitutes of natural gas from marginally economic fields to provide our own requirements.

It is, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, the difference between the short term and the long term that I am really discussing. No one argues that there are not short term advantages in the export of natural gas. Jobs are created as gas wells are drilled, as pipelines are laid, as gas processing plants are erected. But what happens after this process is finished? Too often we have exported natural gas and in the process we have exported economic activity and ultimately, jobs. That's why I think that the whole royalty question that goes far beyond just the natural gas issue, is so important at this time, and I am disappointed that the government hasn't begun the session with a position paper on this issue, so that it can be debated

3-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

throughout the province, so that Albertans who are concerned -- and I suggest that most Albertans really are concerned about it -- so that they can find out where the government stands, and they can begin to discuss it among themselves and make representations.

Frankly, the preparation of a policy paper on this matter only a week before we go into the public hearings is not, in my judgment at any rate, good enough. I think that we have to bargain as hard as we can when the royalties come up for review. In the oil market now we are much more in a seller's market than we were in 1962 when the last review took place. We should use the present American energy crisis to drive the hardest bargain possible, and to take a substantial portion of the money that is collected in increased royalties and use that money to begin the development of prudent, well planned, carefully thought out programs to begin the development of job producing secondary industries. That's why we need a meaningful Alberta development corporation.

This leads me to the final point that I want to make, and that's the question of ownership itself. For many years it has been the conventional wisdom in this Legislature that foreign capital was absolutely indispensable, that this was the only way that we could develop resources. For years we have been told that we didn't have the money. It is rather interesting that a U.S. Department of Commerce report shows that in 1968, Mr. Speaker, in 1968 U.S. corporations found 96% of their investment capital within Canada, and only 4% came as a result of new money coming in from the American subsidiaries. We have been told, you know, that we didn't have the money, but yet in the decade that we have just passed, we sent almost two and a half billion dollars more to the United States in dividends and interest than they have invested in our country.

In short, it's time we began to look at the balance sheet of foreign ownership. No one will seriously argue that there is not a credit side to that balance sheet; we have seen it for the last 25 years, since the discovery of oil in Leduc. Our two major cities have grown, although I must say that our rural areas have not really benefited all that much. As one looks at some of the rather depressing little oil towns like Lodgepole or Turner Valley or even Redwater, you find that the magic of the oil industry is rather short lived. And there has been a credit side to that balance sheet admittedly. But now, Mr. Speaker, as a country, and as a province within that country, we are beginning slowly but surely to recognize that there is a debit side. That is one of the reasons why I am rather disturbed at the government's proposal with respect to the development of Syncrude. I reject their so-called "Alberta first" proposals. One member on the Board of Directors is not going to do anything meaningful to ensure Canadian control. The opportunity of a few Albertans to invest will not change the basic, unalterable fact that control of Syncrude will rest with the major oil companies that are backing the proposition in the first place. Even the use of Canadian labour and materials, where practical, still leaves the major decisions up to Syncrude itself.

On another equally contentious issue, that of Village Lake Louise resort development, the Premier has refused to acknowledge that foreign ownership is an issue in this question. Frankly, I don't think that foreign ownership is the major issue in this question, but it is one of the issues. Nothing so typifies the americanization of Canada as this proposal that a company which is controlled, indirectly at least, by the Standard Oil Corporation of New Jersey, should develop a great pleasure complex in one of the most beautiful national parks anywhere in the world.

Mr. Speaker, to summarize my remarks, I know, and we all know, that there is very little likelihood of convincing any of the members of my point of view. As a matter of fact, speaking in this Legislature is a little bit like the experience I had when I was

March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-35

speaking to the first year medical students at the University of Alberta several years ago on why doctors should be paid a salary instead of operating on a fee for service basis. But that doesn't hurt me very much, because parliamentary democracy requires the vigorous interchange of ideas, the clashing of alternative philosophies, and the questioning of basic assumptions, and I see that as my role in this Legislature. I submit that that role is valid and useful, and that while the views I raise are a distinct minority in the Assembly, they are held by increasing numbers of people in our society. On the question of foreign ownership, for example, a recent public opinion poll shows that in western Canada, 75% of the people interviewed were in favour of the proposed screening agencies suggested in the Gray Report, to curb the problem of foreign ownership.

So, I conclude my remarks. I began by quoting from a famous Alberta Socialist, the late William Irvine. Let me draw my remarks to a close by quoting from a famous British Conservative, Benjamin Disraeli, who said, "Though I sit down now, the time will soon come when you hear from me again."

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to take part in the Throne Speech debate. I would like to thank the hon. the Lieutenant Governor, Dr. Grant MacEwan, with us at this first session of the 17th Legislature, the first Progressive Conservative government in the history of this province, with the first change of government in 36 years. We are very fortunate to have a man of his stature, who truly reflects the monarchy in Canada and Alberta. I have no hesitation in personally congratulating him as a representative of Her Majesty in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on your appointment. You are well known as a just and honest man, based on your activities, in your profession and in society, and fair contributions in that society, and I am confident that this justice and respect will extend to this Assembly in this challenging and most difficult position that you have.

To our new Premier, the hon. Peter Lougheed, I would like to extend congratulations also, sir, and I think this reflects the feeling on both sides of the House. The qualities you have as a leader, with a persistent perseverance and determination to serve our society and meet the needs of this rapidly changing and evolving society, and still be in tune constantly with the individual and family and community, must be described as marvellous attributes. A world of responsibility has settled on your shoulders and you, Mr. Premier, can be sure we will give you all the assistance we can.

To turn to the Speech from the Throne, my comments will be brief. I must concur with the items in the speech mentioned which I feel truly indicate a response to society's needs. This is especially true with the Bill of Rights, and I would hope that the Bill of Rights will have support from both sides. For this bill truly equates with our democratic way of life here and now.

All of us on the Floor of this House for this session of the Alberta Legislature are facing a new experience. For most of us, it is our first encounter as active participants, and I would like to take this opportunity to thank my constituents for allowing me to represent them in this House. For the remainder, there is the challenge of becoming accustomed to the new role, the new roles that have been the decisions of the electorate. But the challenge of adjusting to our new roles is miniscule in comparison to the challenge we face as elected representatives of the people. It is challenge far beyond the basic activities of good stewardship as an

3-36

ALEERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

-----  
MLA, of good attendance, of participation in debate, of presentation of constituency problems and representation of constituency opinions.

No, fellow members, it is something far greater than that, and it is my devout belief that every elected member regardless of the level of government he serves, has his first responsibility to that primary, the most important unit of society, the individual and the family. Our role as leaders and legislators must be to create the kind of society in which every individual has equal opportunity, to contribute to the fullest extent of his ability in the future of mankind. Therefore, I am particularly pleased that the Speech from the Throne focuses on many of the problems dealing directly with the individual and family. If we all accept the individual and family as the most important, and if the government is here to serve them and not oil, gas, coal and so on, which are secondary to them, we must do everything in our power to improve and secure and preserve for them -- the individual and family -- the best possible life, the best quality of life, now and for the future, under the prevailing circumstances. For this is Alberta's greatest resource, the families.

At this juncture, I would like to emphasize and elaborate on a few very important areas that I feel are evolving and threatening this greatest resource. These comments to follow are comments expressed in various ways by my constituents from Edmonton Kingsway, and also from people across the province, from various volunteer groups, from members of labour unions, from members of church groups, members of health professions, and so on. These are a few of my concerns.

I would like to enumerate them first. One, is communication; two, is credibility, accountability of government; three, is poverty; four, is dehumanization of the family; and five, is lack of co-ordination of total health care for the family.

(1) Communication.

This has been sadly lacking, poor and confusing, between the individual family and government. Communication, democracy and freedom go hand in hand. Democratic institutions, such as this Assembly, are here to act for the citizens who have the ultimate power. However, our democratic institutions and society will only work if we share and exchange knowledge and confer with them outside of this House. It is not enough to be conscious of a good program designed to procure or alleviate the various ills of society. I feel it is necessary that we, as representatives, declare ourselves for or against, as we have, but also we must encourage and hear many more citizens outside this Assembly and allow them to express their views frequently and clearly.

I believe it is a fundamental truth that clear and frequent communication must be established for co-operation, co-ordination between the individual, community and government. The news media cannot afford to be irresponsible, sloppy or showy. For if it takes this course this government may take this course, and this would be sad. I would like to suggest a way of improving this most important characteristic called communication, in addition to those items that are coming up very shortly in our legislation. One of them is to indicate to the media that we should have a definite page or section in each community newspaper, whether it be daily or weekly, informing the public what their representatives are doing on a continuous basis. This page or section should be freely available to all MLA's so that our citizens may read clearly their representative's direction of actions as the MLA prints it. They can better respond, and therefore, be better informed. The truth, ladies and gentlemen of this Assembly, only comes through a confrontation of facts.

March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-37

(2) Credibility and Accountability of Government.

While I feel that over the years this has diminished to the point where citizens have indicated their increased concern and suspicion of elected people, I believe that politics of today must reverse this trend. I am pleased that this government, under the hon. Premier Peter Lougheed, is taking firm steps in this direction. I think the trend should be by being relevant and practical to society's needs, and not theoretical and partial; by responding to these needs and not waffling and wavering; by establishing a mechanism for people to express their needs for appropriate governmental action; and when the government does not act, a satisfactory clear explanation is offered. The MLA's must be accountable to society and they must demonstrate this accountability. Therefore, if it is the intention of this Assembly and government to be responsive to people -- and it is -- if it is the intention of the government that the MLA's be allowed to serve and participate to the fullest extent, offering direction for their constituency and the people of this province -- and it is -- then it must be the intent of this government to do the following to make this happen, in addition to what they have done already.

For each MLA all year round, I recommend and suggest private office space in the Legislative Building and in the constituency. At least one secretary per MLA plus appropriate administrative staff and necessary office equipment and postage allowance. And without hesitation -- and I don't know why there has been hesitation -- there should be an adequate indemnity commensurate with his responsibilities. I am sure that our citizens believe that each MLA already has this support; well, he doesn't have it, and we know it. I am confident that our society which is so aware of changes that are necessary will not stand by and see their MLA's wasted when there is important social action that is urgent, critical and immediate. Therefore, again, I repeat, I am very pleased that this government has taken those important steps to allow all MLA's to have increased responsibility. Silence and delay accomplish nothing, even for the greatest believers in good.

(3) Poverty.

Poverty in the world and in Canada is real. It has been stated by the hon. member opposite and I think I have to reinforce it. Its persistence at a time when Canadians claim to have one of the highest standards of living in the world, is actually a disgrace. Statistics show -- and this has come out of reports in Alberta just recently -- that 20% of the people in Edmonton and Calgary are living in poverty. There are 3.5 people, on the average, in every household and 20% of the households are not working at all. Farmers' low income is well known and they are the producers of our food. In Canada this equals to 4.2 million people in 1961, and there has been no change in the distribution of this income over the past 15 years. These statistics suggest very strongly that there is a major poverty problem in Canada -- in Alberta. One Canadian in five, one Albertan in five, suffers from poverty, and poverty is more than just income deficiency. It is also a sense of hopelessness. Statistics do not measure that sour atmosphere of poor housing, bad health, accumulative defeat and despair, which is passed on to succeeding generations.

What about our first Canadians, the Canadian Indian, one-half million, and this will be up to one million in 15 to 20 years. We made some progress, yes, but somehow we refuse to discuss it. The infant mortality is two times that of the general population; 87% earn less than \$3,500. The houses they have -- if you can call them that -- only 57% have electricity; 95% have running water, and 12% have indoor toilets, 10% have indoor baths. In the general population, 90% have these amenities. The life expectancy of a Canadian Indian is somewhere in the vicinity of 35 to 40 years and the general population, as we all know, is in the vicinity of 70 years.

3-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

Well, ladies and gentlemen, these are Alberta's problems. But it is not only their problem, it is not only the federal government's problem. Let us remove those discriminatory laws and thank God for the Bill of Rights. Let us fulfill the treaty obligations which have been ignored, and let us preserve the Indian culture and heritage. Let us meet the needs for health and social economic standards for these people at least to the level of the national average, and not wait for the federal government. Let us not allow that basic problem of yesterday to remain as the problem of today. They are not strangers, they are not historical relics. They are our first Canadian and Indian families, Canadian individuals and families. Let us allow them to fully realize their aspirations in the context of free and equal Canadian citizens in the spirit as well as the letter of the law.

I submit that we in Alberta have neglected the Indian individual and family over many years, and I sense a definite change. Let us take vigorous action to do away with poverty now, not 15 or 20 years from now. To this end, we should develop strong labour markets, as we are doing; anti-poverty programs, manpower programs, as we are doing; individual improvement programs, community involvement programs, income maintenance programs -- all built in with evaluation, so that we can rapidly accumulate data and act on it and circumscribe with education in order that these families will be able to help themselves. We want to help the needy not the greedy.

(4) The Humanization of the Individual.

This has resulted because of the so-called cybernetic revolution. What does this mean? Social complexities, technological changes, computerization. This is another very serious concern, with associative problems and threats caused by isolation and remoteness, and threatening the family. These dehumanizing characteristics of our society are difficult to measure, but they are definitely eroding the moral life of the family. What I am saying here is, although the economic questions are important, doing away with them alone will not resolve the problem and will not bring happiness. May I recommend for your consideration the following: development of a human environment for the individual family using the knowledge we have. Let us recreate our communities as we want them, not only in the physical sense which is important, but also allow individuals and families to act as a community, and allow the community to have a sure purpose. Therefore, we need the components the individual and family can comprehend and share. Then individuals and families will have a feeling of belonging and participate in shared concerns and not only once every election. This is an important part of quality of life. This is the local autonomy we talk about. This is the human environment. I know it is our government's direction.

(5) There is a lack of co-ordination of total health care.

Health care continues to be fragmented, despite the fact that we know total health is physical, mental, and social, and we must accept this. These aspects of health are so interwoven that they can't be separated, and if they are, there are consequences to pay. Examples of this type of fragmentation and lack of co-ordination are numerous and I am sure we can all cite many of them. When we add the element of mass bureaucracy in the field of health and social services, then total health care becomes further and further away from the individual family, costs continue to climb 10 to 15 per cent, and we in Alberta are spending three times more than other countries whose level of health, according to the infant mortality and the accrued death rate, is higher than ours.

I would like to recommend that community co-ordination of total health services be provided across the province. The citizen and the professional have a clear voice in setting directions for total health care at the community level. Voluntary groups, thank God for

March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-39

-----

them, should be encouraged and supported to continue their meaningful and very important work at the community level so that an emphasis will be placed on prevention, rehabilitation, and teaching, as well as diagnosis and treatment. An emphasis to be placed on de-institutionalization of people, with the development of Special Care Homes of the de-institutionalized type, for handicapped children, alcoholic problems, mental problems and so forth. I am pleased to see the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development is going in this direction. Emphasis should be placed on health maintenance and not disease orientation only. Emphasis must be placed on on-going health, total health and social accounting for physical, mental and social needs, in order to minimize studies and service research, which are frequently very costly and outdated by the time they are completed. Yes, the 30,000 alcoholics, the 30,000 handicapped children, the 20% poverty population, and mental health problems, the senior citizens. . .these are "now" problems.

It is an absolute put-out that our world has grown smaller, although this is obviously true in a technical sense. We can travel rapidly and communicate instantly. Yet for the individual the opposite is true. Our world really is too big, too abstract, too remote. Cities spread, and computers perform their mysteries, TV corrupts and movies as well, and the individual and families do not understand. And when they don't understand, and merely experience the world, we have a problem, and I suggest that we are at that doorstep now.

Therefore, my fellow members of this Assembly, I don't think that we should consider these reflections as irrelevant. Yes, we must continue to focus on solving problems of pollution, education and the rest, but we must also focus on ways in which to solve them, and that way must be to concentrate on other items than those related merely to the materialistic things. Not only to allow freedom, but to allow harmony in decisions. Allow the individual family to build their environment with pride, friendship, and shared concern. Allow a course that will make the hopeless, scattered mixture of governmental programs comprehensible and understandable and functional. Of course, to concentrate on human values and a truly human environment, our citizens have worked and paid over many years, and should expect optimal value for their dollar. This generation is an answer-seeking generation and will not take half truths, incomplete or vague answers. Let us make our society clear, understandable, relevant and responsive.

In conclusion, to this end, for that priceless entity, the individual family, I hope this Assembly will see fit to act on social issues together and not waffle or waver, not sit on the fence, not be afraid what some people will say or what the media will say, not be stifled by party affiliation merely to win an election. Let us be bold and creative in our programs for the serious concerns of the people. Let us show other provinces we are distinguished from them by being able to shape our own destiny, based on the needs of the individual family, by placing people before party, by acting now.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I think, to begin with, I would like to thank Providence for giving me the opportunity to enjoy my fourth Session in this House, and I have to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the last three have indeed been enjoyable, and I'm sure that the fourth will be likewise.

I want to suggest at this time, Mr. Speaker, that before the hon. members of this House ask me to stand up in my place to my full height, I want to suggest that in the reconstruction of this place and the redecoration of this place it has been somewhat unfortunate that the constructors have constructed a hole in front of my desk.

3-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

So if I don't stand up to my full height, I must attribute the blame to someone other than myself.

I wish, at this time, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech. They were fine speeches. They indicated the concern that these hon. members have for the institution of government. They indicated the concern that they have for the problems of the people of Alberta. They rose to oratorical heights that could only have been brought about by the depth and the content and the directions laid down in that Throne Speech, a truly remarkable performance in its own.

I would also like at this time to express congratulations to all those people -- several of whom have spoken today -- and to indicate that all of them have expressed concern, and we recognize those concerns as a government. It is our hope that we will have the fortitude and the vision to act in connection with those concerns, and create in this province a much better place to live.

I would also, at this time, like to thank my constituents, Mr. Speaker, for giving me this opportunity to serve on behalf of the people of Alberta, for placing their confidence in our Premier, our Leader, and in me. And it has become somewhat obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Alberta have placed their confidence in a substantial number of other people, in that we have, before this House the first Conservative government in the history of this province. A government that is intent on doing many things.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this government was formed on the basis of a document that indicated a series of new directions, new directions that were needed and were vital to the well-being of this province. And it isn't my intent today to attempt to reiterate all the new directions that had been established in this document. But I do want to suggest a few of them in order to highlight the role that I have been given the privilege to serve. I think that one of the real highlights of this New Direction document was the fact that we felt the need for the establishment of a secondary industrial base, both in connection with our renewable and non-renewable resources. To supply jobs, Mr. Speaker, to supply jobs for our children and their children's children, and this, Mr. Speaker, we shall do.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I think that the position paper or document -- that marvellous document -- highlights the need to entrench human rights. The rights of women, the rights of children, crippled children as well as children; the rights of the aged, and the rights of all members of our society. And it is only proper, Mr. Speaker, that the first bill of this House should, in fact, be a Bill of Rights, introduced by the man who has probably displayed more concern in this area than any other man in this House.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to suggest to you that that document pinpoints the need for the province to play its rightful role within Confederation. And this shall be done. Initiatives have now been taken in this area, and this is just the beginning.

Fourthly, our direction questioned the goodness of bigness and centralization, centralization and bigness of government, centralization in the form of urbanization. And we said -- we're going to do something about this. Not necessarily to stifle the growth of our cities, but to encourage the growth of other areas of our province.

Fifthly, that document said that human services had to be revised and updated and improved, and other members will tell this House what in fact is going on already in this area. The government is moving, and it's moving quickly in this area of vital concern.



March 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

3-41

-----

And sixth, I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that document says that the quality of life is a matter of great concern to the people of this province, and that a new climate of environmental awareness on the part of government is absolutely necessary.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are just some of the highlights of that document, and the Throne Speech is part one of that document; a meaningful part it is indeed.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I wish to thank the hon. Premier for giving me the opportunity to serve the public, to serve the province and the citizens of Alberta in connection with the last point that I have mentioned -- in connection with the need to establish and refine and forever hold before us the need for quality as well as quantity in our human existence. There is a need -- and we recognize it -- that the physical environment in which we live can be refined and improved and managed so that in fact our children can look back and say that our grandparents or our parents acted with vision and with wisdom. They didn't give everything away, and they didn't sell everything away, and they did in fact look at the short-term convenience and the long-time need. It is our intent, Mr. Speaker, to act with this conviction. To act with the conviction that we must plan, not only for us today, not only for the moment, but we must plan for the years ahead and for the decades ahead, because we are, in fact, in a critical period in time. The 1970's will be looked back upon by many historians and they will say that that is where the foundation was laid for the progress that has taken place during the next several decades. And, in fact, I think that we on this side of the House feel challenged and somewhat humble in having been given this task. I can assure you, as I am sure my hon. colleagues will, that we shall do everything that is humanly possible to rightfully exercise this privilege that has been given to us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken generally thus far, but I do wish to get into the workings of my department, to indicate some of the policies that we have established, to indicate some of the broad objectives that we are pursuing as a government, and to indicate to the House and bring before them some of the programs that we, in fact, have been doing and some that we are going to be doing in the future. However, Mr. Speaker, before I delve into the workings of my department, I would like to suggest that the time is now almost 5:30 and in order to start new and fresh in delving into the workings of my department, I would like, Mr. Speaker, at this time to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of the Environment has asked leave to adjourn the debate. I take it you are all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would like to advise members having Motions for Return under notice on the Votes and Proceedings for Friday, March 3rd, that all of these motions will appear on tomorrow's Order Paper and may be called, although there is indication that they will not be called until Thursday, but since notice has been served today, they will in fact appear on tomorrow's Order Paper.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, according to the business of the House going forward, insofar as the four government motions on the Order Paper

3-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 6th 1972

---

today were moved to Wednesday, there will be no sitting of the House this evening and tomorrow afternoon being Private Members Day, tomorrow evening, Tuesday, will begin with further consideration of His Honour's speech.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the adjournment of the House until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 5:27 p.m.]