

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Friday, March 10th, 1972

[The House met at 2:30 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. ALAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and through you to the Members of this Assembly the 30 Grade VII and VIII students of the Fox Lake School. These students are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Ed Whitenet and his wife Doreen, bus driver Mr. Willis Wilson, the teacher aid Esther Noskey and councillor aid Norman St. Arnot. I might mention, Mr. Speaker, that this group has travelled over 600 miles to be with us this afternoon. They travelled by air for the first 60 miles to Fort Vermilion and by school bus from there to the City of Edmonton. I would like at this time to have them stand and be recognized in the Public Gallery behind me, the students and staff of the Fox Lake School.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and through you to Members of this House 24 students of Grade VI from the Mayfield School who are here this afternoon with their teacher Mr. Myslicki. Would they please stand and be recognized?

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table 75 copies of a pamphlet explaining the Beverages Containers Act as well as the regulations. There has been some requirement for this pamphlet and this pamphlet was distributed to all merchants who retail carbonated soft drinks. I would like each member to have a copy.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the public accounts of the Province of Alberta for the year ended March 31, 1971 of the former government. When the Public Accounts Committee of this Legislature is formed I will make a motion to refer same to the Public Accounts Committee of this House.

DE. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual reports of the Public Service Pension Board there are three reports, Mr. Speaker, the 24th Annual Report of the Public Service Pension Board pursuant to the Public Service Pension Act for the year ended March 31, 1971, the 9th Annual Report of the Public Service Pension Board pursuant to

7-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

the local authorities Pension Act for the year ended March 31, 1971, and the second Annual Report of the Public Service Pension Board pursuant to the MLA Pension Act for the year ended March 31, 1971.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table Sessional Paper 53, required under Section 10 of the Mines and Minerals Act, and also Sessional Paper 52, required under Section 406 of the Coal Mines Regulation Act. Those meet statutory requirements, Mr. Speaker, and in addition to those I also table a copy of the 1971 Mines Division Report.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table our annual report for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1971 for the Alberta Hail and Crop Insurance Corporation.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Irrigation Rehabilitation

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has the Minister of Agriculture had any discussions with the Federal Minister of Agriculture in regard to rehabilitation of irrigation projects?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'm wondering if, in any of the discussions with the federal minister, has there been any suggestion as to how they might handle the transfer of the Bow River Project East Ltd to the provincial administration. I'm certainly not going into the details of administration, but just simply wonder if this is part of the discussions.

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as my hon. colleague, the Minister of the Environment, indicated yesterday in the House, this is part of the negotiations that are now going on between this government and the federal government in relation to the entire matter of rehabilitation of irrigation in Alberta.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Is rehabilitation contingent upon the province taking over the east block of the Bow River Project?

DR. HORNER:

Well, again, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this is part of the negotiations and as my hon. colleague said in the House yesterday, in fact, we don't want to tip our position prior to the conclusion of the negotiations with the federal government in this whole matter. I'm sure that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is very much aware of the consequences that are involved in the question of the Bow River Irrigation District, and I'm sure that he's also aware that the reason that the former government never finalized any agreement with Ottawa in relation to the rehabilitation of irrigation districts was the fact that they couldn't resolve this particular question.

March 10th, 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

7-3

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly am not in a position to get into any debate on it, as you can appreciate, and I don't intend to. My purpose is to try and get information. I'll get to the question, hon. members. I am still anxious to know whether or not this is the key to whether or not we will have irrigation rehabilitation?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, this, of course, isn't the key as to whether or not we're going to have irrigation rehabilitation. Not at all. But it's one of the factors in the negotiation with the federal government in relation to the entire matter of irrigation rehabilitation.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Minister of Agriculture saying then, that this subject could be set aside and irrigation rehabilitation will be dealt with strictly on its own?

DR. HORNER:

That's one of the alternatives, Mr. Speaker.

Film Censorship

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. I see, according to the headlines in the Edmonton Journal, which proves, Mr. Speaker, that there are some advantages to reading a paper, that a very prominent film, A Clockwork Orange, has been censored by the Alberta Film Censor Board. According to this article the minister will now be deciding if the film can be seen or not. Will this be his policy always?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. member and I read a rather different edition of the Journal, or we have read it differently, because it is not the intention of the minister to view the films and to make judgments. For the information of Mr. Speaker and this Assembly, what I have done is to approve an appeal which has been asked for in the case of this film, and so pending the decision of the Appeal Board which will view the film within a number of days, this is all the information I am privileged to give this Assembly.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to know, really, if this is going to be the policy, that when anything controversial comes up, the hon. minister will be making the decision or will the board still be making the decision?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the Censor Board makes the decision, and the provisions of the Amusements Act are such that the decision can be appealed, so that is the procedure that's in effect and will take place with respect to the film which was banned.

7-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

Provincial-Municipal Communications

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Industry. Would the minister outline the methods used to communicate government industrial policies to municipal area industrial development departments and city industrial development departments?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd be very pleased to inform the House of our progress so far in communicating our industrial policies to the various municipalities and districts in the Province of Alberta. We have set up, and are proceeding to set up, and continuing to set up the following. In Southeastern Alberta, we have set up an advisory council on which we have asked for participants in that area who are interested in industrial development. That area centres around Medicine Hat and we have had meetings and struck a committee there. We have also organized a similar operation for Southwestern Alberta with headquarters in Lethbridge. We have had meetings with the municipality of Wetaskiwin and in Wetaskiwin and Leduc and we are setting up similar councils there. We have had preliminary meetings with the City of Edmonton and with the City of Calgary and their industrial officers, and we are setting up similar councils there. We have yet to organize Northern Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. Minister of Industry would explain why no letter was sent to the industrial co-ordinator in Grande Prairie concerning the provincial government's responsibilities under the September 1st, 1971 Canada-Alberta Second Spatial Area Agreement.

MR. PEACOCK:

Well, I have had no request, at least it hasn't passed my desk, Mr. Speaker, in this regard, but I can suggest to the hon. member that the reason that I have not been in touch with Grande Prairie in this regard is because that particular situation was designated as a special area, and information was supposed to be communicated by the federal government to that effect to the town of Grande Prairie.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Has the Department of Industry at any time inferred to the Grande Prairie Industrial Development Co-ordinator that they were not eligible for grants under the Industrial Incentives Program passed by this Legislature last year, because they were in the Federal Incentive Area?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, to answer that question: to my knowledge, no.

MR. NOTLEY:

One further question, Mr. Speaker, on this matter. Is it not the policy of this government to communicate immediately to people affected by provincial responsibilities what those responsibilities are?

MR. PEACOCK:

Yes.

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-5

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

Homeowner Grants - Mobile Homes

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. How will mobile homeowners receive the homeowner grant to offset new licence fees set up in the last Session of the Legislature?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, this is a question that has apparently caused a lot of concern in a lot of areas throughout the province. This is new legislation, and it works like this. The mobile homeowner will pay his entire fee for the year and upon submitting proof of residency in the unit for 120 days of the current taxation year, will be eligible as is any homeowner for the homeowner tax discount.

MR. FARRAN:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, will any senior citizens living in mobile homes on guaranteed income supplements, get the \$150 rather than the \$75?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the guidelines for the homeowners tax discount to which the hon. member referred, apply equally to mobile home residences as well as ordinary home residence.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Pearce Estate Fish Hatchery

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Premier. Sir, having regard for your numerous statements concerning support for free enterprise, would you like to advise this House if you have any intention of allowing the private sector to become involved in the investment and operation of the new Pearce Estate Fish Hatchery in Calgary?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that certainly is not a question to which I have addressed my mind. If the hon. member would like to make it a written question, it certainly would be something I would give some thought to, and would be a very useful matter for us to consider.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Premier, would you not agree that private enterprise investment and involvement would give incentives to produce fish food locally, which are now purchased in the United States, to produce fish eggs in Alberta and to involve industry in research and development, a goal that has long been advocated by the Economic Council of Canada?

7-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests is in a position to do so, perhaps he might want to respond to that question.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have a specific response to the question; the principle suggested by the hon. member seems like a sound one and I certainly welcome his suggestions for my benefit in that area as well.

MR. FARRAN:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, wouldn't the first objective of the new fish hatchery be to produce fish to stock our depleted streams which at the moment are very, very short of fish?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, that would be an extremely high priority of this government and of my department.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, is the government intending to produce a fish called 'conservative fish' that is not permitted to open its mouth?

Livestock Dealers

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if you could comment on the Joe Fitzgerald case in my constituency. For the benefit of the members of this Assembly, this has to do with a livestock dealer who has absconded with a considerable amount of money and caused a serious chain reaction.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, he brought this to my attention almost immediately and we have had investigators in the area. The latest report I have is that there is a substantial amount of money involved, most of it involved with other livestock dealers. There are very few individual farmers that have been hurt.

On the other hand, the question of the whole area of policing livestock dealers has been reviewed and I have now asked my department to set up a meeting with the livestock dealers generally, so they could form their own association and deal with some of the matters of policing themselves and also providing bonds for themselves so that the producers in Alberta are not hurt by this kind of activity.

MR. COOKSON:

Supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker, could you advise the hon. Minister of Agriculture with regard to a fund that is available to dealers who are caught in this chain reaction and how soon they can recover funds from this collective fund.

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is, of course, the fund that has been established into which dealers have been paying over the years. The question of when this can be paid out is a little difficult to answer

March 10th, 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

7-7

because, my department informs me, it's matter of completing the investigation and finding all the necessary relevant matters that are involved here. Also, as I understand it, the matter is now before the courts, and once these are resolved and the total nature of the claims are available, then claims can be entertained against the fund.

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. member advise whether an effort will be made to bring this individual back to our country and face the charges as such?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't have that kind of power but my recommendation to my colleague, the Attorney General, certainly would be to do just that.

MR. COOKSON:

May I make a suggestion, Mr. Speaker, in the form of a question? Would it be possible to direct a plane through Australia and Spain and bring back Fitzgerald along with Mr. Geoffroy and his bride?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture a question, and I may have misunderstood an answer. Is it the intention of the government to have livestock dealers formed into an association -- that they would form themselves?

DR. HORNER:

It's the intention of the Government, Mr. Speaker, to enable the livestock dealers themselves to have a much greater input into policing themselves than they had in the past. One of the ways in which that could be done is the question of forming an association that they then could police themselves, and also enter into the negotiations with the bonding companies to have substantially larger bonds than have heretofore been required.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question; would the Minister of Agriculture then be prepared to grant them total powers of control as to who should be a member of that association?

DR. HORNER:

I'm not prepared to grant them anything of that nature, Mr. Speaker; I said that was one of the areas we were looking into to see whether or not these people couldn't have some input into policing their own operations. We don't intend to allow them to have an association which would, in any way, affect the primary producer and we do think that some of the role of looking after these affairs should be done by these people themselves.

7-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

Unemployment Insurance Cheques

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour, regarding the delay in the issuing of unemployment insurance commission cheques. Has the minister received any indication that Ottawa is making any progress in getting these distributed more quickly?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the matter of unemployment insurance as a federal program, at least three ministers, notably the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, the Minister of Health and Social Development, and I, personally have been in touch with Ottawa regularly. There are difficulties getting the cheques out. I should give this information, that an unemployment insurance application is that kind of thing; it's an application for insurance as would be any other kind of application for insurance. Mr. Mackasey, at that time had given me the information that the application takes a week to process, three weeks to get to the computing centre and at the end of four weeks the cheques should be in the mail. I am sure that every member in this Assembly knows from his own representations in his constituency that that is not the case and that the cheques are behind. There are severe problems with the computing centre.

Whatever the problems are, the facts are that the people are not getting the cheques on time. We are making every effort, Mr. Speaker, to get these out to the people by influencing Ottawa. You know that people who have not the money to wait for the unemployment insurance have access to welfare and that the Unemployment Insurance Commission returns this kind of fund then to the Department of Health and Social Development.

Summer Jobs for Students

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation? Has the government completed any programs for new jobs for students this summer?

MR. SCHMID:

In reply to the question, yes we have and it should be announced very shortly as to what the entire program will entail. Three ministers are involved in the program, the hon. Dr. Hohol, the hon. Mr. Dowling, and myself.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in addition to that, is the government providing grants to set up employment agencies in such places as the University of Calgary, University of Alberta, Alberta College, etc?

MR. SCHMID:

The forthcoming budget will reveal all the information the hon. member desires.

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-9

Soft Drink Containers

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of the Environment. Looking at the brochure it reminded me of the question -- has he or anyone in his department considered uniformity of soft drink bottles so they can be re-used, as beer bottles are?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, it is not our intent to get into the business of dispensing soft drinks or in any way to affect the business, except to have those in the businesses be responsible in connection with litter control, resource recycling and the segregation of litter in their own operation.

DREE

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. I would like to ask the question, what topics will be discussed with Mr. Marchand on Monday?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, there will be a great number of topics discussed with Mr. Marchand. I would prefer, Mr. Speaker, because it is a very complex matter and we are talking very broad concepts of the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, and how they will affect our province in the future, that the member allow me to reserve the complete details of our discussions with Mr. Marchand. But I would be happy to discuss the matter with him after we have had our meeting, if there is anything that I think would be advantageous for the House to have.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Spirit River-Fairview and then the hon. member for Taber-Warner.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Industry. In answering a question I posed earlier in the question period, the hon. Minister of Industry informed the House that it was up to the federal government to convey to the City of Grande Prairie, the provincial responsibilities under the Canada-Alberta Special Area Agreement of September 1st, 1971. The federal minister in charge is quoted in yesterday's Grande Prairie Herald Tribune as saying that it's up to the provincial government to convey to the City of Grande Prairie their responsibilities. I wonder how the minister would reconcile what seems to be a very clear difference of opinion between him and the federal minister in charge of DREE?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would pleased to read that article and take it into consideration and report back to the House, sir.

7-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

Potato Marketing

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Hon. Minister, have you or your department any plans which would assist the Alberta potato growers with marketing problems for the 1971 crop?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have been investigating market opportunities for some of the crop that has been both processed and is in storage. We have also been giving consideration to a program of credit assistance to the potato growers in southern Alberta, because of the serious situation that the 1971 crop has left them in, and I would hope that within the next few days we will be able to make some announcement in that regard.

MR. D. MILLER:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Hon. minister, would your plans include the Taber and Vauxhall granule plants? I understand they have a whole year's supply of canned potatoes, powdered potatoes and if they were to close down - which they have already given notice that they intend to - it would put about 200 people out of work.

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are aware of that and this is why we are making an intensive effort to try and move the product that they now have as inventory, to allow them to carry on in the next year.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Calgary-McCall and then the hon. member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

Treasury Branches

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Sir, would you like to give us an indication of the government's position in regard to the Treasury Branch programs in this province?

MR. MINIELLY:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question from the hon. member for Calgary McCall, our government intends to expand the role of the Treasury branches and to increase the effectiveness of the Treasury Branches in the development of the Province of Alberta over the future years.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am very happy to hear this. And also have you taken into consideration the number of branches in Edmonton as compared to Calgary? As you know, there are seven branches in Edmonton and only five in Calgary, and it is my hope sir, that you will give consideration on a priority basis to the City of Calgary.

I would also like to ask for your consideration for the implementation of Treasury Branch service, particularly in an area in the east of Calgary McCall.

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-11

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question, again I would say that the Treasury Branch service throughout the province is being reviewed in terms of its effectiveness and in terms of the development of the Province of Alberta. Certainly consideration will be given on a broad basis to the proper provision of financial services throughout the Province of Alberta.

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary question to the hon. minister. Have you or your government considered possibly asking for a federal charter to convert this to, say a Bank of Alberta, the same as in British Columbia?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, the economic planning committee of Cabinet is reviewing this and I think that the question is hypothetical at this stage.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I understand that the Superintendent of the Treasury Branches is about ready to leave that service, and I was wondering if the government was in a position to announce who the new Superintendent of the Treasury Branches is going to be?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to that matter, we're not in any position today, or at this time, nor do we anticipate for some weeks, to be able to respond to the question by the hon. member.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. Provincial Treasurer aware of the fact that treasury branches are charging 8 3/4 per cent on loans for community organization projects, compared to 7 1/2 per cent that is charged by the chartered banks? If so, what steps will be taken to rectify the situation?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview's question, I have received some reports in this regard, and have this under consideration at the present time, certainly with respect to the matter you're referring to specifically, and other matters which we are investigating.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest has been very patient.

Game Damage

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, if he has now reviewed the game damage situation in my constituency, and also can he inform me as to what corrective action his department is prepared to take?

7-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have. The hon. member brought this rather urgent and serious situation to my attention on Wednesday in the question period, and I promised him that I would take immediate action, which I have.

The snow conditions in that area of southwestern Alberta are the worst in some years, and it is indeed the case that there has been some elk damage inflicted on farmers' haystacks in the Beaver Mines, Burmis, Lundbreck, and Cowley areas, and also by two fairly large groups of deer nearer to the town of Pincher Creek. I've asked for a report on the physical condition of the game; the deer are very good, the elk are getting to the point where it's easy to tell that spring is here. So the situation now stands, that if the weather had not broken -- and at nine o'clock yesterday morning it was 46 degrees and in the sixties yesterday afternoon -- so as to clear some of the ridges that the elk will move back to now, particularly on the southern slopes facing the sun, we would be into a problem right now. But the weather has relieved us of the problem at this moment. However, if we should get another serious snowfall on top of what we already have, I'm prepared to do an immediate helicopter survey of the game location and the feed supplies for them and if the situation is severe enough, I'd be prepared for a helicopter hay drop.

MR. DRAIN:

Supplementary Mr. Speaker and point of privilege Mr. Speaker. I appreciate very much the instantaneous type of reaction that I have received from the hon. minister. However, there's one particular point that has not been touched on. That is the position of those people who have incurred considerable financial loss because of a situation that was above and beyond their control and in which they had no means of properly protecting themselves. Further, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure there were also many cases of humanitarian consideration insofar as the game is concerned. I therefore suggest and request --

MR. SPEAKER:

Question please.

MR. DRAIN:

The question is, Mr. Speaker, will the hon. minister take under consideration the possibility of some remuneration in serious damage conditions?

DR. WARRACK:

I'd be very happy to answer that, Mr. Speaker. The situation is that in terms of the stacks that have been damaged it has so far only been from the sides of the stacks and not on top of the stacks. After the presence of the animals -- and all farm people will know what I mean -- on the stacks it destroys the hay for further use for cattle because the cattle refuse to eat it. My report is that this has not happened and so it's not so serious as was thought to have been the case.

The hon. member from Pincher Creek-Crowsnest is also right, however, that there is no such thing as a game damage fund to cover this kind of problem and I think we'd probably be in a position to agree that that is an area lacking in the proposition that we've taken over here in the new government. I'm considering ways and means to try to devise a solution to that problem, not only as far as elk and deer are concerned in southern Alberta with heavy snowfalls, but also in terms of the kinds of problems we've also run into in other parts of Alberta, particularly with wolf damage.

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-13

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this a supplementary?

MR. DRAIN:

Yes it is, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know how I could say thank you to the hon. minister?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Edmonton-Kingsway.

Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social development. Is it true that the Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission has been revised and revived to make it more functional, more serviceable, and more responsive to the needs in this important health area for the province of Alberta, in this area that has been grossly neglected by the previous administration?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I should thank the hon. member for having given me notice of that question. The situation is that the new direction of priorities in the Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission will relate partly to budgetary matters and will be discussed in the House in due course. The manner in which the commission was originally set up also caused us to conclude that some change in structure should happen which will be dealt with as a legislative matter later in the session, and in the meantime the existing commission has been shored up with the three new appointments that were made last week.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this a supplementary?

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Yes it is, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if the hon. minister would advise us if the hon. member gave him the answer to that question too?

Buried Telephone Cable

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Vermilion-Viking followed by the hon. member for Lethbridge West.

MR. COOPER:

I have a question for the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. When will buried cable be installed in the Vermilion area?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for giving some advance notice on this question. The 12 companies in the Vermilion exchange have all agreed and approved the buried cable program and will be going underground this year. There will also be an addition to the Vermilion exchange and the exchange itself will become operational on May 28, 1973.

7-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

MR. COOPER:

Thank you, hon. minister, a supplementary question, possibly as technical in nature and if you don't want to answer, just shake your head at me. Is it possible to rearrange exchange boundaries once the buried cable is installed?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to that, once the cable is underground it is not possible to rearrange the exchanges, and if exchanges were to be revised it would have to be done probably two years in advance because there is a year's planning and engineering that goes into the whole field before the underground cable-laying actually takes place.

Mental Health Facilities in Southern Alberta

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Are you aware, Sir, of the acute shortage of mental health facilities in Lethbridge and southern Alberta, and do you intend to make some provisions in the budget to alleviate this very serious situation in southern Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question of the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, the situation in Lethbridge is changing and will continue to change with regard to the facilities that are available there. I don't want to take more than my share of responsibility for the shortage as of today, if the hon. gentleman opposite will appreciate the significance of what I am saying in that respect. And Lethbridge, along with the other communities in the south, and indeed throughout Alberta are receiving -- and I say this sincerely -- the most conscientious consideration to make sure that the facilities are as balanced as can be within budgetary limitations.

Rail Freight Rates

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has there been an increase in rail freight rates in the past month?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, it's not a matter that I have been involved with. I could refer the question, however, to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce, who is involved, and handles the transportation matters.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to answer that question. Yes, there has been an increase.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question. Did the provincial government make representation to the CTC on this particular matter?

MR. PEACOCK:

Yes, we have, Mr. Speaker.

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-15

Optometrists and Medicare

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican and then the hon. Member for Innisfail.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister without Portfolio responsible for the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission. In view of a recent press release from Ottawa indicating that the optometrists will be included in the cost-sharing agreement with the provinces, could you advise what effect this will have on Medicare premiums in Alberta?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would thank the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen for giving me notice of this, because the only information that is out at the present time is in the form of the news item which he brought to my attention. I subsequently checked with the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission. They have had no information, and neither has the Minister of Health and Social Development. I might say, though, to the hon. member that this was discussed in broad general terms last September in the general discussions which were carried out with the provinces concerning the new changes and the new proposed financing agreements in cost-sharing, and optometry was one of the items. And also, we feel sure that optometry will be one of those things which gets the first consideration. However, until we know what the proposal is, and have a chance to assess it, we can't possibly indicate to the hon. members what its impact will be on the people of Alberta. However, I would like to assure you that my colleagues and I, as well as the members of the Health Insurance Commission will be very interested, and we will be looking after the best interests of the people of Alberta, financially and socially and health-wise as well.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, and then the hon. Member for Innisfail.

School Board Tax Notices

MR. DIXON:

I thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is it the minister's intention to recommend to his government the implementation of the Alberta School Boards sending out their own tax notices to property owners for tax levy for educational purposes?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, that's a question that has been under active consideration in the public arena for at least two years. I think the hon. member will recall a news release by the president of the Alberta School Trustees' Association following that association's meeting with the cabinet early this year, in which the proposition was put to them, and their president accepted very readily. Hopefully, if and when such legislation were to be introduced, it would be permissive and we would hope that municipalities and school boards could co-operate in sending out under one mailing separate tax notices.

7-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

Bowden Institute

MR. DOAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to our hon. Attorney General, with regard to the Bowden Institute for junior citizens who have gone outside of the law. I understand there are about 108 staff in Bowden looking after about a similar number of inmates there, or junior citizens. Is there a chance that this government might make more efficient use of the facilities there?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure there is more than a chance of our making more efficient use of it. I'm sure we will, but just how has not yet been decided upon. As I've said earlier, we are reviewing the operation of the Bowden Institute.

MR. DOAN:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. Attorney General tell us why the juvenile section was moved out of Bowden after, I understand, over a half million dollars was spent on a boarding school there, which is now abandoned?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, that decision was made some time ago, and I don't know the reason for it.

Village Lake Louise

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. Has your government or anyone in your government at any time been asked either orally or through some other communication by the federal government or by any of its representatives for the Alberta Government's position on the proposed Village Lake Louise Development in Banff National Park?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could answer the hon. member's question. There has been some consultation on the matter of the Village Lake Louise project between ourselves and the federal government. It was to determine whether or not we would be appearing before the hearing, and, Mr. Speaker, we were able to advise them of the position of the government, which has been published and stated both inside and outside the House, that we would not be.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister in charge of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. In view of the widespread interest in this issue, in view of the very large number of briefs that are being presented, has the government changed its mind now with respect to urging upon the committee hearings in the City of Edmonton?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I recall the hon. member raising this idea earlier, and I think this is a reasonable suggestion, if there appears to be that need. By the way, I understand that the hearings have been extended through tomorrow, one additional day, and they are sitting each night to roughly 10:30 or 11:00 p.m. But if it appears there

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-17

still is a need, we will be happy to raise that with the federal government.

Welfare Voucher System

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. What is the present status of the voucher system in the province?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this matter, as a result of representations I've received since last fall, has been made the subject of a review within the department. I'm happy to be able to convey to the House the same indication I gave to people who presented briefs in this regard -- that I thought it was possible, having regard to the timing as being the only difficulty remaining -- that the voucher system could be substantially or completely done away with. Plans in regard to the progress of that will be made available to the House as soon as they are in a position to be finalized.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of the removal of the voucher system, what other programs will the hon. minister implement to care for any types of abuses?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question involves a presumption of abuse in the final words of the question, and as well treated my answer, which was a tentative one, as being final, and he based his question on that. I think that the only answer I am prepared to give at the present time is that the system has been under examination to be replaced and that the replacement and the safeguards in respect to any abuses will be adequate when that is done.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. minister again. What will be done with the monthly allowable income to welfare recipients? Is it your intention to increase it?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is the subject of examination at the present time. There is no policy that I am able to enunciate to the House on that today.

MR. SPEAKER:

I regret that the time for the question period has passed.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Grain Shipments

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I have just a short announcement in regard to the statements coming from Ottawa by the hon. Otto Lang in relation to the delay in wheat movements through the ports on the west coast and the general delay in the handling system of grain on the prairie provinces.

As the House is aware, my colleague, the hon. Minister of Industry, has been in Vancouver very recently. Other members of my department have also had an opportunity to survey the situation and as the House might recall -- those members who were here four years ago -- this was an initial resolution that was brought in by us four years ago. As of this morning, my colleague, the hon. Minister of Industry, and myself, have addressed the following letter to the hon. Mr. Jamieson, the Minister of Transport, with copies to Mr. Lang and to Mr. Olson, as well as copies to our colleagues in the other prairie provinces. I would like the indulgence of the House to read the contents of the letter.

"Dear Mr. Jamieson:

As you are very well aware, the tie-up in shipping through the mountains to British Columbia, and the delay in loading vessels at the coast, has had an adverse impact on Alberta's agricultural economy. This situation has been worsening over the past few years, and it is now apparent that if we are going to increase our export sales to any degree over the present levels, we must make a major concentrated attack on transportation and grain handling problems in our west coast ports. I believe that the situation has been studied and looked at enough, and it is now time to move in a major program on a number of fronts. We would like to suggest the following:

(1) That bulk unloading facilities for grain, and two transfer elevators be constructed at Roberts Bank without delay.

(2) That the capability of the elevator companies to move rail cars into position to unload at their terminals in the port of Vancouver, be completely upgraded so that a greatly increased number of carloads can be moved into those terminals.

(3) That a major port development in Prince Rupert, long overdue, be implemented immediately.

(4) That the feasibility of constructing a rail link between the Canadian National or the Canadian Pacific and the Pacific Great Eastern at Lilloett, British Columbia, be examined. The aim would be to bypass the slide areas which have hampered the grain movement so much this winter, or alternatively, to explore the use of the Burlington Great Northern Railway in the United States.

(5) That any subsidies paid to the railways in relation to hauling grain be paid by way of the provision of new 3,000 bushel covered hopper cars to be used in their grain fleets.

(6) That the inland terminals in Alberta be put to much greater use in assembling grain and moving it by unit train to the coast. Additionally, that an inland terminal be constructed at Grande Prairie.

(7) That the stopover charges levied against grain moving through inland terminals be eliminated. We appreciate that discussions will have to take place between us, yourselves and the railways on this matter. Again we would urge that in place of any additional monies being paid to the railways, a program of providing them additional rolling stock be implemented as the ideal way to pay a subsidy.

(8) The government of the Province of Alberta stands ready to play a meaningful part in association with our producers in the grain industry in Alberta in developing this program. We appreciate that a certain amount of rationalization of our country elevator system might be required. However, we feel

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-19

that this ought to be a gradual thing because it is not the major block in our ability to move grain to our customers."

I would like to table copies of that letter Mr. Speaker, and in addition, this last minute information that I have just received in this regard having to do with the question of use of inland terminals in Western Canada.

The Wheat Board is now saying that there is going to be difficulty using these inland terminals because of a shortage of additional boxcars, and of course the layover charge that I mentioned in the letter also becomes very important. Mr. Speaker, we are following up on this matter and we will have additional announcements in regard to grain policy as they become available.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I take it that I will be permitted to make a comment on the item that has just been referred to. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say first of all to the hon. Minister of Agriculture that we on this side of the House appreciate very much hearing the report that he has just given us today. I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that we have had a great deal of concern in this particular area and this is what prompted us to try and move an adjournment of the House to consider a matter of urgent concern to us, not that we wanted to look at it from a partisan point of view. But I think it is becoming abundantly clear that one of the real problems facing western farmers is the lack of cash, and one of the reasons for their inability to improve that situation is the ability of the terminals, the railways and several other factors in transporting the grain out to the coast.

I listened very carefully, Mr. Speaker, to the report that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has just given to us and certainly I recognize that in rising to speak to it on first impulse after hearing it, that there may have been a possibility that I will lose the impact of some of the proposals that the hon. minister was making. But it seems to me, in listening to the report, that there was a tendency to try and specifically point out the things that need to be done. And I want to make it very clear, Mr. Minister, that I don't disagree with your suggestions of looking at these points, but I do want to stress that we will leave no stone unturned in trying to impress upon everybody concerned that they look at all possible alternatives and that they will not necessarily be tied to specifics at this point in time.

Now I want to say again to the government and to the hon. minister that I hope that they will continue to pursue with all diligence, and place all pressures possible on whatever areas we need to place pressures, to insure that we are not losing world markets. Because I think that this is the key, the ability to retain and to gain new markets, which has been stated by members from both sides of the House. So I assure you that we will do everything we can from this side of the House to assist you and to place pressures to insure that we gain very necessary markets for the farmers at this point in time.

Alberta Hansard

MR. SPEAKER:

A matter of information for the House with regard to Hansard. I have caused to be tabled, and there will be distributed to the hon. members, a short statement of information regarding the present situation in Hansard. I would just like to emphasize some caution in the prediction about the first edition coming out for next Monday.

7-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. GETTY:

In rising to enter this debate, Mr. Speaker, I would like first to offer you my congratulations. I am now more convinced than ever that you will add considerably to the dignity and the respect that this House has in our province. I'd like also to welcome the new members in this Legislature on both sides of the House. I trust that they appreciate the honour and, more important to my mind, the responsibility they have been given by their constituents. I know it's certainly an honour for me to be here, and the responsibility only really sinks in more and more as each day goes by. Since I now have responsibilities as a member of the Executive Council, I'll try to point out some of the matters my department has been dealing with, since we took over the administration on September 10th.

Naturally, I probably will not touch on all parts and points that various members would like discussed, but if I miss any I'm sure there will be opportunities later on, in the course of the business of the House.

Just before I do that, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to direct a word or two to the Opposition. I've had some experience in that regard and in the short time in the House on this side of the Assembly, it appears that they are in need of some. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest when the leader of the Opposition told the House of his side's good intentions as an opposition, but I hope you won't mind, or he won't mind, if I reserve judgment on that matter. Frankly, I find it hard to reconcile his statements with certain actions that his party has taken to date. Actually, some of the things they have done I have found very disappointing.

I would like to draw all the members' attention for a moment back to a week ago, to last Friday afternoon, and to the chain of events we witnessed from the opposition on that day. You will recall that, I think it was the hon. Member for Drumheller made a rather passionate plea for an emergency debate on transportation of grain. He told us the House had to debate the matter; it was of such urgency, he said, that all other business should stop. Well the opposition made their point on this urgent problem for rural Alberta, and indeed, the subject was important enough. I think, Mr. Speaker, you recognized that yourself when you discussed the matter.

What I'd like to know is, Mr. Speaker, could the opposition have been playing games with that very important subject? Because all members will recall that two members from our side of the House participated in the Throne Speech, after that plea for urgent debate, and while they spoke well, they did not speak overly long. That left, I think I recall, something over an hour of precious House debating time, Mr. Speaker, and then what happened? Well, what happened was that an opposition member at that point had the floor, exactly what the opposition House Leader tried to get earlier, and there are no restrictions in the Throne Speech debate. And what did they do once they had the floor, Mr. Speaker? They adjourned the debate. Now, Mr. Speaker, surely their great, urgent matter hadn't gone away -- or had it? Were we to believe that in less than an hour, on the same day, it was no longer urgent?

Our minister in charge of Transportation, Mr. Speaker, in the time that I have watched him handle his responsibilities, looks to be pretty good, but he isn't that good. I had to take a closer look, as a matter of fact, at the opposition, Mr. Speaker, because the member who had called for the urgent debate was sitting right beside the member who adjourned the debate. Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what are we to think? Are they on speaking terms? Do they plan what they're going to do before they do it? In other words was it urgent or wasn't it urgent?

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-21

MR. LUDWIG:

On a point of order - I'd like to refer, Mr. Speaker, to a rule in Beauchesne 148, it's on Pages 126 and 127, Rule 148, Clause 3, it says: "Reference to debates of the current Session, is discouraged even if such reference is not irrelevant, as it tends to reopen matters already decided."

My submission is that the hon. member is not only somewhat out of order, but somewhat negative in his approach to the whole matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

With respect to the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, I understand the reference to be to the absence of debate rather than to debate.

MR. LUDWIG:

On a point of order, he is dealing with a motion of the present session of the House, and the rule states that he is out of order.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, he is not, Mr. Speaker --

MR. KING:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I certainly wouldn't attempt to impute motives to the hon. member opposite, but perhaps if he would care to finish reading the rule which he only started to read, he would find that in exactly the same rule, on exactly the same page, it says that, "Direct reference is permitted, however, when a member wishes to complain of something said, or to clear up misrepresentation, or make a personal explanation, ..."

MR. LUDWIG:

In further speaking to the point of order, the reference of the hon. member is entirely irrelevant to what is being discussed at the present time.

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm perfectly able to appreciate the discomfort on the other side, because really, Mr. Speaker, in a matter that is pretty serious to all Albertans, why would they try and use it for political grandstanding? I wouldn't blame you, Mr. Speaker, or all the members of the House for that matter, if you were to take a pretty close look in the future at any future urgent matters that the hon. gentlemen might come up with. And a word to the newer members over there is that there is an important role and a valuable role that can be played by the opposition in our democratic system; you have that responsibility, and I hope you will fulfill it. I've been on that side of the House, and I am relatively proud of it. But let's hope that it does not include any more funny games like we watched last Friday. Surely the people of Alberta who voted for the opposition, deserve a better performance than that one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my attention to some of the matters of intergovernmental affairs, and some of the problems and progress which I've encountered in dealing with these responsibilities since September 10th. To clear up any misunderstandings early, I should point out that the role of the department as I see it functioning, is to provide the overall co-ordination of policies, programs and activities of the Government of Alberta in relation to governments outside of our provincial borders. That coordination does not mean getting in between our departments

7-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

and our ministers, and other governments and other departments. In fact we encourage meetings by our ministers and other elected representatives in other governments, but we must make sure that these efforts are co-ordinated to fit into our general overall policies and plans.

And so one of our first matters of concern, naturally, was to make an assessment of the magnitude of the contacts and involvements of the Government of Alberta with other governments. I confess that that has not been an easy task. It's not yet even now fully completed but the information we now have confirms our belief that the scope of intergovernmental contacts has grown and expanded tremendously. It also confirms our suspicions that these contacts were often unco-ordinated and in conflict in the past in this province. In many cases they went on completely without the knowledge of other departments in this government which were actually dealing with and had responsibilities in the same matters. Sometimes, people in the same department -- we have established -- had absolutely no idea, if you can imagine that, absolutely no idea of intergovernmental contacts going on within their own departments on matters in which in some cases that they had opposite opinions, and were actually trying to make the other argument with another government. There's no question that Ottawa was understandably confused. Other provinces were confused as to what Alberta's position on many matters was. And of course, even more damaging, Mr. Speaker, Ottawa was able to use that lack of co-ordination and policy in intergovernmental matters to out-manoeuvre our province, unfortunately in a variety of ways.

Some agreements have been so cluttered up with federal restrictions in some cases accepted by the province, in some cases dictated by the federal government, that the agreements themselves are virtually useless, even though they contained that lure of federal funds which normally goes along with agreements.

I'd like to refer to one of the programs that one of the members opposite was asking me a few questions about the other day. It had to do with an agreement which was intended to help the native people by assisting them to increase their economic viability. I'd like to quote from a project analyst for a special ARDA program who is frustrated about those programs, and just one quote which will give the members some appreciation of the problems:

"Conditions required to meet government regulations are totally impossible for the Indian and Metis people to fulfil. For example, to set up a grocery business, three heads of families must be employed, each must receive \$2,500 a year minimum in salary. They just can't do it, and they're getting very frustrated."

Mr. Speaker, that is just one isolated comment but it's an indication of the kind of thing that we have come upon consistently and it's the kind of thing that we are forced to try and improve, and to work with the people, to make sure they will be patient while we try and clear up that kind of bureaucratic regulation which is so frustrating to them.

I'd like to talk about that subject I mentioned a few minutes ago, and that is the lure of federal money. It is that carrot which is dangled before provincial governments who have demanding responsibilities but limited tax sources that has led to the growing number and size of joint cost programs. I believe, Mr. Speaker that this single policy matter of the joint cost programs is one of the most important that we face, I mean the whole Assembly as legislators, because it does take tremendous determination and discipline to resist the federal presence which is seeping into every move that we make. It may cost us money, it may cost us a lot of money, I'm not sure how to evaluate that, but the day is coming when

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-23

we will have to say that this is no more the manner in which these agreements are going to be made. The paralyzing federal presence accompanied by their money and their directives and how it must be spent stifles provincial policies and priorities, and kills the initiatives of provincial public servants.

In northern Alberta today we have an example, because almost every move that's made by local groups or municipalities or organizations starts with an assessment to see how much free federal money they can get. Yet that opens up such a mess of federal government standards and regulations and influence, that this often results in such a bending of local programs to fit those federal desires that projects lose their identity and sometimes their usefulness.

I was interested in this regard to hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition refer to constitutional reform as something that needed to be considered, and certainly constitutional reform would help. We believe, and we're going to work to obtain a clear-cut division of powers accompanied by the fiscal capability to fulfill those powers in a decent, efficient manner for our citizens. But the present system of overlapping jurisdictions can only result in conflict and inefficiency with the taxpayer ending up the big loser.

I might say, when discussing joint cost programs, that I can sympathize with the temptation that they present. I see it with our ministers. They have responsibilities and they don't have all the money, they can't get all the money they'd like from the Provincial Treasurer in order to carry out all their programs, and there is the federal government with its tremendous fiscal preponderance. I wouldn't blame the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Health, the Minister of Agriculture, or any of our ministers, because they have programs to complete, and they don't have all the money to do everything they'd like. One answer would be a joint cost program with federal funds. When that happens, then we're on our way.

Mr. Speaker, I think a warning I'd like to draw very clearly to the attention of the members -- they should all be aware of it -- if we, provincial governments, continue to sell our responsibilities and our constitutional rights for 50 per cent federal dollars, then we can plan to become finally nothing but a regional administrative office of federal government. And once that happens, it won't matter what fancy titles we want to use for ourselves, that's just what we'll be.

Now that's the dilemma which we face and that's the challenge. We must blunt Ottawa's desire to get involved in practically every social and economic program that might arise throughout our province. We must, and we will, resist the recent moves in such fields as urban affairs, pollution, and communications. As I said, we will strive for a clear-cut division of powers, with the taxing rights to do the job.

Now there are many ways in which we are going to work towards that, but one way I think we have a good opportunity to move in that direction is by unified efforts on the part of the provinces of Canada, and we are making progress in that regard.

But, while that's what we are striving for, we have the problem of what about right now, this year, and next year, while we fight for the longer range goals. Well, in this interim period, we must try to either renegotiate or change restrictive agreements presently in existence. We must try, with new agreements, to use the federal money, but have the agreements allow for a minimum of federal presence, and carry out our programs to meet our standards and our priorities in Alberta without selling our rights. That fight won't be easy, but, Mr. Speaker, with the awareness of the problem, and the

7-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

fact that our ministers are dealing with these matters constantly with our department, I would say that we are making progress. I know that agreements we are presently approaching in various areas with various of our ministers who have responsibilities touching also on some type of shared cost program, that they are determined to have these agreements allow them to exercise their responsibilities and their priorities.

I guess I should say, at this point that we recognize there are areas of national responsibility and national interest, and we support our federal government in those areas. But, at the same time, they must recognize ours, and we will resist their intrusion at every opportunity.

I talked a little longer than I meant to on the shared-cost programs, but I think that they are something that is worthwhile for all members to consider, because as this battle goes on in the coming months and years, I believe that Alberta would be best served if all members could support the government on this extremely important issue, particularly when it does cost us money, and I am sure that it probably will. As this debate, as a matter of fact, goes on, I would welcome any comments from any members on either side of the House. Some on the other side have had experience on these matters. I'd like to hear their views on these shared-cost programs.

I think all members will appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that negotiations with the federal government on these matters are conducted over some periods of time. Some days it appears that you are making some headway and getting somewhere, and other days, frankly are quite frustrating. I think I've used the term sometimes in dealing with Ottawa, you feel like you are punching a pillow. You know you are hitting it, but you don't think you are accomplishing anything.

The one effort that my department and our government is making, is to treat these ups and downs as reasonably as possible. Because as I move about Alberta, I sense that it would be quite easy to allow our frustrations to be over-emphasized publicly and could foster a considerable amount of anti-Ottawa or anti-eastern-Canada feeling. Sometimes it's impossible not to do that because it's sitting there, and we are avoiding fanning that fire as much as possible. It's my desire, and I know it's the desire of our government, to work in these matters to build a united, stronger Canada, and not help to divide it by magnifying our regional differences. The corollary to that, Mr. Speaker, of course, is the proposition that when we are successful, and when we do obtain something through these negotiations, we will not treat these as triumphs over the federal government or any other government. Rather, we will treat them as examples of federal-provincial co-operation.

I should say a few words about federal-provincial conferences themselves. There have been many of them. They came rapidly after we came into office, including a first ministers' conference to which I will refer later. But I've been extremely pleased to have Alberta represented so effectively at these conferences, and tremendously impressed and proud of the performances of my colleagues in the Executive Council, as I've observed them meeting their counterparts from Ottawa and the other provinces.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer and I were also very pleased to be able to bring the first federal-provincial finance ministers' meeting to Alberta. The various delegates, as a matter of fact, from all across the country are still writing and, when we meet them, talking about the beauties of Jasper where the meeting was held, and the hospitality of Albertans.

I should, when I'm discussing the Jasper Conference say a word about the people, the staff of my department. As you can appreciate,

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-25

starting a new department is not a simple job. It is time consuming. We have and are operating on, I would say, a minimum number basis. I really appreciate the tremendous workload that the department has handled, and in particular, the manner in which they co-ordinated the many problems, the many details of that meeting in Jasper. It was, if the members would consider, a logistics problem to take all these various finance ministers and their provincial treasurers, bring them to Alberta, put them on a train, move that train to Jasper, have the meetings, the simultaneous translations, and all the things that go with it, have them back on a train, and off to their various destinations. And then we had an additional complication at that time; we had a change in the federal finance minister, and an air strike all on at the same time, so it was a logistics problem, and I was very proud of the way my department handled it.

I might say in discussing that train ride -- the time in Jasper that was not spent in meetings provided a terrific opportunity to discuss various provincial and federal matters on a very informal basis, and we found that these were as valuable as the conference itself.

We also had an opportunity early this year to have a very successful Prairie Economic Council meeting with Mr. Schreyer and Mr. Blakeney, Premiers of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and their various representatives.

Some members, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure have heard my statement that Alberta no longer wishes to be treated by Ottawa as a prairie province or as part of a prairie region, out west somewhere. And our position is clear that we want them to deal with us as the Province of Alberta, not as part of a region. And I should point out that it has nothing at all to do with our desire to work closely with the Provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan on matters which are of mutual concern to us. We intend to do that at every possible opportunity. And we would like to expand that Council if possible, to a Western Canadian Council. We're working in that regard, possibly a Western Canadian Premiers' Council.

At all these meetings and conferences we have worked to establish one thing initially, and that is that our dealings with Ottawa will be on the basis of equals to equals, not any longer as a junior government to a senior government. We insist on this equality at every opportunity. At times we have had to break habits that have been established over the previous years when governments of Alberta did not take this stand. I think, Mr. Speaker, the members will continue to see initiatives by our government which will solidify our position of equality on these matters.

One of the things that was entered into this debate was the matter and the feeling by the hon. Leader of the Opposition that his intergovernmental agency was preferable to a department. And of course, he is entitled to that view.

I can only say that it was clear policy, clearly laid before the people of Alberta in the election, that it was the policy of our government, that these intergovernmental matters are too important for an agency. They must be co-ordinated, must be by an elected member of the Executive Council.

I have had some experience, however, in inheriting the agency that was developed by the previous administration. While the Leader of the Opposition may have preferred it, it appears that in most cases the remainder of his government merely ignored it, from Cabinet ministers right down through the departments, because the conditions, the co-ordination and the policy control was just non-existent. I know that I have had to work with the problems that resulted from it. It is not a reflection in any way on the people who are in the

7-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

agency. They just did not have the proper support and they were considerably frustrated because of that.

We have had references to our Ottawa office also, on occasions in the House. The Leader of the Opposition told us of his great concern that the representative there has returned to the Attorney General's department and I understand is providing valuable service there. I can only say there are good and valid reasons for making that move and we made it as soon as those reasons were obvious to us. However, the hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to us leaving a vacuum, I think it was, in Ottawa. I can only suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the vacuum left by the return of an official has been more than adequately replaced by the presence of our Cabinet ministers in Ottawa. As a matter of fact, if Ottawa is indeed the nerve centre of our country, as the hon. member stated, then we are pleased that our Cabinet ministers are at that nerve centre rather than hearing about it second hand.

I would like to assure the members of the House that the matter of staff in some role in the Ottawa office is still under consideration. You can recognize that there are problems to be considered in that matter, when you want, as we want, to have our relationships with elected representatives and members in the Executive Council, because if you place a man in that spot his presence must be honoured. He would then be between our government and Ottawa and a delay of days would perhaps result while information for us was relayed through him. And then, of course, our own initiatives going the other way are slowed down when you wish to discuss something with them. At the same time I recognize the advantages of a man on the scene, and that there are times when the intelligence work that he can do, or anticipation of federal moves or legislation, and as a contact, might be valuable. While those two arguments over-simplify the problem, there are other considerations and it has our attention.

One of the further matters that our department dealt with shortly after coming into the administration, was the problem which we had of CKUA going off the air. I am very happy to confirm that a two-year extension of their licence has been successfully negotiated and I express my thanks to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities, Mr. Werry, who worked with me in that matter, with Mr. Pelletier of the Government of Canada and Mr. Juneau of CRTC.

As we discussed today, we still have that granddaddy of federal programs, the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion. While we have made some progress I wouldn't say we are anywhere near a solution to the problems that that federal program creates. Due to its complex nature, however, and the fact that we have a meeting coming up within the next several days, I think we will attempt to treat it as a separate issue at another time in the House and not in the course of this debate.

Mr. Speaker, I have two other matters I would like to touch on. They fall partly within my responsibility and I hope the members will bear with me. In the past I have advocated shorter speeches in the House and I find that I break that rule myself. I would like to comment on these because I find they are very important in my mind.

An early priority with our Government was the establishment of Alberta's unique, distinct position as the energy province in Canada. This has taken a considerable amount of our time, time of the hon. Mr. Dickie, Minister of Mines and Minerals, and the time of our Premier. But it was time that we felt necessary to put in, since we believe that the distinction we have been able to make with Ottawa in this regard will serve Albertans well. We had to convince the federal government that this new administration was serious about no longer sitting back and allowing the federal government to manipulate our resources unilaterally and to the possible disadvantage of the

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-27

people of Alberta, who in fact own those resources. I'm very pleased with our progress in this field, because we're determined the people of Alberta would never again have to hear of a secret agreement, Mr. Speaker, signed by the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States directly influencing the future of this province, and have their own government not know a thing about it.

In short, Mr. Speaker, we wanted to establish our unique right to influence national energy policies, not merely hear about them after they have been decided. Now as some indication of our success I'd like to draw the hon. members' attention to portions of the letter which has been received by our Government from the Federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, the Hon. Donald MacDonald. It deals with some of the questions that were raised in the House earlier, which I said I would touch on in the debate. It's a fairly long letter and I will only refer to some parts of it and then I'm going to table it for the benefit of the members and also table a copy of our reply. It starts off discussing meetings, but I think the part I would like to draw to your importance starts in the third paragraph:

"It is of paramount importance, as we have both noted, that the relationship of the Government of Canada to the Government of Alberta in energy policy matters, both in terms of overall strategies and of specific issues be one of co-operation and collaboration. The situation in which our respective governments confronted one another would not serve the development of the Canadian economy, the utilization of energy effectively, both in Canada and for export or your plans for the development of Alberta's own economic welfare. Our discussions demonstrated clearly the need for continuous and effective communication on a large variety of critical issues. I am pleased to confirm our joint willingness for effective consultation with respect to all matters relating to the marketing of Canadian oil in the United States, and with respect to national gas policies regarding utilization in Canada and with respect to export.

In connection with current discussions between Canada and the US on oil matters I will reaffirm specifically our intention that the Government of Alberta be made aware of all essential points."

Mr. Speaker, that was probably the number one thing we wanted to accomplish in regard to energy matters. We are very pleased that we have been able to do that.

We haven't, to be frank, got everything that we tried for. There is another matter which is hanging in obedience, and the hon. Member for Calgary Millican referred to it the other day. It's referred to in this letter and I'll read it:

"I cannot at this particular time advise you of the policy of the Government of Canada with respect to your request for observer status at negotiations between Canada and the United States on access of Canadian oil to the US market. I mentioned to you the critical jurisdictional relationship held by the Government of Canada in matters of trade and external relations and the need to understand thoroughly the implications of your suggestion in total context with federal relations. I do, however, undertake to provide you with an answer at the earliest possible time.

I will assure you now of our intention to obtain your views on the impact upon Alberta of our proposed policies before any conclusion with respect to them is taken by the Government of Canada, and we will, of course, be seeking consultation with other provincial governments, but we recognize Alberta's special interest as the energy producer."

7-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

I have these two letters, Mr. Speakers, for tabling in the House because they touch on those matters referred to in the hon. Member for Calgary Millican's question, also the question about the Washington office. If you recall, I mentioned that I would discuss that at the time I participated in the debate. And as you can tell from the letter that I just referred to, we have established some new lines of communication; we have an existing outstanding request with Ottawa, and the Washington office assessments is still pending in relation to how those new lines of communication work, and how we make out with our request for observer status.

Before I leave the matter of energy, I was going to explain the National Energy Board decision and its impact on Alberta, to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, since when he participated in this debate he obviously did not understand it, and his lack of knowledge does not do Alberta any particular good when he expresses that. But I think that the hon. Mr. Dickie may have an opportunity some time in this debate or another debate, to explain those issues at another time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I am going to relate to the members what I consider to be the highlight of my time in this portfolio, the event that has given me the greatest pride in being associated with it. It has to do with the change in Alberta's position in our country, and I confess that I certainly did not have a great deal to do with it and I certainly don't take any credit for it. But the event, Mr. Speaker, was the occasion on November 15, 16 and 17, 1971 when I attended in Ottawa, the federal-provincial meeting of first ministers of Canada. It was a gathering of those few people who will shape the destiny of our country in the future. They were meeting to deal with important problems facing our country. At that time I had the privilege to watch the Premier of Alberta demonstrate so clearly and so effectively his knowledge and grasp of not only provincial, but national problems, and their possible solutions. For the first time since I have been old enough to care, Alberta has moved into a position of leadership in Canada. The people, both in and out of the conference, soon sensed it and after the first day of that important meeting, you realized that the respected voice from the west, the listened-to voice, was our Premier's. As each one of those national issues was debated, heads of government were looking to Alberta to hear what our government's position was. You could sense their appreciation and their understanding that this Alberta Premier is something really special. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we knew it all the time.

That, Mr. Speaker, brings me back to where I started today, and that is that I am very proud and thrilled to be a part of his government.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to extend congratulations from my self and the people of the Rose constituency on your election as Speaker of this Assembly. May I also extend congratulations to the Premier, who in his wisdom, chose his wife from my constituency. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the privilege to represent the citizens of the Rose constituency which includes the major centres of Camrose, Bashaw, Forestburg, Daysland and New Norway. The area, Mr. Speaker, depends almost entirely on one industry -- agriculture, and its attendant industries, and as a major farm supply centre for the better part of east central Alberta.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have heavy industries too -- a \$65 million power plant, two major strip mines, and a \$25 million steel plant, a fair number of oil and gas wells, and the most productive land to be found anywhere in Canada. But above all, Mr. Speaker, our greatest resource is the people who live in that constituency -- people of many and varied ethnic backgrounds. Many are of the third and

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-29

fourth generation who have continued on family farms which were homesteaded by that fast dwindling number, the pioneers. And what a debt of gratitude this province owes to those pioneers who found our soil fertile, our winters harsh, the neighbours, friendly and cooperative, and the work hard but rewarding. They felt a full sense of accomplishment, and established small communities which usually centred around their churches, schools and stores, and when they were done they passed all of this heritage on to their children. The second generation continued to reform what their forebears had begun, and in many cases using prior experience and pride in farm accomplishments to expand and mechanize. Although the farm is still operated as a family unit, the farm today or the mixed farm has become a dairy farm, a cattle feeding operation, or a grain farm.

Mr. Speaker, the same sense of accomplishment and pride still lives with the present generation. What other community can host 10,000 people to a 'Farmer's Day', several thousand to a salute to the oil industry, another 20,000 to the annual Jay Walker's Jamboree, where the Premier and the leader of the opposition have competed for the bundle-pitching award of North America. However, the present generation, in most cases has found itself unable to continue to operate the family farm, and the rural urban migration has reached alarming proportions. Not only is the existence of the family farm threatened, but also the existence of the small villages, towns, and cities which were once the focal point of all social, cultural and commercial activities. The small villages are, for the most part, made up of first and second generation farmers who move to them after retirement. And these villages are nothing but retirement towns.

Mr. Speaker, the City of Camrose, with a population of 9,000 people, increased only by only 63 people in 1971. May I suggest that when a city cannot keep up to its natural birth rate, that city has a serious problem.

I must congratulate the hon. Premier on his announcement of the two incentive programs for rural development and also upon the appointment of the rural industrialization task force and the appointment of a minister responsible for the task force. I am confident that this will aid in the curtailment of this devastating erosion of talent from the wonderful world of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen a build-up of school bus empires which take our youngsters from smaller towns and areas and move them to larger ones. The school in any community is a valid industry. Rather than moving children to schools in other areas, might it not be more feasible, from an economic and moral boosting point of view, to keep some decentralized schools to a certain grade level and reimburse teachers for travelling expenses?

More and more individuals are forced to leave the rural and small towns because there are no jobs. Costs are prohibitive to a would-be businessman, and operation costs are so high that these businesses cannot stay competitive with those in large centres. A potential businessman finds that he cannot borrow enough money to start a new business in a small town because lending institutions believe that property in rural settings is very poor collateral. Additionally, a potential businessman in a rural community must usually cover a larger geographical area than his urban counterpart. The result of covering a large area is toll charges on almost all telephone calls to customers and to supply houses located in the cities. The alternative, Mr. Speaker, to situations such as these described, could be some sort of subsidization for rural industry and a flat rate of toll charges for in-province telephone calls.

Mr. Speaker, through you may I inform the Minister of the Environment that before the City of Camrose can attract new industry it has to be guaranteed of an adequate water supply through lake

7-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

stabilization at Driedmeat Lake. Also, Mr. Speaker, may I urge through you the hon. Minister of Highways that before rural industry can be competitive in trucking their goods, the highways need to be of a load standard capable of carrying maximum loads. Also, Mr. Speaker, may I recommend to the Minister of Advanced Education that he give consideration for the Camrose Lutheran College to expand it from a two year university course to a full degree granting college.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that these areas of concern will be investigated in detail by the rural industrialization task force. I would like to emphasize, however, that we in the Rose constituency are not looking for handouts but rather the choice of being able to live where one wants to live and a right to earn our own keep.

If the present trend continues there will soon be no choice and our people will have to live in urban areas in order to work and exist.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude with one further example of the difficult positions small towns are placed in, in this rural to urban migration. I trust that the hon. members, and especially the hon. Leader of the Opposition, are aware of the village of Strom which happens to lie within my constituency. It presently has 52 vacant service lots and like so many other retirement towns, because of the lost assessment of businesses relocating to larger areas, the remainder of the population must carry the complete tax load and debentures. This makes for very expensive retirement.

Speaking of Strom brings to mind the rumour which circulated in the area after August 30, 1971. The rumour was repeated in auction markets, elevators, and many stores that the village wanted to change its name to Loughheed to keep up with the times. But when it was pointed out that there was already a Loughheed in Alberta, a compromise was to be reached and "berg" was simply suggested and added to the existing name saving the government unnecessary expense in changing highway signs and such.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank you.

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Speaker, I count it a real honour and a privilege to take part in the Speech from the Throne today. Of course this being my initial address in the House, I count it a real privilege to take my place in this Assembly representing the people of Medicine Hat-Redcliff. I certainly want to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on being elected to this very responsible position. I know that you will be fair and honest as has been the case thus far. I also want to congratulate the new Progressive Conservative party for their victory in the last provincial election. In the same breath, I want to thank the Social Credit party that have led this province in the last 36 years, a government that gained the reputation of being absolutely honest with the people of Alberta, a government that lived up to its promises. You might say, a government that led this province out of a bankrupt economy to the high status it now enjoys today, Mr. Speaker, a responsible government to the people of this great province. I want to say that I am proud to represent the people of Medicine Hat-Redcliff, under the Social Credit label.

Just a comment to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. As he was speaking, I felt that it was a bit ironic that he should criticize us, when it seems to me a few months ago he practically disowned Alberta, and I want the hon. minister to know that I am proud of our prairie province Alberta, coming from southern Alberta.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this being my first session in the Legislature, I am certainly going to take the advice of some of the

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-31

people that spoke before me and not speak too long. I have enjoyed the speeches thus far. I think I've learned quite a bit, but the speech that I am going to give in the next few minutes is going to be, possibly, a little different. I am the kind of a man that believes in speaking what he thinks and what he believes, and this I plan to do.

In the last few months I've spent considerable time reading over the debates and the speeches from this House, and particularly the Progressive Conservative party's. Now, Mr. Speaker, when reading over some of these speeches, I must say that I really became impressed with some of the promises, some of the programs that they were going to initiate now, if they were thrust into power. Here's a few of them, and I thought I might go over just a few to sort of bring it back to their mind, in case they forgot.

(1) Provincial financing of education -- Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, this was one of the major issues why the Progressive Conservatives won the last election, and I believe that the present government is certainly side-stepping in this major issue.

(2) Remove ceiling on oil and gas royalties to municipalities and revert to the one-third share -- certainly the Progressive Conservative party gave the impression to the municipalities that if they were going to be elected this is what they were going to do. I certainly have to agree with the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, Mr. Roy Farran, who stated publicly that it must be very embarrassing -- surely not only to Mr. Farran but to some of the other backbenchers over there who thought that a lot of these programs would be initiated now.

(3) -- Make government more responsive to the people.

(4) -- Not voting on party lines.

(5) Remove provincial tax on pension incomes.

(6) Removal of educational property tax for senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, we could go on and on, like my hon. friend over here said, and probably reach around 100 or even more. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, about 100 promises made by a supposedly responsible political party, and now a supposedly responsible government. In fact, and I say this quite honestly, that during the campaign, the 'now' slogans and the promises made nearly convinced even me to vote Progressive Conservative.

Now I'm not going to spend any more time going over the promises and the programs that the Progressive Conservatives stated they would bring to this province when they were elected. I think that in the next two or three months, we will have ample time to remind the government of these promises.

But Mr. Speaker, in debating the Throne Speech, I want to mention a few points that are of concern to my constituency in southern Alberta. I am going to mention them very briefly today, anticipating a more detailed account at a later date. I want to mention the importance of completing Highway 48 as quickly as possible, and starting on Highway 3 at the east end. As outlined to the hon. Minister of Highways a few months ago by a delegation from Medicine Hat, we are living in a day when increased emphasis is being placed on the tourist industry. With the completion of Highway 48, this will give Alberta another inlet from United States. At the present time I believe we have three or four highways running from the United States to Lethbridge. In the southeastern part of the province we don't have any inlet whatsoever, any highway between Medicine Hat and the United States border. I think it would be a

7-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

real boost for the industry in Medicine Hat and the tourist industry of Alberta.

Of course, another area of concern in my constituency is The Beverage Container Act which was passed at the last session of the Legislature, and then put into effect on January 1st of this year. I'm a bit amazed that a government would support legislation that creates unemployment. Today, over 100 glass workers have been, in effect, legislated out of jobs. And this is difficult to comprehend when, in effect, the government offers incentives for industry to locate in our province. Now, I understand that this legislation was passed both by the government and by the opposition party last year.

Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the government has some responsibility to these people. Now just imagine the government taking away the livelihood of over 100 families -- and I say this is not right -- and then to leave the impression that the government is unconcerned. I am certainly upset with the negative attitude that the hon. Minister of the Environment has taken on the subject. I plan to follow this up and prove to our hon. friend that in fact the cause for the layoff at Dominion Glass was a direct result of The Beverage Container Act. At the same time I feel somewhat sorry for the hon. minister because, with his ridiculous remarks stating that the layoffs were not due to The Beverage Container Act, he may have activated an entire union. Now this whole question of litter comes back to an educational program, I believe, and I personally feel that more emphasis of this type should be stressed, starting in the schools.

Another area of concern to the people of southern Alberta, and one of concern to me which will remain so until this injustice is justified, is the task force set up last September by the Lougheed government. As far as I am concerned, the Lougheed government has discriminated against all of southern Alberta and against the opposition MLA's. How could I think otherwise, Mr. Speaker, when the present government sets up so-called legislative task force committees and virtually eliminates any voice from southern Alberta, eliminates any voice from south of Calgary, and represents only the Progressive Conservative party. Mr. Speaker, is this democracy? Is this responsible government?

We look at the MLA task force on agriculture, 14 MLA's, all Progressive Conservatives. We look at the MLA task force on decentralization and government operation, 6 MLA's, all Progressive Conservatives. We look at the MLA task force on new incentives for Albertans, 4 MLA's, all Progressive Conservatives. We look at the MLA task force on manpower training and retraining, 4 MLA's, all Progressive Conservatives. We'll go on. We look at the MLA task force on opportunities and responsibilities of the individuals, 4 MLA's, all Progressive Conservatives. Now, Mr. Speaker, 32 jobs and five task force committees -- paid positions and all Progressive Conservative MLA's. Mr. Speaker, is this equality? Is this democracy? I feel, personally, that never in the history of Canadian democracy has there been so much party partisanship. I believe that the Lougheed government has underestimated the people of southern Alberta, and that is exactly where I live. We're not going to take this sitting down. This will be a major issue with me. The Premier and the Cabinet should be representatives of all Alberta, not just special PC constituents.

MR. FARRAN:

If the hon. member will permit a question, who would he consider are paid members?

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-33

MR. WYSE:

I think the hon. member had his opportunity to give his speech on the Throne Speech, and I think that I should have an opportunity to give mine. If I feel like answering a question afterwards, I will.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am just asking for clarification of the term paid workers.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is not obliged to permit the question.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. WYSE:

Let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, 32 jobs on five task force committees, paid positions, and all of them Conservative MLA's. Mr. Speaker, is this equality, is this democracy? And let me repeat, never in the history of Canadian democracy has there been so much party partisanship and I believe that the government has underestimated the people of Alberta. I demand of the Premier and his cabinet, in the name of democracy, for all MLA's from southern Alberta that this injustice be rectified now.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have always been one who stands up for what he believes to be right and honest. As a general rule I do not criticize to this extent, but if these were called Progressive Conservative caucus committees, and paid by the PC party I wouldn't have any quarrel. But southern Alberta is helping to pay for these caucus committees, and I will not stop shouting until this situation is changed. You might say that over 250,000 people in Alberta are unrepresented on these task forces. Is this open government? Is this democracy? I believe that the people are becoming very concerned as to the real policies and philosophies and ambitions of this government and I hate to think that this discrimination exists because the PC's did not pick up a single seat in southern Alberta.

Just to sum up some of the things that I have brought to your attention today. I do feel very strongly about them and I am not going to backtrack on them; that the provincial government should discontinue this discrimination against southern Alberta and opposition MLA's; that the government complete highway 48 this year between Elk Water and the U.S. border; that construction begin this year on highway No. 3 starting at Medicine Hat; that the provincial government accept soon, some responsibility for the people without jobs due to passing Bill 103, and that some type of environmental legislation be passed that takes into consideration the employment displacement of such people.

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, it's really an honour to have this opportunity this afternoon to speak on the Throne Speech debate. As you probably know, my constituency was represented for a good number of years by the hon. Russell Patrick, and I think that he did justice to the constituency. I hope I will be able to carry on as well.

A number of historical events have happened in the past short while. I think that last August 30th was one of the most historical things that has happened in Alberta since 1935, when we were able to sweep the province, with the exception of southern Alberta as has been mentioned by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat. However, I think that we will anticipate that this may be changed in the next

7-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

election. Only one thing worries me about this. In the short time that I have been in the Assembly I have learned to enjoy so much the ramblings of the hon. member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, that I am afraid that if we sweep the province in the south, that we will lose his contributions to the Assembly. It may be that Drain will go down the drain.

I want to impress upon the members of the Assembly that, in the short time that we have been in the government, we have been able to make some wise decisions. I think that is borne out by the by-election which occurred in Stettler a very short time ago. Without taking anything away from their new hon. member for Stettler, we were able to gain considerable power in this area. I think it speaks well for the good decisions that have been made by our new government and I want to point out to the members of the Assembly that in making these decisions we will not be coerced into making short term decisions at the expense of long term effects.

I was impressed with the hon. member of the opposition, although I must say I had difficulty in determining who this was, initially, probably due to my inexperience in the Assembly. Among the things that he criticized quite fluently was the problem and the shortcomings of provincial-federal relations. I could entirely agree with the hon. member of the opposition and I feel the approach this province has taken regarding our communications with Ottawa has been tragic.

I would like to take just one moment, if I may, and say to the members of the Assembly how impressed I was with the remarks made by the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs this afternoon. I think that this has been one of the great breakthroughs in our province. I think that we can safely say that we are started on a new road, that we are not going to isolate ourselves from the rest of Canada, that we're going to be a part of Canada, but we are going to have the right to assert our responsibilities and our desires.

I want to point out that our stand on water, and that it is not exportable -- our recent stand -- when someone was asking about some wise decisions regarding our position on the RCMP and our stand on the National Energy Board and our right to express ourselves and be a part of it -- these are good indications of some of the wise decisions that the new Government has made.

I want to congratulate the new member for Spirit River-Fairview -- unfortunately he's not here at the present time but perhaps he can pick this up in the new Hansard. At the same time, while wishing him a long enjoyable period in the Legislature, I hope it's by himself.

I also want to put on record for the Hansard, that our ancestors, who really were responsible for developing Alberta and Canada did not do so by merely sitting on their butts and complaining about the huge corporation problem that we have here in Canada, and while this makes for good news, perhaps, it doesn't solve the problems that we face.

I would like to compliment the Member for Calgary North Hill who spoke about the serious problems of our senior citizens; incidentally, this was one of the problems that the government dealt with early. It rather amused me when the hon. Member for Drumheller commented on being a second class citizen because I thought of what our senior citizens have put up with over the last period. Obviously he wasn't alone in being classified as such. Perhaps, because of our decisions, he will be alone. It's unfortunate that the member for Medicine Hat includes himself in this group of second class citizens. I hope that the members of his constituency in the next election will be able to put in a first class citizen.

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-35

Now, with regard to the Throne Speech, I'm impressed with the Alberta Opportunity Fund which was mentioned in it because it spells out, and we'll be discussing this a little later, it tends in a sense to recognize the problems of small business and smaller centres in the province. I think, fellow members, that this takes political courage, I think it takes courage to identify and recognise a problem which is quite prevalent, knowing full well that, perhaps, these areas do not have the political power that others have and yet have the courage to initiate such a program.

I might just say a word or two about my own constituency, and I would like to impress upon you some of the very serious problems that we face. I have a constituency that is about 70 miles long and 20 miles wide. It is not a large constituency in terms of the rural constituencies; it contains five villages, and four of these villages are losing in numbers over the past twenty years, and I think this is typical of what is happening throughout the Province of Alberta. You might be interested to know that one of these villages, which is one of the better ones of the group, has lost ten small businesses in the last twenty years. When I talked to the grass roots people as to what essentially is the problem, I find that in many instances the comment is that when agriculture fails, so do many of the villages and towns in the smaller centres throughout the province. To me, this is really getting down to the grass roots of what the serious problem is.

In order to impress upon the Assembly the seriousness of the position in agriculture, and at the same time compliment our new government in placing it so high on the priorities list, I will give you a few statistics. There are not many, I hope you can make note of these and possibly ponder them.

I took the statistics on some of the main products that are produced on our farms and I located the comparisons from 1950 to 1970. It might surprise you to know these figures and I know it will surprise you, because of the fact that we are continually reading in the papers of the continual inflation and high cost of food.

I might then quote from the statistics of the Department of Agriculture: wheat in 1950 was \$1.56 per bushel and in 1970 it is \$1.18 a bushel; barley in 1950 was \$1.10 a bushel, and today you can buy the same barley for 64 cents a bushel; cattle were \$27.10 per 100 in 1950, in 1970, \$30.08 per 100; hogs were \$28.57 per 100 in 1950 and 1970 they are \$28.75; poultry meat was 32 cents per pound in 1950 and has now dropped to 28 cents per pound; eggs have gone from 32 cents per dozen to 37 cents per dozen; and fluid milk has gone from \$4.14 per 100 to \$5.89 per 100.

The point I am trying to make is that in effect, there has really been no increase to the farm operator in 20 years of operation, while at the same time his costs have doubled and in some cases tripled.

It is interesting to note that in 1950, the farmer produced enough food for 25 others, and by 1970, he was producing sufficient food for 53 other people. It is also interesting to note, fellow members, that in 1950 the actual expenditure of the taxpayer's dollar on food was 26 per cent of the total personal expenditure, and in 1970, this figure had dropped to 16 per cent. What I am saying then, is that despite what is read in the newspapers and despite what is said, the fact of the matter is that agriculture is in a very serious situation, that despite the fact that they have become efficient in their operation, it is a losing proposition, and I am very impressed with our new government and its approach with regards to agriculture and the family farm.

One other statistic, I don't want to bore you too long with these things, but on an analysis of 60 farms in my area, and I think

7-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

it is typical of areas across Alberta, that the average farm operator's age is 55 years and out of these 60 operators, there are only 30 people, young people, prepared to take over this responsibility. Well, if you were to draw a graph of how serious this is, I think you would agree with me that agriculture is, and has been, on a collision course with disaster, and that we as responsible members, must rise above party politics, above personal desires, sense the danger, and proceed in good haste to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for giving me an opportunity to make my points amongst and between the Assembly members, and I want to congratulate our government and our Premier in placing this very, very important industry so high on the priority list.

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to participate in this debate, and first and foremost, to thank his Honour the Lieutenant Governor Grant MacEwen for his delivery of the Speech from the Throne. It is definitely a benefit to the people of Alberta that we have such a person as our Lieutenant Governor.

My congratulations to the hon. Member for Whitecourt, Peter Trynchy, and the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, Cal Lee, on their addresses, on their moving and seconding of the Speech from the Throne. To the Premier, the hon. Peter Lougheed, for the leadership he has given in the recent years, in order that an alternative be given, for a new approach in the Province of Alberta, for a new government. Not to overlook the hon. Leader of the 'now' Opposition, the hon. Harry Strom; I'm sorry that he has left his chair, but congratulations on his dedicated service, and my understanding goes with it, to him in his new role.

Truly with such a large number of new members in this Assembly representing the majority, and I do say probably more than half of the citizens of Alberta, there is going to be a new direction, and I am confident it will be to the benefit of all Albertans. Possibly one of my colleagues misunderstands my comments; I look at the new members on both sides of this Assembly.

It is no surprise to me to see the reaction of the hon. members on your left, Mr. Speaker, in the Loyal Opposition, or that they are now saying and doing exactly what members did in opposition to them for many years, and they could not appreciate or accept that.

Mr. Speaker, before I overlook it, my congratulations to yourself and the people of the constituency of Edmonton Meadowlark in their sacrifice and in their pleasure that the Assembly placed its confidence in you to be the helmsman of this ship on the voyage of the 17th Legislature, as stated in the first part of the Speech from the Throne, charting a new course for Alberta in the 70's.

Mr. Speaker, the residents of the constituency of Edmonton Beverly were most pleased to be recognized when the redistribution took place. This constituency was only some one-third of the previous constituency known as Edmonton Northeast. However, the name doesn't resolve everything. It gives a strong feeling of pride and the people of this constituency have played a large part in making history in Edmonton. These are hard working people, industrious, and self supporting. The greater majority have owned their own homes and still do. For years they have paid their share of taxes, but demanded little extra. They were humble people and they still are. For their medical services and hospital care they travelled probably further than any other group in Edmonton.

It is only recently that a general development plan for the northern part of my constituency was presented to the people at a

March 10th, 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

7-37

gathering, and they were advised that a hospital complex may be in the making. This proposal could not be too soon, and is very much welcome. As for senior citizens' homes, we do have several and we are pleased that the several homes we have were provided through the initiative of local groups of citizens. We are also blessed to have one publicly organized complex, but I do say that one has only to visit these homes to see the atmosphere in the homes that are provided and organized by private individuals as compared to the climate and the atmosphere in a home that is run by a bureaucracy of people.

Much credit has to go to these church groups and their dedication to organize these homes. These private homes are saddled with debts, because when they were organized there were not sufficiently large mortgage grants provided, and now, while they are providing very fine accommodation for senior citizens, they still have to, through their own initiative, pay off debts that they could not arrange when the home was initially built.

However, it was my pleasure to note that they seem to be able to provide the warmth and personal touch, while still working to pay off the debt. I believe that this approach could return if a new approach could be taken by involving the immediate community in the administration, even in the administration of the publicly organized homes.

Let's get back to community involvement and community responsibility instead of creating ghettos for our senior citizens. In my constituency a group of people, members of the Christian Reform Church, many of them former citizens of the country of Holland who have made their homes here, have spent many days in the last year planning a new home. Sad as it is, many delays occurred because they were not able to arrange for sufficiently large sums of money to cover the capital cost, and are just in the process of building this complex. All this time this group of citizens of this Christian denomination carried out and devoted their time without any remuneration of any sort, and we all are, no doubt, aware of the time that they will spend in the future, in the operation of this home. Mr. Speaker, another senior citizens' home was opened over a year ago, planned and operated by a group of people from the Ukrainian Catholic Church. This home is in need of help to look after the capital debt. These are only two examples of the involvement of people in the constituency to look after senior citizens in their community.

I am confident that this approach could be taken anywhere in Alberta, rather than someone in the Department of Social Development deciding what is best for a certain community. I particularly urge the hon. members representing rural constituencies that this is possible not only in an urban area, and that they should encourage their local groups and their local churches to do the planning with assistance from the department. I personally speak with memory of my service as a social worker with the Department of Welfare, and I am confident that the new direction with the present government will consider the wishes of Albertans, rather than knowing what is best for them.

There is one service that the constituency of Edmonton Beverly is getting more than its share of, and that is with some criticism and some alarm, and that is low-cost and public housing. I'm not opposed and many of my people of my constituency are not opposed to low-cost and public housing, but I urge that long range planning be implemented in order that accommodation in schools is sufficient, because some of the changes that have been approved for public housing has now overcrowded local schools. What about the family that purchased their home in what one thought was going to be a one-family dwelling area, and found that several years later, to their surprise, developments such as these came right immediately across

7-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

the street. When public funds are made available for these projects, it is very necessary that definite regulations be established for local governments to adhere to with long range planning.

Mr. Speaker, as a former member of a school board, I wish to speak about education and the opportunities in the Edmonton Beverly constituency. We have both the Edmonton Public and the Edmonton Separate School Boards providing what I feel is fairly good accommodation for the education of their children. However, the alarming concern is that no high school facilities are found in my constituency. Some of the older schools have not been upgraded for some time. Therefore, the neighbouring new districts have facilities far better in standard than the old schools in the older districts. Of great interest, as I mentioned earlier, is the Christian Reform Church providing two privately built and privately financed schools, providing an education of their choice for their children. A more equitable form of financial support has to be considered. These are future citizens, and if we truly believe that all our children should have an equal opportunity to get their education, this is a must.

By having a controversy that so often enters into people's minds, two school systems, and then private schools, as we have in the Edmonton Beverly constituency, I am confident that, as stated on page 10 on the Speech from the Throne, we are getting maximum value for the dollars spent on education, because we have some comparison and some competition that provides a measurement for the dollars spent on education.

So often we hear comments by many people that we have a multi-cultural society. Mr. Speaker, I urge that over and beyond the programs being encouraged and provided to the English and the French, that we do not provide only lip service for the other ethnic groups. It was only on the Sunday past that I was present in the Provincial Museum, and heard the eloquent presentation by a speaker addressing the gathering on behalf of the Indian community. I would hope that the information the gentleman provided then is provided to Indian families. It was an eye opener to me and I think that these Indian children would be proud if this information was provided to them in their classroom.

As a member of the Ukrainian community, I have so often heard the reference being made that so few people speak the language. Well, the way it is being discouraged and the lack of support it receives, very soon there will truly be even fewer. The different cultures and the different languages make our nation Canada and our province Alberta that much richer and not a melting pot.

Mr. Speaker, may I move to the discussion of the commercial and industrial question that we have in the constituency of Edmonton Beverly. One of the oldest and one of the first large industries in Edmonton, the meat processing and packing plants, are found in there. Very few industries have been established in this constituency, even though a large tract of land in the northern part of the constituency, which could be developed with some long range planning, has been overlooked. We have, on the west bank of the North Saskatchewan River opposite the large industrial plants on the east bank, a very convenient location, but very little industry has been provided.

Next to this area that could be industrialized, we have some 200 acres, maybe more, maybe less, which may be developed into parkland and that would continue with the Rundle Park, and would act as a buffer between the residential area that is proposed for some 80,000 people and the industrial area along the river bank.

One only has to travel through this farm land in the northern part of this constituency, and I am confident that one would wonder why this area so close has been left undeveloped and with no definite

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-39

plan until recently. This goes with all the affirmative debate that took place on March 7th on the provincial parks debate. Again, I refer to the Speech from the Throne with regard to new programs, innovations, and reforms, that will provide a sense of challenge. Until recently, very few thought a large park was possible so close to the city.

Here I have a suggestion that a park of some 200 acres is possible right within the present boundaries of the city, without annexing that park that is named Sherwood Park, that my hon. friend, John Ashton, spoke of and lives in. The planning of parkland must go together with industrial development, and it isn't too late. Now is the time when we still have suitable areas that are natural. However, regulations are a must to protect all parkland against development into industrial sites, roadways, or even oil exploration. This is the role of the provincial Planning Appeal Board. I trust we will find new ways of looking at the ruling on parkland being converted into industrial uses or roadways.

As a member representing what all consider to be an urban population, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and prepared to take my licks from constituents who live in the urban setting, when I say from the bottom of my heart that the emphasis given to agriculture by this government with such strong emphasis in the Speech from the Throne, makes me really pleased. My concern has been the easy availability of funds under the different welfare programs, really encouraging our Alberta citizens, men and women, to leave farming at fairly early ages and move into the urban community of their choice, leaving fewer and fewer people to manage the remaining farmland. One only has to look at the average age of the people remaining to carry out the difficult agricultural operations. This was quite evident when one visited the constituencies during the recent last year's campaign to see the average age of the people turning out. It is alarming.

Here I have my personal opinion, and the reason for the young people leaving for a more exciting life of the urban society. This is the lack of operating capital. No young person is prepared to work under such financial hardships and particularly shortage of money, while the Treasury Branches carried on with large surpluses of cash in reserve, not loaned out at low interest to farming communities to be used. The former government policy seemed to encourage the rural population to move to the larger urban centres. Approximately 10 years ago, maybe more or less, the emphasis was to close every small school in the small towns and villages. So my colleague, the hon. Member from Camrose, pointed out this has carried out the death of small towns. It is interesting to read now, and one only has to pick up practically any magazine or newspaper, that educators and other people who are involved with education speak now that bigness in education is not the answer.

Now the biggest whipping point that has been presently here before us in this Assembly concerns the task forces. I wish to refer to a visit to my office by the present president of the Social Credit Association of the Edmonton Beverly constituency, and this took place on August 31st, 1971, when he called on me to congratulate me. And to his knowledge, his own comment was that the candidate that he worked for did not at any time in the many years -- some 16 years as a member of that party and a member of this Assembly -- serve on committees or on any task force. Yet the hon. members opposite me here are so unhappy when they had every opportunity to implement this program of involving of what they then called backbenchers, and we call members of the team. The criticisms that they hear are naturally there. If one wants to hear criticism, one only has to start it and create it and it will continue coming. My only hope is, as they have commented and stated so often, that they are here to provide honest and responsible government, that they honestly and with responsibility will take a look at the sacrifice and the role

7-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

that these MLA's of the team are putting in, and they will then take second thought and possibly wish that they had done this before.

Thank you very much Mr. Speaker.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I too, like the other members of the Legislature, would like to congratulate you on your appointment. I submit Mr. Speaker, that you are the epitome of excellence, fairness and good judgment and I congratulate you for it.

I'm sure you won't mind, Mr. Speaker, if I go just a bit farther. Up to this point in time, no one has thought to congratulate the Deputy Speaker on his election. Being a former school trustee and colleague of mine when we worked on the Alberta School Trustees Association together, and as I look across the floor, there is something that is really strange about this thing. There are about nine people over there who are either school trustees, county council school committee members, school trustee association employees, school board members, and here I am, the only school person on this side.

I have always felt, hon. members, that I had experienced a very warm and good relationship with those people when I was the president of the Alberta School Trustees' Association, and I personally see no reason why this relationship should change at this point in time.

It gives me a great deal of pleasure and pride, Mr. Speaker, as a novice MLA, to have been afforded the opportunity to address the Members of this Assembly for the very first time in response to the Speech from the Throne. Now I will attempt in the allotted time to give you my impressions of the Legislature, and they keep changing from day to day, incidentally. As a matter of fact I have just thought of a very practical suggestion to offset the expense of Hansard possibly an entertainment tax for those in the galleries might be a real benefit. I'm sure they would be glad to pay it.

I would like to give you a brief history and description of my constituency - Lethbridge West - and just relate to you some of the matters that are of importance to myself and to my constituents. And it is the constituents that I am particularly concerned about, because, after all, they are the reason why I am here in the first place and they shall come before self or party politics at all times. You can be sure of this.

I must say that I am impressed with the appearance of the newly decorated Legislative Chamber. It looks clean, bright and dignified. I think this is the way it should be so that we may conduct our business in that regard, considering the job that we have to do and the fact that we represent the people of Alberta.

Now knowing, as we all do, that the province of Alberta has for many years set the pace in this Canada of ours for dignity and decorum, it is my hope that the discussion and the debate that follow here in this Chamber in the days and weeks ahead will lend itself to that dignity, and that the interests of our constituents and Albertans, as a whole, will be our prime consideration during these forthcoming days and weeks. I can assure you that this is my objective. I expect and I pray that I will have the courage to be honest, to be frank and outspoken on matters that I believe to be in the interests of my constituents and of Albertans as a whole. And I believe that this can be done without being acrimonious.

Now while I am prepared to admit that the Speech from the Throne has referred to many programs and proposals that are of interest and will be of a benefit to the people of Alberta, many areas of extreme importance, I believe, remain unmentioned. Now we shall refer to

March 10th, 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

7-41

them from time to time during the forthcoming session and try to correct them.

The Speech from the Throne made reference to the formation of six special legislative committees that will study, in detail, areas of special concern to the people of Alberta. I would like to say at this time that I would hope that the government will make sure that these committees will be made up of MLA's on both sides of the Floor, and I would hope that they would see fit on a pro rata basis, if they could just go that far. I think anything less than that just may not be in the best interests of the province of Alberta. Now I'm quite sure that most of the MLA's, at least in the opposition, stand ready and willing to serve on legislative committees.

The members of this legislature may or may not be aware of some of the situations in southern Alberta and around Lethbridge in particular. For example, we have no passenger train service in Lethbridge at all. We have no east-west airline passenger service at all. Now grateful as we are to a locally operated air service, Time Airways, we do have north-south quite well; we can get to Calgary and points north very well and we're very happy about that. But because of the lack of these facilities there is a very heavy reliance on east-west travel by automobile, and of course here lies the problem and you have been reminded of it many times.

We don't have a good east-west highway. Number 3 highway from Medicine Hat to the British Columbia border, except for a couple of short intervals, is certainly inadequate and to say the least very hazardous. The hon. Minister of Highways was in Lethbridge and heard hearings on this and we're very glad that he came down. The Premier was in Lethbridge for the annual Chamber of Commerce dinner and I think appropriately reminded that there was some indication that there might be a need for a highway there, so I think that the point has been well made.

But the point is, Mr. Speaker, No. 3 highway is the southern route to the west coast. Now, on behalf of my constituents, I must say that it is imperative that reconstruction of this highway to no less than at least a good wide two-lane with wide shoulders should be taken into consideration at the earliest possible date, preferably about yesterday would be about right.

The hon. Minister of Highways, may I just plead one thing, when, and if, you get around to this, would you please put some signs up. You can head from Medicine Hat and head toward Lethbridge and you don't know you're getting to Lethbridge; of course you get that good warm feeling, but other than that there are no signs. You can come from the west and you have the same situation. I think for a city that is the third largest in the province we're entitled to a little better recognition on the highways, so I would plead with you to take note of this.

While I am on the subject of highways, I must also mention the proposed bridge in Lethbridge that will lead to the west side development where the new University of Lethbridge is located. Now, I believe, that a commitment was made by the former government that a bridge would be built across the river there, but I think they also made it quite clear that it would be at least 1975 or 1976 before this bridge would be built. But because the city of Lethbridge has such a substantial commitment in land development and services which amounts incidentally to about \$3 million, on the west side of the river, I would ask that the present government would give some very serious consideration to moving the starting date of that bridge up to 1973 or 1974, if at all possible.

Now this is really of vital importance to Lethbridge and to southern Alberta, and I can only assume, and I think it's a fair assumption, that the reference in the Speech to the Throne where we

7-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

talked about development of highways, and this sort of thing, must have been referring to Highway 3 in Lethbridge. I can draw no other conclusions.

The Speech from the Throne makes reference to education as a high priority area, and I concur that it just must be considered in that light, and I must congratulate the Minister of Education and the Minister of Advanced Education; I am sure they must have a hand in this. There is plenty of evidence, Mr. Speaker, that the public is disenchanting, to say the least, with our present educational systems in this province. We need new and exciting and innovative ideas in the handling of our education at all levels. We must devise ways of getting more parent involvement and more parent participation, as well as the opportunity to get parents involved financially. I believe -- you may think I am a little old fashioned -- I believe that parents still have the prior right and responsibility to see that their children get the type of education that they want for them.

As mentioned by my hon. colleague from Edmonton Beverly -- he made reference to private schools -- and I just want to mention a word on that. We do have in this province a number of approved private schools and I think they are doing a very commendable job of educating children and receiving only a minimal assistance from the government. Now, I think we must do more to encourage these schools. I don't think we should take away their incentive and their ingenuity, but I think if we recognize them as being worthwhile and we approve of them, let's give them enough so they can get along a little bit better. So I would plead this for them; I think it's a good idea.

Now, I believe we must take steps to give parents a greater choice in the schools that they send their children to, and I expect to bring forward to this session of the Legislature, a request for a study by a legislative committee for a different concept for educational finance and school systems that will give the parents more choice in the schools that their children attend. And I will elaborate on this at that time.

We will also be making representation for improved minimum teacher training programs, including internship and adequate classroom exposure by education students all through their teacher training program.

I would like to say a word about the Lethbridge Community College. The Lethbridge Community College is an institution of excellence that is well equipped, especially in the technical and vocational areas, and I might add is also very well staffed. And we are very grateful, incidentally, to the former government for providing these facilities and I hope the present government will continue to give high priority to educational institutions in Lethbridge.

But there is one small area of concern that I think something could be done about. It is the Apprenticeship Board. They do not always operate in the best interests of the people of southern Alberta. Too often, Lethbridge and southern Alberta apprenticeship students are required to attend the schools in other parts of the province, like Calgary and Edmonton, while Lethbridge facilities, while I won't say there less idle, but they're not going at full capacity, simply because there seems to be a lack of communication and understanding between that board and the other.

Mr. Speaker, I have about two or three minutes, if I could continue on, would it be agreeable to the House? Thank you very much.

March 10th, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

7-43

Now, it isn't that our students don't like Calgary or Edmonton, they simply and purely like Lethbridge better. You can understand this, but the point I'd like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that I believe that we need some liaison between these groups, and what I would ask is that there should be direct representation on the Apprenticeship Board from the board of the Lethbridge Community College, and in this way we can talk back and forth and see that these types of things do not happen, because I'm quite sure that most of them are misunderstandings.

Now, implied in the Speech from the Throne is that we want to make Alberta a better place in which to live, we want to help our people, but we want them to help themselves as well. We want people in other parts of the world to know about our province, about our people, and about our culture. We have many things that we can be proud of.

For example, Lethbridge and the surrounding towns have a very famous group of 40 young female chorus singers, known as the Anne Campbell Singers. Now their leader and director, Anne Campbell, has done a very commendable job of training these girls and bringing fame, not only to Lethbridge and southern Alberta, but to Canada, I submit. Now for the second time, this group has been invited to compete in the world competition for amateur choirs, which is going to be held in Great Britain this coming summer, and I submit that there will be no less than 40 countries taking place. So it is my hope that the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation, Sir, will make provision in his budget for just at least a token assistance. We don't want the whole world, just give us something so that these people can fittingly represent Lethbridge, Southern Alberta, and Canada as a matter of fact, when they go to this competition in Great Britain this next summer.

I should also mention that in 1970 this group of singers were the runners up in that very prestigious BBC program, 'Let the People Sing'. So I think it is incumbent upon this government to support and encourage groups such as these. I think this is what makes good citizenship, and a real good province, and we'll get note of it all over the world.

Now there are other areas of concern that I have for my constituents and Alberta as a whole, such as the increasing of the minimum wage, and I thank the Minister of Labour for making comment on this and bringing this to the attention of the House. I think we should have small amounts of assistance to organizations like the VON, The Victorian Order of Nurses, and there are others. These types of associations, Mr. Speaker, I think do a very worthwhile job. They're trying desperately to continue their worthwhile service of serving the unfortunate people while they are in their homes. And I think this is a good preventative thing. Isn't this much better than putting them into hospitals and nursing homes, with the cost becoming astronomical. So I'll just ask if you will give these types of things some consideration.

Now I know we all represent people who want much, it is human nature. But being realistic people, we all also realize that it takes a long time to acquire the things that we believe are important. We realize too, that priorities must be set. Now some of these priorities must be in the direction of placing in our homes, and our schools -- yes and in our churches, an emphasis on the need for, and the value of physical, mental and moral disciplines. You can't legislate everything. The real values in life you don't legislate, those are things you call obedience to the unenforceable, and I think this is very important.

Mr. Speaker, we do not solve our problems and then just start to live, we solve them by living. So this could be a long and tedious task, but I think it can be an enjoyable and rewarding one if we do

7-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 10th, 1972

it in the spirit of statesmanship, of good management, and a true consideration for those whom we have been charged to serve.

MR. LUDWIG:

I beg leave to adjourn the debate Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBER:

No!

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the person who has the floor at --

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that both members should wait until Your Honour decides who to recognize before making statements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

[Inaudible comments.]

MR. SPEAKER:

I must say that the hon. member for Calgary Mountain View had the floor first.

MR. LUDWIG:

I'd like to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member the leave of the House to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House -- incidently, you didn't require leave -- stands adjourned until Monday afternoon at half past two.

[The House rose at 5:33 pm.]