

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, March 9th, 1972

[The House met at 2:30 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, it is a very special privilege for me today to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly my three honorary Deputy Ministers of Education for today. As a part of the provincial activities planned for Education Week, students in Grades IV, V, and VI all over Alberta were invited to write an essay on the subject "What is a School?" The three winners have been selected and they are present now with their teachers in the speaker's gallery.

The Southern Alberta winner is Barbara Jane McKinley of Herald School in Medicine Hat and her teacher is Mr. Gary Delbert.

The Central Alberta winner, Mr. Speaker, is Calvin Sargeant of the Rimbey Elementary School in Rimbey, and his teacher is Mr. John Miller.

The Northern Alberta winner is Kim Hutchinson of Holyrood School in Edmonton and his teacher is Mr. Ivan Holmgren.

I would say to the Assembly that they have been giving me very good advice all today, all of which I have accepted, with one exception, and that is they made the suggestion that they should have a one week school holiday, and I'm taking that under close consideration.

I'd like to congratulate them on behalf of the Assembly and ask that they stand now and be recognized.

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to all 75 members of the Provincial Legislature 90 students. They are the Grade IX students of Sir Alexander MacKenzie Junior High School in St. Albert. I would also like to say that the name of their school is indicative of how our schools in St. Albert are named, for explorers and early pioneers who made an imprint on our history. There are times for students to look back, and times for them to look ahead. I hope today that these students are looking ahead to the future of their province and the day that some of them may be sitting members of this Legislature.

I congratulate their teachers Alf Gould, Dave MacNielly, and Donallene Angus for including this visit in the education program of these young people.

6- 2

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

Will S.A.M. students stand and be recognized by members of the Alberta Legislature.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to make an introduction to the House, and when I see the number of students from St. Albert who have just stood, and I look at the gallery, I wonder if my students got in. It seemed the entire section stood up. Although I don't do this for the first time, as my friend from St. Albert did -- this is two days in a row for an introduction of students from the constituency of Edmonton Parkallen -- I do have him outnumbered. I have 95 students from Avalon Junior High School from several Grade VII classes accompanied today by their teachers Mr. Lopatka and Mrs. Nichols, and in a similar spirit I would like to compliment them on the interest that they are encouraging in these students in our democratic process. I congratulate the children too, of course, for a similar reason. And so, if they are present in the gallery, I ask them to stand.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Dr. Craig Case

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Attorney General. Can the Attorney General tell the House whether his department has received a communication from the federal Justice Minister requesting an investigation into the Dr. John David Craig case?

MR. LEITCH:

I know of no such request, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the Attorney General intend to conduct a provincial inquiry into this affair?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, as I'm sure everyone in the Assembly knows, that matter is now before the courts, and in my view, because of the rule that matters before the courts shouldn't be discussed in public, we shouldn't be involved in this kind of question.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Again, to the hon. Attorney General. Does the government plan any action to insure that similar breaches of the doctor's confidential files will not occur in the future?

MR. LEITCH:

That is something, Mr. Speaker, that we have under consideration.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question in the general area I raised in my initial question, this time to the Minister of Health. Can the hon. Minister of Health tell the House who pays for the treatment of transient addicts who are not covered by Medicare and who have no funds of their own?

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-3

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I will presume that the looking after of transient addicts is in the field of a number of private agencies, as well as the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, and the single men's hostels in Calgary and Edmonton which are provincially run. If there are other areas of treatment I'm not aware of them.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question directed to the Attorney General. Was it under his authority that the doctor's records were seized in this case?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have issued a press release on this, and I'd be perfectly happy to read that press release in the House, if the hon. member so wishes, but beyond doing that, as I indicated in the earlier question, I do not think there should be any public comment on the cases that are now before the court.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is this not violating the confidentiality of records?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I think my earlier answer really deals with this. This is a matter that's now before the courts, and in my view anything I may say in favour of the action or in opposition to the action is something that may have a prejudicial effect on the trial. And I feel very strongly that particularly government officers should scrupulously follow the rule that there should be no public comment on cases that are before the courts, because such comment tends to prejudice the fair trial of the action.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Health. In view of the rather hazy situation concerning the payment for doctors providing services to transient people, can the minister tell us whether any consideration has been given through Medicare to reimburse doctors, such as Dr. Craig, who have been unable to collect, to date, for treatment provided?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the personal circumstances of Dr. Craig's dealings with the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission. It may be that my colleague the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in charge of the Health Care Insurance Commission, after some consideration of the matter, and without either breaching the principles enunciated by the Attorney General, or the normal principles of confidentiality that relate and should relate to Government documents, could offer my learned friend some more information in that regard, and it will be taken into consideration with that in view.

Methadone Clinics

MR. GHITTER:

A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Has your department looked into matters with respect to whether or not methadone treatment clinics are really the answer to treatment for narcotic addiction in this province?

6- 4

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the question of methadone treatment clinics, both from the point of view of methadone maintenance and methadone withdrawal types of treatment, has been reviewed both by the department and the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, and in addition, is the subject of much interest on a national scale at the present time. In regard to the views of other jurisdictions, our government is keeping in touch in order to be up to date.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Have any addicts to date been refused treatment by the provincial methadone maintenance clinic, and if so, for what reasons were they turned away?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any person approaching the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission for treatment being refused treatment. If such be the case, I could perhaps ascertain that upon inquiry of the commission, which I would be pleased to do, and at that time give the reason. In regard to other agencies, including the private ones that are active in this field, I couldn't answer for them.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Calgary Bow.

Flood Studies

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of the Environment. Sir, is the province willing to entertain a second Bow flood study, another one, which would take into consideration upstream control rather than control in the residential communities?

MR. YURKO:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the nature of that question is such that it can't be answered during a question period. However, if the hon. member writes to me on this matter, I will take it under advisement and consider it with respect to the many aspects that must be considered before a decision can be made.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, really, I was after a yes or no answer. Perhaps if I could ask another supplementary question, the hon. minister might like to answer that one as well as the second question. Sir, is the hon. minister aware that the Montreal Engineering report did not take into consideration the vegetation change in the catchment area since the two major floods of 1879 and 1897, when assessing the current flood dangers on the Bow River in Calgary?

MR. YURKO:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member wants an answer to a question of that detail, then I would suggest that he put it on the Order Paper and I will gladly supply him with an answer. But, I do want to suggest that my department is very, very active in this area and is conducting a major number of studies.

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-5

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. I will do as the hon. minister requested. The supplementary question is, in light of the seriousness of this matter, would the hon. minister be willing to meet with a delegation from the Bowness community and allow them to explain and present their statistical arguments?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, my doors are always open to delegations. I have met many delegations during the last six months, and it is not my intention at any time to exclude any delegation from coming to converse with me.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the hon. minister. Why is it necessary to have these further exhaustive investigations into the flooding conditions in Bowness in the Calgary area when a Royal Commission on Floods was conducted for more than two years in the early 1950's, and presumably their exhaustive findings were available to the previous government?

MR. YURKO:

In all honesty I would just like to suggest to the hon. member that conditions do change, and because of the lack of adequate regulations, building has been done on hills along river banks in such a way that there is now danger in several areas of the hill sliding into the river and blocking off the entire river flow. This, in fact, is the situation that the hon. member across the way is talking about. Uncontrolled development had been permitted to take place in a certain area and this development has, in fact, generated pressures upon this particular area so that there is some danger and it isn't necessarily as acute as the hon. member wishes to have this House believe. But there is some danger that, in fact, this hill can slide into the river and block the entire channel and as a result produce artificial flooding conditions backstream of this point.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Lethbridge West.

Lethbridge Community College

MR. GRUENWALD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. Could you tell me, sir, have you made an appointment yet to fill the vacancy on the Board of Governors of the Lethbridge Community College? There has been a vacancy for between three and four months now. Do you intend to do this in the near future and about when?

MR. FOSPER:

We intend to do that, Mr. Speaker, but I cannot say precisely when that will be. But I comment further, Mr. Speaker, if my hon. colleague opposite has any recommendations or suggestions he wishes to make, I would be very happy to hear from him.

MR. GRUENWALD:

I was under the impression that recommendations had been submitted to you. However, if this is not so, I will gladly look after this. I believe some recommendations have gone forward, but if

6- 6

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

-----  
they haven't been received I would be glad to know about it and would correct the matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. Albert.

Sturgeon River Basin Reclamation

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Speaker, may I address this question to the hon. Minister of the Environment? The Chamber of Commerce in St. Albert and district were told two years ago by the Water Resources Branch that 67 studies or thereabouts had been done on the reclamation of the Sturgeon Valley Basin, that the project was considered a pilot project and that such work would get under way in 1972. Is this still considered a pilot project for river basin development in Alberta and will work commence on the project this year?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the question has budgetary implications and as a result I would suggest that the answers may become apparent during treatment of the budget; however, I would also like to suggest that the study of the Sturgeon River Basin will be treated in all its complexities in the Alberta Water Plan study.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Calgary Mountain View.

Hansard

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Education who brought in yesterday's motion on Hansard. When can we expect the first edition of Hansard? This is now the ninth day of March. We had the first session on March 2nd and I understand that this was supposed to be a daily report. The motion was retroactive to the second of March.

MR. SPEAKER:

May I suggest to the hon. member that he might direct his question to the editor of Hansard, Mr. Peter Swann. The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight.

Annexation of Municipalities

MR. HO LEM:

I would like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. Would the hon. Premier please advise what the government's position is relative to the question of annexation which is currently causing considerable concern to citizens of Edmonton, Sherwood Park, St. Albert, Strathcona, and Sturgeon?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think that question would be more properly directed to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs who has been in consultation with the various members who are concerned.

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-7

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, we have heard via the press over the last two or three week period that the City of Edmonton intends to make a presentation to the provincial government with respect to annexation and a report known as the Hansen Report. To date they have not yet made that presentation. Yesterday, as a result of concern by the other municipalities mentioned by the hon. member, Mr. Zander, Mr. Purdy, Mr. Ashton, and Mr. Jamison met in my office with municipal members of their own councils to put forth their viewpoints, but that is where the matter stands at the moment. We have still not received the submission from the City of Edmonton.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, you mention the number of names of the hon. members attached to this committee. I wonder if you had perhaps considered the name of the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development in that he had made a previous statement regarding his previous stand on this question of annexation?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, let there be no misunderstanding, there is no committee. The members I mentioned are members of the Legislature, who represent or who have within their constituencies the surrounding municipalities who would be affected by the annexation. They simply brought in their local councils to express their concern and that's where the matter stands at the present time.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker --

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this on the same point?

Hansard (Cont'd)

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order and with respect, members of the House have no way of directing a question to Mr. Swann who is not a member of this House, and in view of that could we know the name of the minister who is going to report on Hansard, or do you want the questions addressed to you, yourself as Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

As I understand it, I am not at liberty to answer questions in the House but I will be glad to provide the information.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, there should surely then be a minister who would be answerable to the House for questions concerning Hansard. Could we in due course know the name of that hon. minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the resolution makes the Speaker responsible and I don't think there is any provision in it for a minister to be responsible as well, but if the wish of the House is otherwise it could be dealt with.

MR. TAYLOR:

Another point of order, Mr. Speaker; obviously we cannot ask Mr. Speaker questions in the House and this would not be right or proper,

6- 8

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

-----  
but we should have the right and should know to whom we should direct questions of expenditure in connection with Hansard, and surely some minister of the Crown will be appointed to deal with such questions in the House. I am not pressing for an answer immediately, but we should know who that minister is going to be.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, perhaps we will check into what the practice is in other provinces and in the House in Ottawa, with a view to seeing if some machinery can be set forth to carry out what the hon. gentleman advises, although my understanding is that Hansard is under Your Honour's directions, but I can understand the members' need for information from time to time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Calgary North Hill.

Field, B.C. Resort

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister without Portfolio in charge of Tourism. Is there any truth in the report that the Government of British Columbia has made representations to Imperial Oil Ltd. regarding the establishment of resort facilities at Field, B.C.?

MR. DOWLING:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand from past experience or knowledge that the hon. Premier of the Province of B.C. has a knack of establishing pipelines or claiming to. One of those pipelines is not to me. I have no direct knowledge of any such negotiations under way at the present time, but knowing the hon. Mr. Bennett as I do, I wouldn't be at all surprised.

Marijuana

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development? Does the hon. minister agree with the findings of the report recently issued by the Ontario Alcohol and Drug Addiction Commission, in which it states that marijuana does no harm to the human body?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I want to give the hon. member a full answer to that in the context of a complete examination of the Ontario study. I don't mind saying that in the manner in which the hon. member has put it, by selecting that part of the study on which to base his question, it sounds very questionable to me.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I'm simply asking if the hon. member agrees with the findings of that commission, that marijuana does no harm to the human body.

MR. CRAWFORD:

I say again that the hon. member has selected one part of the findings of the committee in which to phrase his question, the part relating to marijuana and I find that suggestion on the part of that commission to be a very questionable one.



March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-9

-----  
MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Edmonton Highlands.

Dr. Craig Case (Cont'd)

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, in the light of the interest which the topic is engendering in the House, I was wondering if the hon. Attorney General would make a commitment to do as he offered to do earlier, and that is to table and to read in this Legislative Assembly the press report relating to the Dr. David Craig case.

MR. LEITCH:

"Attorney General, Merv Leitch today said that he was aware of the public concern over the seizure of the files of Dr. John Craig, and for that reason was issuing a statement clarifying some aspects of the matter. He said that for some time the police have been investigating Dr. Craig's method of prescribing certain drugs. As a result of that investigation Dr. Craig was today charged with causing death by criminal negligence. During the time the police were investigating the matters which led to the criminal negligence charge, they obtained information from which they laid a charge of fraud under Section 338 of the Criminal Code.

On January 17, 1972, a provincial judge issued a warrant to search Dr. Craig's records and documents for evidence in respect to the commission of the offence of fraud. A lawyer acting for Dr. Craig made an application to set aside the search warrant issued on January 17, 1972. The lawyer also made an application for an order that Dr. Craig's documents be sealed and delivered to the Clerk of the Supreme Court of Alberta, judicial district of Edmonton until the application to set aside the search warrant had been heard. That application was granted, and the files delivered to the Clerk.

Thursday, February 24, 1972, an agent of the Attorney General's Department consented to an order setting aside the search warrant because he was of the opinion that the information filed on the application for the warrant did not contain sufficient particulars. A further search warrant was today issued to seize documents that might afford evidence to the commission of the offence of criminal negligence causing death.

The Attorney General said that fear had been expressed that the police had seized the doctor's records for the purpose of obtaining information about his patients, and he wanted to point out that this was never the intention or purpose of the police. The application for the search warrant was made in both instances for the purposes of obtaining information about the offences for which Dr. Craig has been charged. The Attorney General also drew attention to the fact that the police were subject to severe penalties if they breached the rules of their code of discipline governing the disclosure of information obtained in the course of their duties. Agents of the Attorney General's Department take, under the provisions of The Public Service Act, an oath not to disclose, without due authorization, anything which comes to their knowledge by reason of their employment. He also pointed out that when documents are seized under a search warrant they are in control of the court and not the police. Search warrants merely authorize the police to take possession of the documents and thereafter bring them before the judicial officer issuing the search warrant, or some other judicial officer. The police, in seizing documents, are, in effect, acting on behalf of the court.

6- 10

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

The Attorney General said there was a very important distinction between the public disclosure of information by employees or officers of the government, and a court taking possession of the documents under a search warrant. Mr. Leitch then drew attention to the rule that restricts public comment on cases that are before the courts. In his opinion, officers of the government should scrupulously follow that rule and for that reason he did not wish to make any further comment upon any aspects of the outstanding charges until after they were disposed of by the courts."

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table that release.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary question from the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands.

MR. KING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, who earlier was also involved in the exchange of questions. In view of the recent very stringent restrictions which have been placed on the use of methadone and amphetamines by the federal government, has the provincial Department of Health and Social Development received any communication, either from the federal government, or from within the province, to indicate that the restriction on methadone and amphetamines was the result of the misuse of it in some forms of treatment and the apparent inability of the medical profession to control its use?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think the question of misuse of this particular drug in treatment is involved in the situation referred to in the question. However, to my knowledge, no communication in that regard has been received from the federal government. If representations were received from within the province, from various interested groups, I would have to do an examination of departmental files before answering that for sure, and would be willing to do so.

#### The Police Act

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General. Has he had any representations from any municipality in the province with regard to the amendment or the repeal of The Police Act? I am directing the question to him to answer this and with particular reference to the City of Calgary.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I've had some verbal communication with various people about The Police Act. I don't recall any written communication. I have said to those people, as I have said a number of times in public that The Police Act which came into force in June of last year made some significant changes. It created some confusion or difficulty in those changes and I was of the opinion that we should not add to that difficulty by making immediate changes to the existing legislation. In addition, I said that, in my view, I thought the existing legislation should remain in effect for a little while, so that people could gather some experience with it, and after they had gotten that experience, would be better able to offer criticisms and suggestions for the changes which I am sure will be made in the future.

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-11

-----  
MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the hon. the Attorney General that in the event that he received any correspondence from the City of Calgary, the Council, I would like to have that correspondence tabled on this particular issue.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, that's (a) hypothetical, and (b) I'm sure that I should be given the opportunity of seeing the correspondence before I make any such commitments to the hon. member.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question was prompted only because the hon. Attorney General did not know whether he received any or not.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Lesser Slave Lake Development

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I am referring to the Lesser Slave Lake special development area which was expanded to include Grande Prairie. Is the minister aware of the letter from the hon. Mr. Marchand to the effect that in the extended area of the special areas program, funds will only be available to large enterprises, not small enterprises, and if so, what steps are being contemplated by this Government to protest what in my view is a thoroughly outrageous example of discrimination against Alberta small businessmen?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the question has been one of considerable concern to the people in the Grande Prairie area. You didn't say who Mr. Marchand sent the letter to; I'm not sure how to isolate the receiver, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

[Comment inaudible]

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the real problem was that in this area not a true designated area was created, and we have had considerable discussions with the people who are pretty upset about it. One thing we are doing about it, is that we are meeting with Mr. Marchand this coming Monday in Ottawa, and this will be one of the subjects discussed. Another thing that is being contemplated is certain moves by our Minister of Industry and Commerce. I think those moves will go a great distance in alleviating the problem, and he may have something that he would like to add at this point.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this a supplementary?

6- 12

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

MR. NOTLEY:

Do I take it then that the Provincial Government is making formal representation to have the boundaries of the special areas program expanded in total, in its total concept to the entire Peace?

MR. GETTY:

No, the special areas program, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of considerable discussion, and I wouldn't say that we're making formal representation to do that specific thing. We're discussing it in a much broader context.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Smoky River.

Snow Removal

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways. Would the Minister of Highways tell us if his department has given any thought to implementing a policy whereby government snow ploughs will be used to plough roads to haystacks and grain bins and this type of thing in improvement districts?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, this has been an exceptionally deep snow winter all over the province, and we are giving, and have given consideration to having a policy of doing this sort of work in ID's where an emergencies exist. I think that at this time emergencies do exist in most of these areas.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

DREE Program

Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. In having discussions with Mr. Marchand, do you intend to request that he amend the departmental act that established the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, which will enable the province to obtain the funds that are now allotted towards industrial incentives, so that the funds can be distributed by the province in their order of priority?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the discussions will cover a great many areas regarding Mr. Marchand's department. I would guess the very thing you mentioned would probably be discussed. The problem with the Grande Prairie area Mr. Speaker, to give a little more information in that regard, is that we had the ridiculous situation where not only did the federal government's program not cover the area, but because of poor communications at the time, neither did the provincial program cover the area. So there was considerable dissatisfaction and we are trying to clear that up.

Rapeseed Plant

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has the government given its authorization as yet to the proposed rapeseed processing plant in High Prairie which I understand is going to make application for an incentive grant under the special areas program?

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-13

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture is not involved in the authorization of a plant or in picking the sites for such a plant, and this relates, I would suggest more to the companies involved and the local people involved. My understanding is that the final site has not been finalized in regard to the rapeseed processing plant in the north, but I stand open to correction on that.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question on this matter to the Minister of Industry. Is the minister aware of the very widespread opposition among rapeseed growers in northern Alberta about this location? As the minister may or may not know, High Prairie is off to one end of the district. It would occasion a great deal of added expense and inconvenience to rapeseed growers were it constructed there. And the question I would like to pose to the minister is, failing any changes in the special areas program as it applies to the rest of the Peace River country, will the government consider matching grants or incentive subsidies of one kind or another to locate the plant in an area that would be more in the interests of the rapeseed growers of northern Alberta?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs said, we are having a meeting with Mr. Marchand on Monday and I'd rather reserve making any comment on a hypothetical situation on what the Province of Alberta might do in relation to the support of incentive programs that we may offer to the location of a rapeseed plant in northwestern Alberta until after the Ottawa meeting.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Stony Plain.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Has any correspondence been received from the City of Edmonton in regard to a newspaper article that came out last night about the City of Edmonton wanting to opt out of social development payments?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that has come up in respect to two or three municipalities in the province from time to time. There has been no correspondence with the City of Edmonton as such. The newspapers would indicate that it's a current matter of discussion before City Council and we would expect to hear from them after Council has made some resolution of it in their own minds. I might add that prior to the end of the session, I would hope to be able to have a position paper in regard to this subject before the House.

ARDA Program

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. In his discussions with the hon. Mr. Marchand, will he be discussing the ARDA program and the ARDA agreement?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, yes.

6- 14

ALEERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

-----  
MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will he specifically be looking at the agreement for rehabilitation of irrigation projects?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, it may come up. I would say probably yes, but that isn't the specific nature of our discussions.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, in the light of that question, does the hon. minister feel that the irrigation districts are not significant enough and important enough to put on a priority list?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, it's a question I'm happy to answer. Obviously no, but Mr. Speaker, there is considerable discussion going on on that matter. He was referring to a particular visit and meeting that we're having. There's considerable going on about the irrigation districts. As a matter of fact, it may be that the hon. Minister of the Environment may want to add something at this time in regard to that.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister for clarification. Does he do all of the negotiations for cost-shared programs between the federal government and the provincial government?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, this is something that causes some confusion, I'm sure, with members of the House, and it will be discussed, both in the Throne Speech debate when I participate, and perhaps when certain legislation is introduced, Mr. Speaker, regarding the department. However for clarity, right now, no, all of our ministers are involved in negotiations when the responsibility touches on their departments.

Minimum Wage Law

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Labour. Do you intend, Sir, to make recommendations or hold hearings in an effort to determine the advisability of the possibility of increasing the minimum wage?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the hon. member for Lethbridge and this Assembly it is the feeling of this government that it is time to review the minimum wage law, and to that extent, in addition to our own studies, we will hold public hearings following this session. If I may, with your permission, I would just recall that the minimum wage law permits, at this point, in the sections of the Board of Industrial Relations, \$1.55 an hour. For people under the age of 18 working as students, there are orders which permit less than the minimum wage. This included 15 cents an hour less, to \$1.40. Students working part-time and going to school part-time under Section 8 receive \$1.00 an hour if they are over the full age of 16, Mr. Speaker and 85 cents an hour if they are less than the full age of 18 years.

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-15

Irrigation Rehabilitation

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a further question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Could he advise me which minister would be responsible for settling the agreement for irrigation rehabilitation funds?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. It would be a matter for joint negotiation. It would involve our Minister of Agriculture; it would involve our Minister of the Environment; it would involve myself, whatever people are appointed by the federal government.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Could the Minister advise me if there have been any negotiations on this particular subject by the ministers that are mentioned at this time?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I offered to have the Minister of the Environment provide you with some additional information, and he's happy to, if you so desire.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd appreciate that information at this time.

MR. YURKO:

In reply to the hon. member's question. We have had continuing talks with the federal government with respect to irrigation rehabilitation. Earlier in the year we had approved the Carlsland weir project, which was given by approval by this government for PFRA to proceed with the installation of this weir which was going to cost approximately \$4.5 million. We have subsequently had continuing negotiations at the technical level in connection with resolving some of the matters that still need to be resolved in arriving at an agreement, and I have been in contact with Mr. Marchand on this matter, so that the matter is under very active negotiation.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, if I may ask another supplementary question along the same line as the one considered by my hon. colleague. I'm really anxious to know whether or not the work that the PFRA are doing at the present time constitutes part of the cost-sharing agreements that the federal government have been discussing with the provincial government for some time, or are they going ahead with this without having any agreement on cost-sharing on irrigation rehabilitation?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, PFRA has undertaken this project with the understanding that it in fact will be part of the overall agreement.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, if I might just get another supplementary question on this, and I'm sorry we may not get all the questions we want on it today but I would like to advise the ministers we would like more information. Are the federal government officials still attempting to get agreement on the return of their irrigation project to the provincial government as part of an agreement on rehabilitation?

6- 16

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, we have active negotiations between the technical people, and one item that is still being actively negotiated is in fact the item that the hon. member has mentioned. Another item of negotiation is the extent of continuing aid by the federal government to the irrigation districts.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, another supplementary question. Is it fair then to say that the federal government are insisting that part of the agreement be the return of an irrigation project that is presently being operated by them to the provincial government and become part of the provincial operation?

Mr. Speaker, I see they're shaking their heads over there. I would then like to ask, too, has the federal government said that they are going to retain the operation of their irrigation district? There seems to be an inconsistency, Mr. Speaker.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, this item has been negotiated and it's part of the negotiation at this time.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Supplementary question. Could the hon. minister place before the House the present position of the provincial government?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the whole matter is being negotiated at this time.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, certainly negotiations have to start from a certain point. I believe the hon. minister could place before the House the ground rules that he has set down for the provincial government to use in negotiations.

MR. SPEAKER:

Could I just mention that two minutes remain in the question period.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, it may have been that that kind of negotiation is the type that was carried on in the past, which ended up in the difficult situations that the province is in regarding federal-provincial cost-sharing programs. Mr. Speaker, when you are negotiating something you don't place your position on the table first. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you are able to develop the negotiations far better when you're not taking that kind of position.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I don't quite follow the hon. minister's explanation. Certainly when a discussion occurs --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What is your question?



March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-17

MR. R. SPEAKER:

The question that I would like to ask of the minister is: have they any position at all?

Teachers and The Alberta Labour Act

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Labour. Concern has been expressed by the teachers of the Edmonton Public School Board regarding the possibility of the teachers being taken out from underneath The Alberta Labour Act. I wonder if the government is giving any consideration to taking the teachers out of The Alberta Labour Act.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the whole matter of the collective bargaining procedures in Alberta will be under review when I bring in The Manpower and Labour Act. But this question which the hon. member puts has not been a consideration of this government at the present time.

Irrigation Rehabilitation (cont.)

MR. STROM:

A further question to either the hon. Minister of Environmental Affairs or Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has the federal government placed a position before the provincial government in regard to the matter that we have just raised -- a position that is of a firm nature and that is something that the provincial government can consider?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the federal government has not placed before the provincial government a firm position other than what it had placed before the previous government up to this point in time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time allotted for questions has passed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

QUESTIONS

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I move Motion for a Return No. 107 standing in my name on the Order Paper.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, 107 and 109 are two motions I spoke on Tuesday last and asked that they be put over until today because there was some work I wanted to do and I find I haven't yet been able to do it. I wonder if the hon. member would agree to them being put over to Tuesday next.

MR. SPEAKER:

This applies to both 107 and 109 to be put over to Tuesday next?

6- 18

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague Mr. Clark is sick in bed with the flu and is staying there under doctor's orders. I would be prepared to move Motions 116 in his place providing there is no change in, and I would like to so move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Taylor.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, we find the questions in order and will be prepared to table them exactly as put forth in due time when we get the information together.

116. Mr. Strom moved on behalf of Mr. Clark, seconded by Mr. Taylor:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

- (1) The dates of all meetings held between any officials of the Board of Industrial Relations and representatives of the Bow Valley School Authorities Association from November 15, 1971 until December 30, 1971.
- (2) The dates of all meetings held between the Deputy Minister of Labour and any and all representatives of the Bow Valley School Authorities Association from November 15, 1971 until December 30, 1971.
- (3) The dates and locations of all meetings the Minister of Labour in the Alberta Government had with representatives of the Bow Valley School Authorities Association from November 15, 1971 to December 30, 1971.

117. Mr. Strom moved on behalf of Mr. Clark, seconded by Mr. Taylor:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

- (1) The dates of all meetings held between any officials of the Board of Industrial Relations and representatives of the North Central Alberta (West) School Authorities Association from October 1, 1971 until October 31, 1971.
- (2) The dates of all meetings held between the Deputy Minister of Labour and any and all representatives of the North Central Alberta (West) School Authorities Association from October 1, 1971 until October 31, 1971.
- (3) The dates and locations of all meetings the Minister of Labour in the Alberta Government had with representatives of the North Central Alberta (West) School Authorities from October 1, 1971 until October 31, 1971.

[The motions were carried without debate.]

118. Moved by Mr. French, seconded by Mr. Sorenson:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

- (1) The number of contracts with senior citizens sixty-five years of age and over, receiving premium-free health care as of January 1, 1972.
- (2) The number of persons under sixty-five years of age who are dependants of senior citizens receiving the benefits of premium-free health care as of January 1, 1972.

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-19

- 
- (3) The number of spouses under sixty-five years of age who are receiving the benefits of premium-free medicare and are still earning an income.
- (4) The number of people who have valid medical treatment service cards as of January 1, 1972.
- (5) The number of handicapped individuals under sixty-five years of age, and not a dependant of an individual over sixty-five years of age, who are receiving premium-free medical services.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member for Hanna-Oyen I would request he might consider amending 118 to delete Section 3 because it is information which is not available in the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission records. We are not in the habit of collecting it so it is not available and I wonder if he would consider an amendment to delete.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, if the information is not available I have no hesitation in agreeing to the request to have it deleted.

MR. SPEAKER:

And does the seconder also agree?

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, could the statement made by the hon. minister just not be put in in answer to No. 3?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree to the motion being amended in that way and the reply being dealt with in that way?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the attitude on the point of order, due to the absence of the seconder, I would suggest that it remain as is and the answer given by the hon. minister simply be placed as the answer to Item 3 on the order.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe that is a better procedure and would the House agree to that?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

119. Moved by Mr. R. Speaker, seconded by Mr. French:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

- (1) The number of family units and total number of dependants receiving social allowances at the end of each month during the years 1971 and 1972.

5- 20

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

- (2) The number of family units and total number of dependants receiving social assistance at the end of each month during the years 1971 and 1972.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, in moving Motion No. 119, I have just one or two comments. If the hon. minister wishes to make this return in two different phases I would be most pleased. I recognize that certain statistics are available at the present time and that it takes a period of time to obtain the more current ones for February and March. I would be prepared to accept one submission now and then one later on when the other figures are available.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the seconder of the motion also so agree? The hon. member for Hanna-Oyen.

MR. FRENCH:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree that the motion be dealt with in that way?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to indicate in regard to dealing with it in separate sections that I would think the way it is set out in Motion 119 is amenable to that suggestion and I will take it under consideration, depending on how long it takes to get the current data to go with the available data. For the record as of today, certainly the motion in its present form is acceptable and agreeable.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree to the suggestion of the hon. minister?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

#### MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

MR. HYNDMAN:

The hon. Speaker mentioned that he felt that we should, at this point, unless there was other discussion or another motion changing the rule, to proceed as has been the situation for some years, and have the motion which was adjourned the previous day (Tuesday) drop to the bottom of the list. This would, I submit, leave us starting with Motion 1 proposed by Mr. Hansen at this time.

#### Driver Education

MR. HANSEN:

Mr. Speaker, now I will read the motion:

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-21

-----

"Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta give consideration to driver education in Alberta schools being rapidly expanded to all parts of the province."

I feel it is an honour to speak on this motion to make Alberta and Canada a much safer place to live and also to drive. It is a must to have driver education at this stage of our lives. It is long past due, I feel, that the government should take action in seeing that driver education is available in our high schools. It is partly done now with students getting credits for the work if they pass, and with the rising cost of property damage and the great loss of life every year, I think one of the most important parts of education is to have driver education and also to teach our young the responsibility of driving on our highways. The only time that I figure you can teach people the responsibility that will stay with them over the years is when they are young. This is why I feel very strongly about having driver education available in the schools, because if you start out with a young person and you teach them the responsibility of driving and also the responsibility of the attitude which they have on the highways, it will stay with them throughout their lives. This is the reason why I would like to see driver education put into high schools.

Young people, if they form the right habits when they are young, stay with them through the years. If you start teaching a real old person or a real old horse or anything else, it is very hard to change their habits, but if you start out young and teach them the right way to drive on the highways you will have safer highways.

Another thing that I would like to bring to your attention is the insurance problems that young drivers have today. The costs that are involved in insurance are almost out of the question for some young drivers. I believe that with driver education it would cut down on the accidents in the province and all of Canada, if it goes far enough, which would reduce the cost of insurance in the long run.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the major problems that occur on our highways are not the fault of the cars as a rule; it is the drivers'. This is due to a lack of education of the driver and his ability to drive. I would like to say that I have in my time driven school buses, I have driven a taxi and I have driven many trucks, and I find, through experience, that if the people behind the wheel understand the laws and drive according to them, there will be a great reduction in accidents. These are some of the reasons why I am behind this motion.

I would like to give you a few figures; in 1970 there were 867,730 licenced motor vehicles sold in Alberta. In all of Canada there were 8,254,160 licenced motor vehicles. When you have this number of vehicles in Canada, I think it is well worthwhile to spend some time on your younger generation to see that they learn the right way to drive. I have some figures here. I'm sorry I haven't got them for 1970 but I have them for 1968. In 1968 there were 5,532 deaths in Canada, and over 200,000 disabling injuries occurred in Canada on the highways.

I think it is long past time that we should have driver education introduced into our high schools, so that they have the choice in high schools of taking these courses. After all, ladies and gentlemen, it is one of the greatest means of travelling in this time and age. A person even drives two blocks down to the store these days, or down to the corner drug store. For this reason, I think it is time that the government put some effort into seeing that this education is available in most high schools, if not all.

And another thing, at this time when property damage, insurance rates and everything to do with your vehicles are rising in cost, I think it is high time that the people of Alberta and Canada look

6- 22

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

seriously at this problem of training our younger generation. There are a few schools offering this education at this time, but I feel it should be available to all high schools in Alberta. I will not make a long speech out of this, because I feel very strongly that all the members in this House will agree that it is a thing that has to be put into action, and I hope that this afternoon there will be a debate on this question and many other areas will come to light. I have only given a few here, and I will close by saying that to make Canada a safer place to drive, we should have driver education.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to have the honour of seconding the motion of the hon. Member for Bonnyville, on rapid expansion of driver training within the Province of Alberta. Speaking to the motion, I would certainly first like to complement the hon. Minister of Education, the hon. Lou Hyndman, for the interest he has already shown in this area in the Alberta schools, and the active encouragement that he has given to this program. I know he has indicated quite clearly that this interest and encouragement will continue. I realize, of course, the many difficulties he has inherited from the previous administration, and I have no doubt that with his outstanding ability he will be able to overcome these difficulties.

Thinking about such things as these difficulties, Mr. Speaker, I could not help but note the remarks of some of the members of the Opposition on Tuesday last, remarks regarding politics and politicians. I recall in particular the remarks that the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest made when he was questioning the hon. Minister of Highways, Clarence Copithorne. He brought up during the question period the matter of the "now" slogan that was part of the election platform of the party which this government now represents. And Mr. Speaker, reference to this "now" slogan was also made yesterday by the hon. member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc. I would, therefore, Mr. Speaker, like to remind these hon. gentlemen and their colleagues, as well, that on August 30th last, the people of this province indicated in a very definite and wholehearted manner their approval of the reverse of a very old slogan which was that they wished the government in this province would change from a "never" to a "now" party.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, point of order. Is the hon. member indicating that now "now" means that --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please!

MR. DRAIN:

Does the hon. member not accept "now" as meaning now, or does he have another meaning?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

AN HON MEMBER:

Never a "now," Mr. Speaker.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, as I second the motion, I would like to remind the hon. members of this House, the question being considered is that of

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-23

-----

rapid expansion of driver education in Alberta. My colleague, the hon. member for Bonnyville, has outlined to you many of the benefits to be derived by Albertans by rapid expansion of such a driver education program in the Alberta schools. He covered such areas as saving lives, eliminating physical disabilities, development of mental attitudes, decreased insurance rates, reduction of property damage and many other areas of very serious concern to all of us. These are important things for us to consider. This whole type of a program is of vital concern and vital importance, not only to students in our schools in this province who wish to enroll in this program and participate in it, but also to all the citizens of this province as well. All of us at some time travel the roads in this province, and it is in our interest to encourage every operator of a vehicle to have a thorough and complete knowledge of the responsibility that that operation entails, not only for themselves personally, but for all other persons who travel the highways.

I would like to comment on the high school driver education program as it now exists and indicate why I believe that expansion is so urgently needed. At the present time, this driver education program, which is known as Driver Education 10, is an option course being offered in our high schools for credit purposes, as well as for the benefits in driver education that goes with it. It's being offered at the present time to approximately 930 students in 39 high schools, and when we consider that there are 312 high schools approximately in this province, we see that the percentage of schools where such instruction is being made available is small -- very very small -- something like 12 per cent. And if we also consider the number of students to whom this instruction is available in these schools, the percentage is even smaller, because where this instruction is being offered, it is not available to all the students. The instruction is limited because of the lack of qualified instructors, lack of suitable facilities, and, of course, timetable difficulties within the schools as well.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem that we should consider several priorities, if we are to acknowledge the importance of the driver education program and the expansion of it within our Alberta schools. This is a real vital option subject, and has to be regarded in this manner. One of the priorities should be the encouragement of driver education training for more of the certified teachers within this province. I know this type of instruction is being offered every year to a limited number of certified teachers, but I would have to suggest that the number being trained is far fewer than the needs of the program might justify.

Another priority Mr. Speaker, would have to be the possibility of training more teacher aides who would be qualified to give assistance in this program in the high schools of Alberta.

And a third priority has to be some method of encouraging local school administrations to recognize the importance of this subject, and by so doing to provide the necessary integration of the subject into their time-tabling within the school program.

A fourth priority has to be the provision of the necessary facilities for providing the training and the instruction that is required.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the driver education course being taught as a high school option subject in the Province of Alberta has to be considered in the matter of content and compared to other high school options being offered. This is part, of course, of the high school education program in this province, and I hope at some future time I'll be able to speak on that question as well.

6- 24

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

But, personally, at the present time I would have to say that I believe that driver education should rate very, very highly in a comparison with the other high school option subjects being offered.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want my remarks to be construed in any way as critical of the school driver program being offered today. It has merely been my wish and my desire to indicate to you and all the hon. members of this House the urgency of the expansion of this program and request that all the hon. members will give it their most sincere consideration.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in speaking on the resolution introduced by the hon. member, Mr. Hansen and seconded by the hon. member Mr. Appleby. The matter of driver education is not new in Alberta nor anywhere in Canada. The acceptance of driver education by the general public and by the school authorities and by the teachers has not been sudden, it has been gradual. Every provincial government in Canada has had difficulties in carrying the judgment of the people in connection with a driver education program.

In this province we have difficulties because, first of all, we had to carry the judgment of the Alberta Teachers' Association. I think we carried their judgment and got to the place where the teachers were generally in favour of this program. In many provinces that point has not yet been reached nor is it going to be easier to reach in the other provinces than it was here. There's still tremendous objection to this program going into the schools; for instance, in the province of Ontario, where they have not yet been successful in having the course accepted in the curriculum, except as a subject taught at night or on Saturdays. In many places in Ontario the only time it is taught is on Saturdays. I'm not criticizing the Ontario government because I have known the minister there for a number of years, but unless the minister is going to become a dictator and tell the people what's good for them, then they have to carry the judgment of the people gradually. I would hope that the present government in Alberta is not going to be a dictatorial government and tell people what is best for them and what they should do and how they should do it. I don't think that is the stripe of the present government. I certainly hope not, nor was it the stripe of the past administration.

We tried to carry the judgment of the teachers, of the trustees, and I personally spent many, many hours in discussing this matter with trustees, with schoolteachers, with the general public at public meetings, and I think that we did make a great deal of progress. We established the Driver Education Committee, on which the Alberta Teachers' Association was represented, and a few years before that, that would have almost been an impossibility. Membership also came from the School Trustees' Association, from the insurance industry, from the automotive trades, from the Home and School, from the university, from the Department of Education, from the Department of Highways. The organizations throughout the province affected by driver education gradually were brought together, not by dictatorship, but by carrying their judgment, until we had a viable Driver Education Committee. An organization that played a very important part in driver education was the Alberta Motor Association and I give them credit, and the Alberta Safety Council, and I give them credit, too.

But it wasn't done overnight. It wasn't done by pressing a button, as the hon. seconder of the motion seems to think can be done. I would have liked to have made faster progress, too. And I'm sure every hon. Member of the past Legislatures would have liked to have made faster progress, but I'm not ashamed of the progress that was made. I appreciate the support that the Legislature gave this program the support from members on all sides of the House. A few



March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-25

members objected to injecting driver education into the schools, but the majority supported it, and we were able to offer it, first of all as a straight optional course.

The first province in Canada to do that was the Province of Saskatchewan, and there they made it a high school optional course. But they didn't provide credits for it, and consequently, many students were more willing to take courses that gave them a credit than a course that was going to have a great deal to do with how long they lived and how long other people would live. And so they took the credit courses. We saw this, and so did the Saskatchewan authorities. And I believe the Saskatchewan Government today is still trying to carry the judgment of the people of Saskatchewan in order to get it as a credit course. But in this province we were able to do that. We were able to carry the judgment of the Minister of Education, of the Department of Education, and believe me, that was no easy task, even when the Minister of Education was on your side of the House, because there was tremendous resistance in the Department of Education about making driver education even an optional course, let alone a credit course. Finally we secured a minister in Alberta who was able to carry the judgment, and I pay tribute to the hon. member for Olds-Didsbury for his attitude of discussing this and carrying the judgment of his own officials and making driver education a two-credit course.

This was a big advance, and we're still the only province in Canada that offers this as a credit course -- the only one in Canada. And when the hon. member Mr. Appleby regrets only 930 students taking the course, I'm delighted that 930 students are taking the course, because just a few years ago the number of students taking the course was down below the 100 mark. This has been a hard and a difficult task, and to add to the difficulty, two of the daily papers in the province took a very stiff editorial stand against the introduction of driver education in the schools. And let's not kid ourselves. The editorial columns do influence a great number of people, and reflect the thinking of quite a number of people. This was a difficult job, overcoming some of the arguments that were advanced by the editorial writers of the Edmonton Journal and the Calgary Herald, and maybe other papers as well. I'm not criticizing the press for taking that stand, because I find outside there's a sizeable number of people who still don't think driver education has any place in the school curriculum. With them I disagree, and I'm prepared to use all the power that's at my command to persuade that driver education should be expanded in our schools, and I'm delighted that the present government is continuing the programs started by the last administration.

This is not a political question. This is a matter of life and death to present and future citizens in this province,

I am delighted that the present government is continuing the program started by the last administration. This is not a political question. This is a matter of life and death to the present and future citizens in this province. And I would refuse to play politics with this matter of driver education. It's too important. It's something that people of every political stripe should work out carefully, because people of every political stripe are going to be killed in the future, and crippled in the future, unless more and more of our young people take driver education, become educated in driving, and become better drivers, just as they become better citizens because they take courses in citizenship, and become better calculators because they take education in mathematics.

Yes, I congratulate the government on continuing the program that the previous administration started and I hope -- it's a question that I want to ask the Minister of Education and maybe it can be answered in this debate -- that the driver education course will be continued. It was not political. I don't know the politics

of one person on that Driver Education Committee. Politics was not discussed but it was a valuable committee, and it was there we started the program of training teachers so that we could have a core of trained teachers when the program did come in. There is no use offering a course to the boys and girls of Alberta if you don't have trained instructors. No use at all. You could ruin the course before you even got started. But when we started it as an optional course we had a back-log of some 100 to 200 teachers trained in driver education. And I give great credit to the Alberta Motor Association, because they went the "second mile" in helping to train these teachers as driver education teachers. I don't go along with those who say that a teacher, because he is a top notch teacher in mathematics, is capable of teaching driver education. This is a specialist subject, the same as the other subjects are. It requires special training. And I hope that the hon. Minister of Education and the government will continue that Driver Education Committee because much of the credit for the advancement that we made in driver education goes to the Driver Education Committee.

Now, there are one or two points I'd like to mention. I would like to see every high school boy and girl take driver education. But I think there are some things we have to remember. First, in this province we have local autonomy. And I believe the policy of the present government is to retain local autonomy, maybe to expand local autonomy. I hope so. Local autonomy where the people at the grass roots closest to the people, decide which courses are going to be offered within the framework of the School Act. And it's not a case of the Minister of Education saying to every school board: "you have to," "we know better than you," "we know better than the school board in your area." I don't think that would be sound procedure at all. I think it's a case of carrying the judgment of the local councillors and school trustees so that they will want to put this driver education into their program. Local autonomy should be preserved. And if we lose local autonomy, maybe we are going to lose a great deal. We will -- no maybe about it, -- We will lose a great deal in this province whether it's in driver education or in other matters.

Let no legislature or no government or no minister think that they have all the answers, that they know better than the people at the grass roots. That's the very basis of democracy; that's where we differ from totalitarianism. We think that the people at the grass roots do have information and knowledge and experience valuable to even the most experienced minister, to the most experienced government. And I want to say that as far as I am concerned, local autonomy is an important issue in this particular item and has to be considered in connection with expansion of driver education.

And then, there is another matter, too. The hon. minister, who I am sure, is a strong supporter of driver education, couldn't press a button tomorrow, or next September, and start driver education in all the schools in Alberta. There are not enough trained teachers at the present time. I think a program to train rapidly, as rapidly as possible, teachers in this particular science is important, so that there can now be, since we have a credit course, an increased acceleration of the training of teachers in driver education. It's important, and I hope that there can now be since we have a credit course, an increased acceleration of the training of teachers in driver education. Again I pay great tribute to the AMA and the car dealers and the car manufacturers for their part in making cars available for the training of teachers at no charge to the general public, and this is an important thing. We have to have qualified teachers if we are going to make this course a success.

And then of course, I think the next item that comes up is who is going to pay. I didn't come across very many trustees anywhere in the Province of Alberta who would not like to have driver education in their schools, but they always come up with the question, we don't

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-27

-----

have enough money to put on another course; who is going to pay? Because if you make it a regular course like mathematics and social studies and so on, there is going to be a great amount of increased cost. A great many more dollars will be required.

If the hon. Provincial Treasurer can supply that kind of money to the Minister of Education without increased taxation to the people, I am all for it. But I think we have to remember that in these days when there isn't enough money to do everything you want to do, you have to establish some priorities. I want to see the program expanded as quickly as possible, but I don't want it expanded to the point where we're going to have to increase the amount of taxation we are taking from people today who are already too heavily taxed. I think we have to consider that. Certainly, it's important and the quicker we can get qualified teachers and this course as a credit course in every high school in Alberta, the better it will be. But we can't do it by pressing a button. It's going to take a little time and a lot of hard work to get it into that stage.

And then, of course, we come to the other point about the cars. I think this has to be explored very carefully and I am sure the hon. Minister of Education would be the first to do that. The manufacturers today are prepared to supply cars up to the point we have gone. Would they be prepared to supply cars if every high school in the province offered driver education? I don't know, I have asked them. They said they would consider it when that time comes, but they hope progressively to get up to that point because today I'm not sure that that number of cars would be available for the program. It's a progressive thing and I am hoping that the manufacturers will continue that program and that the dealers of the province, to whom there is a great deal of credit too when they make a vehicle available to the schools at no profit to themselves in which to train youngsters, will continue. I know there is a value in it because if I learn how to drive in a Chrysler, I would undoubtedly want to buy a Chrysler later on. If I learn how to drive in a Ford, I may want to drive a Ford. There's a value there and I think that the dealers and manufacturers will always recognize that. I also hope that they will be able to continue progressively to provide the cars.

I have said some harsh things about insurance companies on the Floor of this Chamber many times when I thought they were not doing the thing that was right. But I do want to commend them for the steps they have taken in giving reduced premiums to those who take an approved course in driver education and pass that course. That means young persons get a reduced premium and it means that over a period of two or three years, even though they paid part of the cost of the course, they are going to be money ahead. And I commend the insurance industry for this.

I have made a suggestion to the insurance industry and I am sorry they haven't accepted it, because today, even with the present program for those who have passed approved driver education course, while that program is good, to the general bulk of young people insurance is not very fair. I have suggested to the industry that it provide a refund, that if it must charge the higher rate to the young person because he has not had experience, even though it now gives the best rate possible to that group, if that young person is able to drive one full year without an accident, he could get a portion of that premium back. That would be the greatest incentive towards safe driving that we could provide.

There is an incentive today to take driver education courses -- but that would be a tremendous incentive because every young person would say -- "I can make money, I can save part of my premium by driving safely without having convictions or accidents." I again ask the insurance industry of Canada to not throw this suggestion away too lightly, because if we want to reduce the costs of insurance,

education is the one way we can do it. If we want to reduce the number of deaths and crippings on the highways and streets of Alberta and Canada there has to be an incentive, a real incentive on the part of every driver to drive carefully and safely all the time.

One of the greatest incentives is when it touches the pocketbooks of young people -- let's start with young people -- if they could get part of their premiums back, this would be a tremendous incentive, one of the greatest incentives for safe driving in this country. And I would wager that we could cut down the death rate on the highways and streets in Canada by at least 25 per cent if that program was put into effect; 25 per cent of 5,000 fellow Canadians who are killed on our highways and streets every year are a lot of people, and I think that it's important enough for the insurance industry to again consider. But what they have done is an incentive towards driver education. I am glad to see the credit course being continued; this is important. The two credits, maybe two are not many, but there are two credits available and this will certainly help a great deal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the resolution that Alberta give consideration to driver education in Alberta schools being rapidly expanded to all parts of the province -- we support the resolution having in mind that we are going to retain local economy, that the dealers and the car manufacturers will be expected to play their part, that the insurance industry will be expected to play its part and having in mind, too, that the costs to the taxpayer are gradually going to increase on this program when it takes place. We have to watch those costs and be very careful, right now, in not adding additional costs on to the shoulders of the people. I don't think there has been much additional cost to date; I don't know the exact figure on the program the way it has been advancing, because of local autonomy, the local people, when they decide to do this, have done it in such a way as to keep their costs down. Some boards may have even made charges to students, and they, because of reduced insurance rates, have been able to come out even better financially than they otherwise would. But we have to watch the taxpayer's money as well as the other things; we have to watch the local autonomy and at the same time progressively advance with qualified teachers and credit courses throughout the province until every boy and girl has an opportunity at least to take a course in driver education. We plan to support this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Cardston.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I don't plan to do a lot of talking in the House but this is one subject that intrigues me. I like the resolution and I'm not going to move an amendment, but I would like it even better if the words 'in schools' were not in it because I think that it's a kind of an education that can be very minimally done in schools.

I think the people who prepared this resolution gave us a fair summary of the advantages which we can hope to gain by driver education, the knowledge of the rules, but more particularly the cultivation of driving attitudes. Now these, I submit, can be taught without any special courses in the schools; they can be taught in a number of courses because they are matters of courtesy and matters of repetition. Nothing is so effective as to show children once in a while actual movies of a wreck. I remember one state in the U.S. at one time who took those convicted of bad driving to places where they were made to see movies of some of the worst of the wrecks that had taken place. These people afterwards acknowledged that it had done a great deal for their attitudes.

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-29

-----

There are two things concerned here; one is the cultivation of attitudes, the other is the actual training, the actual experience in the manipulation of an automobile. The first, as I have indicated, I think can be done without any special place in the high school curriculum. The other cannot very well be done even if you put it in the high school curriculum and there are many reasons for me saying that.

In the first place, children need this experience at the time that they are going to start driving, or at the time they are going to apply for licences. Their birthdays go on all through the year. About all you can teach them about the rules can be taught in two weeks; all you can give them in experience can't be done in any limited time. If a child is nervous, the most important thing perhaps is to develop confidence in that young person who is learning to drive. If a person is too cocky by nature you can usually recognize it and you have to give him some experience which changes that. This would require, I think, that if it were made compulsory, school boards would have to go into a very great deal of expense, particularly our big schools, and I'm not sure even then it would be very effective. I would like to say that you soon forget, whether you're an adult or a child, and if you examine me just after I've qualified for a new licence, I do pretty well on the rules, but I have had the experience with four children with training them. And every time when I got ready to give the new member of the family instruction I was a little horrified at how unsure I was of some of the rules, even though I had been driving for years. And so I say that a course does not necessarily stay with them. Driver education is something that needs some continuation.

Now, perhaps we could have somebody devise a link trainer. We used them very successfully in training pilots for the war, and perhaps something like that is a field where the government might give some direction. A tool -- some of you who have taken some of these elaborate examinations in the States for drivers know what they're like. They put you in this facsimile of a car; the car doesn't move but around you, in three dimensions, moves the highway and they are able to measure your reactions to the various things that happen, and it's a pretty educational process. Maybe we can do something like that.

Another thing I want to mention is that there are very, very many people who have to learn to drive who are not in our schools and who will not be in our schools, and they need an opportunity. About the first thing the drop-out of high school does is get a car, as most of you know, and sometimes the very things that make him a drop-out also make him a little bit dangerous in the possession of a car. Maybe our courts could refer people to special driving schools.

But what I would like to suggest is to encourage a sort of a voluntary system, and there are some ways to do it. One way would be to set up some strips of these abandoned highways specifically for driving training, or perhaps in the city cordon off a block once in a while, maybe every evening, where under supervision people could get practice driving.

Another thing we could do, perhaps, would be to provide rental cars at very cheap rates, and certainly you can drive in a car that doesn't have to be new and doesn't have to be supplied by some company. But most of all, I think, if you could get some of our young drivers -- we're always talking about hippies and young people -- but I have found a great deal of courtesy among some of these people and I have found that whenever you can enlist their help in a program they are anxious to help you. I think if you could give them some special recognition, if they were willing to spend a few hours a day at one of these designated fields or old highways if you wish, giving the youngsters confidence, giving them some practice and direction.

6- 30

ALBERTA HANSAPD

March 9th 1972

---

And in these fields, too, you would need to provide some of the usual hazards; that's one of the most difficult things to teach drivers. I remember taking my own children out where there were lines of gravel and saying: "move over here", while I was ready to take the wheel, and almost invariably they would have lost control of the car. They need to have experience in these hazards which you can't give them just around the city.

Now there are some other things you might do, if you organized a community project, enlisted these young people and gave them some special recognition and some little contest -- we used to have in our town what we called automobile rodeos. We let all the children compete in the handling of automobiles, just one at a time, and they certainly could outdo the old people because I tried it once and I didn't score very well.

Another thing we could do is initiate pledge buttons. When a child comes for a license ask him if he wants to take a pledge and accept a button. He wears a button and this button is a pledge that he will observe the courtesies and the laws of the road. It's something that reminds him that driving is a privilege. On the other hand, maybe we could have some other kinds of buttons. A yellow button, and when a youngster is convicted of an offense we might require him to carry it with him and to hook it over the left hand window of the car he is driving, for a certain period, just to keep reminding him again that these are important things.

Now, to repeat, I would hate to see this made compulsory because as Mr. Taylor said it's expensive. It won't work very well if you make it compulsory for a school to give the course, but if you don't make it compulsory for the student to take it, you haven't accomplished much. And of course you can't compel many people who need driver training to take the course. The important thing first is to cultivate attitudes. You can do it perhaps by having some of what might be horror movies. You can do it perhaps by racing pictures, showing how people can develop great skills in manoeuvring these cars. You can do it by providing a field or a piece of highway with some built-in hazards where these children can be trained. But I think most important of all would be this community effort of getting volunteer people, perhaps volunteer cars, using pledge buttons and encouraging the attitudes which I know in the end will be most important of all.

I would not move an amendment, but I would be very happy, if when the consideration is given it goes much further than encouraging driver education in the schools. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Edmonton Beverly.

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, may I first compliment the two gentlemen, hon. Members for Bonnyville and Athabasca, with regard to their concern about driver education. My number of years as a member of a school board and serving on the executive of the School Trustees' Association of Alberta involved me in many, many debates with regard to driver education.

First and foremost I would like to stress that we have to separate driver education from driver training, and I read this resolution in that context, that it is really looking at driver education to be part of the school program. Driver training is another matter. This is the part where you learn to drive behind the wheel of an automobile. Several of the associations that the hon. member from Drumheller may have referred to have over the past made representations to the former government. The Alberta School

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-31

-----

Trustees have endorsed driver education. The Independent Agent's Association, as early as 1968, spoke and presented in their brief that driver education be compulsory before anyone gets a driver's licence. This seemed to fall rather on deaf ears. Excuse -- not enough trained teachers. Well, this can also be weighed. I'm myself a parent of a growing family, a boy who is driving now, and, as a member of the business known as insurance agents, I know that practically every company that does business in Alberta recognizes driver education, and definitely considers a great reward in a reduction of premium to any young person who completes driver education, or even an adult who has never driven and has completed a driver training program.

I have some criticism of one of the programs that the hon. member for Drumheller praised, and that is a program that is provided by the Alberta Motor Association. They are truly providing driver training, but are short-changing many, many of the students with driver education. So, in that sense, I question the program that is being provided by that organization. But I do hope that they improve and take into concern the shortage that they are giving their students with regard to driver education by providing a fuller program in the education. It was interesting to note that the hon. member from Cardston commented that strips of abandoned highways be looked over, and used to provide driver education. I would hope that he is aware that there are members in this Assembly that are trying to get highways; they cannot even find highways, let alone abandon them.

A short presentation that the Independent Agents Association made and have provided to many, many citizens in this province, indicates that the educators and traffic authorities point out the following reasons for the accidents that are caused. One is lack of accurate knowledge about driving. Others are aggressive personality traits, unsound and immature judgment, lack of cooperative attitudes, willingness to take undue risks, lack of experience, particularly in complex driving situations and emergencies. Out of all of these, only one really applies to driver training; the rest is driver education. The interesting observation of many of the people is that they seem to think that to own a driver's licence or to be in possession of a driver's licence is a right. I feel it is not; it is a privilege and one has to earn it. You don't get this right nowadays just because you are born in this province or in this country and you are able to, at the age of 16, pass a simple written test and get your driver's licence.

Therefore, in summary, I hope that we don't play around with this resolution, that we take it as it is worded "driver education" and that it is expanded rapidly in this province.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the hon. members discussing this topic with a great deal of interest. It seems to me that there are a few points which could be added to the discussion, despite the fact that I feel rather humble and rise with some trepidation, particularly in view of the stirring and stentorian illustration of eloquent prowess of the hon. member for Drumheller. There is no way I can live up to that illustration.

But I am keenly interested in this topic; I feel it is very, very important. It's especially important, of course, because the highway situation which this government has inherited in the province is one which does indeed require a great deal of driving skill. Perhaps that is why the judgment of the people of the province was visited upon the past government on August 30th.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the resolution as it is worded refers to driver education in schools and I am wondering if indeed that is our objective. It seems to me that the objectives should be to assure that all persons who apply for the first time, at least, in the province of Alberta for a driver's licence should have to demonstrate their qualifications for the permission to drive. As the hon. member for Edmonton Belmont indicated, the ability to drive is not a right but rather a privilege and it should be so considered. If that is the case, then I feel that the resolution as worded will indeed not apply and not catch all of those persons who seek to drive on our highways. It is for that reason that I think it does not perhaps go as far as it could.

There is also a question whether the requirement to provide driver training -- or driver education as everyone calls it, and we've had some rather fine distinctions brought to our attention here. Incidentally, I would submit on that point that indeed the ability to drive requires both driver education and driver training. It's both some knowledge of the rules of the road and how to react and some skill in that process.

To get back to my point, it seems to me that we are confronted with a very basic issue here, one which perhaps can be expressed this way. What is the parental responsibility? What is the individual responsibility? And what is the public responsibility in this issue? I would submit, with respect that to suggest that driver education should be provided through the school system assumes that it is a public responsibility. Now, one can debate whether it is or is not a public responsibility. Personally, I think it's a matter of opinion, and it's my opinion at the moment that the public responsibility is to assure that the people who get on the highway and have permission to drive are competent to do so. But it is not my opinion that it is a public responsibility that they should be provided with driving lessons.

There is, further, the question of cost which has been brought up, and I submit that this is a question that concerns this House, and every member of it, as well as the general public, especially with reference to education.

There is another issue which has been mentioned briefly, and that is the problem of providing a time during the school day for driver education. From my conversations with teachers, it is a most difficult program to arrange. Generally speaking, the teacher is able to deal with one or two students at most at one time, and this means that the classes have to be broken up. It would seem to me, especially in view of the rather extensive discussions presently going forward about the school year, the shifting of the school year, the use of school facilities, etc., that if we are contemplating this provision of driver education, we might well do so, perhaps through some facet of the Department of Education, although that is not my position. But if we do, aside from the regular school year.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there are some citizens, and I throw out this point of view which the hon. member from Cardston has also brought to our attention, who would suggest that there are other means of providing driver education than through the school system. Now, the Alberta Motor Association does provide learning facilities and driver training facilities. There are private groups which do the same. And it would be my view that while we are faced, as we are now, and particularly this year, with the great pressure on our limited revenues for priorities, especially, Mr. Speaker, with regard in the school system to the decision which we have to look at whether we expand kindergarten programs or not. It seems to me it is right within the public school system which forces us to make a decision on priorities -- kindergarten or driver education? I respectfully draw to the attention of members of the House that good arguments can be advanced on both sides, but I note -- and recommend that other



March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-33

members note that across Canada -- if we were to compare the acceptance of the two types of programs, the kindergarten program is much more widely adopted, and much more widespread than is the driver education program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to conclude simply by reiterating my point that I feel strongly that all applicants for drivers' licenses in the Province of Alberta should be required to demonstrate some ability in driving skills and some familiarity with the rules of the road. I submit that this can be accomplished -- and accomplished better -- by imposing certain requirements at the time of application for licence, leaving to the individual the decision and the choice of what kind of alternative learning situation he prefers to seek out and to follow.

Thank you.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, now may I join in this debate? And may I speak without raising the hackles of the hon. members on the other side? I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Bonnyville for bringing this very valuable resolution before this legislature, and also to congratulate the hon. member for Athabasca in seconding this motion. Certainly the hon. member for Drumheller has added greatly to our fund "of knowledge on this all-important subject.

Regretfully, at one time I had the data on a study on driver education developed by a research team covering areas such as the States of Illinois and Michigan where this was made compulsory for all young people. The net result and the heading of this particular article, if you can call it that, or study, was: Does Driver Education Pay for the Taxpayer? They went on to prove by statistics that this was not basically so. However, the fact that this particular exercise was conducted in a different jurisdiction may well mean that it could not presently apply here.

I'm sure that all parents who have had children have been ultimately faced with the situation with dear old Dad: "Can I have your car Friday night?" We certainly shudder, and many mothers lie awake at nights thinking about where Johnny or Mary or Jean is, or whoever the case may be. I think this is probably one of the biggest worries that parents are faced with. This is something they have to face and there is no way that it can be avoided.

It was also mentioned by the hon. member for Bonnyville the rather harsh position taken by the insurance industry in the province of Alberta in relation to our young drivers. I had this experience, Mr. Speaker, in relation to one of my youngest sons, the last one -- and incidentally, he did take driver training -- in discovering the rates that he had to pay in relation to the rate prevailing in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. The quoted rate in Alberta with driver training, 18 years old, \$35,000 PL and PD, \$250 deductible, Agent 1 - \$421; Agent 2 - \$400; Agent 3 - \$365. I thought, this is a lot of money on a \$2500 vehicle. With this in mind and to satisfy my curiosity, I wrote to the Saskatchewan Insurance Commission and their quotation for the same coverage, plus a couple of extra fringes, was \$72. This was rather startling to me, so I then wrote to the Manitoba Commission; their rate for an 18 year old driver is \$100. Now I'm not saying, Mr. Speaker, in this particular instance, that the insurance industry is exploiting the young drivers in Alberta. There may be a whole field of different risks that are taken into consideration. Possibly the insurance business is so divided among so many different companies that they cannot functionally meet the competition of a state organization, or it may well be that in these two different jurisdictions the insurance is being subsidized.

6- 34

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

Getting back to the format of this motion, Mr. Speaker, I think it can be agreed that some people have difficulty in mastering the operation of any machinery. Because of my background I am very well aware of this. And surprisingly, and there are studies to prove it, the more intelligent a person is, the less ability they have in concentrating on the processes of driving. Some people have, as already indicated in this debate, aggressive natures. Some people have psychological aggressive tendencies and basically this is one tendency which is brought out by people who drink and drive.

Possibly at some point in time the privilege of driving will also have to contain an analysis as to the adaptability of the person's character. Also, there are certain more fortunate young people raised in a rural background where at 11 or 12 years old they are driving their fathers' trucks back and forth through the fields hauling grain, so by the time they do reach high school, they have had quite a number of years of experience, and I would question, other than the theory aspect of driving, whether this particular training would be of any great value other than allowing them to properly show their friends how well they could achieve in this particular course.

It has been mentioned that the option belongs to local government to determine how this can be done now, and also the financial implications have been indicated.

Then finally, Mr. Speaker, we do still have a screening process; we do have the driver examiners. And I have known of people who have gone for their driving test and have been faulted and sent back to learn some more, gone back to their driving instructors and taken more lessons. So then possibly the approach would be to make the driver examination process a little bit stiffer. However, Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the intent of the motion, I propose to support it and I thank the hon. members for bringing this before the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I crave your indulgence. I wish to read into Hansard, Mr. Speaker, the interpretation of the word 'now' as indicated in Webster's Dictionary.

MR. FARRAN:

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member from Pincher Creek-Crowsnest may have the indulgence of this House to read this quotation, provided he also reads Webster's quotation for "never".

MR. SPEAKER:

I don't know of any rule which permits reading in portions of dictionaries into the record, but if the House wishes to grant its indulgence, and I think it would be that, perhaps we could permit the member to read it in.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your courtesy and I extend my thanks. "Now" -- you know its awful fine print --

MR. HYNDMAN:

If you or the other side are concerned about costs, I think the cost of Hansard eventually will go up about \$5,000 as a result of these insertions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. minister objecting to the reading in of the definition?

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-35

MR. DRAIN:

"Now" means "at the present time or moment, in the time immediately before the present, at the time immediately to follow forthwith". Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. FARRAN:

May I borrow that Webster Dictionary to read the definition of "never"?

MR. SPEAKER:

I think we should proceed, and perhaps the hon. member from Calgary North Hill could make some private arrangements with the hon. member from Pincher-Crowsnest.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. Member leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

#### Provincial Power Grid

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the hon. Member for Lloydminster the following resolution: "Be it resolved that the Alberta Government investigate the feasibility of a provincially owned and controlled electric power grid system."

Mr. Speaker, the cost of providing electric power to many parts of Alberta has risen considerably over the past few years, and there is every indication that it will continue to rise in the future. In that area, I suggest the government has certain obligations and certain responsibilities that should be met.

The idea of a provincially owned power grid system, of course, is not new. However, I would like at this time, Mr. Speaker, to discuss a number of reasons why we as a government should study the feasibility of such a move.

First of all, I think it should be understood, on the basis on which our free enterprise works, there should be a competitive atmosphere in any industry, and particularly in an industry such as the utility industry. However, on the other hand, the very nature of the business wherein you are required to supply a product that costs large sums of money to transport demands that a power company must have a protected area to operate in. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I think we all appreciate that fact.

Now the only means that we have had here in Alberta of ensuring that the consumer will be protected from undue increases in price, or perhaps a quality of service which does not come up to the standard that we expect, is the requirement that those companies who are involved in the distribution and supply of electric power in Alberta must make application to the Public Utilities Board and must lay out all their reasons and so on before they are granted any changes in rates.

With due respect, Mr. Speaker, to the members of the Public Utilities Board, and I would like to talk a little later about that, it is my belief that they have not in the past had an opportunity with limited people and staff to get all the facts and figures and technical assistance to determine whether or not, in fact, changes in rates, kilowatt hour rates, are necessary or needed at all.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that one of the most effective ways to make sure that power rates are competitive would be to have a provincially owned power grid system. In that regard I'm not suggesting, as many members in this House may have thought by reading the Order Paper, that we should go into the business of public ownership of utilities in Alberta. I think that that is about the easiest thing you can say when it comes to the question of power, but it's certainly not the kind of thing you can say with any responsibility until you've had an opportunity to do just what I have suggested here, and that is study the whole question.

It appears to me that a private company, and we have a number of them in Alberta now, would and should be allowed to continue to manufacture power, and I'm only suggesting in this resolution that we should have a provincially owned grid system so that any town, city, rural electrification association, or what have you, might from time to time buy power through that grid system on a contract basis from any one of a number of companies that perhaps might be operating in the province. As a matter of fact in some areas of the province it might be possible that we would buy through that grid system from outside the province, and I suggest that perhaps in the northwestern part of the province we might buy from the Pennett Dam, if that were the most available and cheapest sort of power. I think that any arrangements that places like the City of Edmonton have where there is a municipal owned utility system which is operating to satisfaction, should certainly not be interfered with by government, but at the same time they should be given an opportunity to purchase power to bring into their city boundaries, on just such a system as I'm talking about, a provincially owned grid system.

As I mentioned before, this arrangement would allow the power companies to continue to manufacture power and certainly continue on a contract basis or otherwise in servicing of power distribution facilities in individual municipalities, rural electrification associations and so on. In addition to some of the obvious benefits of distributing power within the province, such a system would give us the ability to, perhaps, sell power outside the province. When you look at the potential of the Province of Alberta and take into consideration our natural resources of coal, gas, and several other products that have a potential to produce electric power, certainly there is an area where, in future years, we may be looking to other parts of Canada to buy electric energy.

Getting back to the original motion, Mr. Speaker, which is that we should have a feasibility study, I suggest that it would have to include a number of important areas. First of all, I am sure all of the major power companies in this province would be most interested in helping and working together on this thing. There should be a study of existing grid lines within the province, together with an estimate of their value, and so on.

Now I know that some of the major power companies, and I presume all of them have very comprehensive studies of their particular area in relation to the need from now until perhaps 1980, in relation to the areas in their servicing areas where they may develop new and potential sites for manufacturing power, but I think it's such an important area to this province that we ought to have all this information concerning the province from the southern border to the northern border gathered into one system where we can actually sit down and say: "This is what we need for the northern part or the southern part," and tie the whole thing in together. I don't think

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-37

-----

it's an area that can be left to designated regions of Alberta. I think we have to look at the entire region and I appreciate some of the work that has been done in that area, but I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that we have done nearly enough. I think in that connection representation should be received from all the major power consumers, the towns, cities, the REA, the industry itself, as well as the general public, with a view to determining what their feelings are with regard to the acceptance of such a system.

A look at the alternatives available in such a system -- some people have suggested to me that the province is in the business of buying and supplying power and I suggest to you that this is not necessarily so; there are several alternatives. The province could buy power and transport it for resale, or they could simply charge a commission for providing a transportation facility. Perhaps there might be, in the course of this debate, some other members who have some other ideas on that subject.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there would have to be, most assuredly in any such study of this nature, a termination of the method and cost of financing, having regard to the effect such a move might have on the provincial treasury here in Alberta.

I haven't, Mr. Speaker, gotten into some of the more specific problem areas in Alberta with regard to power. I would just like to mention, however, that we have a problem which has been growing a little worse year by year in rural Alberta; that is the problem of providing rural electrification into the farms, and the costs as they have risen are becoming somewhat prohibitive.

I am not suggesting that they're any larger than they should be. Wages have gone up; materials have gone up, and so on, but certainly I think we as a government have a responsibility at this point in time to have a look at that situation and see if there isn't some alternative method to financing or paying for the cost of developing new areas in this province.

At the same time I'd like to refer to situations in the resource areas of this province where every single individual in this province is benefitting from the dollars that flow in from oil revenues and coal revenues, low as they may be, and other kinds of resource revenues. Now I suggest to you that when power companies or government or anyone else is forced to go in and service an area like this with power that is producing resource revenue that benefits all of Alberta, then certainly the residents of all of Alberta in this provincial government have a challenge in that regard to insuring that the cost of supplying public utilities to that area is not borne by people in just a small part of the province. I am referring to the fact that in the northern part of the province one utility company has done some very extensive development in such areas as Grande Cache, and Wabasca, and Rainbow Lake and I just have to think, Mr. Speaker, that in order for them to get a return on the kind of investment that they've placed in that area, they must increase rates to the customers they serve. Those customers represent probably 20-25 per cent of all the people of Alberta, maybe even less than that, and yet the benefits that are incurred by that situation of developing natural resources go to each and every one of us and I think we should all share in paying for it.

Mr. Speaker, I have been very brief, I have outlined some of the advantages that might be obtained from a provincially owned grid system, together with some of the areas that I suggest should be included in a feasibility study of that nature. Without any doubt, there are many other advantages and very likely some disadvantages that I have not discussed. It is not the intention, Mr. Speaker, to rush headlong into such a system as I suggested, but only to initiate action that will provide information that in my view, the government of this province and this Legislative Assembly should have had many

6- 38

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

years ago. I urge you to consider this resolution favourably so that the Minister of Telephones and Utilities might proceed in an area that affects the life and well-being of every Albertan.

MR. J. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to second the resolution as presented by my friend and colleague, Mr. Moore the hon. Member for Smoky River.

I'd bring to your attention Mr. Speaker, the fact that of all the Canadian provinces, Alberta's growth in electrical consumption is the most vigorous. In the last decade, Mr. Speaker, Alberta's consumption of electrical power has tripled, whereas that in the rest of Canada has not quite doubled. It also has been estimated, Mr. Speaker, that by the end of this century, Alberta's annual consumption of electrical power will increase another sevenfold. And I might add Mr. Speaker, that at this time the electricity supply to the public in Alberta is handled by three private electric utilities, about 13 municipal electric utilities, and nearly 400 rural electrification associations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all of these utilities distribute and sell electricity to the public within their franchise areas, but only the few larger utilities generate power for their own use and for the use of smaller utilities. It is generally felt that the present structure of Alberta's utility industry is inadequate to meet the province's long range requirements. It lacks the basis from which to plan and finance development in a comprehensive manner. And Mr. Speaker, we feel that in Alberta it is essential that electricity be made available at a uniform rate reflecting the lowest possible cost to residential, commercial and industrial customers throughout the province. This is of particular importance when we are thinking of rural industrialization and settlement in some of the remote areas of the province.

A strong province-wide power transmission network would serve to coordinate the existing power supplies but would also serve in the maximum development of hydro-electric power, in particular with reference to the Peace and the Slave rivers.

Mr. Speaker, this is of a particular importance when one considers that the environmental restrictions on the siting and the cost of fossil fuel thermal generation stations is a major factor at this time.

Mr. Speaker, there is also the possibility of opportunities for the establishment of electrical interconnections with neighbouring states and provinces to export or import power as may be advantageous to the people of Alberta. It is also most important that this capital intensive industry is financed at the lowest possible rates. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that when one considers the importance of this industry and its impact on the citizens of Alberta that sincere consideration to this resolution should be given at this time.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to this resolution I want to say that, first of all, I don't think it goes far enough and I'll be commenting on that in a moment. But because it is at least a slight improvement, however slight, I am prepared to support it.

I want to begin by saying that we discussed this very proposal ourselves in the party I led some ten years ago, at a provincial convention. The proposal was made that a power grid, as suggested by the hon. member from Smoky River, would have many of the advantages that he cited, but our convention, in discussing it in very considerable detail for many of the reasons that I intend to give you

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-39

now, turned down the proposal and once again reaffirmed the position of our party that we favour public power. This is a position, Mr. Speaker, which I think you are well aware of and the members of this assembly are well aware is held by the Organized Farm Movement of the province of Alberta, the position of Unifarm and the position of the National Farmer's Union.

The proposal for public power is not new in Canada. We are the only province west of New Brunswick today that doesn't have public power. Indeed, the Conservative province of Ontario introduced public power nearly 60 years ago. The neighbouring province of British Columbia in 1961 -- one year after the hon. Premier of that province stated in no uncertain terms that he wouldn't take over the power companies -- proceeded to nationalize the power in what I think was an excellent, bold and first-rate step on the part of the government of British Columbia, a step which has, no doubt, contributed to their long tenure of office in that province.

The case for public power, Mr. Speaker, the case to go far beyond the resolution as proposed, is to me a very strong one. First of all, when you look at power rates in this province -- if you examine the Alberta Power Commission Report for 1969 -- you will find that power rates in Alberta are 21 per cent above the Canadian average. This is almost certain to be the case, Mr. Speaker, because when you have, as we had before the end of this year, three separate power companies supplying service, and then in some cases municipalities supplying service as well, you have a great deal of duplication -- duplication of administration, frequent duplication of advertising, duplication which is bound to show up in greater costs. You have the profit factor. I'm not here to argue today that the power companies are making exorbitant profits, although I believe that they have made more than a reasonable return on their investment over the last 25 years. So you have the profit factor which is bound to be passed on to the consumer in the form of higher rates. Private companies, by and large are not able to secure the advantageous interest rates that government can obtain in going ahead with major projects.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the farm people of this province in particular, have, I think, been dealt a pretty unhappy situation in power by their government. In 1948, there was wide-spread support in the rural communities of this province for public power. The members of this Assembly will recall that in 1948 a plebiscite was held on whether we would have public power or not. By the very smallest of margins, the voters in this province voted in favour of private power. But that vote came, Mr. Speaker, only after a pledge was made by the government of the time that farm people would receive power at cost. I might say that if one looks over the records and the poll by poll returns from that 1948 plebiscite, one finds that the rural area still voted overwhelmingly in favour of public power on the one hand, while it was the vote of the two major cities that turned the tide in favour of a very, very small majority, something under 1000 votes if my memory serves me correctly, the very small majority that was recorded for private power.

But unfortunately, the system that was set up, while it was designed to provide power at cost, did not, in fact, do that. We found in many of the public hearings that there's great confusion over what power at cost means. Does it mean supplying power to the farmer at strict cost, or does it include a return on the invested capital of the power company? Well, Mr. Speaker, as a consequence, the installation costs of power in Alberta are considerably above the national average. The Association of Rural Electrification Associations commissioned a report by the late Dr. Mead, a report which examined in considerable detail the cost of installing power across Canada. And that report shows that power installation costs in Alberta are approximately 30 per cent higher than Saskatchewan and double the installation cost in the province of Manitoba.

6- 40

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

I mentioned when I spoke in the address to the Speech from the Throne that even on such small things as tap-in costs, where additional subscribers are brought into rural lines, there is very great evidence that the power companies, rather than supplying this service at cost, are supplying the service at cost plus. The example I cited from my own constituency of a tap-in in a little REA west of Fairview -- the price cited by the power company was \$1,035. When I checked with the province of Manitoba, and the province of Saskatchewan, I find that the figures I received for the cost of providing that service from those two provinces was \$535 and \$389 respectively.

And so the case for a change in the whole power system of this province, in my view, is unchallengeable. And because the concept of a power grid, however cautious, however conservative, however, I think hedged it is, because it is at least a step, albeit a meagre step in the right direction, I'm prepared to support it. But I will say to this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members of this Legislative Assembly will have to recognize that the demand for public power in this province, not just for a power grid to supply consumers, but for public power of the production as well as the distribution of the power will, in fact, be growing throughout Alberta. We cannot be the odd man out indefinitely. Sooner or later we must get in step with the rest of Canada. Sooner or later, the 'now' Tories in Alberta in 1972, Mr. Speaker, will have to catch up with the Tories in Ontario in the years between 1910 and 1920.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the hon. member for Smoky River, and the hon. member for Lloydminster for the resolution we have before us. Mr. Speaker, in regard to the resolution before the assembly, I am not aware of what grid system is available in the hon. member's area of Smoky River and the hon. member's area of Lloydminster, but for the other parts of Alberta, I am.

Calgary Power serves most of the province except for Alberta Power and the City of Edmonton. But they have bus ties into these systems. Calgary Power supplies power from the Wabamun Lake plants, Brazeau hydro sites and will from the Big Bend site when it is commissioned this fall. These plants will feed power to the City of Calgary, carrying voltages of upwards of 250,000 volts. This system can also feed from the southern hydro plants back north. At various times each year power is switched into the Edmonton system or the Alberta power system.

Calgary Power also operates at various voltages from its various plants, depending on the transmission distance. It is difficult to receive figures for the estimated total value of transmission facilities for the province, but these can be received from the Energy Resources Conservation Board. I have figures for the projected requirements of power for the central areas, the southern, and this area of Alberta. The power requirements for this area would be approximately 2,760 megawatts, with a 15 per cent reserve for 1980. To achieve this increase in capacity more sites will be required, and Calgary Power now has an application before the Energy Resources Board for two additional units at the station at Sundance.

I understand that Calgary Power are also surveying various locations in Alberta for other proposed sites. For rural Alberta there are 386 rural electrification associations. The first rural electrification line was built in Alberta in 1947. At this time these lines were built by farmers forming co-operatives through the Co-operatives Activities branch. The cost of these lines depended on the distance involved. The power companies also spent about a thousand dollars per farm to achieve power plants and transmission lines to tie into the REA's. When this was initially set up in 1947, power requirements were low and most farmers went with a 3 KVA



March 9th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-41

-----

system. Later on farmers asked for a different rate structure and this was done through the Mead Report. This report brought out an R200 rating operation which included the operation and depreciation of the system. The first 130 KV costs five cents per kilowatt, but three cents of this goes directly into the REA and is put into a reserve fund; two cents goes directly to the power company. The next 320 KV is bought at two cents and goes directly back to the power companies. Under the old REA system, farmers paid a \$5.50 monthly minimum charge and then so much a kilowatt. The average cost under this old rate, and some people are still under this old rate, is at 1.58 cents per kilowatt. The REA fund has approximately \$18 million in reserve and the REA in this province has invested approximately \$60 million to build these transmission lines into our rural areas.

The question which I leave before the Assembly is: has the province the money to buy out this REA system which would cost us upwards of \$100 million? Thank you.

MR. ZANDER:

I wish to thank the hon. members for bringing in this resolution. I too am not in favour of a takeover or spending huge sums of money to take over the power companies because I think this would be a foolish move at this time, particularly when you consider the rate of interest that you would have to pay and the people of Alberta would have to bear.

But I think we must keep two or three things in mind that the former government failed to carry through, first of all, the grid system is a very fair approach to it. For the people of Alberta to own the grid system, to supply power not only to our neighbouring provinces but also perhaps to the borders to the south. I have to agree that the farm installation costs on the REA's has risen beyond all reason. They have gone up in the last four or five years approximately 100 per cent or more, although the costs of the material have gone up significantly less -- the wire has gone up approximately 32 per cent, and the cost of bolts has gone up something like 14 per cent. The thing that we must bear in mind -- and that is exactly what the Premier of the Province of British Columbia, the hon. Mr. Bennett, did -- and I think these two things stand out very clearly. I feel sorry for the north because the other government, the previous government, was sleeping at the switch. The one thing that we have got to keep in mind is this, what did the British Columbia government get for the downstream rights of the Columbia River? What did we get when Bennett built the dam on the Peace River? What did we get for the downstream rights? Weigh those two factors only. I certainly think that the north country could have had a wonderful grid system and almost free power if the government of that day had taken care of their downstream rights on that river.

When that agreement was signed, Mr. Bennett was laughing all the way to the bank because he saved hundreds of millions of dollars that we as Albertans could have had. Why do we say that we can't have a major public-owned power grid system in the province? We built a railroad to somewhere and we are paying the Japanese to take our coal. Certainly we can look and now we can realize some of the profits out of the grid system to pay for the railroad that we have running up there, that we are using to permit the Japanese to take our coal.

The last question which I consider very important -- is that the former government loaned a company \$12 million, interest free, to build a dam to control the waters of the North Saskatchewan River, at least to control it. They did everything but control it. I believe that we, as a government, should look at the major grid systems as supplying power to the major industries. There are industries that are going to go into the north, very large industries, and certainly

6- 42

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

we should be able to step into this picture, to give these people power at rates that are at least comparable to those in the rest of the central parts of the Province of Alberta. Now, I know that the hon. Member for Fairview has said the time is coming that we will have to try to take over all the power companies. Economically this for us at this time is not possible. If we want to take and borrow the money -- and surely we are not going to expropriate it -- to take it away from the people and say, now you can't have it. Are we going to say to the hon. member, we'll take your car away and not pay you for it?

These corporations have built this structure, and I think it is only common sense that we should let them keep it, but we should control it. I think we have the power in this Assembly to control the power rates of this province and to give the people power at cost. They have to have a reasonable return on their money, nobody denies that. But surely we should, as sensible people, say that we will not walk away and say that we will buy it out because we are not economically in the position to do this.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this resolution, I want to indicate to the Assembly that this government recognizes its responsibilities in all areas of provincial concern, and in all areas of public concern. One of its major responsibilities, of course, is in the management of the province's energy resources. In this area, this government recognizes that there are at least four areas of immense consideration. The first, of course, Mr. Speaker, is for the province to determine accurately the energy potential of this province. This in itself is no small task, Mr. Speaker, as we recognize that this particular province is blessed with many forms of energy. We also have fuel energy forms which are immense in their availability.

It has been estimated that in connection with our fossil fuel energy forms something like 59 per cent resides in the tar sands; 30 percent is in coal, 5.5 per cent is in natural gas. In examining these figures and recognizing that they are near estimates, at best, the government then does recognize and does undertake the responsibility of determining how it should best manage these resources, as the future of this province to a large degree is dependent upon the management of these resources in all their complexity.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the aspect that a responsible government must examine in connection with the province's energy resources is energy conversion. And energy conversion, of course, has many characteristics. If we examine our coal for example, Mr. Speaker, we can say that we can do several things with our coal. We can ship our coal out in the form in which it exists. We can ship our coal out by highgrading it, shipping out basically the coking coal and stockpiling the remainder. We can use the remainder for generation of power, for base load development of electrical power in a very large way, and I think it's to be recognized, Mr. Speaker, that if in fact we generate power on a massive scale in Alberta on a base load level then the price or the cost of power in the province as a whole can be substantially reduced.

Speaking also in connection with coal, we recognize today that we can gasify most of our coal. Much of our coal is amenable to gasification, much of it is low in sulphur, and as a result the cost of gasification is not as high as it is in certain other coal fields in the North American continent. Gasification, of course, Mr. Speaker, is a technology that is being worked on in great haste today and it is being developed rapidly. As far as I can understand, if the figures don't fail me, the United States of America has committed

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-43

-----  
something like \$275 million in the next five years to develop gasification of coal. So this is another alternative we have.

A third alternative we have, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated with respect to coal, is to high grade it and ship out the coking aspects at very low prices and simply stockpile the remainder.

A third area that this government must be concerned with, and is very vitally concerned with, is the area of energy transmission and I think on that point, Mr. Speaker, I would request that I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister has asked leave to adjourn the debate. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Shall we call it half past five?

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, just a matter of House business, before we adjourn. The hon. members should know at this time that concerning Government Motions one, two and three on pages five and six of today's Order Paper, because of the fact that these motions deal with the conduct of business during the session and rules for the session, and because of the fact they should therefore be disposed of and dealt with early in the session, it is the intention of the government to carry on with final disposition of these three motions during tonight's sitting.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order and clarification for myself and other members of the House, is it going to be the rule -- I didn't quite understand your ruling today and I need the answer -- that before we end private member's day today, we are going to revert to dropping resolutions down on the Order Paper, or are they going to stay in their place?

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe that the sense of the House was we should continue the practice as it was, and upon further consideration of the rules I think perhaps that may be sound.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Privileges and Elections Committee might consider an amendment to make this situation entirely clear for the future conduct of House business in this matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

[The House rose at 5:25pm.]

\* \* \* \* \*

-----  
\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8:00 pm.]

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Sponsorship of Bills

Moved by Dr. Horner, seconded by Mr. Yurko:

Be it resolved that the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta be amended by adding the following Rule after Rule 57:

57a. Where a bill has been introduced by a member who is not a Minister of the Crown and has been given first reading, a motion may be made at any time without notice when the order of business is "Introduction of Bills" to have the bill thereafter placed on the Orders of the Day under "Government Bills and Orders".

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, as I was concluding my remarks the other day, I was touching on the comparison of a statement made in the Speech from the Throne on this issue and I was attempting to quote the motion verbatim for purposes of emphasizing the point I was making, and then to continue with my remarks. I wish to point out, at the outset, that I agree with this motion very much. I think it's commendable that the hon. the Premier should permit this thing to come in, but as we were getting into the debate some serious doubt was cast on the meaning of the words in this motion by the hon. minister who moved the motion and the hon. minister who seconded it.

And then to create further doubt as to what is meant by this motion, the hon. member for Highwood, Mr. Benoit, posed a question to the hon. the Premier and the answer was one that certainly made me wonder as to what this motion is doing before the House. I was surprised at what I believe to be a slight shift from the position expressed in the motion as it is written. That is why I wanted to state that I believe that the government is bound by what it said in the Speech from the Throne and what is said in this motion. Explanations by ministers who think it is for "government members" only do not seem to tie in with what is in the motion. I think we have to read the motion into Hansard and to determine where on earth can one say that this means government members only, because if this is so, then my whole faith in the word of the hon. the Premier, and the two ministers has been shaken rather greatly, and I'm entitled to make this assessment.

I believe that most hon. members in this House, and there are quite a lot of lawyers on the other side will certainly read a motion like this and by no stretch of the imagination can one say, well this is government members, because it doesn't say so. I think that the hon. members on this side have to stand firm and demand that this motion be given the interpretation that it should, in the way it's written. I also understand that this was a government caucus decision and it behooves ministers in the House who come in now to try to shade the meaning of the same government members.

If it was through inadvertence, they can explain later, but if it wasn't, then we have something on record in Hansard that I don't believe will stand this government in good stead. I want to go back to the remark in the Speech from the Throne that I think may not bear directly on the resolution we're debating, but it certainly indicates what was intended. It states here on page 2; "the status and responsibilities of MLA's as representatives of the people..."

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-45

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The hon. member continues to refer to another debate, and I'm wondering if you would rule on that point.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The hon. member is not referring to another debate; he's referring to statements in the Speech from the Throne which now belongs to the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

If it becomes abundantly clear that he is referring to another debate, in a way not permitted by the rules, perhaps we could advert to the point again.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to use part of the Speech from the Throne which bears directly on this motion to indicate what, in my opinion, the intent of this motion is. Now, if any members object to me doing it, then we could have a debate on the point of order, but this motion is the result of the statement in the Speech from the Throne. They are related. I am not going to debate the interruption. I will continue as I had intended.

It says here that

"Status and responsibilities of MLA's as representatives of the people in their constituencies will be substantially increased. To accomplish this, two specific steps will be taken.

(a) A resolution will be introduced to assure that all members of the Legislative Assembly will have a reasonable opportunity to debate public bills other than government bills, proposed and introduced by them, in response to requests by their constituents and by other Albertans."

I subscribe to that view and I believe that that view is probably reflected in this motion if it is given --

MR. SPEAKER:

State your point of order, please.

MR. KING:

Having just heard the hon. member opposite, I believe that he is speaking to Government Motion 2, standing on the Order Paper, which provides that bills other than government bills may be debated on Thursday afternoons.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. Surely an hon. member can quote from any book or any document, and he's quoting from the Speech from the Throne. Surely, we're not going to be confined to the point where we can't even refer to other documents without being called on a point of order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may disagree with my comparison here. I'm entitled to make it the way I see it. I think that nothing interrupts like an interruption, and I appreciate his

6- 46

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

concern, but I would like to be permitted to proceed to make my point.

Now to get to the motion. The Motion 1, now on the Order Paper, moved by the hon. Dr. Horner, and seconded by the hon. Mr. Yurko. I'm still dealing with this motion in relation to the remarks made by the two ministers and the hon. the Premier. I'm taking issue with what they said, and I think that it wasn't called for. I think that, if anything, their own colleagues ought to be concerned as to the lack of concern as to what is intended, and what these hon. ministers are saying it is meant to be. The motion states: "Where a bill has been introduced by a member who is not a Minister of the Crown, and has been given first reading, a motion may be made at any time without notice, when the Order of Business is 'Introduction of Bills', to have the bill thereafter placed on the Orders of the Day under 'Government Bills and Orders.'"

I agree with that wording, and I support this motion. I don't think anybody disagrees with this motion. The main argument here is that two ministers and the hon. the Premier put an interpretation on it that I think is misleading. So I would like to have someone from the government side of the House affirm that this is a motion that's intended, that they intend to give it effect and that it will be meaningful. On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I give my wholehearted support to this motion.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, and in the interests of precision and clarity, I should like to move an amendment to the motion, notice of which I formally gave to the hon. members opposite this afternoon.

The amendment which I move, seconded by the hon. the Premier, is that the motion now under consideration be amended by adding after the word 'time', the following words, 'by a Minister of the Crown,' which would result, Mr. Speaker, in the amended rule reading as follows:

57a. Where a bill has been introduced by a member who is not a Minister of the Crown, and has been given first reading, a motion may be made at any time by a Minister of the Crown without notice, when the order of business is "Introduction of Bills", to have the bill thereafter placed on the Orders of the Day under "Government Bills and Orders".

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, in seconding that motion and having regard to the observations made on the main motion by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, I would like to assure you that I will do what I can to clarify the position of the government on this matter. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I will do it without being out of order. But I am forced by the comments by the member for Calgary Mountain View to relate specifically the motion on the Order Paper with the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, Government Motion No. 1 as amended deals with Paragraph 5 in the Speech from the Throne on page three. And the statement in the Speech from the Throne in paragraph 5 is as follows: "The position and significance of government MLA's who are not members of the Executive Council will be recognized by a very significant innovation: the introduction by, and the responsibility of, such Government MLA's for certain Government Bills which do not contain budgetary obligations."

It was to cover that particular specific that Motion No. 1 was moved. In its original intent it was not to be concerned with the fact that it would be possible for the motion to be made by other

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-47

-----

than a Minister of the Crown. And in explaining that matter, or attempting to for the very valid point that was raised by the hon. member for Highwood, I attempted to explain that although primarily and on a paramount basis it was intended that this motion would concern government MLA's, it was not intended to be exclusively so. However, I became alarmed at the interpretation that was placed both on my remarks and on the motion by the member for Calgary Mountain View, because it became apparent that if one wanted to extend it beyond the original intention, it would be obvious that an obstruction of the basic intent of the rule change would be fairly simple.

However, I would like to inform the members on both sides of the House, particularly the Opposition, with regard to Motion No. 2 on the Order Paper and the comments regarding it, that if, after debate at second reading of a public bill that is not a government bill, there is a feeling on the part of the government and the Executive Council that the merits of the proposal that has been put warrant immediate consideration -- rather than, I think, what can happen in most legislatures, perhaps a delay of a year, of a bill of that nature with the merit that it contains -- may be immediately converted to a government bill. This would mean that even though that bill may have been introduced in this exceptional case by a member other than a member of the government, it still would be possible for a minister of the Crown to make the motion to order the placing of that particular bill as a government bill with the consent of the Assembly. It may be, of course, that the Assembly might not accept that particular motion. And so the view, I think, was very well expressed by the member for Highwood on the previous occasion, Mr. Speaker, that there should be some provision contained in this where a bill presented on the opposition side could, with the concurrence of the House, be placed under Government Bills and Orders is still provided for by the amendment. On the other hand, to avoid the misinterpretation which seems to have developed, judging by the remarks made by the member for Calgary Mountain View, it is imperative that it be clear that this is a matter where the government feels it must control its own business on the Order Paper of the Legislature. And that is the reason for the amendment.

I would therefore ask hon. members to relate 57a as amended to paragraph 5 on page 3 of the Speech from the Throne. Then Mr. Speaker, I am sure in due course we will say that Motion 2 on the Order Paper will deal with the matter raised by the member for Calgary Mountain View which is the paragraph 4(a) of the Speech from the Throne contained on page 3, and which is that a resolution will be introduced to ensure that all members of the Legislative Assembly will have a reasonable opportunity to debate public bills other than government bills proposed and introduced by them in response to requests by their constituents and by other Albertans.

That, of course, deals with another motion and I know I am treading on a line here, Mr. Speaker, in attempting to explain this, but that deals with Motion No. 2 which is on the Order Paper. I don't know if I can be clearer than that, but that is the position that we would like to present to the House.

MR. HENDERSON:

Speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, I think I can assure the hon. member seated opposite that we have no particular objections to this amendment. From our standpoint it is really somewhat meaningless in that we don't expect that the government is going to be particularly gracious about adopting any bills from this side of the House even if we did make the motion. The amendment itself is of no concern to us, but if I were seated on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, I would be concerned about it. Basically I can only conclude that the amendment has been brought in to make sure that somebody in the backbenches doesn't get out of line, introduce a

6- 48

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

private public bill, have it moved and adopted as a piece of government legislation.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, it is of no particular concern to us; we conclude from our position that it is something the government has brought in to keep the ranks of the Conservative party in line. We think this might be a good idea, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am one of those members of the non-executive council about whom, as suggested by the hon. member on the other side, there is an endeavour to bring into line, and so as a result I feel somewhat constrained to enter this debate.

I would suggest at the start that I am somewhat surprised over the attitude of the loyal opposition with respect to this motion, but then as I look back on the 36 years of the position of the past government, I am not really so surprised when I consider the attitude that the past government has had to the members of the non-executive council in this Assembly. But let you be aware of the fact that this will not be a government where those of us who are not in the non-executive council will come into this Assembly to sit on our hands, to read newspapers, to give a speech once a year and collect a cheque and go home. We are here as a government of 48 members; we ran in an election to represent this party from the point of view of being involved, from the point of view of working, and from the point of view of taking an active role in the participation of this government.

I would suggest here and now to the loyal opposition, that they take notice that those of us who are not the Executive Council are here to work, that we are not here to sit on our hands, that we are not here to go into the side rooms to smoke cigarettes and collect a cheque, that we are here to offer the citizens of the province of Alberta full value for their money. I would suggest to the members of the loyal opposition as they sit and criticize or suggest that this motion is one to hamper the so-called backbenchers, that instead you should congratulate the government for taking a point of view that is modern, that is contemporary, that is one which will take advantage of the abilities of the members that we feel we have here tonight. We would suggest to you that the thought that this government is allowing us to present bills and to become involved is not hampering us but is doing a job for each and every one of us so that we will all be able to contribute in a meaningful way to the debates and the activities of this House.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to get into this debate, but when I hear statements from the hon. member for Calgary Buffalo, I think I can't sit in my place and let him make accusations of which he has no proof. He has not sat in this House and I think it is an insult to many of us who have served in this Legislature and served faithfully. This can be proved by the hon. members here who have been re-elected many times by their own constituencies. I think if a man has proof of something like that then there is a good case for action against the hon. member for disregarding parliamentary procedure. We will wait until the hon. member serves a few years and then maybe I'll be able to criticize him then, but I want to be fair to him.

Mr. Speaker, I think when an hon. member gets up in his place and makes accusations on things about which he has no idea -- he was never in the House and all of a sudden he knows how everybody acted for the last 10, 20, 30 or 50 years. I just don't go along with that, and if the hon. members want to vote for this resolution and they all want to make out like they are ministers without responsibilities; this is fine with me. And if it makes them feel



March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-49

any better I think the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc has said it's meaningless, it's a lot of window-dressing, and like a lot of other things we have seen in the last few days, and so as far as we are concerned we are voting for something that doesn't mean anything. But I did get up on my feet to say that the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, I think, deserves to be reprimanded for his actions. He doesn't know anything about what went on and yet he's been in here a week and he knows everything. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. KING:

Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. DIXON:

Most certainly I would permit some questions.

MR. KING:

Since we on this side have obviously been misinformed of the previous practice in this House and since I am aware that the hon. member who just spoke was not a minister of the Crown prior to the election, could he advise us of which bills he introduced in this Legislature which had the concurrence of the Executive Council and were made law?

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, well number one, I couldn't introduce them naturally when I was Speaker of the House, hon. member, and I thought you might know that, but prior to that I have introduced private bills that were passed in here. But I would like to ask the hon. member a question. How many bills have been passed in the House of Commons -- let's forget about this Legislature -- in the past 50 years? I'm just telling the hon. member that as far as I'm concerned it's a lot of window-dressing. After all, we have 22 cabinet ministers and if they can't introduce their own bills then I think, as somebody mentioned yesterday in one of the debates, apparently they are looking for some replacements in the front bench. Why don't they get rid of the ones they don't like and get the boys moved up?

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, a further question. Am I correct in assuming that the crux of the debate in the hon. members mind is really the belief that with 22 cabinet ministers the participation of non members of the Executive Council is unnecessary?

MR. SPEAKER:

With respect for the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands I wonder if we might terminate the question period.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in taking part in the debate on the amendment, I wish to state that this exercise on this motion has certainly been very important as far as the record of the very new Conservative government is concerned. However, remarks I made on the motion were made in the light of what the hon. Leader of the Opposition stated last session with regard to bills he wanted to introduce, and here he projected the view that he was going to bring in something new for all the hon. members, and so he got the mileage out of that statement. Maybe what he states doesn't ring clear to me -- but I would like to know how on earth clause 4(a) in the Speech from the Throne -- how can he indicate that that is provided for in Motion No. 2?

6- 50

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

I think that the whole thing is ridiculous and I have to state that right in the House here I have lost a lot of faith in this man. I used to doubt remarks he made verbally, I used to say does he mean them or not. But now I have to say that I don't trust him even when it's in writing and this is on record now. I have to say that there is a Premier and a government in this province eight days old and I have to say publicly that I can't trust the man any more, with lots of evidence to support it. This is a sad commencement for a government that just got --

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think it is customary in this chamber that the hon. members of either side do not refer to any other hon. members in the words just used by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View regarding trust, and I think he should be given the opportunity to retract those words.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the point of order please? It states here on page 130, rule 154, clause 5 and I'll read it: "It is not unparliamentary to say that a statement is untrue, but it is unparliamentary to say that it was untrue to the knowledge of the hon. member."

I am not saying that what the hon. Premier said was knowingly untrue. I don't know what he does knowingly, but what I am saying is, his views as set out in the Speech from the Throne, and the way he interpreted it in his remarks in his new government, I say they are untrue in my interpretation and it is parliamentary, and I don't think the hon. member is right. I think he is out of order.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I don't usually get up until I get my feathers ruffled, but Mr. Speaker, I believe that on the day of the election the people of this province were taken in by a selling job and now they are trying to do a selling job on us in this Legislature. I feel very strongly about this because I feel that when this public relations firm across the floor from us was telling us about this open government, about the wonderful innovations they are going to bring in here, we really thought that it applied to all the members of this House, Mr. Speaker. But we find that this is nothing but a straight political ploy, a little bit of window-dressing, so that John Doe back in the back benches can go home and say, "Look folks, I introduced a bill and it was passed through the House."

The hon. members on that side of the House, Mr. Speaker, have the opportunity through their caucus; they have the opportunity through those 22 men in the front bench; they added five more just as soon as they got elected because they didn't know what to do with all those fellows to whom they had promised jobs, so they added five more, Mr. Speaker. They have an opportunity through that front bench to present their views, to present their bills, and as I reiterate, it is nothing but a selling job on the people of this province, trying to justify the fact that they are so holy and so great because they are bringing something new into the House.

They have the opportunity; it is in that front bench -- and I have to say to the hon. Premier I think he has done an excellent job of selecting the men in his front bench. The men in his back bench are pretty fair guys too -- not all of them -- and Mr. Speaker, I am waiting for somebody to get chopped in that front bench so they can move the hon. member, Mr. Farran, up to the front so that we don't have to listen to him jumping up and down during question period when we are trying to answer questions.

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-51

-----

Really, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this motion could have been useful, and it could have been used in this House if it had applied to both sides of the House; but the way it is, Mr. Speaker, it is nothing but window dressing and a political ploy. I thank you.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, in dealing with the amendment, may I say that in terms of any motions of bills that I introduce, I suspect that any discussion as to whether the government would pick them up or not is largely academic, so consequently, I am not worried about this from my own point of view. But I do think, Mr. Speaker, that the members of this Assembly, especially those of us on the opposition side, were led to believe that the proposition of open government involved a distinctly new and significant role for all members, not just the members of the Cabinet.

As a consequence, I find that the hon. Premier's remarks tonight are disturbing inasmuch as this is going to be defined, in the main, to government members of this Legislature. I think that is unfortunate because, where it applied across the board, especially in a House, Mr. Speaker, where 74 of the 75 members have a very similar point of view, it seems to me that the government could very well be in a position to gain from the opposition side valuable ideas which could be taken in the form of motions and introduced immediately.

The concept of open government as enunciated prior to the election and as outlined in the Speech from the Throne does have a great deal of merit, but I find that this attempt perhaps, -- if I can use an expression from my own party -- to waffle, on this principle, is something that I regret very much, and in this respect I share the concerns of the members of the official Opposition.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment, it appears to me that the amendment to the resolution is a logical and a sensible addition to this resolution. I doubt whether prerogative for a private member should have the right to move that any bill should become a government bill. I think that is a prerogative that properly under our parliamentary procedure belongs to ministers of the Crown -- those who are members of that government. Otherwise you could have bills moved to become government bills that were completely contrary to government policy. And in that sense I think the amendment made by the hon. Minister of Education and seconded by the hon. Premier is in line with parliamentary procedure as we understand it, and in line with Beauchesne and the House of Commons, whether you go back to the mother parliament or evolve it from the House of Commons in Canada under the rules that we follow.

But having said that, if I may be permitted to speak to the same amendment in order to save getting up again, I believe when you provide special consideration for one group of people, all of whom should be there on an equal status, that this is the beginning of trouble, and the beginning of unfairness.

I taught school for a number of years, and I may have made many mistakes as a school teacher. I looked upon the responsibility of teaching boys and girls as a very sacred responsibility, and one in which I could influence a boy or girl in a really positive or negative way, as the case might be. One of the things that I endeavoured to do was due to a lesson that I learned when I was a youngster myself and saw a teacher who provided favouritism and special consideration for some members of the class as against other members. One mistake I would never make would be to favour any boy or girl over others, because to do so would be to destroy one's effectiveness as a school teacher.

I would like to bring the comparison right into this Legislature. I was unhappy to hear hon. members imputing motives to other hon. members. I don't think that is our responsibility. I have been elected by the people of the Drumheller constituency, and it is my intention to serve them to the very best of my ability, in accordance with my thinking, with my desires, and so on. I can't maybe do the job that the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo will do in his constituency, because he has thinking and ideas of how he can best represent his people. But we can both respect each other and recognize that we are both trying to do the job for which we were elected. And once we impute motives, undesirable motives, then we are getting very close to breaking one of the cardinal rules of British democracy.

I hope we will not continue in this House to impute motives. Take for one instance, reading newspapers; I, many years ago made up my mind that it was not proper to read newspapers in the Legislature, and I think the hon. members of the front row who were here will so verify that seldom have I ever read a newspaper when the Legislature was in session. But I know members who have read newspapers and who provided probably far greater service than I provided. Reading a newspaper wasn't the criterion on which to judge whether they were serving their constituencies well; as a matter of fact in our rules, reading a newspaper is considered acceptable because you may well be trying to feel the pulse of the people and find out something that will make you a better debater or a better member. I personally don't think the Legislature is a place to read newspapers, but I can't condemn those who think otherwise, because maybe they are serving their people as well or better than I am serving mine even though I don't read newspapers.

As for smoking in the Legislature, the rules provide for this in the Committee of the Whole. I don't happen to smoke, so again I have never smoked and put my feet up on the desk, but I have seen quite a few members in this Legislature over the last 32 years smoke too, even while they were speaking. This doesn't interfere with their ability to do the job and I think we have to recognize the right of every member to try to do his job and give him credit for trying to do it to the best of his ability.

When I first read the resolution, and I'm hoping that no one is going to suggest that I'm out of order right now because I'm simply doing it so I won't have to stand up again when the point is carried and it's so close to the main point. When I read the resolution originally, I was very happy. I thought this is right. Here we have an opportunity to introduce a bill that the government may well think is worthwhile, that they have no objection to making government policy. I'm sure the hon. Premier will agree that all of the wisdom is not contained on the other side of the House. Certainly, we should concede the point that we have no monopoly of wisdom either. Good ideas may come from any side of the House, and we should be in a position to adopt these and make them law if they are in the interests of the people of the province, who we are here to serve.

Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat disturbed when the mover and the seconder emphasized that they were discussing, generally speaking, government members. I was disturbed because I think it's contradictory to the parliamentary procedure that has evolved; contradictory in this sense, that once you give some members who are logically backbenchers, whatever they call them, different privileges and different considerations from those who are not members of that particular party, then you are sowing seeds for future trouble. You are sowing the seeds of discontent; you are sowing the seeds of discrimination that may well grow into trees or plants that are going to destroy the very thing we are trying to protect.

I would again say that if the bill is going to be left as it is, and I assume the government is not going to make any further

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-53

-----  
amendments, that when this becomes part of the rules I think it should be taken as it reads; that is, a member, not a government member. I could not support it if we had inserted the word "a government member." I can support it when we say "a member," because when I read "a member," it means a member of any party that the people have elected and sent to this Legislature. He should have equal rights with no difference in regard to his particular stripe. The amendment looks after the other point. Any bill introduced that is contrary to government policy -- obviously no Minister of the Crown will move that that becomes a government bill or order.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say I support the amendment. I think it's the sensible, logical thing to do, and I hope more and more that we can get away from this idea of talking about government members and opposition members. We are all members elected on an equal status, elected to serve our people, and I don't think any government should in any way interfere with our desire to do so.

MR. SPEAKER:

If there is no further discussion, the text of the amendment is that the motion be amended by adding after the word 'time' the following: 'by a minister of the Crown'. Would all those who are in favour of the amendment please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those opposed please say no. I declare the amendment to have been carried.

The motion as amended now reads, "Where a bill has been issued by a member who is not a Minister of the Crown, and has been given first reading, a motion may be made at any time by a Minister of the Crown without notice, when the order of business is Introduction of Bills, to have the bill thereafter placed on the Orders of the Day under Government Bills and Orders." Is there any discussion on the motion as amended?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate on the motion as amended, I have a few remarks that I'd like to make in relation to the debate that has gone on. I must say that I am rather surprised at the amount of confusion that developed with regard to the resolution in the first place. I thought it was made quite clear, both by myself and the seconder, that this, in fact, was an instrument to implement that part of the Speech from the Throne that dealt primarily with those members of the Legislative Assembly that belonged to the government side. I thought I made it clear in my opening remarks that, in fact, this was the indication from this government that we were a government of 48 members, and that we considered that all members, all members of the Legislative Assembly --

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister permit a question?

DR. HORNER:

When I'm finished, Mr. Speaker. We listened to the hon. member become quite confused about this whole area, and I think that he should just remain quiet for a moment and I'll try -- and I say that with some degree of doubt -- to clear up his confusion.

Mr. Speaker, we made it very clear, and have made it clear right along that we considered ourselves a different kind of government in the sense that we were a government of all the members that were elected to this Legislature on behalf of our party. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my view, and I've been a part of a number of caucuses in this place and in others, that this is an extremely historic occasion. There is no other Legislature, to my knowledge, in the British Commonwealth whose governments are based on the British Parliamentary system, in which this move has been taken, and in my view, it is a significant step forward in bringing Legislatures into contemporary times, and into making the legislative process a much more worthwhile one.

When I listened to the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View and the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc try and distort the resolution right off the bat -- the Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, of course, immediately jumped on this; he was going to be able to move that any bill will become government business. Of course, this wasn't the intent --

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's what the motion said!

DR. HORNER:

No, that wasn't what the motion said at all. My hon. friend has had his opportunity to speak, and I think that he should at least have the courtesy to listen for a moment. The hon. gentleman hasn't been here very long, but he's been here long enough, Mr. Speaker, to know that the government has to control the business of the House, the government business, or otherwise it isn't a government. It's as simple as that.

When we saw that there was going to be some confusion in the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite, we didn't want to be accused of saying one thing and doing another. And we didn't want to put the -- [laughter] -- All right. And as the hon. Premier said this evening, we want to make the intent of this motion very clear. We have made it clear, and we didn't want to put the pressure of the decision as to whether or not any hon. member could move what the government business was going to be. As my hon. friend for Drumheller very clearly stated, we didn't want to put the pressure of the decision on the Speaker. It wouldn't have been fair to do that. Therefore, we've made it quite clear.

It means, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the Legislative Assembly who are elected to the government side of this Legislature have a significant role in the legislative process. In my view, as I said in opening this debate, this means we will have better legislation. I for one, haven't been very proud of some of the legislation that we have passed in this Legislature, mainly because of the pressure of time, the pressure of knowledge, and the pressure of these things that are required to have adequate and good legislation that we can pass out of here.

I want to say again that we intend to take advantage of the distinctive qualities and intelligence and abilities and special skills of every one of our members. The hon. members have made some point that there's a distinction between members in this Legislature. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, immediately, that there is. There are those over on this side that belong to the government, and there are those over on that side that belong to the opposition. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, having spent some time in both areas, that they are different. That doesn't mean that they can't, too, play a significant role. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my view the kind of significant role that the hon. members in the opposition can play will depend very significantly on the kind of leadership that

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-55

they get from those people over there who presume to be leaders. I hope that I don't include the Member for Calgary Mountain View in that, or we'll have utter confusion over there for a long time. Because there is some responsibility in leadership --

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I have never considered him much of a leader either, so we're even.

DR. HORNER:

I am not really very concerned about whether the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View considers me in any way because I have disregarded his views for a long time, dating back to about 1962.

In relation to the question again, Mr. Speaker, the question of favouritism one way or another, I want to suggest again that every member of this Legislature, if he is willing to work, whether he is on this side or that, can in fact make an impact on this Legislature. But you can't make that impact if you are not willing to work; if you are not willing to do the research; if you are not willing to apply yourself to the legislative process. In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, what an hon. member contributes depends on that ability and that willingness to sit down and work, and to do those kinds of things that are required to come up with reasonable legislation. As the hon. Premier said, and I can reiterate very clearly, if perchance there should be that kind of legislative initiative over there that is worthwhile, then we as a government are willing to take this step to move it into government business.

I was rather surprised by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican suggesting that this had never been done. Of course it has been done. There have been a number of occasions in the House of Commons where private members' bills have been moved into the government orders and bills, and have been passed as such.

MR. DIXON:

Can you allow a question? Have there been any bills passed in the House of Commons -- this is what you are referring to -- other than maybe a bill such as changing Trans Canada Airlines to Air Canada, that type of thing, but no substantial bill, you know that.

DR. HORNER:

My hon. friend doesn't know it because I will give him another illustration of a very substantial bill to western Canada. And that was in a very effective bill, a private member's bill. Rapeseed was designated a grain, and then became eligible for Crowsnest Pass rates. It has meant several million dollars to western Canada every year since. There have been others, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry that my hon. friend hasn't got the knowledge of history of the Parliament of Canada that perhaps he should have.

Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised that in an attempt by this government to open this Legislature and improve it, to make sure the legislation that we pass is better, is more effective in serving the needs of the people of Alberta, that we should have had to get into an acrimonious debate. I suggest to you, sir, that was the direct responsibility of the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View and the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc who failed to accept this resolution in the spirit in which it was given.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion as amended, moved by the hon. Dr. Horner, seconded by the hon. Mr. Yurko, now reads: "Where a bill has been introduced by

6- 56

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

a member who is not a Minister of the Crown and has been given first reading, a motion may be made at any time by a Minister of the Crown without notice when the order of business is 'Introduction of Bills' to have the bill thereafter placed on the Orders of the Day under 'Government Bills and Orders'."

Would all those in favour, please say 'aye'. All those opposed, please say 'no'. I declare the 'aye's' to have it. The motion as amended is carried.

Private Members' Public Bills

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I propose the following motion to this Assembly, seconded by the hon. Mr. Werry:

Be it resolved that rules, orders and forms of proceedings of the Legislative Assembly be amended as to section 13 by the addition of the following subsection:

6. On Thursdays at 4:30 o'clock, Public Bills and Orders Other Than Government Orders shall be called and debate limited to 20 minutes per sitting day on each bill dealt with thereunder. At the expiry of 20 minutes, the debate shall be adjourned, and if not disposed of the bill shall drop to the bottom of the list under this heading.

Mr. Speaker, the intent of this resolution is to increase the status and enlarge the responsibilities of all MLA's of this Assembly as representatives of Albertans in their constituencies. Each member of this Assembly will thus be given a reasonable opportunity to debate Public Bills other than Government Bills, to propose them and to introduce them in response to requests by their constituents and well as by other Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very privileged to introduce this resolution because it follows in my mind the spirit of open government which is part and parcel of the Conservative government of Alberta. It means to me that members from both sides of this House can make great contributions to government over the next number of years. It can be made by every MLA equally. It means a greater role for the MLA, a greater amount of involvement, and as my hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture and Deputy Premier said: "All it takes is a little bit of homework; all it takes is a little bit of involvement, a willingness to work." I know and everybody in this House knows, Mr. Speaker, that no one has a monopoly on good ideas and no government has a monopoly on good ideas. This has been amply demonstrated over the last number of months and the last few years in the government changes across this country.

It means to me, Mr. Speaker, that a situation that existed over the last two sessions of this Legislative Assembly. In 1970 there were 22 bills introduced by the Conservative opposition, and I am certain if they had been investigated by the then government, many of the ideas could have been introduced as government legislation in the following year, and they would have served to the advantage of all Albertans. But they weren't. There were 22 of them. They died on the Order Paper. The following year there were 21. I recall my frustration, much the same as many of the members here I am sure who are new, feel the frustration of a Legislative Assembly that doesn't seem to listen. Well this government is prepared to listen, it is prepared to accept new ideas from all sides of the House.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, to be brief. I believe this is a resolution that should have very little debate. It seems to me it is one that will fit the bill from every member's standpoint. It gives then, Mr. Speaker, an opportunity for every MLA



March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-57

to debate any bill, regardless of which side introduces it. This opportunity was not heretofore available. It will enable a sponsor of the bill to receive the view of other members on both sides of the House as well as from constituents in all parts of the province.

There may be some difficulty in accepting the 20 minute limit, but I would suggest that the members in this House reflect on what has happened in the last week, and how brief the hon. members on this side of the House have been in making their presentations and what tremendous contributions they have made to the proceedings in this Legislature. So I have no difficulty with the 20 minutes -- in fact I think it's ample. Since these resolutions or bills will be rotated, they will come up again and again and there will be ample time over the course of a session for them to be debated.

One final point, Mr. Speaker, this resolution is presented in the general interest of the public and for their ultimate benefit. Public bills in my view reflect public interest and therefore there should be an opportunity afforded for their debate, irrespective of who sponsors them. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK:

Will the hon. minister permit a question? Hon. minister, will you be introducing all 42 of these bills now that you are sitting on that side of the House as you presented them when you were sitting on this side of the House?

MR. DOWLING:

That is not a bad question, Mr. Speaker. I have looked over the ones I introduced, and I believe they won't be introduced by me, but I am positive they will be introduced by another member on this side who has the responsibility for the areas that I dealt with. I would suggest the ones I introduced, yes.

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this motion I do so with a great deal of pride, because I have been privileged to sit on the other side and have been a member who has sponsored a number of public bills and orders other than government bills and have had the dismay of seeing them die on the Order Paper. But fortunately sitting on this side, this year, Mr. Speaker, I will see those bills come up again as government bills. Previously, before these rule changes were suggested, the private member who sponsored the bill was limited to a very brief explanation as to the intent of the bill, in principle only. When this resolution is passed, Mr. Speaker, the member sponsoring the resolution or the private bill will have 20 minutes to debate the pros and cons on moving the principle in second reading, and in that 20 minutes I'm sure that a lot of significant ideas can be expanded upon which were not the privilege of the members of the opposition in years past.

If I might just enlarge upon what is the procedure in the House of Commons -- and I think this would be relevant to bring it up at this time for the hon. members' attention -- when private bills are brought to the clerk in order to provide for the equality and equity of a member, who, say, has one bill in preference to one person who may put in ten bills, there is a draw at which the Whips of the respective parties and the clerk are in attendance and the bills are then drawn out of the hat in the order in which they will be on the Order Paper. So that each member is assured that his bill will receive 20 minutes during the session in order to explain the full principle of that particular bill. I would also like to suggest that if a bill is worthy it can be referred to a standing committee of this House and be brought back in as a government bill. Mr. Speaker, I think this gives all members the opportunity to play a much more

-----  
meaningful role within this House than has heretofore been possible in previous sessions.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to rise to speak to this particular motion. I would say at the outset that if the movers, seconder and the hon. the Premier when they spoke in the last motion had stated the case as clearly as the mover of this resolution, some of the debate wouldn't have taken place because I note the mover of this motion went out of his way to say that the motion is clearly intended to be applicable to all private members of this House. I had some fears that the only private members in this House were on this side of the room. However I'm pleased to see that we have finally got onto an intelligent note when discussing these issues.

Mr. Speaker, while we welcome the spirit in which this motion has been introduced, we have some concerns about the precedent that this particular motion is going to establish. We are quite aware, Mr. Speaker, of the regimented manner in which the hon. members opposite speak 15 or 20 minutes on motions. Once this particular motion is on the Order Paper, and the words of the mover of the motion, themselves gives us some cause for concern or confirmation of our concern, this becomes a prelude to reducing the debating time on other procedures, motions and debates before this Assembly. Now this may or may not be a good thing but I think it is one of those things, if we are going to take those precedents, Mr. Speaker, that in order to avoid the type of debate we got onto on the last motion that it's hardly desirable to go through the usual procedure we have had in past years, in revising the rules of the Assembly, to get a committee of representatives from both sides of the House and to settle this thing in a sensible fashion, rather than making a partisan issue out of it, such as was the case on the previous motion.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, the fact that the speaking time is reduced to 20 minutes does itself establish a precedent, and needless to say we accept, none the less, the spirit in which it is offered. But I think, logically, Mr. Speaker, again from the debate on the previous motion, it is to be expected that the majority of the private bills or public bills to be introduced by the non-members of the Executive Council seated opposite are basically going to be adopted as government bills. I won't say this will be entirely the case all the time but I think we can logically assume that this is going to be the case most of the time. This particular motion is thus going to apply to bills introduced by the opposition.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that if the time allotted were coming out of the government time, the time that is allotted by this House for government business, I could understand a little bit better the reason for putting a 20 minute reservation on it. But, Mr. Speaker, it is coming out of private members' time, and during that time when we are normally debating resolutions, during which, Mr. Speaker, we are governed by the rules where it allows 40 minutes debating time. While I am not necessarily recommending that a person speak 40 minutes -- that's the rule. Consistent with the last part of the motion, a resolution then drops to the bottom of the Order Paper. I think, Mr. Speaker, since the matter is establishing a precedent in this House, and since the time is coming out of private members' time, it's not coming out of government time, it is mainly going to be related to bills introduced on this side of the House -- a further factor, I think somewhat contrary to the comments of the mover, who indicated that 20 minutes would provide an opportunity for everyone to speak. Of course, if we get 20 or 30 private bills on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, it isn't going to provide an opportunity for debate because I suspect in many cases the mover will take the 20 minutes, and I think there are going to be cases, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, where the members of the government are going to want to have the opportunity of responding at

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-59

-----

the time the bill is introduced and spoken on. At least during second reading, they may want some time to debate the private public bill itself. So we suggest Mr. Speaker, that limiting it to 20 minutes is not really going to afford an opportunity for all members on both sides of the House to deal with the private public bill. We therefore suggest, for the consideration of the members, Mr. Speaker, an amendment which would read as follows:

That the motion be amended by striking out everything after the word "called" in the second line of the main body of the resolution and the following be substituted: "and debate on the bill be governed by the rules of this Assembly that are applicable to private members' resolutions."

This will maintain uniformity with the procedures that are established in other debates in the House. If there is then some consideration to be given by a joint committee to an examination of the rules of speaking time, then, Mr. Speaker, this particular speaking time and these motions can be examined at that time -- as can be the speaking time of the regular resolutions, and speaking time during debate on government legislation, as, for example, the Speech from the Throne. But we suggest Mr. Speaker, that the change in the policy should conform to the practices which are now in effect by themselves and the procedure for the private public bills for debate should be comparable to those in existence.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker -- oh, pardon me, Mr. Speaker, the motion is seconded by Mr. Wyse.

MR. SPEAKER:

The amendment is that moved by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc and seconded by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff that the motion be amended by striking out everything after the word 'called' in the second line of the main body of the resolution, and substituting the following: "and debate on the bill be governed by the rules of this Assembly that are applicable to private members' resolutions."

Is there any further discussion on the amendment?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I think that insofar as the resolution does deal with the private members' afternoons, with one of them, that it's not unreasonable to feel that the amendment, as proposed, if it's felt by members on the other side that this would better enable them to have matters which they raise properly discussed, then we certainly have no serious objection to having the amendment go through.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any further discussion on the amendment? Then taking the amendment as read, would all those in favour of the amendment please say 'aye'.

HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those opposed, please say no. I declare the amendment carried.

And now the resolution as amended reads as follows: "On Thursdays at four-thirty o'clock public bills and orders other than government orders shall be called and debate on the bill be governed

6- 60

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

-----  
by the rules of this Assembly that are applicable to private members' resolutions." Is there any discussion on the motion as amended?

Would all those in favour of the motion as amended please say aye? Those opposed say no.

[The motion as amended was carried.]

Media in the Legislature

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am enthusiastic about proposing this motion to the Assembly, seconded by the hon. Mr. Getty.

Be it resolved that the broadcast media under the guidance and advice of Mr. Speaker may record and/or broadcast by audio and/or visual means the proceedings of the Alberta Legislature conducted in the Legislative Assembly,

and that newspaper photographers may take still photographs of the Assembly while in session under the guidance and advice of Mr. Speaker,

and that persons in the galleries of the Assembly may take notes or tape record the proceedings of the Assembly under the guidance and advice of Mr. Speaker.

Your Honour, I think this resolution represents a unique precedent in Canada. I believe it will move the Alberta Legislature, it will move this Chamber into the new media communications age which began in the 1950's, and I believe it will add two new dimensions -- that of radio and television -- to the existing coverage of the Legislature by the press which, of course, has existed for about 200 years.

A few definitions at this point, Mr. Speaker, may be useful. The word 'broadcast media' as used in the resolution, of course, includes both radio and television. On three parts of the resolution, the words 'under the guidance and advice of Mr. Speaker' are inserted, and the purpose of that, Your Honour, is to insure the day-to-day concerns of the members regarding this new direction of allowing radio and television to move into the Assembly. The day-to-day concerns which may be expressed when the recording starts, when the broadcasting starts, can be reflected through yourself, sir, to the media who will hopefully take advantage of this. Many details will arise and I suggest that some vehicle should be set up to mirror what the Assembly is thinking when this is going on, especially during this first session.

'Record and broadcast' -- those words of course, relate not only to live broadcasting which would be possible under this resolution, whereby what is happening could be broadcast over radio and television throughout the province from 2:30 to 5:30, but also to 'recording', meaning delayed transmission, also meaning all of what is carried on in the Assembly or edited portions of what is carried on in the Assembly, such editing not to be carried on by the Assembly or any member, but by the media who do the recording. The words 'proceedings in the Assembly' Mr. Speaker, of course, refer not to the standing and select committees, but do include the committees of the whole House.

The history and background of this concept, Mr. Speaker, has been quite varied. One proposal which was made and rejected in Britain was that there be a separate television channel financed by the government with complete and continuous transmission of legislative proceedings. That has been virtually ruled out by most

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-61

legislators because of the high cost and the probable low interest of viewers in many such proceedings.

The plan in many jurisdictions in the Commonwealth, in any event, that has emerged as the most likely is for some form of television program approximately 15 or 30 minutes in length giving an edited and condensed account of the day's debates or the week's happenings, the editing again to be done by the media that did the recording, either radio or television.

In other countries, it is interesting to note that a study by the Interparliamentary Union in December 1968 revealed that out of 50 countries surveyed, 29 transmit live or recorded radio broadcasts of daily debates, and 20 of those 50 transmit live or recorded television of the daily debates. Complete coverage for sittings is very rare, but has existed in New Zealand since 1936 and Australia since 1946, and the Philippines have done so for many years on radio. Denmark has full coverage on radio and television continuously. The more common use in most jurisdictions is the radio broadcasting of extensive extracts in the peak listening periods, often with commentary to supply continuity.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the electronic media are inevitably entering into more and more areas of life, and citizens are coming to rely more and more on them for news and information. Television and radio, together with the press, in my view are increasing as the media through which people are informed of sporting events, cultural events, and political events. I think many citizens have budgeted their time to watch television and listen to radio in addition to reading newspapers and magazines. I don't believe that society or this Legislature can really gain anything by ignoring the natural evolutionary advances in the process of communication.

I would like to deal with, and suggest, five reasons why it is appropriate, useful, and contemporary at this point in time to allow the radio and television media into this Chamber. I believe that the general electorate, firstly, will be better informed about their Legislature, brought closer to their representatives here and the machinery of government. I think televising proceedings will enable many more citizens to see now what only a handful of people can see, because in areas outside the City of Edmonton, citizens can seldom take the time to come to visit the Legislative Chamber.

Secondly, I think that the bond between the electorate and the elected will be strengthened, and that interest in the Legislature and its proceedings will be stimulated. Basically I think, Mr. Speaker, that people have a right to see their government in action and television and radio permit that might to be realized more fully than by simply the newspaper reporting.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I believe that television and radio coverage will bring a more healthy balance of power within the governmental structure, because it will strengthen the parliamentary democracy. I think that the power and authority and prestige in the democratic process should be here in the Legislature in this Chamber where it belongs. Accordingly, I think it can be strongly argued that it is in the Legislature's own interest to allow its proceedings to be televised and have radio coverage.

Fourthly, I believe that television and radio coverage will lead to many long overdue reforms in organizing parliamentary procedures that may be out of date or anachronistic, which slow down the functioning of parliament, because I think that many Albertans, on seeing the procedures on television and hearing them on radio, will get in touch with all of us in this Chamber and say, well what on earth is that procedure for? Wouldn't it be better to expedite matters in this fashion? I think we will make the Legislative Chamber more relevant, modern, and contemporary. If we don't do

this, it is going to be irrelevant and that is the danger point, I suggest, in democracy in this province.

Fifthly, I believe, contrary to many others, that if we have television and radio, members will be less likely to engage in ungentlemanly behavior, such as boisterous reactions or inappropriate interruptions or camera catching exhibitionism. It has certainly been shown that the presence of television at most public gatherings, in North America in any event, has demonstrated that when that camera is there, people behave more humanely and they argue more reasonably. I think it would, Mr. Speaker, encourage members to speak more succinctly and more briefly, and more to the point, rather than by making long statements. I think we would have more points of view, and more information, and all hon. members would, perhaps, do more homework to have all sides of a question put forth in a succinct and precise way, knowing that the media are watching and listening, and that perhaps a couple of hundred thousand people would be listening to what they are saying.

A word about the technical aspects. There is space, of course, in this Chamber, with the size of modern cameras, for television cameras to be on the floor or in the gallery. I'm told the lighting is probably adequate as it now stands, with modern film techniques, perhaps with a bit of beefing up. What would be involved with the radio situation, would be, I think, plug-ins in the gallery, and perhaps other feeds, whereby either the newspaper reporters or radio reporters could plug in to the sound system of the Chamber here, and then have their live actualities to broadcast directly from what has been said by members here in the Chamber.

A word about cost, I think, might be useful in view of the remarks of the hon. Member for Drumheller last night, regarding cost. What this motion proposes is that there not be any payment of government monies, either for camera equipment or for buying any kind of time. It simply means that the Chamber will allow such radio and television media as may wish to do so, to come in at their own expense and broadcast when they want, what portions they want, at the times that they want. It is not setting up a provincial government broadcast network, not buying hardware, and not buying time on private or government channels.

I would like to deal very briefly with some of the arguments which have been suggested against the concept of having the media in the Assembly, Mr. Speaker. Firstly, I have alluded to the question of editing. Someone said that there must be control by the Chamber over editing. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have, and parliaments have, for two hundred years, trusted the fairness and accuracy and propriety of the press gallery, of the journalists in doing their own editing, regarding their interpretation to newspapers of what goes on in this Assembly. I believe that has been done properly and sensitively over the years, and I can see no reason why the same parallel cannot and should not apply to the radio and television media. I do not believe it is right or proper in any way for this Chamber or any committee of it to be considering the editing or censoring of either radio broadcasting or television coverage of this Assembly.

It is interesting to note that the BBC program Today in Parliament, which is broadcast in London from 10:45 to 11:00, has been produced since 1945 without any serious complaint levied at its objectivity or professionalism.

The subject of defamation has been raised by those who would oppose or wish to delay the implementation of television and radio coverage. The British House of Commons in 1966 conducted a study, and the Attorney General there expressed the view that he felt that members who made defamatory statements in the House, covered by the radio and television, would probably be protected by absolute

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-63

-----

privilege if such statements were included in a broadcast of the proceeding. There is certainly a very real question as to whether the media doing the broadcasting would be protected. Indeed, it may well be that they are not, but on the basis of this resolution, that would be up to the media to decide. They have the risk, and they will take the risk, and will make such changes in the views and the judgment of their editors to delete matters which might be defamatory. But there is no problem regarding members of the Assembly who, I would hope, would not be making defamatory statements at any time. There is no danger in cutting away the traditional authority of members to speak their minds in this Chamber, because they would still have that absolute privilege, irrespective of by what means or what vehicle what they said and did was transmitted from the Chamber.

Before I conclude, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with the latter two sub-paragraphs, very briefly, of the resolution. Newspaper photographers taking still photographs seems to me a logical extension which follows naturally from the resolution; if radio and television are to be allowed in the Chamber to cover movement, then newspaper photographers using their cameras should be allowed to take still photographs. Again the caveat of this being done under the guidance and advice of the Speaker is inserted, because I think that all hon. members will agree it would not be possible or agreeable to any members of this Chamber to have seven or eight press photographers round the Chamber flashing flashbulbs during the debate. For example, the guidance and advice of the Speaker in this case, I should think, would include that such still photographs could be taken from perhaps one place in the galleries without flashbulbs -- films are available whereby flashbulbs would not be needed -- and without any noise, so as not to disturb any debate going on.

The last sub-paragraph dealing with persons in the galleries of the Assembly taking notes or tape recordings relates to a prohibition which derives from a 300 year old resolution of the British House at Westminster. At that time it was felt, 300 years ago, that no person in the public galleries or the speaker's or members' gallery could make any notes. Indeed, I think, many citizens of this province who have been interested in making a few notes in the galleries of this House have found that they have been stopped from doing so. It seems to me that is an anachronism, especially if we are going to be considering the introduction of radio and television. I could see many groups, for example, in the education field who might well be interested, during a discussion of the education estimates or a bill on education, coming into the Chamber and in the galleries, taking notes as to what is going on and the comments and the debate back and forth, so they could report back to the senior people in their organizations.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to adopt this motion. I think it means and will mean that public business will be conducted in public in the widest possible way, adding two dimensions. It will be a modern and contemporary step, and I think a new direction in tune with Alberta in the 1970's.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I always look forward to the Legislature and enjoy it so much is that I can sit in my place and hear the hon. member who has just spoken and admire the quality which he adds to debates in this House. The ability which he exhibits and his clearness of thought and speech, Mr. Speaker, are certainly something that all of us could pattern ourselves after.

As the hon. Member for Highwood mentioned the other day, television and the broadcasting of the debates in the House have been

discussed in this House before. So I hope that members recognize that there has been considerable discussion of the matter.

I am particularly pleased today to second the motion, Mr. Speaker, because the other night, when digging through some files, I found one of the first private members' resolutions that I ever had the privilege to move in this House. And the intent of it was remarkably similar to the one moved by my hon. colleague, Mr. Hyndman, today. I noted, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Hyndman seconded my resolution at that time, so I am happy to return the favour this time around.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the Assembly should be eager and anxious to make sure that the public business of Alberta be conducted in a manner to allow as many Albertans as possible to view it and understand it. I recognize that our Assembly is open and there are people in the galleries tonight and people can come in. But to be realistic, every elected representative here knows that some 90 per cent, I imagine, of our constituents have never been in the House and probably will never be. Probably the percentage is higher in the rural areas. But in times of rapid change, such as we are now experiencing, I think one of our biggest problems is to convince the people that our democratic system that we operate under is capable of handling the problems that we face now and will face in the future.

I think the people must understand and have faith in democracy. Understanding can only come from knowledge. And I believe that the opening of our procedures to the broadcast media and the other innovations as outlined in this resolution will increase the awareness and knowledge of Albertans and the manner in which their province is governed. So I think we should approach the resolution enthusiastically, not defensively, not negatively as has happened in the past. Members should note that there is nothing compulsory about this. If we approve this resolution, we are merely making these proceedings available. There is nothing to say that anybody is going to use them. I happen to hope that they will, but they don't have to.

Also, as laid out in this resolution, we may come across problems. I don't think anybody believes that in our first attempt we will come up with something perfect, but it is a start, and though we have problems and as imperfect as this may be, I think we should give it a try and not, as has happened in the past, prejudge it and decide that it is something that we should be afraid of. I might also say that I think the members should resist very strongly any attempts to have members of this Assembly edit in any way the coverage of our proceedings. I think that we should allow the media people to cover and show the portions they wish. I have the feeling that they will demonstrate their awareness of the need and the responsibility which they will have to use their communications with understanding and tact. I think it is necessary for them, not only to show the Legislature in operation, but to explain as they show them the traditions and values of the system, so that they will be appreciated by people who are seeing them for the first time.

There was one line in this old speech, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to say again today, because it is still truth. At a time in our history when Albertans can marvel at the view from the moon in their own living rooms, it is absurd that they are not able to watch their own Legislative Assembly.

Our political system only works well when there is open debate in an open form. Surely then we are closer to reaching the ultimate perfection when as many citizens as possible can see the process in action and judge the results.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.



March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-65

-----  
MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate it is not my intention to take very much time. I simply want to say from our side of the House we agree with the sentiments that have been expressed by the mover and the seconder. I believe that they have outlined very well the situation as it will exist if this resolution is supported, and I certainly want to say that, as far as we are concerned, we are prepared to support it. I hope that the suggestions made by the hon. Minister of Education may in fact always prevail, that it will not in any way lengthen debates, that it may not cause any member to rise in his place to take part in a debate simply for the hope that he will be appearing on TV, because I for one certainly have to agree with what has been said. I do not believe that the coverage will be any greater in length than it is now, and of course, it will be more directly related to the actions and the deliberations of the House in that it will be an actual coverage of statements that are being made in the House.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is a key statement in the resolution itself that all hon. members ought to keep in mind when giving consideration to the resolution. I refer, of course, to the statement in the second paragraph, I believe, where it states "under the guidance and advice of Mr. Speaker." I want to say Mr. Speaker, that in the short term of office that you have had, you have demonstrated to my satisfaction that it is your intention to operate as a truly independent speaker guiding the operations of the House to the best of your ability and insuring that it is conducted according to the rules laid down by this Legislature.

I am sure that the coverage of the Legislature itself will be subject to your close scrutiny, and that you will be ensuring that the coverage is such that it does not break or in any way contravene any rule that we may lay down for ourselves. So to me the key to the resolution is that the total operation will be under the guidance and advice of yourself. Having said that Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that we are prepared to support it and if there are problems that arise I am sure that they can be dealt with later.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take two minutes of the hon. members' time and I would like to say that I am entirely in agreement with the resolution, and would also like to compliment the hon. Minister of Education for his eloquence. If I ever need a lawyer, heaven forbid, I may ask for his services. But I would like to make one point on the concern of editing, and I would like to quiet any fears that any of the members in this Assembly may have, if they are worried about editing by the media. I happened to see an article in Time Magazine, it was last fall I believe, when the issue of editing was discussed in the Senate, I believe, in the United States. When this was brought up, the media made this statement: "We have had people looking over our shoulders for many, many years and those people who censure us are the general public", and they felt there could be no one more critical, no one more observant than the people who read the material. So I want the members of this House to feel that there is no danger that the media will in any way be slanting or taking things out of context, because they must answer to the general public, the people whom they serve. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say very briefly that I completely support this motion. I want to congratulate the government on introducing it; it seems to me that the arguments for it have already been very capably expressed. The most important of these in my view is the vital necessity of providing communication to as wide a number of Albertans as possible.

As the members of this Assembly know, some years ago the Legislature in Saskatchewan permitted coverage on the radio of the proceedings of that Legislature, and having on quite a number of occasions travelled in the Province of Saskatchewan, I can testify to the fact that the legislative broadcasts were very popular, and that they contributed to a greater depth of public understanding of provincial issues in that province than would have been the case had these programs not been carried. Because I think, Mr. Speaker, we are all concerned about having the communication of the very important debates that take place in this Legislature go to the people of Alberta and that we have an alert and aware populace. I think that we can all support this excellent motion and I am very pleased to do so today.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few observations with regard to this resolution. I appreciate very much the spirit of the response by the members opposite and the Leader of the Opposition. It is an historic first, truly, for a Legislature to present such a motion and hopefully receive the concurrence of the members. There have been experiments in other provinces, which the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has referred to, that have dealt with the matter of radio coverage, and there have been experiments with regard to television. This is an open-ended resolution. I am sure there are going to be days when all of us, perhaps even you, Mr. Speaker, will say, "that was quite a thing we did back there on March 9th, 1972", but on the other hand I think that's what the evolution of the democratic process is all about and we are prepared to move ahead with it.

I am sure, as members have mentioned, there are going to be times when certain details will concern us. I certainly wasn't insensitive to the odd one on the timing of the reading from the Speech from the Throne. I'm sure there will be others, but as the leader of the Opposition has pointed out, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure too that you will be able to deal with them in a very fair and proper way.

But more than anything else I feel it is absolutely critical in this day and in this era that the democratic process is used for the resolving of disputes. Naturally we become acrimonious from time to time, but at least our disputes are in fact resolved here in this Assembly and not in the streets. For our society to succeed, our democratic institutions must succeed and they must grow and they must have a growing degree of goodwill and support by the people. I feel very, very strongly that the broader the communication and the understanding throughout a province as widespread geographically as this, among people from all corners of it, the better it's going to be for our democratic traditions. I'm delighted with the response on the other side, and by all members, and I wholeheartedly endorse this step towards open government.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the mover of the resolution wish to close the debate or shall I put the question?

May I say before I put the question that if the question is resolved in the affirmative, we may be in this House on an historic occasion, namely, the occasion of the taking of the first photograph of the House while it is sitting as a House. I think I should mention this before putting the question in case some of the members wish to adjust their boutonnières, or put some additional books on their desk, or otherwise prepare themselves for that high standard which the mover of the resolution mentioned would be in effect once the media were admitted into the Chamber. I took it that I might exercise my discretion, which is intended to be conferred on me by

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-67

-----  
this resolution, even if it were to take effect simultaneously with the passing of the resolution.

[The motion was carried.]

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, this may be a signal honour for me and this may be one of the rare occasions when I get my picture in the paper.

Following the traditions that have been outlined by Mr. Kennedy in his column, I will now draw to the attention of the hon. members that today in the Pincher Creek-Crowsnest constituency, and this is for the benefit of these members that come from the 'frozen noses' areas of Alberta, the temperature was 60 above, Mr. Speaker. Think of that.

I have become overwhelmed by the attention that the hon. Minister of the Environment has been giving to a large number of practical affairs. It would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, since his promotion to the right side of the Legislature, that he has certainly eaten of the tree of knowledge. I am concerned certainly as to the pollution control measures that may be advanced, and which have been alluded to in the Speech from the Throne, which certainly, Mr. Speaker, could possibly have a rather serious effect on the basic industry of my constituency which is coal mining.

I suggest that a practical approach can go a long way in many areas where pollution represents, actually, the non-use of a certain product. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to a product which we have in rather a profuse amount in the Crowsnest Pass, that being residue coal from mining operations which still has probably a higher British thermal unit than that which is presently being utilized at the Wabamun Plant. Capitalize this unique approach -- total utilization, the cleaning up of the environment by the utilization of these huge piles of slag, the fly ash being used as an additive to cement, the power developed in the Province of Alberta and shipped outside of the province -- a unique opportunity for employment. This is the type of approach that I would like to see towards the solutions that we must be faced with in the future in regard to pollution. Possibly even the water of the residue, or the heated water, the discharged water from one of these plants could be used on a supplementary basis to field a hot-house industry. Ten years down the road or possibly sooner the opportunity of getting fresh vegetables in the Province of Alberta will be less and less.

I didn't check the clock, Mr. Speaker, but I'm very well aware that there would be no way that I could possibly deal with several important subjects, so I will forego this at this time and enter into the tradition that now has been established by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview and the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell and quote from that eminent Conservative the great Disraeli. I'm sure all hon. members agree that what Mr. Disraeli would say about the Conservative party would carry great weight and great truth and I herein for the edification of the hon. members quote verbatim from Disraeli. This is in regard to conservatism and here is a quote:

"Conservatism disregards perception, shrinks from principle, disavows progress, and having rejected all respect for antiquity, it offers no redress for the present and makes no preparation for the future."

Mr. Speaker, I like this guy and I would like to make another quote. No, I had better not. Do you really want to hear this one?

6- 68

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

---

HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. DRAIN:

"A Conservative government is an organized hypocrisy."

I don't think he was thinking right at that time, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sorry I quoted this one. And, Mr. Speaker, from Disraeli: "No government can long be secure without a formidable opposition."

Mr. Speaker, we all bend ourselves to that task. Thank you.

MP. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to add my congratulations, as others expressed in the House, to your elevation to the position of Speaker of this House. I know that in your past experiences of good judgment and fair play you will indeed give this concept to both sides, regardless of party affiliation.

Mr. Speaker, may I just take a few moments to pay tribute and my respects to our leader, the hon. Premier of this province. It is indeed a pleasure to have worked for him for the leadership of this party, but it certainly is a greater pleasure to work with him for the betterment of all people of the Province of Alberta.

Our Premier is a dedicated man who considers the well-being of the individual person first. This is the reason for Bill No. 1, the rights of the individual. It is people before party, it is open government for many years and those who have found the armour of the previous government impregnable can see the difference. Yes, they can feel it.

Referring further to the Speech from the Throne regarding the role of new MLA's being involved in the structuring of government policy in open government, certainly does not appeal to the hon. members on the other side of this House. I am just wondering if the party on the opposite side of the House, just one year ago, figured that the other side were second-class citizens also.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed one of the finest Throne Speeches on record and perhaps not all the goodies could be wrapped up in the same package. But now -- and I stress this for the members on the other side -- I mean now, the senior citizens of this province, the mentally and physically handicapped and those engaged in agriculture, will at least be top priority for our government.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency that I represent is the oil capital of Alberta; it is also the oil capital of the world. In my constituency there are approximately 6,000 oil wells and all the heartaches that also go with it. The oil capital of Alberta was for Alberta what Fort Knox was to the United States government. I must say that it was only a stepchild in the member family. May I stop for just one moment and say why a population of over 4,000 people have never enjoyed a provincial building in that area. They have scattered the provincial buildings of the treasury branches, the liquor stores, all over town and I would certainly enjoy, Mr. Speaker, if this government would see fit to put one provincial building in an oil capital of Alberta that has contributed so much to the provincial treasury in the past and is still contributing now.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I think probably the hon. Minister of Public Works must have read my mind. We have no senior citizens' home, we have no nursing home, but you know just today I received a letter from the mayor of the town asking me to turn the sod tomorrow at five o'clock, and since I wrote this speech I must apologize, we now have a senior citizens' home.

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-69

-----

The hon. Member for Smoky River said that he had no roads. Well, we have two highways, but you know the one leading to the north is so narrow that when they paint the green lines they run out on the grass, and I wish the hon. minister would correct this in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that we desperately need out there is a nursing home. In a population of 20,000 people our nearest nursing home is approximately 100 or more miles away. As I said before, this is a young town, the average age in the town is 28 years or less, but we have in the surrounding communities pioneers who have pioneered the soil, who have given their all in the development of this community and yet we find we have no home for them. We have a 50-bed hospital which is full to capacity with senior citizens and certainly people who have lived out there since 1904 are deserving of a nursing home or access to an active treatment hospital that is not full at all times.

There is another problem in our rural areas and I imagine it exists in all the areas of this province. I can only blame the former Minister of Municipal Affairs -- I'm sorry that he is not here in this House. Well, somebody said maybe I'm not either. Mr. Speaker, there is just one word to be changed in The Municipal Government Act that would permit this to happen and may I read that section, sir: In The Municipal Government Act, that is Section 188, subsection (2) it now reads:

"That any municipality or rate-payer requiring or requesting such services shall pay for such use of machinery at a rate not less than the rate paid by the Government of Alberta for rental of similar equipment."

Now you will note that the one word we would have to change would be from 'shall' to 'may', and we will give the municipalities and counties powers to give our senior citizens in the rural areas the much needed services that they are certainly desiring.

Mr. Speaker, it is encouraging to note in the Throne Speech the importance given to the secondary road system of this province. Although the former government brought forth the secondary road system in 1971, they only found it convenient because it was an election year, and I stress that point. We in rural Alberta are crying for needs for better roads, and as the hon. Member for Smoky River mentioned just yesterday, he was complaining of the muddy, gumbo roads. We have children getting on the buses at five and ten minutes after seven, in the summertime, especially last year in May and June and July when the roads were impassable. I wonder how many of you gentlemen in this Assembly here would want to send your children out at five minutes after seven to catch a school bus, when in all probability that school bus would never come to your gate until about ten to eight because of the conditions of the road.

Mr. Speaker, we are thankful to the former government for the many bridges that were constructed within this province, but now we have bridges and we have poor rural roads. Some of the locations of bridges were poorly planned, and of course, some were built for political reasons. I will refer to one only, Mr. Speaker. Just west of the City of Edmonton, there is a bridge known as the Genessee bridge, and only a rough trail -- well let's call it a road -- leading north and south to major highways. Very few people use this bridge because of the dangerous condition of the road. For all intents and purposes, Mr. Speaker, this bridge could have been constructed in the Sahara Desert, for all the use it receives now. Perhaps the former government should have looked at their counterparts in British Columbia. They built their highways first and then their bridges.

May I refer to the education of our young, Mr. Speaker. Education must be redirected to the training of our younger citizens in trades and jobs that are available, not after Grade XII, but before Grade XII. We have many graduates with PhD's running around, looking for jobs, but who are not properly trained for the jobs that are available. We must begin now to retrain, to take those off social assistance and make them become better citizens of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I extend an open invitation to any member of this House to fly over and examine and get a bird's eye view of one of the finest recreation areas west of the City of Edmonton. I refer to the Brazeau dam and canal. Mr. Speaker, words cannot describe the utter desolation and the mess created by the former government by flooding the area before the forested area was cleared. Mr. Speaker, if the people of this province had received five cents for every tree which grew in the flooded area, the people of Alberta would have received something of cash value, and the cost of clean-up in 1959 would have been less. A beautiful recreation area was made desolate by foolish planning and the cost of clean-up now will be ten times greater. And to consider that the people of Alberta under the former government gave an interest-free loan for over \$12 million to create this mess. To destroy one resource for the sake of another makes no sense, Mr. Speaker. It is distasteful for me even to mention the havoc created without supervision in the frantic haste for the discovery of oil in the southwestern part of my constituency, having no regard for the salvaging of forest products, making huge cuts in hills, drilling seismic holes which are still flowing fresh water ever since 1954 and 1955. The erosion has already taken its toll in the forming of huge craters and gullies. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we do not have to destroy all the resources to get out one single resource. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we should leave the land in much better condition after we have left this earth than we found it before.

Let me mention one vital concern of the people engaged in agriculture in my constituency. This was mentioned before in the House on March 6th by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview regarding the rural electrification in our area. We find the extensions in my area run at a price for one and a quarter miles of construction \$4,436. In the same area -- and I refer to the Buck Lake area -- one and one-half miles at \$5,600.

Can you imagine, Mr. Speaker, just four or five years ago we had construction in the same area running at \$2,226 for a mile and a half. This price has gone up 100 per cent within the time period. Wire has gone up 32 per cent and the price of poles and other material has gone up only 14 per cent. Where are all the costs? Are they labour? We would like to know.

Farmers are now living in an agricultural community without the benefit of power and it is high time that we as a government investigate and take proper measures. Regarding agriculture, there is still a farmer policy in effect which is detrimental to the farmers of Alberta. This is a farmer policy of the past Social Credit government.

Mr. Speaker, may I at this time draw to your attention, and to the attention of this Assembly, that we propose to help young farmers and we are asked to pay 11 years in advance for the service rentals received from various oil companies. If this is not bad enough, Mr. Speaker, we charged them interest on it also. So, in other words, by the time the young farmer receives title for his property from the Crown, he has paid for 16 years advance rental. The well may have been dry many years before this. And I say that we in effect, are still carrying out policies which are not policies of the Conservative government, but are policies of the Social Credit government, and I think it is high time that we change this policy.

March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-71

-----

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude -- and I am going to make this as brief as possible -- there is a matter of great concern to me. And concern I think, that the hon. members of this Assembly heard and saw on television tonight, about the agricultural community that is surrounded with the discovery of oil. I believe you all saw it on television tonight. This happened in my area.

I have before me, Mr. Speaker -- and I was hoping to table this, but I will do this later in the session, maybe next week, because I have only two copies. This disturbs me. As you well know the hon. Minister of Agriculture has asked me to head up the new Surface Rights Act. Once this matter hit The Journal and the people read it I have never rested since.

I have been in every part of the province. I have listened to farmers, and to landowners. I thought it was localized, but I never knew that it was province-wide.

Before me is a summary of an award made by the Right of Entry Arbitration Board, and the award is to two farmers very close and dear to me. They live only seven miles apart, and one of the farmers who I have previously mentioned to the caucus had over 200 head of cattle before a pipeline went through. This man - and I saw it - was feeding his cattle in June because of the pipeline right-of-way. The mud and mire had cut him off so that he could not get his cattle into the other pasture. He was pasturing hay land that should have been preserved for winter use.

I will leave them here and table them later on in the session, and you will note the total allowance that this man received, You can imagine, you men that are cattlemen, you know what it means to disturb the breeding cycle of cattle, especially range cattle.

Also, I'll mention as I have before, that it is still the policy of the former government. You know, and the evidence is here, that the Crown only received in this one award, we the people of the province of Alberta are supposed to take care and handle our natural resources in the best interest of the people of Alberta. I'm sorry that this was not done by the former government and there is ample evidence of that. In my search through how we handled the Crown leases, I found them running from \$17.17 per year to a high of \$50. Right next to me, Mr. Speaker, there is a quarter section which is Crown land, and I'll give you the location. It is the NE 1/4 of Section 29, Township 50, Range 6, West of the 5th Meridian. Agriculture surrounds the whole section, and the people of the Province of Alberta receive only \$54 annual rental for one well site and battery site.

I think it is time that we, the people of Alberta, bring into focus and proper perspective the values of land that the people of the Province of Alberta own. That is their deserving right. I don't know why the former government carried this policy. In this award stated on page 23, this was government leased land, it was grazing land. The government got \$25, the farmer that operated it got \$42.50. Now gentlemen, this is no excuse. I think the people of the province are entitled to just revenue from their natural resources. I had thought in the past two or three months that the board had done a wonderful job, but in telephoning this evening, I have about 18 more. I attended a meeting at Heisler and I'm sorry that I told them the wrong thing. I told them that if they could not settle with the company concerned they should go to arbitration. Mr. Speaker, I must have made a mistake. I hope that we can correct this mistake, because I can see that they did not take proper consideration all the matters that pertained to the facts of arriving at a proper decision. And Mr. Speaker, I can only recommend in this House that we ask for the immediate resignation of the board and that we put in a board that is willing to look after the affairs of the people of the Province of Alberta, and the affairs of the companies concerned to

6- 72

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 9th 1972

-----  
give a fair verdict in rendering decisions to the surface landholders.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I don't consider the hon. members on the opposite side as second-class citizens. Mr. Speaker, they were entrusted for 36 years with the job of governing, and although the electors on August 30th decided to terminate their office of tenure, I still expect them to come up with constructive ideas and programs to help us govern more effectively. Let us hear your concerns, your ideas, and your problems. I am sure that our Premier, and we on this side in open government, may accept some of your recommendations and make them useful and effective for the people of Alberta. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, as others have done, I wish to congratulate you sir, on your election to the high office of Speaker of this Assembly.

I represent the important constituency of Lethbridge East. After the last redistribution, the City of Lethbridge was split into two, Lethbridge West and Lethbridge East. The constituency of Lethbridge was ably represented in this House for 27 years by John C. Landeryou, and I am sure we all wish him well in his retirement.

The City of Lethbridge is the third largest city in Alberta, and I believe the most modern and progressive little city in the whole of Canada, and will compare favourably with any city its size in the world. We want to keep Lethbridge and southern Alberta moving ahead, along with the rest of the province. To do this we must complete Highway 3 from Medicine Hat to the British Columbia border. Highway 3 is one of the more important links in the highway system of western Canada. There are other highways in southern Alberta that require improvement, such as those leading to the United States border, as well as those leading to our provincial parks and our national park at Waterton.

In the City of Lethbridge we have the first public college established in Alberta, and the third university known as the University of Lethbridge. Both these institutions are doing important work. We have dedicated staffs in both institutions, and I sincerely hope that the Premier and his government who have called for decentralization of our colleges and universities, will assist in the development of our college and university rather than the overly large institutions in Calgary and Edmonton.

This brings me to another important matter, the decentralization of industry. I am sure we can all remember the promises of the Conservatives to do something to save the smaller communities. I say that Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Fort Macleod, and other centres in southern Alberta fall in the category of smaller communities that require more industry to keep us moving ahead to provide employment and add to the wealth of our area. We will all be watching closely and await the plans of this government to bring about the improvements in the field of industrial expansion for our smaller communities that I have mentioned.

I am pleased to note that the government has decided to build a new senior citizens' home in Lethbridge. This home was promised by the Social Credit government and I sincerely hope that accommodation for single rather than double occupancy will be provided in the new home, as surveys show that is what is required.

I am prepared to support measures to improve fishing and hunting in this province, and hope that encouragement of the tourist industry will at least equal the efforts and success of the Social Credit government in this important field.



March 9th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

6-73

---

MR. ANDERSON:

Many promises were made by the present government and I refer to one in particular. That is the reduction of the education tax on homeowners. It is generally recognized that municipal taxes are continually rising, creating a very real hardship for many taxpayers. The Conservatives promised to come to the assistance of the taxpayers in the municipalities, and we are waiting for this very anxiously. I have brought to the attention of the government some of the projects we want carried out and indicated the needs of the government to carry out these promises made to their electors. I sincerely hope the policies outlined in the Speech from the Throne will not suffer the same fate of many promises made by the members of the government to their electors of the province. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Are all the members agreed to the adjournment of the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now stand adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier has moved that the Assembly adjourn until tomorrow at 2:30 o'clock. Are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 10:15 pm.]

