

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Monday, March 13th, 1972

[The House met at 2:30 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

NOTICES OF MOTION

MR. LOUGHFEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give notice to a motion of this Assembly by myself and seconded by the hon. member Mr. Diachuck for Tuesday next, tomorrow, to the following affect:

Be it resolved that this Assembly direct the Government, on behalf of the people of the Province of Alberta, to extend an invitation to Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, His Royal Highness Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, and members of the Royal Family to visit the Province of Alberta in 1974 to join with us in the celebration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the arrival of the North West Mounted Police in Alberta; or, alternatively, to visit the Province of Alberta during 1973 for the celebration of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the proclamation of the North West Mounted Police.

I would ask at that time, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow on Tuesday, on Motions other than Government Motions if we could have the leave of the House to deal with that ahead of the other motions on the Order Paper.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and through you to the hon. Members of this Assembly the students of Avonmore Grade VI. They are accompanied by their teachers Mrs. Woodrow and Mrs. MacIntosh. May I thank the teachers for creating the interest in our democratic process in their students and thank the students for coming here. May they now please rise to be recognized.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in filing the Second Annual Report of the Alberta Colleges Commission of 1970-71.

8-2

ALEERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to file the Annual Report of the Department of Highways and Transport. I would also like to file the other documents in regard to surveys and the Highway Transport Department commercial vehicle report.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the return required by the Assembly under authority of Section 24 of The Gas Resources Preservation Act.

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to table at this time the information requested in Motion for Return 105.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Men's Hostel Meals

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Is the minister aware of the absolutely inadequate, and I'd say outrageous, quality of meals being served at the provincial single men's hostel in Edmonton?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that question involves a presumption. If the hon. member is, in fact, asking if the meals are outrageous, as he says, I don't mind checking into it, and finding out if anything is lacking in that regard, and will do so.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I might just say by way of explanation that I've received a number of letters on this matter and several deputations. Will the minister assure the House that after checking into it that he will make this a priority item and report back to the Assembly?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I don't mind assuring the hon. gentleman that both the quality of the food and the report to the House will be accorded their appropriate place in priorities.

Grain Commissioner

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Deputy Premier, and Minister of Agriculture? Is the government giving consideration to the appointment of a grain commissioner?

DR. HCFNER:

We're giving consideration to all matters that are related to grain in Alberta, and when that policy is finalized, it will be announced in the House.

March 13, 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

8-3

Air Ambulance Service

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question, I'm not sure to which minister this would apply, but I'll direct it to the hon. Premier and he can pass it on. Has the government any plans to discontinue the emergency air ambulance now operating in Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

DR. BOUVIER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. If you're not discontinuing the emergency air ambulance, are you changing the manner in which it is being operated at present -- I mean by having private enterprise charter companies do the transporting?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, some consideration is being given to changing the manner in which the ambulance service is being operated.

DR. BOUVIER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does this involve the use of a King Air from Edmonton to pick up patients, say, in Janvier reserve and fly them to McMurray and fly them to Edmonton empty?

MR. CRAWFORD:

The hon. member's question is a matter of detail and I don't think I could be expected to answer it here, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Transport and Highways. The federal government has recently introduced Bill C2 in Parliament, which, if passed, would repeal Section 238 of the Criminal Code and will provide that a judge may prohibit a person from driving a motor vehicle in Canada at times, or at such times and places as may be specified in the order. Now, my question to the minister is whether the government will be introducing at this session of the Legislature any amendments to Section 206 of The Highway Traffic Act to modify the terms of the present mandatory suspension of an operator's licence, following criminal code convictions for impaired driving, or driving with more than .08 per cent alcohol in his blood?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, in regard to that question, we'll give this consideration. Certainly some of the findings that have been brought down recently in the new federal legislation should be of dovetailing our legislation to the federal legislation.

Grain Commissioner (cont.)

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. If a grain commissioner is appointed, will it be done through a competition?

8-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, if and when that is done, we'll announce it in the House. I might say that in relation to competitions (or otherwise), what we in the Department of Agriculture are concerned about is getting the right kind of people to do these marketing jobs, so we can improve the marketing opportunities for our farmers.

Rapeseed Plant

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. It concerns the proposed rapeseed crushing plant at High Prairie. Is the hon. minister aware of the research prepared both by the National Farmers Union and Unifarm in the Peace country which shows that a central location for the plant would save Peace River rapeseed growers up to \$1 million annually in trucking costs.

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am aware that the NFU and Unifarm have both put before me a substantial amount of information. I might also say that the members of the Legislative Assembly from that area have also placed before me a number of matters that relate to the question of the rapeseed crushing plant. However, as I said in the House previously, I don't think our department has to make a judgment on the matter of the site with regard to the incentive grants of DREE, also having regard to the company that is putting up the plant. And while we might like to direct them into certain areas, certainly we would not want to stop the development of rapeseed crushing plant in the Peace River country because of this. And so I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I think the hon. member has some merit in pushing the site of the crusher in the Peace River country; I think that this has to be settled by sitting down with the various communities and the various farm organizations, and trying to get the best site that would suit everybody in that area.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the hon. minister's answer and in view of the Canada-Alberta Second Special Areas Agreement, under the terms of which I understand that major projects are to be funded by the federal government, smaller projects by the provincial government, or at least to be given consideration by the provincial government -- in view of this and in view of the concern expressed by the farm organizations, will the minister give the House an undertaking that he will commission a meeting of the promoter of the project and the farm organizations concerned to consider site and to perhaps consider in addition, possible matching grants from the province as per the Canada-Alberta Special Areas Agreement?

DR. HORNER:

Well Mr. Speaker, I think that I can give the hon. member the commitment with regard to the meeting. I would say, however, as he is aware, the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and the hon. Minister of Industry are in Ottawa today discussing with Mr. Marchand in DREE a number of these questions. And therefore, I'd like respectfully to suggest that the outcome of those discussions will have a bearing on the latter part of his question. I'll certainly bring it up with the hon. ministers of Industry and the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs return from Ottawa and their discussions on this area that we're talking about right now.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-5

Nursing Home Contracts

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Are there any outstanding applications for nursing home contracts in north Calgary, and what in particular is the status of an alleged application from the Seventh Day Adventist Church?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the applications are made in the first instance, of course, at the local level through the Calgary Auxiliary Hospital and Nursing Home District Board. In respect to specific delays I would be glad to make an inquiry and see if there have been applications made that have not been responded to, and discuss it with the necessary local board.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister regarding these recommendations based on the decision of the local board, is it not true that these recommendations and all applications are forwarded to the department for final approval?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Alberta Hospital Services Commission has been gathering applications from points throughout the province.

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister could possibly, in keeping with this question of nursing homes and the discussion that has just taken place, advise the House as to whether the government, as a matter of policy, are not going to allow any further expansion of the private nursing homes in the province. Are applications officially being restricted to non-profit or public authority?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is an overall matter of policy, but my understanding of the applications that are being received by each of the boards from time to time is that they are still receiving both kinds.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, this particular application that has been referred to by the hon. member from the opposite side, was it not submitted to the Hospitals Service Commission for consideration?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may be giving rather than seeking information and I believe the House, if it can be aware of matters which are in the public domain, may be aware that the hon. member is related in some way to the board in question and all I can undertake is to enquire specifically into it.

Family Allowances and Victoria Charter

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier and ask him, in light of the announcement from Ottawa, and I

8-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

gather simultaneously from Quebec City, concerning the matter of family allowances, is it the intention of the Province of Alberta to rethink its position with regard to the administration of family allowances, and at the same time would the Premier comment on the Alberta situation concerning the constitutional charter?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had intended on Orders of the Day to deal with that matter, but I will deal with it at this time. I received this morning, a letter from the Prime Minister dated March 9th, 1972 which dealt with the matter of family allowances and manpower centres and I will be happy to table that correspondence for the benefit of members' perusal.

In addition to that, I will be tabling correspondence between the Premier of Saskatchewan and the Prime Minister, arising out of the Prairie Economic Council Meeting of January, 1972, together with the response to the three Premiers of the Provinces of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Alberta by the Prime Minister which reply correspondence was dated March 1st, 1971.

The matter that is raised in this letter, of course, has very large and important implications, and it would not be my intention to respond specifically at this time nor would the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. There is a great deal of study and assessment that has to be made with regard to this letter, because the letter appears to involve some new directions in relationship to the views of the federal government in response to provincial jurisdiction. It certainly is going to require some elaboration by ourselves with regard to the definition of the word 'family allowances' as contained in the letter and what is intended there and how it relates to provincial programs as they exist now or as they may be contemplated. So there will be, and we have already started in process, a very extensive survey of the implications of this letter and this direction upon the provincial government, and I am not prepared to say more about that at this time.

However, the letter that I received from the Prime Minister this morning does refer, too, to another matter, and that is, if I may quote from the letter, on the question of manpower centres and occupational training allowances. Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the Prime Minister's letter dated March 9th, 1972.

"We are still in the process of examining the ideas brought forward by provincial governments during discussions on various aspects of this question which have been going on during the past year or two. We are also considering the recent representations we received from the Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta governments. We are hopeful that as a result of these studies, and of further discussions with the provinces, it may be possible to arrive at conclusions satisfactory to all concerned."

We intend to follow up with the suggestion at the conclusion of the letter that that particular matter as well should be developed. Perhaps I could phrase it as interpreting the letter to mean that there is a crack opened in the door relative to the greater provincial involvement in the matter of occupational training and manpower centres and a larger provincial involvement, because we feel very strongly that that is needed.

The latter part I believe, that the hon. member's question had to deal with, is the question of the Victoria Charter and I would like to give that matter some more thought. It is, I think, true, Mr. Speaker, that this was one of the major matters upon which the charter in Victoria foundered insofar as the Province of Quebec is concerned. However, there were others, and the new government has

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-7

not taken a definitive position with regard to that charter. but it is apparent from this letter received from the Prime Minister this morning that it is now incumbent upon the administration to make that further assessment if the Prime Minister of Quebec responds to this letter in such a way as to indicate that it very largely meets the concerns that their government had at the time.

Superintendent of Treasury Branches

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. the Provincial Treasurer. Is it the intention of the government to appoint a new superintendent of Treasury Branches from within the existing employees?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I answered that question on Friday.

Edmonton Public School Board

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education, perhaps even more than one. Let me start by saying has the department or the minister given an answer to the request of the Edmonton Public School Board for some special consideration, I believe in the vicinity of \$600,000?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No, Mr. Speaker, not yet. We met with the Edmonton Public School Board a little more than a week ago and my officials are looking for further information which they have agreed to provide. We expect to be in a position to answer their questions and set forth the government's position within a short while.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Are there any school jurisdictions in the province that have made application or sought the ministers' approval with regard to the holding of a plebiscite?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker; firstly it's not, I believe, required to have approval from the minister or the government with respect to holding a plebiscite, but the school division of Wainwright is having a plebiscite on Saturday, March 18th for, I believe, some \$120,000.

Alberta Service Corps

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation. Mr. Minister, I would like to know if there is any truth to the rumour that the Alberta Service Corps will be dissolved?

MR. SCHMIL:

As you just said yourself, it is a rumour. However, I can tell you that it's not only going to be dissolved, but I have a much better program for them in mind than has been in the past.

8-8

ALEERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

St. Paul Survey

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a another question of the hon. minister. Now, hon. minister you may not know this off the top of your head and, if not, I can answer this, but it's in relation to an Order of Council as passed in relation to the fact that there's going to be a grant of approximately \$4,000 given to the town of St. Paul to set up a recreational survey. Now my question is, are your department and the people in the area not capable of doing this without bringing in an outside consultant?

MR. SCHMID:

Maybe I should tell you first of all that tonight I have the people from St. Paul coming in to meet with me personally. St. Paul does have a particular problem because they have several areas of recreation available where others are missing, and we found that to have a correct study made - and to have it done as early as possible because they are looking at some other projects - we should get in an outside company because of the speed that they would like to have it done. Therefore we called this study for that matter.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary then. You are saying that the people on your staff cannot conduct a survey; you have to bring outside help?

MR. SCHMID:

It's an ongoing program, that of St. Paul recreation, and the study is being conducted in order to ascertain what the people of St. Paul really need and want.

MR. GRUENWALT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister without Portfolio in Charge of Tourism. Sir, I am wondering if you are aware that the South Alberta Tourist and Convention Association does not receive per capita grants that are equitable to other tourist and conventicn associations in the Province of Alberta, and would you intend to correct this situation when the budgets are brought down?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, the grant is not a per capita grant; it's a grant given by the Alberta Government Travel Bureau on a matching basis. It's a 60 per cent grant from the government and 40 per cent from the sponsoring body in the local area. There are 12 zones in Alberta and each zone receives a particular amount of money depending on the program they submit for approval. It's not on a per capita basis because, if it were, our total grant would probably be used up by the cities of Edmonton and Calgary. It's on a basis which promotes tourism over the total province rather than centring it in the two major centres. I can give you the figures, tomorrow probably, for the amount of money that each of the zones has received over the last fiscal year. A proposal has been forwarded for consideration in the estimates for this fiscal year, which I am not able to give you at this time, but the total program and how it is established and run is under very strict regulations, and I would be happy to forward it to you.

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-9

Alberta Advertising

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister without Portfolio in Charge of Tourism. Is the government considering looking after all advertisements for out of the province in order to make it unnecessary for each zone to carry out advertising of its own particular area?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, if I gather what the hon. member is asking, he wants to know if all of the advertising that is presently being done by the zone will be taken care of by the Alberta Government Travel Bureau. No, Mr. Speaker, we rely to a great deal on the private sector to promote the tourist industry and the program that they come up with will be supported with funds up to 60 per cent, and if a brochure is part of that program we will be happy to support it.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it be more economical and more far reaching if all of the advertising was looked after by the province, even though each zone paid a portion of it?

MR. DOWLING:

Well, I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, if this is correct. The program of the Alberta Government Travel Bureau is being revamped and hopefully during the estimates you will have an opportunity to question what we're doing and I would be happy to deal with it extensively at that time. Thank you very much.

Completion of Highway 15

DR. EUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Highways. I would like to know, first of all, hon. minister, will be the City of Edmonton be receiving any assistance in completing Highway 15 from the end of your responsibility into the city?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, that's a budgetary matter and can be discussed at the time of the estimates.

St. Albert Traffic Lights

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, a second question, will the hon. minister inform the House what percentage of the costs the Department of Highways will be paying in proportion to what the Town of St. Albert will be paying for the traffic lights on the highway that goes through there? This is not the amount but the percentage. I'm sure the budget won't hinder you there, sir.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't sat down and sharpened my pencil to the point where I have worked out percentages, and in any area --

8-10

ALEERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

DR. BUCK:

A ball park figure, hon. Minister, will be fine -- is it 60/40, 50/50, 40/60?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, maybe if the hon. member would put that on the Order Paper, I will get him an accurate answer.

DR. BUCK:

I am glad the hon. Premier directed you in what you were to say.

Unemployment Insurance

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Social Development. On Friday, a question was asked related to the problems of people who haven't been able to collect their unemployment insurance benefits quickly enough. I wonder if the hon. minister would advise the House to what extent his department is ready to fill the gap created by the delays in payments under the Unemployment Insurance Act.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of sides to the important consideration involved in the hon. member's question. In direct answer I would say that so far as I know the department is, in fact, filling the gap in providing assistance, in some cases knowing it will be for a short period, for people who are shortly to receive the federal benefits.

The other side of the question, of course, is whether or not, if it's a case of straight delay on the part of the federal government, the recipient will either be receiving the same funds twice, or the province will be expending funds which should properly be expended by the federal government. In connection with that I've had discussions with my colleague the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, and representations are being prepared to the federal government in regard to that matter.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, is this temporary relief extended to single people as well as families?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, if there are cases where it is not being extended, which the hon. member knows about, I would be glad to have them looked into. I have certainly conveyed no directive to the department to draw any distinction among applicants.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question on this issue, Mr. Speaker, this time to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Has the government given any consideration to advancing temporary loans from the Treasury Branches to people who have not as yet been able to collect their unemployment insurance benefits, but who are eligible to receive them?

MR. MINIFLY:

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned on Friday that several aspects of the Treasury Branches were under consideration at the present time and when we have made and completed a full review I will be in a position to reply to your question.

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-11

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Provincial Treasurer include in his deliberations the possibility of underwriting income tax rebates which are now presently being used as a means of exploitation in many cases of poverty, where people need it? This of course, would be probably something that would help considerably.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, certainly I would say, as I have said, there are many, many aspects and situations which the hon. members are raising in connection with this, and I think they are of valid concern. What I would do is encourage any of you who have considerations which you would like our government to consider in this review, do by all means send me a letter and I'll follow them up and see what can be done. I think it's difficult to answer a specific situation without reviewing the total context.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In view of the serious situation among people who aren't able to get their unemployment insurance benefits as well as the people the hon. Member from Pincher Creek referred to with respect to T4 slips, in view of their immediate circumstances, could the hon. Provincial Treasurer give the House some indication as to when this review will take place, so we might have some idea as to whether or when the Treasury Branch could fill this role?

MR. MINIELY:

Well the first thing I'd like to say is certainly that I appreciate the valid concern that you have. I think it is important, though, that hon. members realize, with respect to Treasury Branch policy, that the Treasury Branch's total loaning policy is one over which the government has some control.

With respect to individual loans to individual citizens of Alberta, I am sure you will appreciate that in no way should the government interfere with the individual loan policy and the proper administration of these loans within the broad policy of the Treasury Branches. Certainly, with respect to that, if the hon. member for Spirit River-Fairview would like me to examine this particular aspect to see if anything could be done, I'd be happy to report back to you on it.

Treasury Branches

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Has the hon. Provincial Treasurer noticed any large withdrawals by the depositors from the Treasury Branch?

MR. MINIELY:

The answer to that question is no.

MR. TAYLOR:

One other supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. There is considerable concern among many people in regard to the indecision of the government regarding treasury branches. Can the hon. minister give us the assurance that there is no thought of closing down the treasury branches?

8-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

MR. MINIELY:

We've made our position very clear on this, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question. I think this has been done several times and again we'll assure you that the treasury branches are going to be, if anything, expanded. We think they can play a vital role in Alberta, and we will pursue this in our total review of the future of the treasury branches.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, has there been any consideration given to the possible sale of the treasury branches to a chartered bank?

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer a question? Would the hon. Provincial Treasurer consider having a legislative committee study the future role of the Treasury Branch?

MR. LOUGHFEED:

Mr. Speaker, that is certainly a reasonable matter for us to consider, but I think our reaction to that would be that the total financial institutions within the province, and their effectiveness in terms of our transition period economically, will have a great deal of government policy input. I'm sure, during the course of this session, that many of the ministers will be commenting upon the matter raised by the hon. member. But I feel it has to be something that is established by way of government policy and then considered by way of debate here in the Assembly. So with respect, I would suggest that it doesn't, in my view, form an appropriation area for a select committee of the Legislature, at least at this time.

Unemployment Insurance (cont.)

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the hon. Attorney General, and it is with respect again to the people who have been put in a very difficult position because of the failure to collect their unemployment insurance benefits. Has the hon. Attorney General given any consideration to appropriate legal action in dealing with those firms which are taking advantage of the desperate circumstances of the people, and charging interest rates which are completely usurious?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I'll try to make my speech shorter than the question. The answer is yes, we have received some complaints. We're looking into it. One of the things that need to be kept in mind, of course is that the amount of the charge for the loan is an interest rate and that falls within federal government jurisdiction. At this moment we're still gathering information and I do not know the exact terms of the arrangements all of these companies make with their customers.

The Police Act

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Attorney General. Do I conclude properly from what you said the other day that The Police Act will not be brought before the Legislature at this session?

MR. LEITCH:

I do not anticipate bringing it before the House this session, Mr. Speaker.

March 13, 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

8-13

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary. In view of that, is there any thought of changing any of the regulations or adding to or deleting some of the present regulations of The Police Act before the fall session?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, at the present moment I don't have any regulations that I plan to pass under that act, but there is a possibility that something could be done later on in the year.

Licence Plate Outlets

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Highways. Will there be any additional licence plate outlets opened in the City of Edmonton? I know there is always a big traffic jam down at your building; I was wondering if there would be further outlets.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. We have opened up some additional licence receiving areas in outlying communities.

Alberta Hospitals

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. The Alberta Mental Health Association and the present advisor to the Department of Health and Social Development have recently disclosed that the Alberta Hospital in Edmonton and the Alberta Hospital in Ponoka are now in a dangerous state. I was wondering if the minister was aware of the situation, and is his department planning to answer these grave charges in any way?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has made reference to grave charges without specifying them and therefore I don't suppose I can answer to what hasn't been asked. The overall question of the status of the institutions mentioned is part of an overall review and a program of action in regard to mental health which will very shortly be before this House.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The reason I asked a question, to clarify it, is I was just wondering what are the dangerous situations that your advisor is talking about? Not me -- what your advisor is talking about.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think the hon. member is suggesting that he has been talking to my advisor. I think he is referring to a speculative newspaper article that he's read or some news report and I'm not going to comment on that.

MR. DIXON:

Just for clarification, Mr. Speaker, I'm reading from the Alberta Mental Health brief to the government.

8-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would have assisted by making reference to the fact that he was referring to the brief when he asked his question. All the matters that have been referred to in the brief are matters that the government has under consideration.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it then, that there is no dangerous situation existing in these two hospitals?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is inviting me to draw a conclusion which he would wish to lead me to if he could. I do not allege that there are completely satisfactory situations in all institutions. We're always working towards the improvement of them.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Is the department or government giving any special study to the types of coal which are found in the Drumheller Valley?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can say we're dealing in that area and when the new Coal Conservation Act comes in for discussion, we'll review the program as outlined at that time.

DPW News Releases

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. Does the Department of Public Works intend to issue written publicity releases to all news media regarding contracts awarded for new provincial buildings?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, it has been the habit of the Department of Public Works to issue news releases on this. We will probably be continuing to do this.

MR. COOPER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would those same news releases be circulated to all the members of the Legislature, Mr. Minister?

DR. BACKUS:

If this is the desire of members of the Legislature to have them circulated as well, I can certainly have this done and will speak to my department about having it done. If this is the desire of members of the Legislature to have them circulated to them as well, I can certainly have this done, and will speak to my department about having it done.

Dept. of Highways News Releases

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to a different minister -- to the Minister of Highways. Mr. Minister, does your department intend to issue releases regarding contracts awards for new provincial

March 13, 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

8-15

highways, and if the answer is yes, will you circulate them to all the MLA's as well?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, our policy has been that we advertised our jobs, and on the acceptance of the bid, there has been a news release issued on them. At this time, we have not issued a news release to the members representing the areas.

MR. SPEAKER:

Five minutes remain of the question period. The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Government Offices in Calgary

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Public Works. I understand that the government is advertising for about 25,000 feet of space in Calgary. Would he care to tell the House what that space is for and whether it is an expansion of the services?

DR. BACKUS:

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, this is for expansion of Health and Development. I can't give you full details at this time, but if you'd care to submit that as a written question, I'll be happy to give you a full answer on that.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the office space in the John J. Bowlen Building been exhausted?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I again would appreciate a written request for question. As far as I know, I don't believe that the space has been exhausted, but there may be a requirement for additional building in this area for the particular space referred to in his previous question, which may not be satisfactorily be fitted in to the Bowlen Building.

DPW Calgary Staff

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary to the hon. minister. Is there any intention of reducing staff in DPW in the Calgary area?

DR. BACKUS:

We are reorganizing the department to some extent. At the present time, however, I don't have any specific intention of reducing staff in Calgary. Later on, as the reorganization occurs, there may be changes in staff, but certainly no significant reduction.

4-H Clubs

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. Have there been submissions from interested breeders' associations across the province concerning the possibility

8-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

of the 4-H program being moved from your department to the Department of Agriculture? And secondly what is your response to these representations that have been made to you?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question, I have received three letters requesting the return of the 4-H Clubs to the Department of Agriculture. These three letters came from breeders' associations. One of them has already replied that it is now quite satisfied to have the 4-H Clubs remain in our department. I have several other letters commending us for the work we are doing, and I would be quite prepared to reply to the question in writing, because I can then, with statistics, prove that the move was an excellent one.

The Margarine Act

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. It has to do with the current situation in the dairy and oil seed industry. Has the hon. minister, considering the current circumstances, given any consideration - or will he be giving any consideration in the future - to the possibility of removing the colour section in The Margarine Act?

DR. HORNER:

These matters are under review, Mr. Speaker, and when a decision is reached, the policy will be announced in the House.

4-H Clubs (cont.)

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Agriculture with respect to the 4-H program. How many letters has the Minister of Agriculture received requesting that the program be moved back to the Department of Agriculture?

DR. HORNER:

Numerous ones, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, what has been the response the minister has given to the letters?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, under the guidance of the new Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation, we in Agriculture are pleased to be able to co-operate with him in the formation of an ideal 4-H program for the rural youth of Alberta.

Superintendent of Treasury Branches (cont.)

MR. WILSON:

In view of the hon. the Premier's previous answers to questions regarding the Provincial Treasury Branch, would you advise us, sir, if it is the government's intention to advertise the position of a new superintendent of treasury branches?

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-17

MR LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, it's not the Provincial Treasury Branch, it's the Treasury Branch of the Province of Alberta, and I've given my answer and we will in due course deal with it in the Assembly.

Highways Commission

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways and transport. Is it the intention of the government to appoint a Highways Commission?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, if it is the intention to appoint a Highways Commission, it will be announced at a later date.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the many hon. members who have extended congratulations to you on your appointment to the office of Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, and for the manner in which you are discharging your responsibilities. I wish you a successful career as Speaker, and I'm sure that your performance in the last few days is an indication that the office will be very well discharged.

In making my address to the Assembly today I'm rather concerned about the Speech from the Throne, not so much as to what it contains, but because some of the major mandate issues that were discussed during the election, and which are of serious concern to the people of this province, are not included in the Speech from the Throne. And I'm going to introduce just one issue that I will deal with later.

The main concern of the people of this province was the matter of education costs and property taxation. And I'm saying that when this matter was aired before the public, there was never an indication given that this was going to become the subject matter of a study. The indication given, and many people believed it, who are now expressing grave doubts -- the impression given by the hon. the Premier and his colleagues was that this was going to be something that will be dealt with as soon as possible. We now learn that a study of rather broad proportions is going to be conducted, and some vague reference was made by the hon. the Premier that this matter will be dealt with in the future. I'm just raising this as one example of the serious concern that the people have with regard to issues which affect the individual and taxation and property. And there are several others.

I believe, in speaking about the Speech from the Throne, that one ought to look at the speech and give it an analysis. On Page 1 we have and I quote: "Change will be viewed not with fear and apprehension, but with optimism, with a sense of challenge and opportunities to be grasped." And after a very brief performance of the Government of the Province, I believe that the hon. the Premier and his colleagues have created a considerable amount of apprehension in the minds of all hon. members. I'm referring to their effort to deal with one of the few real reform items in the Speech from the Throne. When you have the government amending its own motion before debate is under way, it is an indication that not only will reform and change be viewed with fear and apprehension, but that there is some display of confusion as to what is intended by a major clause in

8-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

the Speech from the Throne. And I believe this will be an indication of things to come.

One of the matters in the speech which ought to be criticised by all concerned, and ought to be objectively assessed - and I would like to see the government withdraw it from its position in the Speech from the Throne - is the matter of allowing its government members and backbenchers to be appointed to caucus committees and travel through the province retrieving information for the hon. Premier, at public expense. This is something that I find repugnant to the democratic way of doing things and I would like to see a good debate on having that section in The Legislative Assembly Act repealed. The kind of behaviour displayed by the government on this particular point is an indication that this section could be exploited, and could be exploited legally. My comment on this is that it does not appear to be the proper thing to do. I don't know whether there is any precedent for this kind of behaviour; we have never indulged in this kind of operation at public expense, and as I stated, this matter lends itself to exploitation. I believe that the right thing not only has to be done, but it has to appear to be done. The government would be well advised to reconsider its position because criticism of its behaviour will continue until the matter is cleared.

One other matter that I would like to comment on is the matter of calling two sessions. Very commendable, but it is underlined, underscored by the fact that this is one way of having more open government. I fail to see the logic of that endorsement, and I would like to caution that we have to bear in mind not how many sessions we call, but what we accomplish. We mustn't use the next session coming up in the year, whenever that will be, as an excuse to postpone decisions which may be required to be made now. There will be examples, at least one very good example, of this happening right from the beginning. So to that part of the Speech from the Throne of calling two sessions, it is achievement that will count and not the number of sessions called or the amount of taxpayers' money that we can spend by sitting longer than we need to.

One of the matters that deserves to be very carefully discussed during the Speech from the Throne, and during the debate of the improvident Bill of Rights, is what is said about it in the Speech from the Throne. I would like to refer to page 6 of the Speech from the Throne where it says, "immediate priorities". These immediate priorities are a bit fascinating because immediate means something that has to be done almost now; it has precedence over everything else. Priority means prior in time and importance, and one can get many definitions of the words "immediate priorities." And if the Bill of Rights which is set out right under the immediate program priorities is an indication of how the hon. the Premier will deal with this issue, then I say that if a bill that was introduced on the first day of the sitting and then given an indirect six months hoist - a bill that is No. 1 under immediate program priorities - I am wondering what will happen to things that are not of such immediate program priorities. This is a clear indication that our hon. the Premier will say one thing and do another thing and people are catching on very quickly. It's an indication of more of the same to come.

There are a number of questions which ought to be raised and answered by the present government, and one of them, Mr. Speaker, is the matter of labour legislation. I would like to quote part of a letter apparently signed by Peter Lougheed, MLA, and here is how it reads. This is a letter to the Civil Service of the province:

"In conclusion I would like to state that a Progressive Conservative Government would move very quickly to give the Civil Service a much broader and definitive act which would give

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-19

the members the same basic bargaining right enjoyed by organized labour in the province."

This is a very important issue, but it isn't raised in the Speech from the Throne and I'm suggesting that the Civil Service is going to try and make the Premier come across with this one and I also believe that the safe money would be on a strategic withdrawal by the hon. Premier.

A number of speeches by the hon. members recommending that more spending be made throughout the province, but in particular criticizing the past government for not having done enough here and there and everywhere. Maybe some of that criticism is justifiable, but it has to be reconciled in the light of the furor of the present government in relation to the amount of money that is available to be spent. And sooner or later the hon. members opposite are going to learn, probably from their Treasurer, that advocating spending is very popular, paying for it requires raising taxes and perhaps telling the taxpayer that it's going to cost him more. That is the part that is now the responsibility of the government. I am of the opinion that there will be a serious change of thinking in a lot of the good things that are recommended for the people when the economy -- the revenue position -- is explained to the people of this province.

There are a number of questions I would like to raise, which I would expect the hon. members opposite to answer when they speak either on this debate or in any future debates. The matter of the expansion of the Court House in Calgary was very seriously pursued and pressed by the hon. members opposite when they were in the opposition. I am suggesting that the situation so far as the main Court House is concerned in Calgary, has become worse in the last year, so that if there is a need to add three or more storeys to that Court House that the need is far greater today than it was a year ago. I would like to see the hon. members who pursue this matter, particularly the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, the hon. the Attorney General, take a good look at this and see if construction on this much needed facility can be commenced in the near future. I am aware of the fact, in being in the Court House from time to time, that the space situation has deteriorated, particularly in view of the fact that many cases which used to be handled by the magistrates court are now finding their way to the Supreme Court, the higher courts, because of legal aid. There is, therefore, some urgency about looking at this matter.

Another issue that I would like the hon. Minister of Public Works to deal with -- I see he has left his seat -- is the Remand Centre in Calgary. Remember that a year ago the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and the Mayor of Calgary and all the council members were very excited about the possible delay in construction of the Remand Centre. I later announced that we would make every effort to have the Remand Centre tendered for construction in November of 1971 or as soon thereafter as possible. I now find that there has been a serious delay in the Remand Centre due to something or other that the city has proposed to do, and the Remand Centre, in my opinion, will not be tendered until late fall of this year -- almost a year later than we had intended ourselves.

One should be prepared to look at some of these delays objectively to determine whether they are needed and whether what is done will be an improvement. I am prepared to do that. The only concern I have is that there was almost a wave of hysteria in the council of Calgary about the matter a year ago, and a year later it is admitted that the delay is caused by the city. Not in any way criticizing the hon. Minister of Public Works, who was fair enough, we used to hear, very often, from the hon. members opposite in previous years, the issue of appeals from administrative boards and

8-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

tribunals. This was a constant issue that was raised from time to time with some support from the legal profession, support from very well written periodicals by learned people, and I often wondered whether we shouldn't take a good look at this issue. It is rather unusual, Mr. Speaker, that now that we have the hon. members who were demanding this kind of reform in administrative law, now that we have them in the government, and 12 lawyers together, that they should remain silent on this issue. I believe we could expect some leadership from them now in keeping with their past performance and declare where they stand on it. I think that this is not an unreasonable request and I am sure that the hon. the Attorney General will have some remarks to make on this issue.

I would like to recommend that when the proposed museum is built in Calgary with the intended provincial grant, serious consideration be given to maintaining the present museum, that is the old Court House in Calgary, and preserving that building as an historical site. There are very few buildings in Alberta that have a more impressive relationship to the past, as far as Alberta's history is concerned, than this old court house. It not only is a fairly attractive building, it is located in downtown Calgary, but it could be put to use in several ways, primarily in the manner that it is used now. I would like this matter to be seriously considered by this government because we could not preserve every old building as an historical site. There are some buildings where to do otherwise would be doing an injustice to future generations of Albertans. But I am very strongly in favour that the area can be beautified and that this matter ought to be taken into consideration before other plans are made for it. I agree with the hon. Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation, that it is very valuable land. That is all the more reason why the recommendation I am making ought to be considered.

I believe that this government has a serious accounting to make to the people of this province, and that is on the matter of an issue I raised a little earlier; that is the removal of education costs from property. This one cannot be permitted to pass without some specific stand by the present administration as to what is intended to be done. This was, in my opinion, the real mandate issue in the last election, and we on this side have no intention of letting the hon. the Premier and his colleagues by-pass this issue to a convenient date in the future. I see the hon. Minister of Education is laughing about this, but a lot of people are not. They are very disturbed. This whole situation is likened unto a father who tells his young son, "I'm going to get you a bicycle for Christmas". Come Christmas time there is no bicycle. The son says to the father, "Where is my bicycle?" and the father says: "Well, son, I told you I'd get you a bicycle for Christmas, but I didn't tell you which Christmas." I think a man like that should be able to hold his head up high and walk proudly. So, Mr. Speaker, this is a serious issue and a lot of people are concerned. They want answers and the hon. members are now smiling, but I believe they will have to account if they are accountable at all. It is our job, I believe, to see that they take a stand, and a withdrawal on this one can be fatal to any long range plans of the hon. Premier in office.

The taxpayer concern is one more matter that should be discussed in the Legislature on this debate. The people are aware of many things that were proposed to be done during the election, and some of the things that were proposed were nice things to have, but the facts of life have to be faced, not only by the government, but by the people. The people are now wondering how much is this going to cost? How much will the taxes go up? But this whole issue should be determined in the light of a proposal made on page 11. I see the hon. Provincial Treasurer isn't here either, but this might be his big responsibility. Either they will come across with this, or the hon. Premier will have a lot of explaining to do as to why he made this kind of a promise and didn't do anything about it.

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-21

I'd like to quote a portion of the Speech from the Throne under Position Papers. It says:

"Therefore, my government intends to start a new approach by presenting to the Legislature, from time to time, a series of New Direction Position Papers, so that the members and also the public may have a better appreciation of policy positions or alternatives which may form the foundation for subsequent legislative or budgetary proposals."

This statement ties in directly with what I'm saying, in that the hon. Provincial Treasurer ought to issue a White Paper on taxation so that the people will know which way we're going on the matter of removing education costs from property. I believe that this is an urgent matter, and a priority matter. I believe that if the hon. Premier and his government do not take a stand on this during this session, that they will be, not only subject to a lot of public criticism, but perhaps will deserve public condemnation on an issue of this nature.

The other matter that I would like to deal with briefly is the Bill of Rights. There is a history to the Bill of Rights in this province, starting with 1962 when the hon. member Mr. Watkins introduced a bill. It was somewhat along the lines of Bill 1, which is before the House now, introduced by the hon. Premier, but had a lot more to it. This was in 1962. At that time a lot of opinion expressed by authorities on the Bill of Rights was that this Bill of Rights was not really doing anything for the individual; it sounded good, it was the enshrinement of the law as it was, and that is admitted. I would like to point out that the debates at that time were quite justifiable since it took almost ten years for the Bill of Rights of Canada really to get recognition from the courts. And I'm referring to the Drybones case where a split decision was given in favour of an accused, Drybones, for having been intoxicated off a reservation. This is a first real indication that the Bill of Rights may have some meaning, albeit to a very limited number of people.

Then the Bill of Rights of 1970, Bill 140, about 39 sections more or less, 14 pages, was introduced by the hon. Premier as a high priority matter, by the hon. member Mr. Lougheed then. This was flashed around a lot, discussed and received fair mileage. Then in 1971, the hon. member and the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Lougheed introduced Bill 145 and was very indignant when he was not permitted to debate that bill. That bill also has about 39 sections, more or less -- I'm quoting from memory -- and about 14 pages.

Then a year later, more than a year later, the hon. Premier introduces Bill 1, which in my opinion, is a slightly watered down version of Mr. Watkins' Bill of 1962, not having nearly the same significance or meaning to the people, but is almost entirely the Bill of Rights of Canada, which as I said previously has had very little real meaning to the people of this country until the Drybones case, and even then the interpretation placed on that bill is such that perhaps a responsible government could repeal legislation which is repugnant or an abridgement of individual rights and freedoms, rather than leave it to the courts to determine what the act actually says. But then the performance of the hon. Premier on this Bill of Rights has to be brought to the attention of this House and the people of this province, because as I stated, on page 6, this was a high priority, immediate program priority, and it's the first time that a leader of a government would rush the introduction of a bill, discuss some of the principle of the bill on the opening date and then give what I call a six month's hoist to the bill, which he argued was of such urgent, immediate priority.

I have come to the conclusion that we have a problem with this government because they will say one thing and before the sentence is finished they will do another thing. I believe that not only the

8-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

hon. members ought to look with some concern on this kind of behaviour but the people of the province are asking questions. They're asking questions not only what happened to the Bill of Rights; I believe the immediate priority was to introduce it, but not to pass it. I'm stating, Mr. Speaker, that after looking at the hon. members and getting a clear indication of what is to be happening in the future, I doubt very much whether there is going to be any real reform in this field, the way the zeal for reform of the hon. Premier on this issue has waned after election. Otherwise an explanation would be in order why the urgent Bill 145 of 1971 has been pushed back to some future session to be considered, or perhaps to be studied and have public representation.

It's obvious that the hon. members who had instant solutions to all the problems that were before us in the last session are now backing down from questions which require simple answers. Everything now is a matter of policy decision, of review, of study, of boards, of committees, and we find that these gentlemen opposite didn't have the answers, that the impression created in previous sessions was most misleading. There wasn't a question, there wasn't a problem in Alberta that the hon. members opposite didn't have an answer to last year, or more than one. They had so many answers that I often wondered -- when the hon. Premier had all his answers -- I got the impression one of them may have been right, but I also got the impression that he didn't know which one it was.

We have an indication of the performance of this government in the last eight or nine days that we, on this side, better ask questions, better let the people know what they're doing, better demand that the government take a stand and not keep the people guessing about what's going to happen to taxes, what's going to happen to education and what's going to happen to the Bill of Rights and what it means.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I've made my position clear that although the government has given us an indication of what is to come, I have expressed my views as to what my responsibilities are on this side. We will watch carefully but I think that the answers will be forthcoming or the hon. Premier and his government will be subjected to serious public criticism and possibly condemnation.

One more item I'd like to deal with and that is the Bill of Rights. Perhaps someone ought to tell the hon. Premier that when the Rt. Hon. John Diefenbaker introduced a Bill of Rights in the House of Commons, that bill was given very wide coverage and I believe a lot of mileage was obtained by the hon. Prime Minister. It should also be observed that in the next election he was very soundly defeated, and the lesson that is to be learned from that is not to place all your stock in the Bill of Rights. There are an awful lot of "bread and butter" issues that have to be dealt with, and I would say a stand should be taken on them now.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it's with a great deal of pleasure and anticipation of being able to make some small contribution that I enter the Throne Speech debate today. I will choose the occasion to address my first few formal remarks with the very agreeable custom of saying a few things about my constituency of Edmonton Parkallen. As other members have so well expressed here in the Chamber since the opening several days ago, for me, as for each of us it is indeed an honour to be selected in this way to be the representative of any group of Albertans. I wish to thank and publicly record my appreciation to the citizens and particularly the citizens of Edmonton Parkallen who have accorded me the honour of being their representative and the

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-23

opportunity to serve them and, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province.

[The Deputy Speaker in the Chair.]

As I go through my remarks, I think, having regard to the breadth of the portfolio that I hold, matters will occur to hon. members from time to time that fall within the range of my responsibilities, and they may expect some remarks in respect to most or all of these items. I hope to speak again, in a general way, during the budget debate, and cover some points that won't, perhaps, be covered at this time. I just wanted to warn hon. members that I have a list of about seven or eight items, including the reorganization of the department, the discontinuation of the payment of Medicare premiums for those over 65, some general remarks that would be appropriate before the introduction of the bill in regard to The Medical Health Act, a further few remarks in regard to some analysis of the mental health program that has been done to date, a little bit in regard to programs for the handicapped including sheltered workshops, and also a few remarks in regard to community health and social development centres. Other matters may be more appropriate to the budget and we'll have to deal with them at that time.

I do want to say, Mr. Speaker, I'll address you for just a moment as Mr. Deputy Speaker, I'd like to join in the congratulations that other members have offered in effect to your selection to your high position by this Assembly, and even in the absence of the Speaker, to further record my satisfaction that one as well qualified as he is has been chosen for the Speaker, and has received the support and, I think, respect of all hon. members, even so early in the carrying out of his duties.

I want also to say to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne, the address and reply, that they have made a great contribution to this debate already, and I congratulate them on the quality of the speeches that they gave on their first occasions speaking in this Assembly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as we slowly get down to the point of talking about hon. gentlemen opposite, which is unavoidable from time to time, I hope that the gentleman who has the honour to represent Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, and appears to me to have such an amiable personality, won't mind if I take the liberty of making a slight play on his name. I did want to observe that viewing what I have of hon. gentlemen opposite to this point, I thought how useful it was for them to have a Drain in the corner. And in particular, although I regret the absence of the hon. member from Calgary Mountain View at this time, I'll say that I had fleeting thoughts of him when that idea came to mind.

I hope that in the presentation of the case that I have in mind for my department, I will approach the grasp that has been shown by the Minister of the Environment in regard to his department. I selected him because he is one of the educators, I think, of those of us who are new here, including, I'm sure, some of those who are new across the floor. In particular, when one of the hon. gentlemen opposite that hasn't risen with a dictionary in hand -- which has already happened in this session -- and I can understand that in respect to many areas in getting familiar with a new vocabulary, I notice the Minister of the Environment referred to gasification. At the time, as the new word drifted in one ear, I said, "What is that that he is saying about the hon. Member from Drumheller?" And then, Mr. Speaker, I appreciated as I listened more, that what he was talking about was the generation of electricity by power of coal, rather than the power of wind, and everything became entirely clear.

8-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

Mr. Speaker, I do feel deeply the honour of being associated with the splendid and long tradition of the parliamentary system. I feel deeply the opportunity for service that is to be found here in the Legislative Assembly, and I'm well aware that throughout the centuries parliament has been both the protector and the durable symbol of our right of free speech, and therefore, more closely identified than anything else with the freedom of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary system is the cornerstone of the process by which our people may progress if they wish. And that is so because it is as much representative of people and the wishes of people as can be obtained in any society where free minds range over every shade of opinion. We heard some quotations earlier in the session, twice from a very unexpected quarter, of the Right Honourable Mr. Disraeli and I have a short quotation from Edmund Burke that I would like to add to the record. When he was speaking of the House of Commons he said; "The virtue, the spirit, the essence of the House of Commons consists in its being the express image of the feelings of the nation." And by the very nature of it, parliamentary government requires that any group or party that would undertake parliamentary responsibility should include supporters from each segment of the population in each part of the province, and preferably, that it should not claim the support of the whole membership of any particular group in the province to the exclusion of the general interest.

Mr. Speaker, I believe our government has this broad representation and this broad support which is acknowledged to be of such importance. And in the atmosphere of this Assembly, where shortly a Bill of Rights will be debated, I believe it appropriate to remark that the freedom of choice by which political methods and systems are tried and by which they are judged, and indeed improved, on the basis of a deep abiding faith in democracy and its moral foundations, that the most basic right that each of us as free men and women could claim is that right of free expression here. And I hope this Legislative Assembly will be worthy in full measure of the heritage from which it stems.

Mr. Speaker, during the 1960's an American social psychologist, by the name of Donald Michaels, predicted, and again I read a short quotation as follows, and this may be sort of heady stuff for legislators to wrestle with from time to time. He said: "Those elected to government will for many years be chiefly the products of our past. And they will reflect the perspectives of a population that will still be chiefly a product of the past." In substance his prediction was that the necessary rationalization of government activities will be slowed by politicians, by members of the public, and by powerful bureaucrats whose status is deeply invested in their offices and in their agencies.

Mr. Speaker, what an interesting time to ponder the clear implications of recent political changes in Alberta. These recent changes can only be regarded as a reflection of the popular will of the people, that change will in fact take place in both policy and administration. The Speech from the Throne is a document that both points to these necessary new directions and yet has as its supporting base, as in the example of the elimination of health care premiums for those over 65, the fact that as of the time that I speak, much has already been achieved.

I indicated that I would deal with the question of the organization of my department. It is well known to all members of the Assembly, not only the record of departments of this type across Canada in the various provincial government and the basic structure of the federal government, but it has been an area of much change in thought over at least a decade. The theory of having the two departments of Health on the one hand and Social Development on the other, put together for the purposes not only of integration and

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-25

efficiency of operation, but for the only real purpose that could be hoped for ultimately, and that is to provide to the citizen, to whom service is to be provided, the most effective service. This being the philosophy behind the integration for a merger of such departments in the various governments across the country, some have had experiences that have caused them to reverse themselves in that, and some are in the position of where they have maintained the separate departments.

In Alberta, the situation is that less than a year has gone by since the formal act of merger has taken place. It therefore brought with it a period prior to that during which, no doubt, there was some unsettlement in the department. The change in government as of last fall, I think left the employees in the department and to some extent the public, wondering if we would carry through with what had been begun by my predecessor, the hon. Member from Little Bow. We said publicly last fall, that we would carry this experiment forward throughout what had to be considered a fair testing time of approximately a year. We felt it was necessary, as it often is, with statements of that type to make them publicly at the time, but now for the information of the House and its relevance to the department for which I have the responsibility, I am giving that same information to the House. One of the early decisions that was made in this regard, after reviewing the advantages and disadvantages of allowing for the prospective review period after approximately a year, is that I felt in order to have an experiment to be a valid one, I should feel obliged to have for the benefit of department employees in particular, and those associated with dealings with the department, a firm commitment to the philosophy of the integration of the services as long as it can achieve its objective, which is the ultimate provision of a superior brand of service than could be expected from the separation of the departments and all of the history in that regard.

As of December of 1971, Mr. Speaker, I began with some structural modification in the department, including the appointment of a Chief Deputy Minister as a general manager of the department. I think it fair to say that no attempt was made in that to create a new classification of civil servant. The Chief Deputy Minister is, in fact, a Deputy Minister and is the principal administrator of the department, with the other two deputies having more service oriented responsibilities and reporting to the Chief Deputy Minister.

Since that time, and the question having arisen as to whether or not the original breakdown of the department between institutions and services was a valid one, some steps have been taken with regard to integration of support services. This includes the budgetary planning areas and research and forward planning generally. These have been integrated and operate across the whole department rather than separately.

Also, as I mentioned, there was some question of the breakdown as between institutions and services, and so some changes have been made which relate more closely the institutions with the services that they provide, and the deputy ministers are allowed to give leadership which is consistent with the provision of the services to the particular institutions rather than the artificial separation of institutions on one hand and services on the other. I want to stress that we don't look upon the creation of institutions as any particular achievement on behalf of the people of Alberta at any time. We are far more interested in assessing what we are trying to achieve, in the delivery of the ultimate service, and seeing that whatever we do is related to the program and not tied to some institution. So often it can happen that you create a institution and then you want to make all of the people who are supposed to be served by it, conform to some rigidity which results from the structure you have created. We don't want to do that, we want to

8-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

work from programs for the people and make the institutions conform to those objectives.

Further, as to the reorganization of the department, there are two new sections which are responsible at this point to the chief deputy minister - one for mental health and one for services to the handicapped. This involves a reorganization of the former position of director of Mental Health which was filled in only acting capacity at the time we assumed office last fall. We believe that changes that are not complete in this area yet, were essential in order to give the programs the priority standing that they have been accorded by the government and which were referred to in that way in the Speech from the Throne.

We also found that handicapped programs suffered over the years as a result of confusion between the mentality ill on one hand and the mentally handicapped on the other, and we are in the process of a re-evaluation of all of these programs in order to make them most effective.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that one of the early commitments met by the government is one that I was assuredly very proud of as Minister of Health and Social Development. That discussion was shown I think, to be very much the voice of the people at the time in regard to relieving senior citizens of the obligation to pay premiums on health care. This was responded to by the new government in a very short period of time. We place it among our highest priorities and when elected we were ready with the program which was announced shortly after that and had the effect of removing this premium from the people over 65, effective as of January 1st, 1972.

Occasionally I have heard the hon. gentlemen opposite debating among themselves and attempting to debate, indeed, with us the meaning of 'now'. One of them came armed with a dictionary. We are satisfied to leave the interpretation of that in the hands of the public and to allow them to draw their own conclusions in regard to the significance of a 'now' of four months, as compared with the 'now' that the previous administration was able to muster in respect to that type of reform -- I suppose it would be accurate and fair to say the differences between the 'now government' and the 'then government'. I was just trying to make my little contribution, gentlemen, to the understanding of these terms.

Mr. Speaker, the rationale, of course, was well known with respect to the reform I have just mentioned, but our government believes that, particularly in times of inflation which have been with us so consistently, the senior citizen is entitled to priority wherever possible in government programs. Albertans 65 years of age and over are generally trapped on a fixed pension income and on very tight budgets at a time when medical and drug costs are rising too rapidly. Senior citizens are in a difficult personal financial position and the cost of Medicare and optional health benefits through the Blue Cross Plan constitute a significant annual expense. Mr. Speaker, I think it can be said that the reaction has generally been favourable, not only from those over 65 but from other fair minded citizens in other age groups who know that that demonstration of appreciation for what has been contributed by the senior citizens over the years was overdue at the time.

Mr. Speaker, coming to mental health, it has been made clear that legislation in this respect will be introduced to the House during the session, and so I would deal with it only in general terms at this time, and not go into the detail of the proposed Act. However, the overall intention is to give the government the legislative authority necessary to achieve its objectives in mental health, the objective being to develop first-rate community based services for the mentally ill with de-emphasis on the use of large central institutions, except in cases where that is the only way in

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-27

which the treatment can be provided. I think experience has shown that there are many ways and many occasions upon which treatment could have been provided in individual cases, in a less formal type of institution than Alberta has had up to the present time, and that in many cases the well being of individual patients would have been served much better by less of an emphasis on institutions to which the mental health programs in Alberta have been so closely oriented in the past.

We will propose the utilization of allied health professionals to perform specific tasks. We will attempt to attract to the province highly qualified workers in this field. It will be our desire to encourage the upgrading of skills among those who are currently employed in the system, and thus broaden the range of therapeutic expertise available to the patient.

We hope also to achieve local involvement in planning. We will encourage the creation of regional councils and the relating of them to other planning groups in the field of health services.

I suggest that an important adjustment that will be gone into in more detail later will be redefining the committal and detention procedures. This would, we hope, clear the way for general hospitals to undertake the care of some involuntary patients, which group represents sometimes seriously ill people. Once again, experience has shown that the hospitals in some such cases would be more appropriate for patients than the existing institutions, particularly with reference to the comments that have had to be made over the past several years about overcrowding of the major institutions located at Edmonton and Ponoka.

There will be administrative changes in the Act in order to decentralize control, and in keeping with civil rights legislation, which will also be coming before the House, special attention will be paid to patients' rights and the assurance that these are respected, both in admission procedures and in visiting rights, and in the matter of communication by patients with people, members of their family and others outside the institutions.

The appeal procedures in the previous Act, on the whole, were thought to be satisfactory and it is proposed that substantially the same procedures be carried forward.

Now, the new Act will not only achieve much in the sense of legislation, but it will be the stage for new programs. Programs as such, of course, wouldn't appear in the actual words of the Act; they will empower us to conceive and execute the best programs that can be devised.

In programs we want to pay particular attention to the evolution of the present institutions to make them and keep them active in their communities, and co-ordinate them with services that are being provided locally in other areas of health care.

That brings with it the assumption that the present institutions would continue to operate and would be reorganized to fit in with the recommendations of the Blair report, and so far as can be foreseen at the present time, it would be our intention to operate them on that continuing basis.

I suppose Mr. Speaker, I should clear up something that is referred to from time to time. Every once in a while we hear hon. gentlemen opposite remarking upon the fact that we have been here now with the responsibility of office for several months, and, by golly, there are some things we haven't done yet. And this always amuses me a little bit. I didn't hear the interjection of the hon. member from Calgary Mountain View, but I'm glad to see that he has now returned to his seat and I'll be glad to fill him in on the important points

8-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

that I have covered up to this time, to the extent of his ability to absorb it.

Mr. Speaker, we were saying that the interpretation of 'now' is all very well, and I've made my own reference to 'now' and to 'then'. There are a lot of things, though, that we didn't say that we would do now, and it's these items that hon. gentlemen opposite occasionally refer to and say "what are you waiting for?"

I think all should know that our commitment in our platform in regard to mental health was a five year commitment -- and this is something that should be clearly understood -- on the basis that work would be started on it at once, which has been done, and because of the enormous amount of work that would have to be done thereafter to continue the development over a period of years. I think we're entitled to have it understood that these commitments will take some time to fulfil, and that no commitment was ever made to fulfil them in a lesser period in respect to implementing the provisions of the Blair report. No undertaking has been made to fulfil them in a period of less than five years, and that program is being rapidly developed at this time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have already made known to the manpower resources we have in the system our proposals for certain development in respect to the health manpower available for the field of mental health in Alberta, and their involvement in it. This is a current matter which is being discussed between officials and the professional staffs throughout the province, or their representatives. I won't make any remark on that now, except to say that it is going on at the present time; we're looking for ways that will improve our recruitment and that will result in a more qualified staff at a level which is equitable in regard to remuneration of them, and to provide ways in which they can, on a continuous basis, upgrade their abilities to serve in the field that they've chosen without penalty. If this goes the way that I think hon. members would like to see it in regard to reorganization of the service, they will not be penalized because they are in the public service instead of private practice, and we will assure that institutions are giving the people who require their services in Alberta the very, very best of treatment available.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go on with a few remarks in regard to the handicapped program. We were, when we took office, inundated with mail and telephone calls from people who were experiencing, in many cases, personal tragedies of their own, directly related to severely handicapped children in their homes, autistic children, hypersensitive children, ones who had required a highly specialized degree of care throughout some period of their young lives and had not been able to receive it at all. When we investigated the situation we were shocked at the lack of concern of the former government in regard to this situation and the needs of the retarded. We were told of a waiting list for admittance of retarded children to the Alberta School Hospital in Red Deer that numbered over 600 -- 300 of them being classed as emergency cases. I suggest that it was inexcusable that the situation had been allowed to continue for several years. My own estimate of the plans that were in progress at the time we came into office was that, if carried out, the plans to construct new facilities would be up to two years from the time that we came to office last fall before a large attack could be made on that waiting list.

Therefore, rather than use the long-term plan which had been inherited, we felt an immediate program was necessary and instituted one whereby 200 beds would be made available to retarded children during the spring of this year, using the renovated facilities of the old Misericordia Hospital to handle almost one half of the 200 beds. I am pleased to be able to say to the House that, as at the end of February, the progress in the changeover of the Misericordia

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-29

facilities in all except the first floor, where it is 50 per cent ready, was from 78 to 95 per cent ready on all floors to go ahead. So, we are still looking forward to the installation of equipment within a matter of a few days and the transfer of patients early next month.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, 50 additional admissions are possible at the Red Deer School Hospital, and the preliminary work in that respect, including patient selection, has been almost completed. This, once again, was a short-term program which we thought would be advisable and will, I am sure, obtain the general approval of those who are involved with it as soon as it is operational. This is the conversion of existing space at Red Deer which was not being utilized at all and yet was suitable for the purpose.

We hope to develop up to seven group homes located in various communities in the province and this will provide for the balance of up to 200 that I mentioned in my figures. I think the House will see that in a space of a few short months being able to have two of the 300 emergency cases allowed for is indeed a very successful program and one that we are very proud of indeed. There will be further developments in regard to decentralized residential care for children who are able to get along in that type of accommodation as opposed to the institutional accommodation.

Mr. Speaker, in placing a priority on the need for development of services for handicapped children generally -- and here I make no specific reference to the neurologically handicapped, I refer to all handicapped children -- the government is aware of the recognition achieved by programs of the Glenrose Hospital in Edmonton for treatment and education of multiple-handicapped children. Although from time to time representations are made, some adjustment should be made in the program content and administration of that institution. I think it would be wrong not to say that it has had some outstanding successes in the way in which it has carried on its work. Therefore, without duplicating the facility, but because of the fact that the Glenrose has tended to serve northern Alberta more than southern Alberta, we intend to pursue plans as soon as possible to extend diagnostic treatment services for multiple-handicapped children to southern Alberta, and as the program in that respect is developed I will make more information available to the House.

In respect to sheltered workshops, new policy initiatives have been established. Previous methods of funding were haphazard and sporadic. In many cases, no government funds were being provided for this important service. Services to the handicapped being a priority, much thought has been given, as I've mentioned, to the children, and moving into the area of sheltered workshops allows us to give consideration, also, to more adult patients who continue to require care because of their disabilities.

A new policy is being developed at the present time for assisting in the support of sheltered workshops currently in existence or which may be planned in communities in various parts of the province. These workshops provide an opportunity for handicapped persons who don't have the capacity for competitive employment, and enables them to work in a controlled setting and be productive to the best of their abilities. The new policies will assist local associations and agencies, primarily, in both planning and in support, to the extent that the government is able to do that in a financial way.

In establishing policy for sheltered workshops, we intend to emphasize community involvement in both planning and content of the program and especially, of course, in the administration of the actual program on a local basis. We will continue to support the work being done by existing rehabilitation agencies in providing services to mentally and physically handicapped persons who have some

8-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

capacity for self-support. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this new approach is once again consistent with the basis upon which we said to the people of Alberta during the last year or so that this important area should be approached and dealt with.

Now, a few other matters, Mr. Speaker. I said last week that I might make some remarks about whether or not social assistance was a right or a privilege, and I ventured the opinion at that time that the black and white nature of the question might be such that was not capable of a precise answer, but is one that is more in the area of continuing discussion, debate and evolution. I think, to a large extent, the reason why I said the question was rather philosophical is that no great purpose will be served by nailing down hon. gentlemen opposite in respect to what their thoughts on it are, unless they choose to do so. I certainly don't mind saying that my views on it are open for suggestion, and that the views of all members will always be borne in mind in consideration of this difficult matter. I think it would be fair to say, though, that it's well known that this particular area is legislated upon both in the federal and provincial fields and has been made the subject of federal-provincial agreements under the Canada Systems Plan. And in the sense that the province has the right to legislate in regard to property and civil rights, it also has the right to declare it to be a right instead of a privilege if it chooses to do so. The fact is that the present legislation has not been changed from that on the books during the term of office of the previous government. Although I'm not giving legal opinions this afternoon, my view of it, Mr. Speaker, is that it makes it a privilege and one with a sense of fairness that most people bring to a consideration of that subject. No hardship results from stopping short, as I would do, in referring to it as anyone's right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think I should say to my colleague the member from Edmonton Kingsway that I'm approaching a subject dear to his heart and in all sincerity I acknowledge the leadership that he has consistently shown over quite a period of time. In regard to public debate which he has encouraged with respect to community health and social development centres, I certainly have every admiration for his large store of knowledge on this subject.

As far as present policies are concerned they all have to be, of course, within limits of what can be achieved through the budget, and I acknowledge that the concept dealt with when most people think of a community health centre is one that has a lot of attention focused on it right now all across Canada. And my assurance to the House, I think, would be that certainly in Alberta we will be keeping in touch with all of these developing programs that point in that direction. Now the term itself, I suggest, refers to delivery of care both primary and ambulatory care for individuals and families at the local community level. And I think this should be understood that the orientation to which I refer is that at the community level, whatever may be the size or definition of the community, the patient is looked upon as the focal point. He is the one to whom the service comes, and every attempt is made not to divide him into too many pieces in having various government agencies attempt to serve him without careful integration and careful planning of joint objectives. If successful, it should promote rational and economic use of resources and effective involvement of all those who provide the services, and greater satisfaction to those who need the services.

I mentioned that Dr. Paproski's work in this area has awakened much interest, which I welcome. And I further mention that I agree in principle, but this is an experimental development at the present time, and, in fairness, much more evidence is required as to the substantial cost savings which many proponents of this scheme across the country are claiming for it at the present time. I suggest the approach to community health centre development should be both optimistic and cautious and that much thought is going to be

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-31

required, as well as perhaps experimentation, some of which is being conducted in various parts of the country at the present time.

The Alberta Medical Association has submitted a brief in regard to community health services which I won't go into in detail at the present time, but I think it would be fair to say that one of their major concerns is to assure that the private sector of medical practice is not under attack as it is in some provinces as a result of the thinking that is taking place in Alberta in regard to community health services. I have no hesitation, in existing circumstances, of providing whatever assurance is necessary in that regard, and have done so in dealing directly with representatives of the Alberta Medical Association.

One major study which is well known and is still in progress in regard to this matter is the Hastings report, and we are keeping in touch both with the interim report that was published in recent months and the timetable for the publication of the final report which is expected later this year -- possibly as early as the month of June.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reference which was made earlier in the House today with regard to the federal plans for family income security, perhaps deserves a comment to the effect that I think this initiative on the part of the federal government is interesting and it is also timely, and by that I don't mean only from their point of view, with reference to predictions that some people are inclined to make about the possibility of an election federally this year. But we are very interested in the proposals they are making; we regard them as being tentative, but to a large extent innovative in their approach, and I personally have no doubt that if our studies of them can be completed within a reasonable time, I would be interested in providing the House with further information with regard to it before the end of this session, in order that as full an understanding as possible can be had of this new and rather complex approach of theirs.

Mr. Speaker, I have reached the conclusion of my remarks. I want to thank the House for their attention to me during this time, and I do want to say that, in respect to the government's program and the action that is going to be taken on the Speech from the Throne as the session goes on, I feel that this government is one that will act throughout with a deep sense of commitment to a very fine program as enunciated in the Speech from the Throne. I am perfectly willing to abide by the impression that the people of Alberta gain from the action we are taking and will take in respect to these matters, and I think, Mr. Speaker, I can live with the criticism that occasionally comes from across the floor.

Thank you very much.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, may I at the outset, add my congratulations to the hon. Speaker on his elevation to this high office, and at the same time say that the expressions already conveyed by previous speakers are much in harmony and full accord with my personal feelings. It is my hope and I pray that our good Lord will guide him and grant him strength and wisdom in the performance of his duties in this House and to the people of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, as a new member of this Assembly, I was, of course, very interested in learning the procedures of the House. In fact, I recall that on the first day the important issue of oriental export was mentioned. I want to record, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not willing to go.

8-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

Another observation, Mr. Speaker, is there were many quotes attributed to the elder statesman, Disraeli. I would like to add a quote attributed to the same author. I have also have a few quotes of the noble one, Confucius, but for today I think that Disraeli has the priority. Now, Mr. Disraeli, in answer to a question from a new member of the House, when asked, should I take the advantage of getting up and speaking to every issue that comes before the House? Mr. Disraeli replied: "It is better for the House to wonder why you do not speak, than for it to wonder why you do."

So, Mr. Speaker, I have more or less taken that to heart. I have waited for the first day in the second week to speak to the Speech from the Throne. Frankly, I am sincerely and deeply honoured to have this opportunity and responsibility of addressing the members of the Alberta Legislative Assembly as the first representative of the Calgary McCall constituency. My constituency takes in the extreme north east section of the City of Calgary, and it is probably the fastest growing area in all the province. The new houses added to my constituency in the past five years, if placed alongside one another, would form a continuous stretch of building lots from Calgary half way to Red Deer. My constituency supplies a large portion of the labour force of the entire city. We have an extremely large number of small businesses in the constituency, many of them family owned establishments.

The new Calgary airport extension will be in my riding. Several new freeways are in the planning stage for the Calgary McCall area. Because of this expansion, Mr. Speaker, we are experiencing some severe growing pains. We are, naturally, pleased to suffer a certain degree of growing pains, but we look to the provincial government to recognize our problems and to offer some help in the areas that fall within provincial jurisdiction and responsibility. At the present time, for example, ten blocks in my riding, Memorial Drive, which forms a major east-west freeway in the City of Calgary, is left unfinished, mainly because of the lack of provincial contributions to this project. This is, of course, causing a great deal of traffic congestion in the already bad situation in Forest Lawn, which forms a greater part of my constituency.

Now, in the matter of ecology, Mr. Speaker, because the McCall constituency is located in the east end of Calgary, with the rivers flowing from the west to the east, we find that at certain times of the year our river water is polluted by the time it comes down to our section of the city. Most of our winds, chinook or otherwise, also come from the west and even the most gentle western breeze wafts a combination of some unusual and peculiar odours. These originate from places like the oil refinery, stockyards, fertilizer plants, rendering plants, and of course at election time, from political forums, and other places where some restrictive pollution control would be in order. There are even a couple of hotels in the area that emit odours not normally associated with the more urbane watering holes in the city.

In short, because of the growing pains and industrialization in my area, we are experiencing numerous difficulties and inconveniences. The most urgent are; street congestion, water pollution, air pollution, and underdeveloped recreational areas for our fast growing community.

I earnestly solicit the provincial government to assist us in solving the problems before they become major obstacles in the future expansion of our area.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to direct some of my comments to provincial matters, rather than constituency matters. While one is naturally inclined to attack the opposing side, I believe that most of our members and most certainly the public have become tired of listening to the Conservatives blame the

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-33

Social Creditors and the Social Creditors blaming the Conservatives and the NDP blaming everyone in sight for the bad state of affairs of our government.

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that we get down to the business of our province. Let us not only seek Conservative answers or Social Credit answers but let us be sure that we seek the right answers. Let us not try to fix the blame on the past, but let us accept our responsibilities for the future and for the people of this province.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make mention of my reactions to the Speech from the Throne. Perhaps it is because of the fact that I am a new member in the Assembly, or perhaps it's because I expected a little more. But the fact is, the Speech from the Throne left a lot to be desired. Quite frankly I was unable to learn anything from it. Any specific revelations, if indeed there were any, escape me. A multitude of items were mentioned in the speech, but there was nothing to indicate what actions might be taken for the people of Alberta. I was unable, for instance, to determine if the government had in mind anything that really dealt with the bread and butter issues. As a political document, the only thing that can be said for it was that it was an exercise in ineffectual projection, and an unqualified masterpiece of ambiguity. May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this Speech from the Throne was a real disappointment to the people of Alberta.

Surely our government must realize that the public is capable of digesting a document with a few more specifics. The speech could at least accord us an acknowledgment of a modicum of intelligence and a capacity for discernment. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this speech was not indicative of what the future proposals might contain or how they are to be presented in the future.

To me the speech was memorable in that it reminded me of a bikini, that what it conceals is more vital than what it reveals. There is no indication, in the speech, of whether the government intends to straddle the fence on the right or on the left of the political spectrum. We do not know if we are to have more free enterprise or socialism. There is always, of course, the possibility that the speech does represent the sum total of the government's thinking, in which case we can only look forward to riding in a ship of state that does not know where it is headed.

Mr. Speaker, I acknowledge that the Throne Speech sounded good on the surface. It was saturated with Mom and apple-pie niceties, but there was little, or no, bread and butter. I see nothing but generalities when it comes to definite programs to provide work for seasonal unemployment. Only two sentences were devoted to this important problem out of the twelve-page document. There were, of course, a small morsel for the aged, a few crumbs for the children, and a bare cupboard for the people who pay the bills.

I am particularly concerned about the government's obvious avoidance of mentioning the words 'sales tax'. I am aware of the statement that says a sales tax will not be instituted in 1972 or 1973, but I would like some assurance from the hon. Premier that a sales tax will not be pressed upon this province during the life of his government.

I am more than a little concerned at paragraph 6 on Page 5 of the Throne Speech. This is in reference to the Cabinet Committee on Metropolitan Affairs. A committee consisting of only six members of the Executive Council would seem to be rather restricted in scope. Surely of the many members representing the urban areas, the government could amplify a more thorough cross-section of ideas and opinions if this committee was more representative of all the cities in the province. I am sure you will agree that there are more cities

8-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

in this province than just the two which are experiencing special problems relating to urban growth and development.

There is also the marked absence of the mention of financial aid to our cities. Surely something must be done to give them a wider and more permanent means of providing for their financial needs. A strong policy of financial help and guidance should be an item of high priority. We all know that there are some services which are better administered at the local level. Therefore the municipality should have the authority and the financial resources to carry out these services in accordance with their ability to administer such responsibility. Provincial legislation should be designed to provide the statutory authority necessary to allow for this, and at the same time ensure an orderly development of local government administration. We must never allow a repetition of the fiasco of a few months ago when the municipalities didn't know where they stood in relation to financial aid from the province. With this kind of uncertainty, they would have to employ pressure groups, whose sole purpose would be to come, hat in hand, to the provincial government begging for funds. They could wonder then, is it \$38 million or more or less, or is it \$42 million less or more? We must give them a more permanent arrangement of understanding.

Still on this issue, because of the heavy concentration of the population in the urban centres, the province should, I believe, be the first to recognize the need and advantages of sharing certain autonomies, benefits, and responsibilities with the municipalities, inasmuch as a substantial share of the provincial revenue is collected from, by, or through municipalities. It seems only logical, as well as astute, for the government of Alberta to revise its program in the field of provincial municipal fiscal relations, especially if a revised plan could produce a more acceptable relationship and more revenues accruing to the municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal briefly with other matters that I suggest should receive high priority. On the important question of housing, I strongly suggest that the government allow the Alberta Housing Corporation to remove the freeze from the direct mortgage lending field. The present freeze affects those people who do not qualify for conventional loans from regular lending institutions simply because they happen to be in the lower income bracket. It has never been the policy of the previous government, and I trust it will not be the policy of this government, to discriminate against people of lower income. We must be particularly aware that we do not penalize them in the matter of essentials.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of homeowners' tax discounts, for the past number of years homeowners in this province have enjoyed a modest, but welcome, direct tax refund. I feel that any other form of grant or rebate would be most unfair. For example, if the rebate or grant was given directly to the municipalities, it could and probably would be used as general revenue, or used to supply some areas with amenities while not giving proper regard to other areas in the district. I was very much disturbed, therefore, Mr. Speaker, in November of last year when one of the ministers of this government suggested that the discount or grant would likely be discontinued under the new proposal for a new tax scheme. Only by a direct tax grant to the property owner is money available for proposals for disposal as the homeowner sees fit.

Mr. Speaker, a word on the care of the aged. I am particularly interested in the care of the aged and the aged ill. We need a new and modern concept of care for these people. We must not merely get the old folks from under our feet, but we must give them the care and the dignity that they are entitled to. In addition to looking after their physical ills, we must give them a measure of social life, with the ultimate aim of giving them all the peace and security that befits a great province such as we have. These people have

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-35

contributed much towards the progress and the development of this province which we so much enjoy. We cannot give them less than the best care available.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, on the question of the Alberta Bill of Rights. While I do not intend to criticize the Bill of Rights, what I question, however, is the matter of priority. I find it rather hard to believe that with all the problems facing this government, and there are many, what most concerns them is the fear of discrimination. I firmly believe that by such emphasis the government is creating a problem where there wasn't one before.

It is true, we hear of isolated cases of discrimination against one race or another. It is not, however, and never has been, the serious problem that our government is trying to lead us into believing. Just have a look around this floor, Mr. Speaker. We see names here such as Topolnisky, Yurko, Diachuk, Paproski, Bouvier and Smith; that sounds like the starting lineup of the Stampeders. In addition to these names we have some more Anglo-Saxon names such as Ho Lem and Loughheed. It is not in my estimation a sign of discrimination. In fact, I think it is truly a tribute to the people of this province. I am the first to admit that a person who is determined to find discrimination in this province can probably do so. This kind of discrimination however, is not going to be legislated out of existence no matter what our law says. We have so many people claiming unfair treatment today that we have certain groups claiming rights such as rights for criminals, even murderers, rights for the accused, rights for students, rights for women, and there is even now a group seeking to establish rights for husbands. To some I don't think that is way out.

We will always find these kinds of people with us. It is a matter of attitudes. For this kind of discrimination, I submit it is education and not legislation that is needed. I submit that this education must be nurtured in our homes, in our churches, in our market places, and in our community that we are all a part of.

Mr. Speaker, in summation, I am proud to be representing the Calgary McCall constituency and I am proud to be representing the Social Credit Party, but even more than that, I am chiefly proud to be representing the people of Alberta.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to leave the House with this thought. I wish to assure the present government that I will always support good legislation provided that they can convince me that it is really good -- at times, I may be hard to convince -- but only, Mr. Speaker, if this type of legislation is designed for the overall good of the people of Alberta.

MR. APPELEY:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much this opportunity to participate in the Speech from the Throne Debate in the first session of the 17th Alberta Legislature. I know that the Speaker of this House has received a great many good wishes and congratulations, and I might have some concern that the weight of all these accolades might be somewhat of a physical strain upon him, but as I have watched his performance here during the first few days of the session, and noticed his wisdom, his understanding, his patience and his tolerance, I can certainly understand that there will be no such need for concern, and I want to add my own felicitations to those he has already received.

Briefly, I would like to congratulate all members of this House on their election and particularly those who have been chosen to the Cabinet of this government, and I express my appreciation for the co-operative and understanding attitude they have taken to the members of the government. I feel very fortunate, Mr. Deputy Speaker, in my

8-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

seat mates in this House, because I have yourself here on my left, well informed in the procedures of government, who gives me advice on all matters of procedure, and on my right I have the most recent addition to this House, the member from Stettler, Mr. Graham Harle, who has, by his victory in the Stettler by-election indicated the confidence of the people of Alberta in this government.

Mr. Speaker, as I enter this House each day and take my seat and see my name on my desk, I sometimes have some reflections as to how this all came about. I know that there have been times over the last few years when I have thought perhaps I would like to offer myself as a candidate for the Legislature. But these thoughts never became very clear or very firm. They never crystalized until I met our Premier, the hon. Peter Lougheed. And I was impressed, not only with his vision and his imaginative ideas, but also with the fact that he had the ability and the energy and the desire to see these ideas and the ideas of others who were attracted to him put into practical realization in the many new directions that this government intends to follow in the Province of Alberta. And I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this very same reason is the major one why you find all the other members on this side of the government today.

Mr. Speaker, I have certainly been very thrilled to hear the numerous speeches from all parts of the House, because this has opened up a kaleidoscopic type of vista of the whole province for me, and it has proved very enlightening and very educational. I commend the members of the House and all parties who have made their contributions. Naturally, I would like to pay a special commendation to the Mover and the Seconder of the Speech from the Throne, the hon. Member from Whitecourt and the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight. As one other member said as we left the Assembly that afternoon, they gave us a pretty hard act to follow. And I heartily agree.

I note that the Leader of the Opposition is not present today, and I know this is unavoidably so, but I trust that his colleagues will carry to him the message that I certainly appreciate the positive attitude he expressed in his speech and the indication he has given since that he intends to co-operate in the expediency of the conduct of business in this House.

However, he made one remark in his speech which caused me to go and check the results from the last election, and I found that the percentages show that the Progressive Conservative Party had received 46.4 per cent of the vote and the Social Credit Party had received 41 per cent of the vote. Perhaps I misinterpreted his remarks, but he said that we were the government, even though they got the most votes, and that is quite significant to me, because I think that the percentages as they are in the book are very meaningful.

Another impression that I thought maybe he wished to create was that this was a rural oriented type of government. I know the hon. Minister of Environment, Mr. Yurko, has already commented on this, and I would also like to say that although I represent a rural constituency myself, I certainly have a clear understanding of problems in the urban centres, and I know that this government is giving serious and dedicated consideration to these many complex and involved problems. I would like to make it perfectly clear that this is not a rurally oriented government and it is not an urban oriented government, but it is a government of 48 members for all the people over all the Province of Alberta. And for the benefit of some of our friends from the south I would like them also to understand that we are quite aware that the southern boundary of Alberta is at the US border.

I was just going to say something about my hon. friend from Pincher Creek-Crowsnest because he struck a very responsive chord in my makeup when he showed concern for the wildlife in his constituency and I think this was a very merited type of concern to have. I was

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-37

also impressed by the remarks the hon. Member for Lethbridge West made on his remarks on education. While I perhaps do not agree with everything he said, and no doubt we may have some differences later on, I certainly respect the fact that he has a great deal of concern in this area.

Speaking of some of the other remarks I heard this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View meant well with all the advice and suggestions that he gave this government, and I'm also quite confident that he used to give similar advice and suggestions to the government of which he was a part, but in view of the disastrous results this had on his own government, I'm afraid we will not be able to entertain these remarks too seriously.

Also I found quite refreshing some of the remarks made by the last speaker, the hon. Member for Calgary McCall, particularly with his reference to Disraeli, and his references to ethnic backgrounds, but I find it difficult to understand his impatience with the Speech from the Throne. I'm somewhat amazed because certainly such impatience with this particular government, after only five months in office, does not become the member of a party who sat around for 36 years waiting for something to happen.

In the Speech from the Throne we had a fair amount of emphasis in the field of agriculture, and indications of which new directions this government intended to follow in this respect. There is little need for me to repeat these views because these have been admirably brought out by many of the rural members on this side of the House already. I would certainly like to add that I am very pleased that the hon. Dr. Hugh Horner was selected as Minister of Agriculture, because I have been well aware of his experience and his ability in this field for many years, and am also fully aware that this department started to move on September 10th and the pace has been accelerating ever since.

Mr. Marvin Moore, the hon. Member for Smoky River, has explained to you something of the task force on agriculture, and I want to compliment this Member for Smoky River and also the hon. Member for Lloydminster, Mr. Miller, as co-chairman of this task force, in the manner in which they have encouraged the members of the task force who have each been delegated a certain specific area of responsibility. I, myself, am a member of this task force with the responsibility for specialized crops, and these specialized crops include honey produced by the bee keepers of Alberta. I have been made aware of some of the problems of the bee keepers in particular. I know that they have a very difficult problem with pest control, believe it or not, particularly with bears, also, that they feel they should come under the umbrella of crop insurance. And they also have great concern in the matter of the use of herbicides and insecticides and certain spraying conditions.

I was privileged to be invited to attend the convention of the Alberta Bee Keepers Association last November in Calgary, and I found this a very enlightening development. The hon. Minister of Agriculture was also able to be present at their annual banquet as guest speaker.

I would like to make one comment about the remarks made by the hon. member for Drayton Valley, Mr. Rusty Zander, regarding the views he expressed on the problems of surface rights and the Right-of-Entry Arbitration Board. I am well aware of these same types of problems as they exist in the northern part of this province, and the deficiencies that have to be rectified, and I certainly would most heartily endorse his recommendation regarding the fact that the present board should be replaced with something that can be much more effective.

8-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

You know, Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the remarks of members from their various constituencies. Some have talked of the rich resources in their constituencies, and some have described the beauty of the land; some have told us of the wonderful advantages of living in that special part of Alberta, and others have seen fit to tell us a lot of things they haven't got in their constituencies as well.

As I noted these various remarks, and looked toward the front benches of the government, I just wondered what was the best strategy for me to use. However, as I tell you something about my own constituency, the constituency of Athabasca, I come to something that is very near and dear to me, because this, Mr. Speaker, is the land where I was born. And if we look back into history we find that this is the land where Peter Pond explored for the Northwest Fur Traders in the 1770's, and where David Thompson surveyed and mapped in the 1780's. The hon. member from St. Albert has mentioned to you about the Sir Alexander Mackenzie School in St. Albert, and the majestic Athabasca River is the pathway taken by Sir Alexander Mackenzie as he travelled on towards the Slave and then down the river which was later named after him to the Arctic in 1889.

This, Mr. Speaker, is also the land through which passed many of the Klondikers on their way to the Yukon in search for gold in the year of '98. And this is a land where live many, many fine people to whom now I wish to express my sincere appreciation for having chosen me as their elected representative to this Assembly for the constituency of Athabasca. And although, Mr. Speaker, this is an area that is rich in historical tradition, and the blood of the frontier pioneers still courses through the veins of many of the local inhabitants, this also today is a well settled area with modern farms and progressive hamlets and villages and towns.

The southern two-thirds of this constituency is a farming area, mainly devoted to livestock raising, particularly cattle, and because we have so many swift flowing streams in this area with fast water, we have a problem because this is the type of area where the black flies can breed and incubate and they become a problem for the cattle raisers. However, I am pleased to know that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has taken this problem under consideration and that steps are being taken to bring in some form of control so that we will not have this problem in the future.

It's also a pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to note that in the Speech from the Throne we have The Agricultural Development Fund Act and The Alberta Opportunity Fund Act. I am sure that both of these acts will be very useful to people in my constituency who are trying to formulate gas co-ops or to start small industries.

Mr. Speaker, I have a considerable amount to tell you yet about the northern part of my constituency, and I do not feel that there would be sufficient time left in this afternoon's sitting for me to complete my remarks. I would, therefore, ask permission to adjourn the debate and have the time considered as 5:30.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It has been moved that we consider this 5:30 and the debate be adjourned. Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The Deputy Speaker left the Chair at 5:24 pm.]

* * * * *

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-39

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

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE (cont.)

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I discussed with you and with members of this House some of the problems with regard to agriculture, not only in my constituency, but in other areas as well. This evening I want to go into another area that concerns not only my constituency but many others, not only in the north but in other parts of Alberta as well.

In the northern part of the Athabasca constituency we have what is still known as a frontier region where people come to fish commercially, to engage in lumbering, hunting, trapping and guiding. People from the Athabasca constituency engage in these occupations and people come from other constituencies into this area to do the same thing. In speaking for a few minutes about these things here this evening, I do so because I have a great deal of interest in these particular types of occupations and because I have been actively engaged in them for a considerable number of years.

The hon. Member for Smoky River has already spoken to this House about the problems to do with hunting and guiding in his area last fall in the Valleyview area. Thankfully we didn't have the type of publicity that this drew to his constituency, but we do have some similar problems in our constituency of Athabasca with regard to hunting, with regard to trapping, and all the related things.

I was rather impressed by the remarks made by the hon. Member for Camrose when he spoke of the two provincial parks in his constituency. He mentioned the fact that a number of the employees within these parks do not have very many duties in the off-season and he made some suggestions for making use of these personnel. I have wondered, Mr. Speaker, since then, if perhaps some of these people, particularly perhaps the rangers and the wardens, might not be given sufficient training so they could help our wildlife officers during the hunting seasons, when the pressure is greatest on these officers, and when we are so sadly understaffed in these areas. I think this is something that could be given definite consideration.

The hon. Member for Smoky River also made note, and I would like to reiterate this, that the problems we are speaking about were inherited by the present hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, Dr. Allan Warrack. I certainly sympathize with him on the load he has undertaken and the responsibilities he has accepted, and I know that he will give them the consideration they deserve.

In the Athabasca constituency we have a number of residents who live on local lakes where in the past there has been commercial fishing for a great many years. These people as well do hunting, guiding, trapping, work in the lumbering industry, and some of them are engaged in farming. But each year, at certain seasons of the year, they look forward to spending some of their time setting their nets and engaging in commercial fishing. Unfortunately in recent years, difficulties have arisen in this occupation. One of the things that has made it difficult for these people is the fact that due to the juggling around of regulations from time to time, sometimes the people who actually have lived on these lakes all their lives and taken advantage of the fishing seasons, find that other fishermen arrive and start setting nets in these lakes where they live, without them knowing that a season has been opened.

Another thing that has been developed in recent years, I think it was within the last two or three years -- and it was rather appropriate that this report from the Freshwater Fish Marketing should have come into the House last Friday afternoon because this

8-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

was a corporation developed by the federal government with the full co-operation of the Alberta provincial government, and it has certainly created a number of difficulties and hardships for our commercial fishermen here in Alberta.

There is much left to be desired by the Freshwater Fish Marketing co-operation. I met with a group of seven or eight of our commercial fishermen in Alberta this morning and they're very unhappy about this corporation. This particular report is simply a "snow job", an expensive brochure which our commercial fishermen have had to help to support, but it doesn't tell the true story in any respect. For instance, the prices quoted that the fishermen receive for their fish do not reveal the number of hidden costs in the way of transportation, packing, storage, royalties and other charges. And while the report makes it look as though commercial fishing in Alberta is in a very rosy situation, this is not actually the case.

Now the fishermen in this province feel that the production of fish in Alberta is sufficient to supply the needs of the people of Alberta, if the marketing is promoted in the way it should be, and they would very much like to see this type of promotion undertaken. They are willing to undertake it themselves, and I'm certain that this should be encouraged.

There are a number of other things regarding commercial fishing. I'm sure that the hon. Member from Lesser Slave Lake knows of some of the problems in that area. Lesser Slave Lake at one time used to yield a prolific amount of fish in this province (about one million pounds a year) and now the yield from that big body of water is almost negligible. The previous provincial government did research on this for years and years and years, but they came to no conclusions as to why this lake could no longer be fished, and I don't think that these conclusions have been reached as yet. But this commercial fishing in Alberta is in a sad state and requires certain decisive responsible action before it can be brought back to the state where it should be.

Now I'd like to speak, also, for a few minutes about the timber situation in this province, because commercial fishing and timbering were two things that I was well acquainted with. In the first place, I do not have any quarrel with the present system of forest management in Alberta. In fact, I presented the first brief on forest management to the Social Credit Government, on behalf of a group of lumbermen, and it was from this that they originally started to look at the ideas of forest management. However, the way that it has been administered is what I would like to take issue with, because there has been a deliberate attempt here in Alberta to eliminate the smaller independent timber operator from the lumbering industry in this province, I think mainly for the purpose of expediency in administrative details.

We have a number of large complex companies and some so-called co-operatives who have received incentive grants from the federal government and subsidies and concessions from the provincial government, and it is against these types of operations that the independent operator has found himself allied. The difficulties that have arisen is the fact that these larger concerns had the facilities and the finances to go into the more remote areas and set up a lumbering complex, and yet they were encouraged to first buy up all the timber that was in the easy accessible locations and this, of course, created a problem. Another thing that happened was that because some of these co-operatives, in particular, were financed in part by federal grants, and this was taxpayers' money, when it came time to competitive open auction on this timber we found the situation of the independent operator being forced to bid against somebody financed by some of his own money as a taxpayer. This has made it very sad.

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-41

We also have another situation where there are a number of promoter type individuals who have no processing facilities of any kind, who purchase timber quotas and then they resell these, or get other operators to work them for them at a considerable profit to themselves, and I don't think this is right. I think if there's any extra profit to be made out of the timber resources of this province, then this should accrue to the people of this province by their inherent right.

I have attempted by these few remarks to identify some of the problems that I believe exist in this particular department. I know that the minister is giving careful consideration to all of these things because I have had discussions with him regarding them.

I also know that there are a great number of very capable people working, and I've had acquaintance with these types of employees for years within this department, who have been highly frustrated by the lack of direction at the very top. Mr. Taylor, the hon. Minister from Drumheller, has spoken of second-class citizens, but it has always been the policy of the previous government to relegate this particular department to the status of a second or even third or fourth-class department, I know there is a great deal of work; far reaching and extensive changes have to be made before it can develop into the type of department that can take its place in the front ranks as it should. It deserves a much higher status than it has been accorded in the past. And, as I said, this is due to the lack of policy direction from the top.

These are the renewable resources I have been talking about in wildlife, fish and timber, and they require a great deal of careful administration. They have to be nurtured not only for ourselves in this generation but also for the generations in the decades to come.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I close my remarks I would be remiss if I did not pay tribute to two very fine gentlemen who are both very close personal friends of mine. Due to the redistribution of boundaries of the Athabasca constituency, we have in the new constituency parts of the two former constituencies of Pembina and Athabasca. The representative from Athabasca was Mr. Tony Aloisio; the representative from Pembina was Mr. Carl Muller of Westlock. To these gentlemen we owe considerable gratitude for the contribution they have made in the life of this province.

As I said in the beginning, I sensed a considerable spirit of co-operation within this Assembly. Certainly we will have our differences; we will not have agreement on all issues, but I am sure the hon. members will all agree that last Thursday evening we had a very dramatic evening here in this House when we passed the resolution regarding the broadcasting and picture-taking and so on. I, for one, felt that I was very privileged to be present on such a dramatic occasion, something that was far-reaching in the history of the British parliamentary tradition.

As I have sat here in my seat and listened to the speeches of the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, one thing has come across to me quite loud and clear and that is the fact that all the members of this Assembly have a great deal of concern for people, not only the people of their own constituencies, but all the people in this great and wonderful province. Thank you.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this Throne Speech debate I welcome this opportunity to congratulate you on your election as Speaker. Your decisions and conduct of office have convinced me you are well qualified to fill the office to which you have been elected. And I am confident you will attempt to be very fair and impartial to

8-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

all members of the Assembly, irrespective of where they sit in this Assembly.

I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate all other members, irrespective of where they sit in this Assembly, on their election on August 30th. I would also like to extend my congratulations to the Premier, the members of the Executive Council, and to the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition on assuming their new responsibilities. I would also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne and to all others who have proceeded me in this debate.

I want to say at the outset I consider it an honour and a privilege to again accept the responsibility for representing the people of the Hanna-Oyen constituency. This I promise you I will do to the best of my ability. This means I will support legislation which I feel is in the best interests of the people. I also hold the prerogative of speaking out against legislation which I do not deem to be in the best interests of the people. I think we are all here to do a job for the people of this province irrespective of where we sit in the Legislature. Although the government appears to be zealously exuberant over the results of the election, I want to remind them they inherited a very honest and efficient administration. Any thought or suggestion that there might have been wrongdoings at the crossroad, have certainly been dispelled by the Touche, Ross report, and when history is written it will be recorded that no other provincial government in Canadian history has ever inherited such an efficient operation and in such good shape.

I want to remind the new government that when Social Credit was first elected in 1935, the total budget at that time was \$17 million. When it left office in 1971, the budget was \$1,200 million, and during that period of time as a living monument of enduring significance, over \$1,600 million worth of physical assets have been provided for our people. It is not my intention, Mr. Speaker, to go into full detail with respect to these assets, except to say that they can be found on pages 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28 of the Public Accounts for the period ending March 31, 1971. And incidentally, just a brief look at these four or five pages, I see roads, bridges, ferries, etc., \$864 million, public buildings, \$141 million, school buildings \$98 million; correctional institutions \$26 million; court houses, land titles buildings, etc., \$21 million; universities \$238 million; irrigation projects, colleges and other items which total \$1,600 million, and when you go back to the consolidated balance sheets on page 20, you will note that these general assets which are known as C4 have been reduced to a nominal value of \$1.00. And, Mr. Speaker, as the new government has assumed their responsibility, I want to remind them that the people of this province will hold the new government responsible for any deviation from the progress and prosperity we have enjoyed in Alberta for the past 36 years.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Social Credit has given Albertans an outstanding record of service, and a record of achievement and integrity that will be difficult to equal. I sometimes think that before the last election, if we had taken some of our campaign funds and had distributed them to some of the people in the province and said: "Go and take a trip to other parts of Canada and come back to Alberta in time to vote," we would still be the government in office in the province of Alberta.

Now for a kind word for the new government. With reference to the Speech from the Throne, I commend the new government for indicating that there will be special programs aimed at assisting agriculture which is our basic industry. I am cognizant of the problems facing some of our smaller communities, and I trust the new Alberta Opportunity Fund will be able to provide some of the answers to their current problem. In the area I represent, farming and ranching are the major industries. Naturally the roads leading into

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-43

the towns, which are the service centres, are very important to these small areas. One of these ways to assist our small towns is to upgrade the roads leading into them. This will also provide a market road for agriculture. I certainly trust that the new government will pay particular attention to the emphasis on main highways which have not been completed and this will include highways 36 and 41.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in looking back over the past six months and examining the record of the new administration, I must say that we now have a government that must be branded with waste, extravagance and arrogance. To substantiate these observations I would like to review what has taken place in the first six months of office.

When the Cabinet was sworn in on September 10th, we found a record number named in the new Cabinet, 22 in all. The previous government had 17 members; this is an increase of 30 per cent. I thought it only fair, Mr. Speaker, to compare the position of the number of Cabinet ministers in the other provinces, and so I took the liberty of going to the library and according to the Canadian Almanac and Directory, with amendments up to February 28th, 1972, I find the following: in the House of Commons there are 30 members in the Cabinet. The number of members in the house is 264 and according to the population figures (and the figures I will be quoting are from the current Canadian Almanac and Directory) it shows the population in Canada as 20 million, and this is from the 1966 census.

Now coming to Alberta, the number of members in the Cabinet 22, members in the Assembly 75, the population 1,520,000 according to the 1968 census. British Columbia - members in the Cabinet 17, number of members in the House 55, population 2,128,000, according to the 1970 census. Manitoba - members in the Cabinet 13, members in the House 57, population 960,000 according to the 1964 census. Ontario (and this is an up to date figure, because there is an amendment to the book that is in the library dated February 21, 1972), members in the Cabinet 11, members in the House 117, and the population 7,610,000 according to the 1970 census.

Now having a look at Quebec, and this is according to the amendment in the library dated February 28, 1972, members in the Cabinet 24, members in the House 108, the population 5,667,000 and this is according to the 1965 census. In Saskatchewan, our neighbour to the east, members in the cabinet 12, members in the House 60 - population 961,000, according to the 1969 census.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, when you compare Alberta with the other provinces you will find that we have more Cabinet ministers per thousand population than any other province in Canada. -- [Applause] -- I'm very pleased that the members are applauding because a little later in my talk I'll have some comments to make which I hope will be disturbing to every member in this Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How many Deputy Premiers?

MR. FRENCH:

As a matter of fact there is only one province with more Cabinet ministers than we have in Alberta and that is Quebec. We are tied with Ontario for second place and we must keep in mind that Quebec has a population about three times ours, and Ontario has about four times our population. So, Mr. Speaker, surely this is a clear-cut case of extravagance, when we only have one-seventh of the population in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my second observation is that of raising the salaries of the four Ministers Without Portfolio from \$4,800 to \$9,000 a year. I say, Mr. Speaker, if these four ministers were

8-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

involved in a full-time operation of their portfolio responsibilities, I feel they should be paid the equivalent salary of a full-time minister of the Cabinet. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, if it is only a part-time occupation, I find it very difficult to justify raising the salary from \$4,800 to \$9,000. Thus, with the increase from 17 to 22 in the number of Cabinet ministers, salaries of the ministers without portfolio increased from \$4,800 to \$9,000, this coupled with the deputy ministers, directors, executive assistants, research staff, must certainly be labelled as waste and extravagance.

When we were in government, the opposition charged us with having the most expensive government in Canada. They even said that they would cut the fat out of government if they were elected to office. I must say what short memories they seem to have.

This brings me to my next observation, and that is that of doubling the staff in the Premier's office. This, naturally, will double the cost of the executive assistant in the Premier's office. I suppose I should not be too critical of the doubling of the cost of running the Premier's office, as it is only consistent with the extravagance which has been exemplified in the cost of running the Executive Council.

And coming to my next point, Mr. Speaker, I hope that during the current session somebody on the government side of the House will explain the reason for the huge wall in the east corridor of the third floor. According to the Return tabled in the House, I see that the cost of this huge wall, and some other renovations, was over \$9,000. When I hear all this talk about open government, I'm wondering if this Tory wall is to keep the staff in, or keep the people out.

My next point is that of purchasing an executive aircraft for some half million dollars, I believe it is \$460,000, and I say Mr. Speaker, where are our priorities when we have people who have been living in Alberta for the past 50 years and are still waiting for roads, and we see the spectacle of purchasing an executive aircraft for a few cabinet ministers? Mr. Speaker, I say it's wrong in principle to put more than three or four executives in a single aircraft. Hardly a day passes that there is not an air crash in some place in the world, and who knows they may suffer the same disaster that a whole football team did a few years ago.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Put them all in!

MR. FRENCH:

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I promised the government a little earlier that I'd try and be kind to them. But in all seriousness, have we come to the place where the air bus and other commercial airlines are not good enough for our cabinet ministers?

While I presume some of the members welcome the improvements to the Legislative Chamber, with the elevated floor, new carpets, new chairs I question the priority for this expenditure when we have many communities in Alberta still waiting for accommodation for their non-existent offices. I am particularly thinking of Oyen, a very progressive community in east central Alberta, where the Department of Public Works purchased the property some six years ago. The property is still vacant and I certainly question the priority of improving the Legislative Chambers for our benefit when we have people living in the rural areas who have been very patiently waiting for their public works buildings. And I've been wondering if there could be some particular significance to the colour red which has been chosen for this Chamber.

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-45

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we're certainly living in a period of change. As this is my 13th year in the legislature, I have served on many caucus committees. Never once in the 12 years have I been paid for even out-of-pocket expenses for work on a caucus committee. I'm certainly not opposed to the government appointing their own members to caucus committees; this has been a long established practice. As a matter of fact, I would be quite surprised if the government did not appoint members with their own government members when they are formulating government policy. But why should they be paid extra for doing so? I've always regarded it an honour and privilege to serve the people who have elected me. I'm certainly amazed the new government would appoint five Tory caucus committees who have open-ended expense accounts.

Listening to the hon. Member for Athabasca this afternoon, when he made some reference to the results of the last election, I couldn't help but think that maybe the government has taken a look at the results of the last election. The Tories got about 46 per cent of the vote, Social Credit about 41 per cent, the NDP and the Independents received the balance, and so when you look at the total figures, we represent a larger combined vote on this side of the Legislature than the government with its 46 per cent on the other side. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, when expense accounts are paid only to members sitting on caucus committees I say this is morally wrong and it's certainly making a mockery out of our traditional system of democracy.

I have been impressed with some of the speeches on the government side of the House, and I fully agree that the members who have taken part in this debate certainly are going to be worthwhile representatives of their respective constituencies, and I've been wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the Conservatives held out the proverbial carrot before the last election and this is one way of paying their Tory caucus committees. Is this one way to appease the appetites of those that expected an appointment to the Cabinet?

And now Mr. Speaker, I've heard some allegations that the government has inherited a leaky ship. If this is their view, I find it most difficult to understand the reason the government is not exercising some measures to curtail controllable expenditures. Instead it's quite evident the new administration must be tarnished with waste, extravagance and arrogance. This has been displayed by the new government when they increased their number of members by 30 per cent in the Cabinet, increased the salaries of the ministers without portfolio, additional deputy ministers, directors, executive assistants, research staff, new aircraft, new carpets, new chairs for this Legislative Assembly, and then even paying their own government members for Tory caucus research.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I trust the new government will accept this criticism in the spirit in which it's intended, and that is, to be constructive.

I want to say in all seriousness -- and this is the point I want to come to and I think it is a very serious problem that we have in Canada -- Alberta is not alone in increasing the cost of government.

Very briefly, I would like to refer to an editorial which appeared in the Free Press Weekly of September 25th. According to the latest official projections of Statistics Canada, governments collectively will claim this year's revenue amounting to 46 per cent of the nation's total production of goods and services, or 42 per cent if pension and hospital insurance premiums are excluded from accounting. To a great extent the growth in the cost of government reflects the growth in the size of government. While Ottawa has been the leader, it has not been alone. In the federal and provincial governments we now have 38 more ministers than were required to govern the country in 1960. This number would have been deemed more

8-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

than sufficient in that year to staff the governments of the two most populous provinces, Ontario and Quebec.

The cost of supporting ministers has, of course, increased dramatically in the interval, although this is the least significant aspect of the matter. As we all know, these figures would be adjusted on today's level, Mr. Speaker; this is dated sometime in September.

I was born in Alberta, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a citizen of Alberta, I am proud to be a Canadian, and I say this escalation must be stopped before we reach the point of no return. To me this is one of the greatest challenges facing all governments in Canada today. I don't think I need to remind the members of this House that if they read history, they will realize what happened to cause the downfall of the nations I am referring to. I haven't time to go into it in detail but I am sure the members will know what I am referring to.

I also want to say that the attraction of big government is obvious. It can be advertised in departmental pamphlets; however, I still maintain that if we had a reasonably modest government the average citizen would have more of his own money to spend. This in turn would provide more employment which would be an increase in our economy which in the long run should be more beneficial than the effects of big government.

Now before closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to what I consider one of the most serious problems that we had in our constituency this last year. I am referring to the Bow Valley teachers' strike which kept about 12,000 students out of the classroom for a period of three weeks. As most of our schools are under the semester system, this would be the equivalent of about six weeks under the normal school year. I know of one dedicated teacher, during the strike, who phoned the Deputy Minister of Education. He also phoned the Deputy Minister of Labour asking permission to continue to teach, even if it required using another building. In both cases, he was told he should be prepared to suffer the consequences if he took this action. Naturally he took the advice of the two deputy ministers, so there is no question in my mind that the students in this particular strike were the unfortunate victims, and they were not the ones who were responsible for the strike in the first place.

Following the strike, a number of students have not returned to the classroom. In the case of a Grade XII student, this would mean the loss of his high school diploma. At one time we took a great deal of pride in our academic achievements. This was only possible with a high teacher-student morale. Today the teacher-student morale is almost nonexistent. I say, hon. members of this Assembly, for those who are interested in education, this is a very serious problem. Looking back on this strike, I would request an examination be made of existing legislation with a view of suggesting policy alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended to deal with one or two other topics. One was the matter of election and the other was a matter of Hutterites, but knowing that there will be a legislative committee appointed to go into these two areas I do not feel it will be fair to present my views to the Legislature at this time.

I want to thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this Assembly for your patience during my debate. Thank you very kindly.

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Speaker, at the most delightful party hosted for us recently by His Honour the Hon. Lieutenant Governor, the Hon. J. W. Grant

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-47

MacEwan and Mrs. MacEwan, I thought to myself, who will ever replace this man? What a job it will be to follow this man, and what a job it is to follow my colleagues in this House after the calibre of speeches we have heard here in the past week.

Seventeen years ago I wrote an editorial advocating a Hansard for Alberta. Continuously this matter of a Hansard was brought before the executive council of the former government, but always it was ignored. To see this job accomplished, it has taken 17 years and an August housecleaning. Wasn't it a grand housecleaning?

Open government is now at work, and we must never spoil it with any amendments which will stifle the media. Twenty-four hours after Hansard was approved, the open government policy of this government was expanded even further by admitting television, radio and news photographers into this Assembly, a first, I believe, in the British Commonwealth.

Now, on this day, an important day in my life, I realize that what I say now and in the future in this House will go into that record, which is good for my constituents and good for every voter in Alberta.

Let me say first, Mayor Dent and his Council notwithstanding, the Hanson Report notwithstanding; the Edmonton Journal's editorial comments notwithstanding the vast majority of the people of St. Albert and M.D. Sturgeon have no desire to become part of a concrete jungle and something called Greater Edmonton unitary government. What we really need is to encourage growth already started in centres within the orbit of Edmonton, with open areas between those centres. Morinville, Fort Saskatchewan, Spruce Grove, Leduc, Bon Accord, Gibbons and St. Albert are developing as healthy towns, good towns for those people who choose not to live in the city where they can pursue their own life-style and where they exercise a vigorous voice in their own affairs through the councils they elect and serve upon. When I observe week after week, every Monday night, the number of delegations heard by the council of the town of St. Albert, I can only say it's absurd to believe that all these groups and individuals could be given this time and attention by a Greater Edmonton unitary government when St. Albert would possibly have only one representative on that authority. Mayor Dent said Friday that conflicts will be inevitable if satellite towns are allowed in this region. For that matter, conflicts are occurring all the time within Edmonton City Council, and between Edmontonians and the council, and rightly so. This is how open government works. Another Mayor (Mayor Lindsay) said some time ago that New York is impossible to govern.

I believe that unitary government for this whole region would mean that people would have less and less say in municipal affairs and that would be a step in the wrong direction. I say it is bureaucracy that is inevitable, costly bureaucracy, if one council controls the vast area proposed in the Hanson Report. Let me say for the record that in the four years I serve here I will never cease to fight for the independence of St. Albert and the municipal district of Sturgeon using all the resources at my command. And those resources include many able, informed, intelligent people in the St. Albert constituency -- people who are prepared to make a stand for a way of life they have chosen for themselves and for the children who come after them.

Our hon. Premier, Peter Lougheed, speaks well and truly for Albertans when he says we should not allow Alberta to become a province of two joint cities. I believe there are far too many Albertans who will suffer much if Edmonton becomes a second Chicago, and Calgary a second Los Angeles. We must take a new direction now. The history of St. Albert predates that of Edmonton. Father Lacombe's missions at St. Albert and Lac Ste. Anne were the earliest settlements in what is now Alberta. His bridge in St. Albert was the

8-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

first west of Winnipeg. When the Hudson Bay Company wrote to him and told him to tear it down, he said, "Let them come and do it." The bridge stood. In the '70's, we too, like Father Lacombe, may have to resist pressure from big companies if Albertans are to keep control of the single most important asset we have, the land. If we cover good, fertile land with concrete, houses, industrial and commercial property, we have lost it for ever. We should never lose sight of two facts: 40 percent of Canada's gross national product comes through agriculture; and one job in three in Canada is related to this basic industry, this industry that depends on the land.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at who is presently in control of land use in this area described in the Hanson report. I suggest to you that in the Edmonton area land, and therefore land use, is to a considerable extent in the control of a handful of very large developers. What does it cost these giants, and they are not all Albertans or Canadians, to exercise this control. Is it, in fact, precious little by way of dollar investment? Do options not hold large blocks of land at little expense until that point in their plans when the developers know their profits will soon start rolling in? In this context, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the infamous Hanson Report, my choice of word, admittedly. The Mayor of Edmonton and his council commissioned this report. They think of it not as infamous, but as gospel.

In St. Albert we have held a plebiscite and the opinions of our residents are now plainly evident. The people of our town do not want to become part of Edmonton. In Edmonton, no poll has been taken of the residents' opinion of the Hanson Report recommendations. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that large numbers and perhaps a large majority of Edmontonians have no wish to see their city grow to the extent outlined in that report.

Is this pressure to increase Edmonton's area to 191 square miles -- which may be compared to New York's 310 -- an empire-building scheme of a mayor and council and big business interests in the city? A council and a segment of society who are not in tune with the times? If developers can control land use in given areas at little expense and then reap large profits, so perhaps can the provincial government. But I hope it doesn't have to come to that. The large developers who control much of the residential developments in this region must therefore, in my opinion, pay more attention to public housing of high standards, to improving home building design, to the thinking of the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission and to the clearly expressed wishes of the people for open area between centres.

When I say land is our most valuable resource, I am thinking of its value to people. We are familiar with the high sounding campaigns of the Socreds on the theme of human resources, the captivating idea that they considered people our most valuable resource. If they really thought so, Mr. Speaker, would we now be facing a situation where the pioneers who built this great, rich province now find they cannot get into an auxiliary hospital, often though in urgent need?

And at the other end of the age scale, the 'have' province has provided neither kindergartens nor day care centres. So this new government has marked out some new directions and already begun work to implement them. I am proud to be part of the government team. I have come to know all of them, and take note, loyal opposition, although most of us have never served in this House before, we 48 will not be easy targets for your front bench. Combined, we 48 have massive experience in so many fields, and that experience will tell in this House long before any 36 years roll by.

We have advanced so rapidly in technology and electronics, biology, genetics, and have accomplished so much using these tools, that society seems to be in danger of letting the tools and the

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-49

people who invent and operate them take over. The idea seems strong in society that what can be done by technology must be done. If a computer can be built to take over a task, it must be built in the name of efficiency or progress. The young people were the first to become uneasy, and fearful. My own son, home from a Social Studies class at age 13, said: "But Dad, I don't want to grow up and just become a consumer." And the cry of the students at Berkeley in 1964, "I am a human being, do not fold, spindle, or mutilate." And why was it a computer that the students at Sir George Williams College smashed? I bring this thinking to your attention because I am of the opinion that we should move with care in adopting new technology. It is expensive for Canada, with our smaller population, and our government must watch expenses. And we also must think of human beings first.

The most important task of governing has got to come down to the best use of money -- money from taxpayers, and income from all sources, which means setting priorities. And when we wish to establish priorities, we have to separate the wheat from the chaff. This in my view, is the most important task before this Legislature, a subject to which I have been giving much thought. Where do we cut, where do we increase, where should we try to hold the line? The mechanics fall to our Provincial Treasurer, but in broad outline, let me review some areas deserving of increases, and some where we might effect decreases, as I see the situation. We increase those areas of spending which will expand markets for all agricultural products and preserve our arable land, and an increase in this area must tie in a grid road program. We increase funds to build viable healthy secondary industry in Alberta and thereby build a bonafide job market, bonafide jobs as opposed to make work projects, which are mainly a stop gap action.

We have no recourse whatsoever, but to greatly increase spending to improve and preserve our environment. This could become a matter of life or death in the next generation if the increase is not provided.

I see no answer to increased expenditures in education. We can only hold the rate of increase down as low as possible each year. We must start educating our children at age three, surely television has taught us that. And most urgently for our poor and underprivileged children, we must spend for kindergartens and for day care centres. We could, I believe, decrease costs for equipping high schools considerably by taking out fridges, stoves, sewing-machines, typewriters and business courses, power tools and shop equipment. Students in these programs could be served by leaving school after Grade XI and completing their last year in a technical school or business college. They would come out at the same age, much better trained in their preferred field. They also would be much more interested in the final year of their schooling and the drop-out rate could fall.

We must spend for auxiliary hospitals, nursing homes, and facilities for the retarded and handicapped, until we have caught up in these areas which were so sadly neglected by our previous administration.

If we increase spending for day care, kindergartens, and secondary industry, I believe we can begin decreasing considerably our spending for welfare. Until we get major economic measures provided for, I believe we must question whether the provincial government should be involved in something called 'Social Development and Preventive Social Services'. Do people want government reaching into this corner of their lives? When they do want help there are many existing agencies and volunteer bodies available to them, such as marriage counselling and Alcoholics Anonymous, to name only two. I suggest that government can help more by providing employment and housing. These two needs locked after would accomplish much more in

8-50

ALEERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

preventing social difficulties for our people and so deserve the priority in spending. But -- and let me emphasize this -- preventative health services, including expanded guidance counselling for children and health unit programs, are needed.

I have said it before, Mr. Speaker, and I say it again, money spent on creating a Department of Youth would have been better spent on creating secondary industry leading to good jobs for youth -- my wheat from the chaff thinking. Culture and recreation are two areas of government which play a most significant role in our time. Work in both these fields will be increasing at a rate which will keep even that bundle of energy and ideas, Horst Schmid, plenty busy as a minister. Further decreases, I have no doubt, can be made and substantial decreases in spending by doing another house cleaning job this summer, and streamlining every corner of every department for improved efficiency administration and the use of funds.

This speech, my first in the Legislature, gives indication of where I will be standing during my term of office. It is really a stand for a way of life in my constituency and in this province. A way of life I think Albertans are seeking.

We have to spend more money in the most important areas to achieve these goals and this way of life, which means we must spend less money in other areas, which may be deserving but in my view are not so important. Before I sit down I would like to congratulate Mr. Gerry Amerongen on his election to the office of Speaker of this Assembly, for I am certain he will serve this important office with distinction and with dignity.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I concur with all the --

MR. SPEAKER:

I think perhaps we have one of those ties here, and in view of the division of the House perhaps we should have another member from this side.

DR. WARRACK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, hon. Member for the constituency of Cardston, for giving me the opportunity to speak before you; I appreciate your courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, this is my first opportunity to speak in this Legislative Assembly, and at this time it's my very great pleasure to add my sincere congratulations to you as Speaker and to the Deputy Speaker, and my colleague, Mr. Bill Diachuk from Edmonton Beverly, and I would like not only to congratulate you on your election, but to add congratulations on your performance; it has been just outstanding.

This is my opportunity, too, to congratulate other members of this Assembly, and in particular a man that I admire so greatly that I can hardly add words to those that have been uttered before, and that's to the Premier of this province, the hon. Peter Lougheed.

Even though I, too, am a new member of the Legislative Assembly I would like to extend my congratulations to all members of this Assembly who are here for the first time on both sides and representative of all parties in this House. I would like to extend my congratulations to you, and I think it is particularly fitting that the Throne Speech itself was moved and seconded by -- I'm sure everyone will agree -- truly outstanding speeches on the part of Mr. Peter Trynchy, my colleague from Whitecourt, and the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, Mr. Cal Lee.

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-51

Finally, but no less, I would like also to take this opportunity to reflect just a bit and add sincere congratulations again on both sides of the House, to all of the re-elected members of this Assembly that are here. I have some recognition now of the kind of public service that was extended through the years by all members who are elected to this Assembly. I congratulate it, I recognize it, and I would like to reveal now my humble respect for the past and for the people, the human beings of Alberta, who represent that past in Alberta and in this Legislature. And, indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is my opportunity to offer my humble regard, too, to my distinguished colleague on the other side who gave of his public service from this desk prior to this most recent election.

I would like to acquaint the members of this Assembly, and yourself, Mr. Speaker, with the most important constituency in Alberta, the Three Hills constituency. The Three Hills constituency is the constituency that the Progressive Conservatives couldn't win, or, if you like, it was the constituency the other side couldn't lose. But if you don't know any better you just go ahead and do it anyway.

It hadn't been my objective at the outset, Mr. Speaker, to tease anyone, but in the light of the remarks by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen, I couldn't help but mention that a number of the distinguished gentlemen in this House had said that very thing, that Three Hills couldn't be won.

Three Hills is a constituency that has, I think, a rather unusual layout about it. It overlaps with five different municipal governments or local government. It overlaps with primarily the municipal district of Rocky View, and it happens to be my pleasure that I have the current Reeve of Rocky View, Mr. George Boyack of Keoma in my constituency, and also the immediate past Reeve, Mr. Sanford Sidness. The other major local government area that's a part of the Three Hills constituency is the Kneehill Municipal District where Mr. Ralph Brown of Acme is the Reeve. In addition I have some fairly large parts of the County of Mountain View, the County of Wheatland, and a very small part of the County of Red Deer.

All five of these local government jurisdictions are a part of the Three Hills constituency and in the latter of these jurisdictions, it was under the very able leadership for some considerable period of time by the former Reeve of that Red Deer County, now MLA from Innisfail, Mr. Cliff Doan. So that's five local government jurisdictions that are a part of the Three Hills constituency and also, it turns out that there is an overlap in my constituency with three different federal constituencies, the federal constituency of Crowfoot, where Progressive Conservative Jack Horner is the Member of Parliament; the constituency of Palliser where Progressive Conservative Stan Schumacher is the Member of Parliament; and the federal constituency of Red Deer where Mr. Robert Thompson, Progressive Conservative, is MP.

The area that involves Three Hills has, then, so many different jurisdictions, provincially, locally, and federally, that I'm really trying to say that I think we should do a little better job in the regional co-ordination package, and I'd like to offer some suggestions in this regard as we look toward future changes in The Election Act and the boundaries that involve them. It's very difficult for people to know what to do when there are so many jurisdictions to go to. You can get tired before you find the right one. But this constituency has 61 total townships in the area, and I know it well, since I've knocked on every door in 50 of them, 49 before the election and one since, and I think I know these people very well. These are rural people of Alberta, and despite what we might believe, or might have believed before talking to many of them, these are rural people of Alberta who crave involvement in the affairs of Alberta that affect their destiny. They want to be

8-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

involved in what goes on in Alberta. These people have new ideas and are receptive to new ideas, and above all, Mr. Speaker, the thing that impresses me most about them is that they really do care.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, these are progressive people in the Three Hills constituency, and now in fact they are Progressive Conservative people. These people are, of course, represented by the Progressive Conservatives now; there's that word again; my own definition for now is 'no other way'. The people of the Three Hills constituency want, and I on behalf want for them, the opportunity for open involvement because they crave this opportunity to be a part of what affects them. They also want a demonstration and execution of leadership. They want the government to get organized, and I think they told us that on August 30th. And they want some more attention paid to rural affairs, and particularly agriculture.

I submit to you Mr. Speaker, and to the members of this Legislative Assembly, that for these things that are so badly needed in the Three Hills constituency, the Throne Speech is an excellent genesis.

The broader brush stroke across the affairs of Alberta revealed in the Throne Speech demonstrates a social conscience and the immediate program priorities of the Throne Speech are actions which focus on the forgotten people. As you have the opportunity to go door to door, even in a rural area, it surprises you to find so many forgotten people. You only find these people when you are seeing them all, every one. And you find those senior citizens who are desperately in need of help, but far too proud to say so. You can see it in their eyes only. You find the mentally ill. I found several mentally ill that had no place to go. There were mentally ill people housed at home, not only with no place to go, but even the people in immediate neighborhoods didn't know they existed. Isn't that amazing? And of course, there are the handicapped as well. These people have been dealt with with such kindness in the Throne Speech. It is an act of social conscience to focus on these forgotten people, and it's a thing that I feel very strongly about, having had the opportunity to witness the plight of several of the people.

These people are there, and not in all cases can they reach out, and it's surely the responsibility of government to reach them even though they can hardly reach out at all to help themselves. The course of least resistance, surely in government, is to be a government of the building and a government of the squeaky wheels. The squeaky wheels do not represent all of the human beings in this province or anywhere else and there are a great number of people who need help very badly, who cannot find any wheels to squeak. It's the great challenge of government, it seems to me, to serve these people. These, I think, are the people who have had some attention at last, long overdue, as witnessed by the Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, moreover, that each individual MLA -- and this is surely aside from what side of the House one might sit -- has a kind of ombudsman role in terms of finding his own forgotten constituents, to find those forgotten people in his own area. If I may say so, Mr. Speaker, a number of things have already come forward that had been brought forward before without success. In a number of cases the solution was right at hand; it just took the extra effort to get it done and some of the solutions have already been found.

I would like to credit, as a focus on these forgotten people, the Throne Speech as the broadest, most important thrust as it affects all Albertans. Many of these actions, particularly regarding the senior citizens, the mentally ill, and the handicapped children are actions which have already been taken, and this focus on these forgotten people was vastly overdue.

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-53

Turning back again to the constituency that it's my pleasure and opportunity to represent, the Three Hills constituency, this is a rural constituency as I mentioned before, with Three Hills being the largest town with less than 3,000 people, the second largest town being Trochu with less than 1,000 and the third largest town with only 400 people; that's Biseker. So this is indeed a rural constituency and they share the basic problems of rural Alberta, particularly agriculture, and with it several specific problems to the local area.

The basic problems, if I might enumerate a list that's far too short, are agriculture first, secondly rural development and employment. The time has come in this modern day to concern ourselves with issues of employment in rural Alberta as well as in the urban areas. Thirdly, transportation, this is a very serious area, and fourthly environment, including the need for revamping the surface rights legislation of the province.

The agricultural problems break basically down into two groups. One is marketing and the second is farm development. In the area of marketing, we have had the opportunity to report already that some very considerable progress has been made because the main thing that's been needed in agricultural marketing, Mr. Speaker, and gentlemen and ladies of this Assembly, is the leadership -- the positive leadership and competitive attitude that it takes to compete successfully and get the job done. We've had a demonstration of that already through the Deputy Premier and the hon. Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Hugh Horner, and with the help of the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. Don Getty. I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture, in particular, deserves applause for these actions that have been so badly needed for so long.

The other part of the marketing problems involves market planning and market research and as all of us, I'm sure, are aware, it is a fact that the Department of Agriculture has already been reorganized into the marketing and economics division, the production division, the rural development division, and within the marketing and economics division, there has been the separation by important marketing functions into the market expansion, product development, and thirdly commodity promotion areas, all of this within the Marketing and Economics Division of the Department of Agriculture. That is a set of actions and a set of steps taken by the Minister of Agriculture that have been overdue for a very long time and I'm sure we'll have the opportunity to debate this in some considerable detail in one of the resolutions that stands before the House at this time.

In the area of farm development, the key here is the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to help and aid those who wish to help themselves among the younger, smaller farmers, who have everything they need except the resources to carry them forward into the kind of economic farm unit that it will take to sustain them over a period of time in the agriculture of today. And there's the announced program coming forward, with legislation, in the Throne Speech, the Agricultural Development Fund of \$50 million for just that purpose, to supply the credit and other assistance that's needed for those younger farmers who are necessarily the smaller farmers, and who will be the leaders in agriculture in the future in this province.

There are a number of other areas, as well, such as the need, partly aided through the Agricultural Development Fund, to ease the transfer from generation to generation, or specifically from father to son, and also to have a reexamination, which one of the proposed legislative committees will conduct, of the crop insurance problems of this province. This is a serious area in agriculture in this province as well, and is hampering rural development and farm development.

8-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

In the area of rural development, we have a great and crying need to achieve a diversification and a balancing in this economy of ours; We need not only a diversification and balancing in the urban part of Alberta and in the rural part of Alberta, but within the rural part of Alberta we also need to have a diversification and balance of the economy in the nature of economic activities; that is, the primary resource based activities of which we have a considerable amount now, in proportion perhaps too high for balance, with a great need for expansion of secondary industry and of service industries. In the latter two cases, please note on the employment front, Mr. Speaker, that these are areas where the pollution spin-off is relatively low, and the labour absorption factor is relatively high, and these are stable industries, as well. We need these very badly, and above all, we need these in rural Alberta. And I'm just so delighted to learn of the Alberta Opportunity Fund Act being a part of the Speech from the Throne and a commitment on the part of this government, because it's something that's been so badly needed as well.

In the area of transportation -- this was the third of the four areas I wanted to mention specifically, regarding the Three Hills constituency. I think it's fair to say that, as of election day, there was no such thing as transportation policy. It didn't exist. A very serious area, both in the moving of products and raw materials throughout Alberta, particularly to and from rural Alberta points, and also for people. For example, the largest two population centres in the Three Hills constituency, Three Hills and Trochu, as I mentioned previously, despite being represented previous to the election by the Minister of Industry and Tourism, have been, in fact, isolated from the rural industrialization potential that exists. Why? They are isolated from the hope of attracting industry because it's essential to have 72,000 pound gross vehicle weight roads in order to get the inputs in and the products out economically enough to be a logical location for industrial development.

And on top of that, as a matter of fact, it turns out that from those two largest population centres in my constituency it is nearly impossible to take commercial transportation service, that is, commercial passenger service, to Edmonton or to Calgary from those towns. For example, if you want to go to Edmonton from either of those particular population centres, you must go to Stettler, stay overnight and catch the next bus, or go to Calgary, and take a bus from Calgary. That's not good enough. And as a matter of fact, the Canadian National Railroads stopped passenger service to those towns July 1st, 1971, and nothing was done subsequent to that for those people, particularly the poorer people who may not have their own transportation. There was no action taken in order to adjust the transportation system so that they had a way to get around this province.

I'd like to add that I'm grateful to the Minister of Highways, Mr. Clarence Copithorne, and also to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Fred Peacock, for some of the actions that they have taken in this transportation area as it pertains to the Three Hills constituency. What delights me though, Mr. Speaker, is that it's clear from the Throne Speech there will be a transportation policy in this province, and we really need it in the Three Hills constituency.

Fourthly, in the area of environment, one of the things that I learned -- and you never talk to enough people that you can't learn more by talking to more of them, particularly in a constituency -- is how fervently the rural people in my constituency feel about environmental preservation. This is a very broad-based concern and it's certainly an area shared by urban and rural alike. Rural people are indeed the conservationists. I guess if you think about it a bit and their basis in agriculture, it's clear that agriculture is basically practical, renewable resource management, and that is

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-55

really what people are asking for from their society and from their government.

People in my constituency have for some time demanded, even pleaded, for fairer legislation in the area of land surface rights and I'm just delighted again -- and another plaudit is in order to the Deputy Minister of Agriculture -- with the fact we can look forward from this legislative session of 1972 to fair surface rights legislation.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to add a few remarks regarding the Department of Lands and Forests in the interest of brevity, rather than make too long a speech as has been suggested by a number of people who spoke previously. I would like to be relatively brief in remarks pertaining to the Department of Lands and Forests and have the opportunity at a future time to develop this more fully. However, I would like to paint a broad picture of the concerns of the department of Lands and Forests, namely that we, in the Department of Lands and Forests are comprised of five operating divisions: the Forestry Division, the Lands Division, the Parks Division, the Fish and Wildlife Division, and the Technical Division. The first four of these five are regionalized around the province. So that's a very challenging opportunity to deliver to the people of Alberta some of the public service that they wish to have and that is so essential from the Department of Lands and Forests.

At the same time I have to take note that at the Christmas party, that is a tradition in the Department of Lands and Forests -- and that was about the time I realized that it was the most important department in government -- I was introduced as the new minister. And I really did find that a humbling experience. But it was a sad experience also because it was pointed out that that was the fourth consecutive Christmas where a new minister had been introduced. Mr. Speaker, that's not continuity; that's not leadership, in short, that's not performance.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You'd better take warning.

DR. WARRACK:

I have bad news for the hon. member; I have a four year plan.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, being serious again, I would like to pay a tribute to the extent of help, and indeed, in some cases, patience that I am putting into my command, and particularly, I would like to thank Frank Appleby and Marvin Mocre and recognize the very, very considerable assistance that they have given me and they made remarks in their own speeches in this the Throne Speech Debate. I think it is most important that I recognize some of the help, moreover, that the hon. Member from Whitecourt, Peter Trynchy, has given me, and I think that he probably would have made more comment specifically regarding the Department of Lands and Forests, except that he was moving the motion in this debate. He has helped me very greatly, as has Bill Purdy. These gentlemen have helped me very greatly and I shall be looking forward to additional help from them and to comments on an entirely open basis, regardless of from what side of the House, they come, as to possible ways in which we can do better.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the Throne Speech. Why? I applaud the Throne Speech because of the measures therein to help the people of Alberta including my people of Alberta, the Three Hills constituency people, the people who elected, me. And I also applaud the Throne Speech because it focuses with priority on the things that help people in important ways. I hesitate to respond to the rather trivial things like, how much did the wall in such and such a hall

8-56

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

cost, it's \$9,000, and of course, we all know that when the previous Premier took office the renovations cost \$43,000 but that's really trivial. That doesn't have that much to do with people. And even the comparison of an increase in 30 per cent in number; in terms of output, Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested to me that there has been a performance increase of more like 200 percent around this building.

In any case, Mr. speaker, the 1.6 million people of Alberta, not all voters, but the 1.6 million people of Alberta on August 30th didn't think the government was being run so well, so I applaud the Throne Speech. I applaud it because it helps people, it shows a care for people, and it offers concrete, forward looking programs that will help these people and among these people are the people of the Three Hills constituency.

Thank you.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, let me add to the congratulations which have been expressed to you and to the hon. Premier and to the government on the other side of the House. I must observe that I think that no government ever came to power recommending itself so highly. I had to come to the House to learn what 'now' meant. Down in our country, we are so accustomed to words like NAIT and FEP we thought 'now' meant 'no overall wisdom'. However, Mr. Speaker, I do want to congratulate these men and I think the hon. Premier is pretty fortunate to have attracted to his party the quality of men who have been elected, and we are going to expect a lot from them.

Perhaps had my constituents known that there would be a change of government, my political opponent might have been here, and had he been, he would have been a worthy addition to the House on the other side because he is a very able young man whom I respect very much.

As I listened to the speeches of the new members, I remember when I was first here, and I got to wondering just how many people over the last 66 years had been elected just in time to save Alberta. Once in a while, however, we have a humbling experience. The young gentleman that I mentioned previously was with me at one of these farmers' meetings that's arranged. After the meeting we stood talking with each other outside. Two gentlemen came out and one said to the other; "What did you think of them?". "Well", he said, "I'm going home and thank the Lord that only one of them can be elected." And so it goes. At that meeting that night my young friend told us how the government was going to remove the fat from government, now when I get up here I discover that with so many doctors in the party they have been persuaded that they can do much more with the figure with some injections of political silicone. That's what we're getting, be it good or bad.

When I read in the paper that the hon. Premier had decided to increase the Cabinet so very much, I thought immediately of one of my city friends who had gone into the livestock business. In his eagerness to improve the quality of his livestock he decided to double the number of bulls. There, however, the comparison ends because as I recall my friend was willing to support the steers in the back corral and let them bellow their approval or disapproval, but he didn't encourage them in any false motions in that hope that they would get some credit for herd improvement.

Be that as it may, I like open government. I have observed frequently though that things that are left open usually turn out empty or polluted. I hope that doesn't happen to be the case in this particular instance.

I'm serious, though, when I say I am impressed with the quality of the people on the other side. I'm impressed with the great amount

March 13, 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

8-57

of work which I know this government has done. One of the things I felt was a little unfair about having a September or August 31st election was that it places the government at a disadvantage, particularly in budgeting, in that they have so many problems to face, the ministers have to become accustomed so quickly. So I have a great deal of sympathy with my friend, the hon. Provincial Treasurer, from some experiences that I have had.

I'm happy too that the government seems perfectly willing to answer our questions, whenever they seem to be sensible, and they are striving to be rational in their approach. I'm particularly thankful to see two farmers over there, because they'll find that they do have to use some haywire once in a while to patch up mistakes they make with more valuable materials.

My approach is a very simple one. I think that a government is charged with the duty to provide leadership and that they do it through proposing legislation and formulating regulations and good administration. I think that the opposition's duty is to see that there is no negative information or point of view which is allowed to be overlooked. We can oppose with vim, vigour and often with futility, but it is our business to oppose. I think that we should ask no questions, except to get information and no criticism except to see that there is full consideration given, that they deserve our support and I fully intend to give it to them as far as I can agree with the policies they may accept.

For a few minutes because the Speech from the Throne makes me a little bit worried about the role of government as a new government sees it, I want to talk about the role of government. Government is defined many ways, but to me a government is that body charged with the monopoly of the use of force in a jurisdiction. Politics, on the other hand, is the arena where we wage the contest over who shall have this monopoly of the use of force and how we will use it. Once a government gets that monopoly there are two basic ways that they can regard it, the left and the right. On the left the government proposes that it will accept the responsibility for the total welfare of its people, the material welfare, and that to accept that responsibility and to achieve it they must govern the total lives of the people whom they govern. On the other hand is the theory that government is very different, that it was instituted to protect the life and the liberty, to enforce contracts, to regulate the individual in his seeking of fulfillment of his desires so long as he doesn't interfere with the rights of others to do those things, and only those things, which are for the general good. Democracy alone in the history of the world has championed free enterprise and free enterprise, of course, can go too far, too. We have had times when it was laissez-faire, when it was might is right. None of us want that kind of free enterprise.

Free enterprise, in the history of the world, has accepted the premise that there is no incentive like the assurance that the individual shall own, control and use as he sees fit, the fruits of his endeavours so long as in so doing he does not interfere with the like rights of others. It takes the premise that business is to make money. There can be good business citizenship but, primarily, business is to make money, and if it does there will be some results, if it does it will attract share capital; people want to get into it. It will reinvest a large portion of its capital. It will pay dividends to its shareholders. It will create employment and it will produce an abundance of goods and services which always react to the benefit of the individual. It will contribute to the financial welfare of whatever government is in power, and it will bring to individuals amenities and necessities which increase their comforts and their satisfaction.

Now if a business doesn't make money it goes out of business, perhaps. It creates a loss for its shareholders. It takes from the

8-58

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

marketplace a part of the abundance which has served the people. It may create a pocket of unemployment. It may dampen the speculative enthusiasm upon which economic progress is based. It may waste the facilities which are put out of use. On the other hand it may be all to the good because it may discover the reasons for its failure; it may improve its management, reorganize its structure and overcome its ineffectiveness and it may revitalize the morale of its personnel and so make money.

Now if a business is dishonest it will certainly hurt some of the people, but in the end those who perpetuate the dishonesty always have to face the consequence of the criminal law. In the end they always fail. In their dishonesty they teach the people a few things too. They teach them to be wary. They teach them to consider character as well as advertising, and so it goes.

But at any rate free enterprise is of the opinion that the less meddling by government the better off will be the people under that government. And that is the role I would like to see our people look at.

Then along come the do-gooders. There is a little bit of do-gooder in every one of us. We feel sympathy for people. We don't ask: "Is it their own fault? Is there anything logical to be done about it?" We don't say: "If I help them, in the end will it hurt them?" Our tendency is to help them, and thank goodness we have that characteristic, but sometimes the do-gooder in us, and particularly the professional do-gooder, does more harm than the robbers and the burglars and the dishonest people he decries.

Now if a business is honest it usually reaps the rewards, so I think we shouldn't be carried away in our do-good tendencies by thinking we need to regulate every little thing that seems wrong in our society. The do-gooder in us often obsesses us with a fanatical zeal to enforce morality, to relieve the individual of the consequences of his own laziness and neglect and foolishness and vanity and greed, and in that respect we often do a very great deal of harm. In the role of government we have to be aware of the do-gooder tendencies in ourselves and particularly the do-gooder tendencies of those who lobby us, who are always meddling, because they always think the end justifies the means and that's pretty dangerous. They popularize the idea that the weak and the lazy and the wasteful should be supported by the strong, the industrious and the frugal, and they want to go to such an extent that those people who use the taxpayers' money have the same standards as those who pay it. And maybe that's going a little bit too far.

Now, how does this do-gooderism work? Well, let's look at business failures. If business has failed somebody comes to the government and says: "We've got to save this business. There's going to be unemployment." You've heard it from our side of the House and you'll hear it from your own. So what do we do? Well we subsidize the business, or we make a grant, or we give it a government order, or we give it unjustified credits or we give it price supports or a protective duty, or we use some licensing procedure to protect it. We prevent competition and sometimes we place embargoes on it.

Those of you who want to review history will remember in Britain the very wonderful crop of 1813 and the government's pressure from the do-gooders to prevent the importing of any grains at a price less than that which was prevailing in England. And the government did it. Then the manufacturers said: "Protect us too, because we're going to get a flood of manufactured goods from Europe," and the government did that. Things went along that way until finally they realized they were stifling themselves by this procedure and so in the course of some 40 years there was a great deal of pressure to do

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-59

away with these things and the Prime Minister, Mr. Peel, finally did repeal the Corn Laws completely.

We had the nearest to free trade that we have ever had, and what was the result? Agriculture flourished in Europe as it had never flourished. Trade flourished in England, as it had never flourished, and in that period England reached the total height of its economic strength. And so, what do we do next? If you begin to listen to the do-gooder in yourself, and you think that government can overcome all the little weaknesses and inequities that are around you, you always perpetuate inefficiency and you make futile the discipline which we ought to get from suffering the consequences of our own foolishness.

Then, let's look at Group 2 who cry for some do-gooding -- the labourer. Now, it's true that labourers historically have had a sad lot, and perhaps they needed some help. The do-gooder said we will form unions, and then the do-gcoders and the union prevailed upon governments to give them one power after another; the right to strike, the right to check off, to get funds to back up the strike, almost immunity to kill which has happened so many times, those who propose to work when they are on strike. Have we really in the end accomplished very much by that system? Among them are the professionals. The professional do-gooder says to us, you must not let somebody lesser trained than me do this or that, because it's not in the best interests of the people. We're going to have proposals like that from my hon. colleague to the left who said, we need to give teachers more training. My answer has always been, if you can find anybody who can go into a classroom with me and tell me by watching the teaching or by measuring the achievement of the students, who has four year training or who has two, I'll give up; nobody has accepted the challenge. I wouldn't have you think I'm against training; what I'm saying to you is that the do-gooder is working for the benefit, perhaps of the staff, but not necessarily in the best interests of the children. What we want are results. I remember saying in this very House once when we were being plagued by this particular question that you could train a jackass for ever, but you wouldn't likely win the Derby. There is a meaning there, if people don't have the basic qualities, training alone won't overcome the difficulties.

And then the manufacturer comes along and he says, I don't mind competing with my friends in Alberta but I don't want to compete with the world, so will you please put on an embargo, will you add some duty, will you do something to protect me, or if you don't do that will you give me a subsidy and some tax concessions? And so we do, we've got to protect these people who are our friends, even if so doing, we prevent the general good.

And then comes Group 3, the utility companies, and they say to us, we'll put utilities in, Calgary Power will build a Big Horn Dam just like they built the Frazee Dam, the government puts up the money, gives them the utility and a monopoly and they do fine. Well maybe I'm a little of a socialist, because I thought that if we were going to put up the money maybe we ought to own this thing, maybe we could lease it to them and spend the lease money for better purposes. All I'm pointing out is the danger in the role of government of always wanting to do good. Because these monopolies, these protections which they give them in the end, are never good for the general good of our people. We look at the banks, we give them the right to lend money which they create out of nothing, and then we borrow it as governments, and we pay them interest. I'm not decrying the banks, our Canadian banks are perhaps the best in the world, but I'm saying that the do-gooders have persuaded us to foolishness when we give the banks this particular privilege.

And so it goes; we come to the Civil Service. They tell us that they don't want any patronage and so we agree, but you really can't take patronage out: sometimes we disregard brains and character in

8-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

our selections; we set up standards, and we say if you pass this examination, you can have the job. And maybe that's alright, until we begin to let them run our affairs, until we let them establish bureaucracies, and sometimes I'll admit they're wiser than we who are elected, as history has demonstrated so very many times. But these internal empires which we are led to tolerate are not particularly good for us.

Now I want to ask you to look at our policies about youth. This is a new group of people and franchised long before they have reached the age of discernment and experience and responsibility. Why? Because we said to ourselves that if they're old enough to fight for us, they're old enough to vote which wasn't a very good reason after all. But that's all right with me, until we go too far, until we begin to let them believe they can defy convention, that they can act on impulse with impunity, that they can demand of society the means to gratify their exploratory urges, the right to disrespect law, to trespass with immunity from the consequences of rashness. It's another good case of government meddling. We need to be on the alert that we don't go too far or the youth will not become the responsible citizens that they must become to take over from us.

Last of all, in this temptation for governments to meddle, come the consumer group. Just now they're getting a great play. Somebody pointed out the fallacies and weaknesses in automobiles, and now he has a whole organization behind him telling us how we must protect the consumer. I wonder if the consumer needs protection, unless of course we just want to keep him docile and usable for political purposes. Are price controls good in the end? I submit that they are not. Are housing subsidies in the end good? We have put billions into housing subsidies of one kind or another, only to have the greatest housing shortage we ever had, largely because it's not profitable any longer to be a landlord. So we have two groups of people, those with the fine homes and those who are forced to live in an ever-expanding slum area despite our best efforts to destroy it.

We give universal Medicare. I suppose I'm the only one in the House who ought to thank the new government for taking over my responsibilities for Medicare. It was a wonderful gesture but until they did it, I hadn't ever thought to demand it. I guess I was asleep at the switch.

All I want to say is, I know there are old people who don't have enough money. I know there are some who are in difficulty. But I know some other things too. I know that many of those who are pretty close in the day to day need for money, nevertheless, are going to leave estates to their children of 25, 35, 45 thousand dollars. They can't spend it. Even the people on welfare, we let them live in a \$45,000 house if they're in it. We'll even help them make the payments. In the end, we have not helped them necessarily. We have helped their children in our efforts to do good.

What about universal Medicare and pensions for all? I could understand why there was a demand. People are never aware of the danger of asking somebody to take the money out of their right pocket and put it in the left, with the idea that they are helping you. Sometimes we forget that we have to pay the bill. The professionals didn't like it. I submit that we haven't had better service and that we will not have. I submit that there are very few people getting medical service today who were not getting it before we were tempted by our 'do-goodism' to meddle in this particular field.

Tax rebates, tax exemptions. I'm criticizing the government of the party to which I belong as much as any other. We're led to do these things because we think they need help. A new government going to take all the taxes off property for education. I should thank them for that too, because I paid them those taxes, but in the end I wonder if it's going to be a good decision. I wonder if we are right

March 13, 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

8-61

to attempt to teach our people that they should not pay for these benefits which they get in so much abundance.

So I talk about the consumer. I wonder also about such things as minimum wage laws. I know we're going to be urged to raise the minimum wage law and when you do, you'll create total unemployment for a group of people who want to work but who are incapable of giving value to the extent of the minimum wage which we set. So they're not going to have any employment and you're not really going to help anybody by doing it. These are the temptations of 'do-goodism' and I hope that the new government will consider these things in establishing its own role.

Then we come to discrimination. It's a terrible thing. I've been discriminated against myself. Down in our country the Indians held an all-Indian rodeo and I couldn't compete. What I want to say, seriously, is that to me the right to discriminate is the greatest of all freedoms. To me, education has no other purpose than to teach us to discriminate wisely. I wonder how far the do-gooders are going to get us to go? Are they going to say that when I choose a mate, I have to consider brown eyes as well as blue eyes? How far are you going to go in this matter of discrimination? I submit again that the right to discriminate is not foreign to the general good. On the other hand, it's important. Now, I don't object to telling a hotel which offers its services to everybody, that it can't discriminate against certain people, but if a hotel, on the other hand, sets up and says I will serve only a certain type of clientele, then I think it is not discriminating, if it lives up to the warning that it's already given.

And then comes centralization. In our efforts to do good, we must centralize. I've been through it all. I went to school in a little rural school. I don't know how I got educated, and sometimes I wonder if I did. And then I watched these little schools develop some of the finest citizens we ever had. I remember being reminded that Sir Winston Churchill learned to read by the spelling-out system. They'd never heard of our new methods, but he was a pretty good reader. At any rate, time went on, and we felt sorry for the rural child who couldn't get to high school, and so we put some centralizations in. We gave leadership. And that was pretty good, except that we went to the blanket tax system, the idea that the government would collect the money and that we would apportion it back to the people. And then the people discovered that we had lost the grassroots of democracy. With the passing of the little school, what use was there in having a local school board? Nobody paid any attention to them. What use was there in having a public meeting? Nobody paid any attention, and the costs were terrific. As a superintendent, I recall one time getting word from a little school out in the country with a broken window, 8x10. The chairman of the old school board said I'll pick it up and put it in for you, but we didn't get that word soon enough and so we sent the repairman out, and he got stuck and took the rear end out of our truck, and it cost us \$287 to replace the window. But centralization is still good, or so we tell ourselves.

Now what do we do about it? Once we begin the blanket tax system, there is no longer any encouragement for a local government to seek any economies. There is no longer any reason for the people of a district to discriminate, to say we only want this much education for which we are willing to pay, or to say we want much more than that. There is no encouragement for them to make the fullest use of the buildings which they have, or to keep them a little bit longer, and, of course, if inflation continues -- they are foolish because the inflation will more than offset any interest they might pay on the new buildings. In the end we have discouraged the very democratic practices which are so important to us, and we do some more meddling.

8-62

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

Now I just want to remind you of a few things. During the depression in our land, our people had more of the amenities -- more food, less hunger, less real poverty than exists in some of the totalitarian countries to this day. And it was not the new deal of President Roosevelt that brought us out of it at all. It was the lessons we learned from a little hardship; the fact that people in spite of the depression were able to get busy. We talked about welfare today. People lived in those days in ways that some of you younger people can't understand. Here in the City of Edmonton, I recall so well, there was not a vacant lot in the city that somebody didn't want for a garden. Nobody wants to do it today because our do-gooderism has taught the people that you don't need to help yourselves. We'll look after you. We'll even deliver the groceries. Well, I could go on about these things, but I want to remind you that the greatness of England fell away the minute they decided that they must give the dole. It started then and it's continued ever since, the idea that those who want to consume the tax dollar are entitled to the same standards as those who produce it, and so it's a little dangerous.

That brings me up to the Bills of Rights. It's another evidence of the do-gooderism in us. We see the abuses, and by the Bill of Rights we think to overcome them. But I wonder whether you can? I wonder whether it isn't dangerous for a government to put in a bill telling us what our rights are, and then for us to have to assume that we have no other rights than those which they may have put in the bill. I suggested in friendly conversations with the hon. Premier that maybe we ought to have a bill of responsibility too, just telling us some of the things we have to do. For instance, if we see a policeman in trouble and we don't help him, there's a penalty. If we don't pay our taxes there's a penalty, some things we ought to do. In the end it wouldn't do very much good, would it? Well, that's the way these things go. I'm not going to say any more except to say I hope the new government will consider for a little while every day its basic role, that it will be aware that it can be led into pitfalls which in the end will bankrupt us, not only of our money, but of our sense of independence, our moral values, our true values, and that this in the end would be dangerous.

Now I'm going to treat just a few little things. In the Speech from the Throne we have PEF. I do know what it means. But I suggest to you that priority employment should go further than this. If today, not by law, but by giving priority this government and the major industries of this province would not hire people when their family already has a very adequate income and when there are people who really need the jobs. If we just practise that kind of priority there would be lots of work to go around. There would be some other benefit too. We wouldn't need these day care centres that we talk about. It has always been a little strange to me when the sociologists in our part of the country say to me, "We mustn't let these mothers go out to work when they have three children." And I say, we must not, why? Here is my neighbour, he makes \$10,000 and his wife goes out to work and she has four children. Maybe we ought to pass a law that she can't do that. And who will be the first to use the day care centre? It will be my neighbour's wife. She'll go out and get a job and the day care centre will be handy. But will the girl on welfare go out? I doubt it very much. So I'm saying to you that there are priorities in employment which a little good sense might turn to good account.

I don't suppose I dare mention Hansard, since I was the only one against it. Well, I didn't talk about it because I was years trying to slow up the government of our own party in this regard. But I did feel like getting up and asking you businessmen, how would you like to have read in the minutes of every one of your director's meetings, every word that anybody said in one of your discussions? I don't think you would like it very much or you would think it was worth it, and you're going to find it with Hansard, a lot of rubbish, a lot of

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-63

encouragement for us to say things, to get our names in the paper, and nobody will make reference but me, and I'll say, on a certain date I told them that. They wouldn't listen, the dopes. Well, it's characteristic. I'm only using that as an example.

And then it talks about the fall sitting. I have no objection to that; it is probably going to get me out of some hard work on my own farm. And along with it I think there are some advantages. I think it's a policy that this is very well conceived. When it comes to legislative committees, without being critical, I would say to the hon. Premier and to the members of the government that perhaps you are missing the boat. Perhaps you are not aware that on this side there are many members just as concerned as you are with working on any task force which is seeking better ways to serve our people. And you would be welcome to all the credit because it would be yours. On the task force reports you have the right to make the decision. You would avoid what seems to me a rather valid criticism of paying the expenses of committees that are not truly legislative though I know they're going to serve a good purpose and I'm in favour of participation of other members. Well, I said I'm not trying to be critical; I just want to mention that perhaps this is worth some new consideration.

We have some mention here of the desirability of limitation, if any, upon foreign investments. It needs discussing. There are both sides of these questions. And I certainly congratulate the government for initiating studies to evaluate them.

Well, let's go to natural resources. For many years as Provincial Treasurer, I tried to persuade the government that we ought to set up natural resources as a capital account, particularly those natural resources which are going to be here once and not forever. I'm quite aware that in timber, even if we cut it all, tree farmers with experience will perhaps produce more lumber than we can ever use. I'm aware that in the states today the tree farmers are producing three times as much lumber as the natural forests ever did. What I'm saying is, there is a danger in using the revenue from those resources which are not renewable to pay current expenses. If, on the other hand, we were to convert them into real assets, roads if you like, public buildings if you like, dams to produce hydro and control river flow and provide irrigation, perhaps that would be wisdom. I think the government might be very wise to look at that with some consideration and decide whether or not it should be capitalized. Two Ministers of Education -- I don't know whether that is good or not. It will depend on the quality of these men and the work they put in it. I would not be critical because I believe that they are approachable and that they are very concerned that we get the most we can in education at all levels.

Telephones -- I have an axe to grind in telephones. I have tried to persuade governments perpetually that with the changing of rural life particularly, we have to have a new look at telephones. At one time we could put in a rural exchange and all the people were happy because in every little village there was every one of the services. There was a little service station; there was a blacksmith; there was perhaps someone running a beauty parlour; there was a little branch of a bank. Now these things are gone and I am concerned that a government, and I have to say it started with the government of our party, going out, bribing the people to give up the rural telephone systems which they own by saying to them, we'll buy your system for more than it's worth, we'll take it down and pile it up and sell it back to you for a dollar or two, whatever you want to bid, but be careful you don't bid much, because you are going to get it -- and I mean you are going to get it -- are we going to put in an underground system. Now if we can afford to do that we can afford to throw away overhead systems which are still good, and pay for them. We can afford what little extra cost there will be in heavier cable to carry these exchanges to centres where people can get

8-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

service. It's a pretty sad thing today when an exchange is set up so that the people on it cannot reach a doctor; they cannot reach a dentist to get an appointment; they can not reach a mechanic; they can reach somebody to deliver oil or gas to them without a long distance telephone call. I submit that it isn't going to cost that much more. It is important that in setting up these new exchanges everyone will be able to reach the necessary service people without it being a long distance call.

Now, if I go on just a little bit, the Department of Metropolitan Development I think is good. I think today, when we realize that our rural population is becoming a minority, that the great problems of our society are developing in the cities, perhaps this is a very wise step.

The immediate program, the protection of human rights, all I say is against whom, because protection against government might be the more important of all of them. The difficult circumstances of our senior citizens -- all I say is evaluate carefully and be sure we are not carried away by just plain do-gooderism. The protection of human rights -- nobody is more concerned than I with that particular part of the program.

The ombudsman is another thing I opposed, almost alone. Not that I had anything against the ombudsman, because I didn't. But I had studied its use, and I had come to the conclusion that the proper ombudsman is you, and you, and you, the very members of this House, and if a government is serious about open government, it will then let its members bring to it these problems. It will give them an analysis, and in the end they will get the fair treatment that they deserve. We don't need an ombudsman, because whether he likes it or not, an empire will be forced upon him. It will be costly, it will be ineffective, he'll make mistakes and the government will get the blame.

We'll, let's get to the family farm. I've got one of those and I hope you can save me. Now I don't want any loans. What I want is for you to supply me a family that will run this darn farm. And seriously, that is going to be the problem. How many of the boys and girls today want Dad's farm? I went around my communities and we have people 58 and 60 who would like to leave. But it startles me to discover that a man with seven sons hasn't one who wants to farm. But that doesn't mean that we shouldn't help those who do want the farms. However, we ought to remember that we are not going to preserve the family farm by giving unwarranted credits. We're not going to save the family farm by loans or by laws. If the family farm can be saved it will be saved by the initiative of the people and I'm all for it as a way of life. But I know the difficulties are many, and I know that the Americans have been as concerned as we and yet the rural population is down to 8 per cent who are valid farmers. I can remember reading in history about the weavers who got together and destroyed the power looms in the factory to protect themselves, and I'm just wondering if in our zeal to protect the family farm we aren't facing that same difficulty, that in spite of our efforts we are going to fail and that perhaps we should let those who can produce the most economically produce most economically, and if it takes bigness to do it let there be bigness. On the other hand let's encourage people to live on the farms and do it not by the means that we often suggest, but by giving the family some emphasis.

I might as well, while I'm here, talk about mental care and the handicapped and the unfortunate, because it fits in. If you want mental health in this province or anywhere else, if you can in some way bring about a return to the old style family life, if the children can help, if they have some chores to do -- and I don't know just how you are going to do it, but one of things is what I mentioned earlier, the priority of employment, the idea of not encouraging mothers to leave the home. If you can get back to some

March 13, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

8-65

of that kind of family living, you'll do more for mental health than anything else you can do. If you leave the family some responsibility for their own handicapped, you may not give them the technical assistance which the handicapped need, but neither will you rob them of that more important thing - the love and the affection and the association of the family to which they are accustomed. And so we do have some danger in our 'do-gooderism' in some of these plans.

Agriculture is important, very important and I wouldn't have you think that I'm not in favour of anything we can do in wisdom to maintain the family farm. Surface rights? Well I don't feel as sad about surface rights as some people do. I watched the development of the oil industry; I saw land that wasn't two dollars an acre suddenly become worth two hundred when somebody wanted to get some help with it, and I just wonder how important some of these things are.

Well, the Speaker has just sent me a note that my time is up. All I'm going to do now is to tell you that in my constituency we have a few unique things. Mine is the land of Whiskey Gap and Standoff and yet you can't buy a legitimate drink in my constituency. I have the largest Indian reservation, with the largest Indian population in the province. They are the best backers that the Conservatives ever had and when I ask them why, they don't know. But they are smartening up. You can't tell what they'll do.

I'm going to table the Kainai News because I think it's the only Indian paper there is. It's a very fine paper and I would like some of the members to see it.

I'm going to finish by just saying one or two things, I hope the Speaker will bear with me if you will. One of them is that in my constituency all we want is what is rightfully ours. We want all that we deserve and nothing more. All I expect from the government is the right to bring my people up to present their point of view, with fair consideration, and that's all I have ever led my people to expect. In my own dealings with government I hope I can deal fairly, and I hope they'll never feel that I'm trying to embarrass anybody, that I'm trying to be mean. I hope they'll recognize, too, that I can be provoked to fight a little if I think I'm getting any injustice.

In the end I'm going to use two quick quotations. One is the last sentence of John Stuart Mill when he said; "The worth of a nation in a long run is the worth of the individuals composing it," and "The nation that protects the interests of their mental expansion and elevation to a little more of administrative skill or that semblance to it, which practice gives in the affairs of business, the nation that dwarfs its men in order to make them more docile instruments in its hands, even for beneficial purposes, will find that with small men no great thing can ever be accomplished and the perfection of the machinery to which it sacrificed everything will in the end avail it nothing for want of that vital force, which, in order that the machinery might work more smoothly, it has chosen to banish." If we just keep that in mind, it may help.

Now I do expect a good government, and I know the way to get it is to have Conservative men and Social Credit measures.

MR. FLUKER:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

8-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 13th 1972

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at half past two.

[The House rose at 10:15 p.m.]