

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, March 14th, 1972

[The House met at 2:30 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 19

The Department of Education Amendment Act, 1972

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Department of Education Amendment Act, 1972. Among other changes, the bill will delete and reduce the powers and prerogatives of the Minister of Education in respect to authority he now has under legislation to appoint temporary and part-time staff. In addition, it will delete the regulation-making power of the minister regarding the establishment, operation, and administration of vocational and technical schools or institutes, the responsibility for which is passed to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 19 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 22: The Coroner's Amendment Act, 1972

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Coroner's Amendment Act, 1972. It contains several amendments of a technical or procedural nature.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 22 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 5

The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act, 1972

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act, 1972. The most important amendments concern claims under \$500, to allow the administrator to permit the claim to be made without a judgment. Another amendment defines more specifically the duty of a judge hearing an application, and the other amendments are of a procedural nature, including one important amendment concerning the naming of the administrator in legal proceedings. This gentleman unfortunately now has a poor credit rating.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 5 was introduced and read a first time.]

9-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I move that The Motor Vehicle Accident Claims Amendment Act, 1972 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there a seconder for the motion?

MR. COPITHORNE:

It is seconded by the hon. Len Werry.

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in introducing to you and through you to the hon. members of the Legislature, Warrant Officer David Gleed of 700 Wing. Through your courtesy, Mr. Speaker, he is seated in Mr. Speaker's Gallery. Warrant Officer David Gleed has served six years in the Royal Canadian Air Force Cadets. He is a member of 700 Wing RCAFC of the City of Edmonton. He has earned his wings and did this in a Cessna 150. He has participated in the Senior Leaders' Course in 1969 in Quebec, and in 1971 he won the Gordon E. Taylor Trophy for the top flying cadet in 700 Wing. It's my pleasure to welcome Warrant Officer David Gleed, an outstanding young man, who is emblematic of what can be done by the Royal Canadian Air Cadets and it's my pleasure to welcome him now to the Legislature.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to introduce a distinguished group sitting in the gallery behind me, who are the Greenland athletes who have recently been competing in the Arctic Winter Games at Whitehorse. I think I've been chosen for this honour because I represent Calgary North, and I have some erstwhile connections with the north of Ireland. Anyway, I'd like to read the names of these distinguished athletes from Greenland, if they would please rise and be recognized: Miss Olga Andreassen; Karl Steffensen; Torben Larsen, Sr.; Uvdlo Jakobsen; Joergen Zethsen; Kurt Tittussen; Tobias Heemann; Ludvig Ingeman; Vittus Hiemann; Otto Berhelesen; and their leaders, Mr. Lars Chemnitz, Mr. Hans Hoim; and their guide, Mr. Conway from the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in introducing through you to the Assembly this afternoon 62 students along with their teachers, from two Grade IX classes in Mt. Carmel School, located in the constituency of Edmonton Parkallen, in south central Edmonton. Mr. Holzman and Mr. Paquette are the two teachers who are with the students today. They are in the members' gallery. I would like to congratulate them, both teachers and students, on the interest they have taken in our legislative process, and hope that they enjoy the proceedings this afternoon. I would ask them to stand and be recognized.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of this Assembly, 31 Grade V students from the

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-3

Spruce Grove School, accompanied again today by their teacher Mr. Ibsen and the bus driver, Mr. Gerry Breithaupt. This is the second class that Mr. Ibsen has brought into the Legislature in the past few days, and I would like to congratulate him for taking the time to bring these children out to see the Alberta Legislature in session. I'd ask the teacher and the bus driver and the students to rise at this time so they can be recognized.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

The following reports were tabled by the members as indicated:
1970-71 Annual Report, Department of Public Works -- Dr. Backus
1970 Annual Report, Alberta Housing Corporation -- Mr. Russell
Regulations under The Alberta Gas Trunk Line Act -- Mr. Lougheed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Victoria Charter

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier. Before stating my question I would just like to make a point of clarification that I am aware of the reply that the hon. Premier gave to my hon. colleague in regard to the Prime Minister's letter to the Province of Quebec, of which I believe the hon. Premier has a copy. My question to the hon. Premier is that in view of the fact that this may well be one of the most important concessions made to any province since the beginning of constitutional discussions, is the hon. Premier prepared to give us a detailed outline of the province's position on this matter?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I think I should correct something. Perhaps the hon. Leader was not fully aware that the Prime Minister, in fact, wrote individual letters directly to the premiers of all the provinces with regard to the request that is certainly something that we recognize in importance and significance as I mentioned in my remarks yesterday. We're taking immediate steps to follow up as I described it yesterday, I believe, the crack in the door relative to a much larger provincial role in manpower centres and occupational training, in particular. We also recognize the broader nature that's involved in the alteration of thinking by the federal government. As far as an overall position on this matter, it would certainly be my intention to deal with it after we have completed our assessment. Whether or not that's something I can specifically say would occur during the course of this session, I'm not in a position to respond to that directly, but we do recognize the importance of the matter. And as I say, there are going to be some specific initiatives followed up by our government on the matter.

I'll repeat again the position I took yesterday. The Progressive Conservative government did not, either at or about the time of the Victoria discussions of last June, take a definitive position with regard to the proposed Charter, and when the government of the Province of Quebec concluded that it was not satisfactory to them, we didn't at that time feel it was necessary to do so. It's now apparent as a result of the change that has occurred and the response that we've had -- and we've had some formal discussions as well with other provincial governments in the last 24 hours -- that the situation has altered. We will therefore, commence an assessment of the provisions of the Victoria Charter as to whether or not the provisions as therein contained are adequate as far as the new government of Alberta is concerned.

9-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Did I take from the reply that the hon. Premier gave just now that we could not expect a statement before the end of the session?

MR. LOUGHEED:

No, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't saying we would not make a statement, I was merely saying that I was not prepared today to commit ourselves to one until such time as we have had further opportunity to consider the nature of the document and its implications.

MR. STROM:

I'm wondering if the hon. Premier could give us some indication of how soon we might expect an indication of when a statement might be made.

I can appreciate the requirement of time, but again I simply make the point that it is one of the last discussion points that was outstanding with the provinces, and I am a little concerned as to the federal government wishing to take positions. This leads me to the second part of the question then - is the Prime Minister suggesting to the provinces any date for future constitutional conferences?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the second part of the hon. Leader's question, the answer is 'no', although the letter as tabled yesterday reflected that there could be a follow-up to that effect. With regard to the first matter, all I am prepared to say at this time is when I participate in one of the debates in this Legislature I will raise the matter as to when the members may hear some remarks or a statement from the government side.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, are there any position papers that have been prepared at this point in time by the government in regard to constitutional matters?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we are quite prepared to place copies of the position papers that we submitted at the First Ministers' conference last November before the members of the Assembly. To a considerable extent they deal with the matters raised in the Prime Minister's letter which was tabled yesterday, but not completely so in relation to the specific question of family allowance. I may say, further, that my third reading of the letter from the hon. Prime Minister indicates to me that one of the important questions that is left undefined is a clear definition of what is or is not included within the term and the phrase 'family allowance' as used within the letter. I think some clarification is required on that point before any sort of a definitive statement is made by the government.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview was on his feet.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-5

Film Censorship

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Is an appeal in fact being made by Warner Brothers in regard to the film "A Clockwork Orange?"

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I spoke today on long distance with a gentleman from Warners on the matter, and it is under consideration by him and his company as to whether or not they would pursue this particular route or some other one.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary on that, Mr. Speaker. Is the government prepared to repeal censorship legislation and replace it with categorization at this session of the Legislature?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, this gives me an opportunity to give the House the kind of information I might have done in my address on the Budget or a ministerial announcement. The government position at the present time (as it has been for about four months) is that you would assign a legislative committee and this committee would look into the whole matter of censorship in Alberta. At this point a chairman has been appointed - the hon. Member for St. Albert, and he will undertake, with the help of the government, to assign a committee of the Legislative Assembly to look into the whole matter.

I should mention, too, that one of the things that I might have announced later and done before was to recommend to the hon. Premier and the Executive Council that the matter of censorship in the same way as any art form, theatre, film, books, or architecture, really is a matter of culture, and so by ministerial regulation this function of government will be assigned, or has been assigned this morning to the Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, again with respect to the film, "A Clockwork Orange." Will there be an appeal in the event that Warner Brothers do not officially lodge a request for an appeal, and if so, will that appeal take the normal course of you, sir, appointing a committee to judge whether or not an appeal should take place?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, with respect to this particular film, "A Clockwork Orange," the exact procedure will be followed that would be in the case of any other film. You may or may not know that another film was banned by the Censor Board. This particular company appealed within a few days, in the 30-day limitation, and we saw no reason, in this particular case of "A Clockwork Orange", to treat this film in any other way than we have the other picture that was banned. It's not our intention to appeal, it isn't part of the procedure for government to appeal its own board's judgments. The only people who could appeal it is Warner Brothers. I let them know this morning what they have known since March 1st, when they were informed that this particular film was banned, that they had 30 days from March 1st to appeal or thereafter give up their opportunity for appeal for a period of two years.

9-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question then. Am I given to understand that unless Warner Brothers themselves officially ask for an appeal, that there is no way that any review can take place with respect to the banning of this film in Alberta?

DR. HOHOL:

No, that would be inaccurate, Mr. Speaker. The appeal, as an appeal, can be lodged only by the sponsor and the owner of the film. A review, which is the word that you used in your second question, in contrast to an appeal, your first question, can be instituted by the government and by a committee of Cabinet, or by the Cabinet, or a committee of the Legislature or the whole Legislature, as occurred in British Columbia in the case of this particular film. A committee of the Legislative Assembly viewed it and passed an opinion but no judgments.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. This censoring of a film such as this, is this not contrary to the new bill that he is bringing in?

MR. LOUGHREED:

Mr. Speaker, it may be. The important point the government feels with regard to the question of censorship, as has been clearly set out in the Speech from the Throne, is that this is a matter which should involve, as the members have anxiously mentioned from time to time, Mr. Speaker, the views of the Legislative Assembly at large. We feel for that reason that a select committee of the Legislature, and we're in the process of moving it as quickly as we can, should be established so that the views of members on all sides and all corners of the House may be brought to bear on this important question.

MR. TAYLOR:

Another supplementary question. Is the Premier not afraid that such a film might pollute the minds of the young members of the Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER:

Has either one of you a supplementary?

DR. BUCK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Premier. Do I understand then, that only legislative committees will be asked to serve on controversial issues, or is this the policy that you are making?

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, on this issue again to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Do I take it then that we have a commitment from the government to review, either through a committee of cabinet or by the members of the Legislature as was the case in British Columbia, whether or not this film will be shown in the province?

DR. HOHOL:

No, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the question because the government on this matter of "A Clockwork Orange" does not wish to be misunderstood. I tried to give information a few minutes ago, that the usual procedure with respect to appeal will be followed in the case of this film, which was banned, as has been the case of other

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-7

films which were banned in Alberta. That is to say that unless the owner of the film, "A Clockwork Orange", lodges an appeal within 30 days, beginning on March 1st, that will end the matter. There will be no other kind of procedure set out, outside the usual and normal procedures of the censorship board in this matter.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier regarding censorship. This goes back to the former censor and I remember at the time that the Premier made public statements to the effect that if a civil servant is charged with an indictable offence, suspended, then acquitted, he should be reinstated. If we ignore this type of matter we are ignoring the judicial system. My question is - is the Premier going to recommend that Mr. Jack Day be reinstated as provincial censor?

MR. LOUGHFEED:

Mr. Speaker, at this late date and having regard to the government's actions, it's obvious that you are not dealing with an individual case, but I do think the point that was made and so very well quoted by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican is one that has a considerable degree of merit and certainly one that our government is considering and will be entering into discussions on with the Civil Service Association.

Federal-Provincial Discussions on Industry

MR. TAYLOR:

May I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry? I wonder if the hon. minister can tell us how many dragons he slew in Ottawa yesterday?

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in the light of the obvious success of the legion of government press release writers in stirring up interest in the Minister of Industry's trip to Ottawa, would he tell us what he accomplished?

MR. PRACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd be delighted to answer that question. First, it was the first reading of its kind, followed by the hon. Mr. Pepin, and it was an exploratory meeting to identify some of the problems that we are facing in the provinces of Canada in the industrial development programs that each sector had undertaken. It covered subjects of international trade which related to the entrance of Britain into the Common Market; what affect this would have on Canada, generally, in dollars and product; what are the recent legislative programs in the United States, such as DISC; what effect they might have on Canada, and the particular provinces, and also the situation with Mr. Pepin's recent trip to Japan, how that might effect future Canadian trade.

Then the subject turned to one of internal area, that is what we call domestic trade, and Alberta, forcefully I think, put in front of the Assembly the positions that led to some of the problems preventing Alberta from becoming more actively industrialized.

They are basically centred around one thing called transportation, and unless we eliminate the inequity that Alberta as a land locked province experiences -- and it's a very complex subject and, I think, far too lengthy to discuss here at this time in the question period, but I can assure you our department is involved and

9-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

has program priorities being established on it, to eliminate these inequities so that we can proceed.

The other thing is, of course, in order to establish an industry, and a base industry, and a labour-intensive industry in the Province of Alberta, we must either look at steel or to the feed stocks for the petrochemical industries. So we established that position, we hope, in Ottawa, that Alberta is vitally concerned with, that is the commercial policies that exist between Canada and the United States, which do not afford us the market place which we need so much, which is California in the northwest. Our concern for those commercial policies are of a regional nature, exactly the same as what Ontario and Quebec experienced in the Autopac, and that we would hope we would have their sympathetic and understanding approach to this problem.

And the third thing, of course, which you are all aware of, is that Canada's statistics unfortunately group Alberta into a prairie economy, and this is not good enough to permit us to identify and define some of our problems, and we would like Alberta treated separately. And so having said that, it pretty well concludes the question.

MP. WILSON:

Perhaps, the minister misunderstood the question. I didn't ask for a speech I just wanted to know three or four things that you accomplished that would be of benefit to Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. I don't think the hon. member is entitled to enter into debate concerning the answer, but if you wish to ask a supplementary question that might be in order.

Alberta House (London)

MP. LUDWIG:

I would like to direct a question to the hon. minister. Is there any intention on the part of his department to increase the staff in Alberta House in London?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, that particular area comes under the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs, and I would allow my colleague to answer that.

MR. LUDWIG:

Then I will direct my question to the hon. minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder, we have another question now, could we save the supplementary until the answer has been given to this one?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if on a point of order...

MR. SPEAKER:

Supplementary answer.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-9

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, if the government has made up its mind what it's about to do, I'd like to ask a question of one of the ministers.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He was about to give us an answer!

MR. HENDERSON:

Oh pardon me, I'm glad to yield the floor if it's with the view to getting some information.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, as a member in the House once mentioned to me, if the opposition would get their knees working in co-ordination with their heads, they'd be OK.

As a matter of fact, with regard to the Alberta House in London, we are quite concerned about the function, the role that can be played there; we will be making considerable assessment of the type of impact we want to have in Europe, and I hope we will be able to provide the House with that decision as quickly as possible. I'm not sure if it will be during the session.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to whichever minister could answer it. Are there any investment inquiries being made, or have been made through Alberta House since this government took office, with regard to Alberta?

MR. GETTY:

It's very difficult to tell whether they came because of Government House in London. As a matter of fact, our assessment to date is that the Government House in London has not been functioning very well at all. It appears that it was treated very badly in the past; they have had a lack of reaction to requests that they have sent back to Alberta, and they were completely unco-ordinated with the former government, and we are going to try and do everything possible to straighten that out. I don't know if it would be possible to isolate any particular investment requests; maybe the Minister of Industry might have one, but if I could isolate them I would be happy to do so and give you that information.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In light of the answer of the hon. minister, do I take it then, notwithstanding what has happened, that he doesn't really know what he is going to do about it?

DRFE

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Did he meet with Mr. Marchand when he was in Ottawa? Did the minister meet the hon. Mr. Marchand when he was in Ottawa?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

9-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

MR. P. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister itemize the subjects on the agenda of discussion?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. P. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, would the minister outline the reasons why the people of Alberta cannot have that information?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the people of Alberta that information as quickly as possible when it would be wise to do so in light of the negotiations and discussions that we are carrying on with Ottawa, but it would not be wise to do that right now.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister just outline the topics, not the details?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, I could do that, Mr. Speaker. It was to discuss the broad concepts of Mr. Marchand's department's operations in Alberta and how they might deliver their objectives in Alberta in the future. I would say, too, that I think Mr. Marchand expressed that some of the ideas which we presented to him were completely new, that he'd like to assess them, and we had a very good meeting with him. I think we made a good deal of progress, but it would not help that progress at all to get into specifics.

MR. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister advise the House as to how long the meeting was with Mr. Marchand?

MR. GETTY:

About an hour.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister advise us when the broad objectives were discussed as to whether the ARDA program was involved in that discussion?

MR. GETTY:

Very briefly.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, when discussing the program of ARDA, was irrigation rehabilitation involved?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker, the subject was not involved in our broad discussions of the future of Mr. Marchand's department.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-11

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister indicated that there was progress in discussion. Would the hon. minister report that progress so that we are aware as Albertans.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has missed for some time now the advantages that the government of Alberta can establish if it does not lay its total position on the table of this House or discuss it while we are in the midst of negotiations. Surely he should be able to appreciate that. He has participated in, I understand, these negotiations before.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Does the hon. minister mean that in running an open government that information is hidden from the people?

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. I can appreciate the point that there may be some necessity to refrain from immediately reporting to this House because of the negotiations. But in view of the importance of issues at hand, can the hon. minister give this House an undertaking as to when we will have a full and complete report?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I should assure the members I would like to give them every possible bit of information that I can, and I will do that at the first instance it looks like it would be wise to do so.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the hon. minister established a follow-up meeting, a schedule with Mr. Marchand?

MR. GETTY:

Well, it is a follow-up course of action. It doesn't necessarily involve an instant meeting. There are some things we have to work out and they have going to look at. We are negotiating, Mr. Speaker.

Unemployment Statistics

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. I wonder if the hon. minister could tell us what the present unemployment figures are for the Province of Alberta?

MR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the number of unemployed at the end of February is the same as it was at the end of January -- 33,000. However, the important information to this Assembly is that the unemployment rate dropped to 5 per cent in February from 5.1 per cent in January, as a result, in particular, of the increase in the labour force of 9,000 people in February 1972 over the end of January. I think this is significant, Mr. Speaker, because February is usually a high unemployment month, so it is significant to note a decrease in the February unemployment rate. Compared then with 6 per cent in February of 1971, the February 1972 unemployment rate has decreased by 1 per cent from 6 to 5 per cent.

9-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

It is difficult to ascertain the importance and significance of the priority employment program which was described in detail by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight. There is no question in my mind, as chairman of that committee, that it made an important difference to the unemployment figures.

Speaking of that, I wish to take this chance to indicate my appreciation of the kind of work that the hon. Member for Three Hills did in assisting the matter of co-ordination, and the eight member executive committee that carried on this kind of work. The work of the several departments had an important impact on decreasing unemployment through job placements and also through training placements in the institutions of Alberta.

Let me summarize then, Mr. Speaker, for this Assembly, the Alberta picture with respect to unemployment. The total labour force at the end of February was 657,000, up 1.4 per cent from January. The employed figure is 624,000, up 1.5 per cent, and in view of the 9,000 people added to the labour force, this is a particularly significant figure. The unemployed number, in absolute terms, is the same 33,000, no change. The unemployment rate is 5 per cent, down 0.1 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vegreville.

MR. PATIUK:

I do have a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. Minister of Labour be able to tell us how unemployment compares with unemployment in Saskatchewan and Manitoba?

DR. HOHOL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. It's interesting to note that Manitoba figures rose from 4.1 per cent in December to 6.3 per cent in February, a period of two months. The Saskatchewan figures are 6.1 per cent unemployed. British Columbia has 7.6 per cent unemployed and the national unemployment rate is 7.3 per cent.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

DR. BUCK:

I have a supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. In arriving at your statistics, what are you using for base figures in arriving at your figures, the unemployment insurance records that they have?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, Statistics Canada made the usual random sampling across the nation.

Rural Industrial Development

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry. Late in 1971 the Battle River Regional Planning Commission presented their brief to you. Essentially it calls for a decentralization of economic growth of the two large cities of Edmonton and Calgary into smaller centres. May I have your stand on this point, Sir?

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-13

MR. PEACOCK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think our platform is our stand. We're doing everything we can to decentralize industry and stimulate rural activity and rural industry.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. Minister of Industry care to indicate just briefly three or four things that his department is doing to stimulate industry in Alberta other than grants or loans?

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps the hon. minister would like to answer the question.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I think that answer will be in the budget portion of the proceedings when we will be establishing an outline of our department's program, and we will answer the hon. member at that time.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could word it a little differently. What alternate sources of revenue does the hon. Minister of Industry see that he can introduce into Alberta?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I think I mentioned that this will be forthcoming in the budget speech.

ARDA Programs

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The question I would like to ask regarding the ARDA program that was signed on August 11 by this provincial government and the federal government -- or I should say the previous provincial government and the federal government -- for rehabilitating marginal farms, are you going to implement this program, sir?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, while the hon. member is correct that the master agreement was signed in August of this year, there was provision for each of the programs under the master agreement to be negotiated and we are negotiating those programs at this time.

MR. MANDEVILLE:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the agreement it states that there is a committee to be set up to accept these applications. Has this committee been established?

DR. HORNER:

Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I can check for the hon. member, but I would suggest that the various programs underneath the master agreement have to be negotiated on an individual basis. These agreements are being looked at now and included in that negotiation is the additional program that Mr. Olson has put forward with regard to the small farms.

9-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

Big Horn Reservoir - Recreational Facilities

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address the question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests or the hon. Minister of Tourism, whichever minister may be responsible for this matter. I'd like to know, Mr. Speaker, as to whether the government has under way, or is planning the development of recreational facilities on the Big Horn Reservoir?

DR. WARRACK:

Some of the other ministers may also wish to respond, Mr. Speaker, but with respect to the establishment of provincial parks, which would be under the jurisdiction of the Department of Lands and Forests, this has not been done.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are there any plans under way for development of recreational facilities other than publicly owned and publicly operated facilities?

DR. WARRACK:

Not in the immediate dimension of the Big Horn Dam, Mr. Speaker. However, I would anticipate that this would be the kind of thing that private people and the public would be interested in doing. And as the time grows towards when this should be planned, I'm sure we will be looking at these matters.

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplemental. Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the government, when they do get around to consideration of these particular facilities where private enterprise is involved, to publicly tender the opportunities?

DR. WARRACK:

Well, I think that is a hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker, but at the same time I think it's a valid point to say that we're interested in the private sector doing as much as we can in this economy of Alberta, and only in instances where the private sector cannot do the job much better, should we engage the public sector.

MR. HENDERSON:

If I may restate the question, Mr. Speaker, I was asking that if private enterprise is to be involved, whether the government will be tendering the opportunities for development of facilities? It wasn't a question of choice of public versus private, Mr. Speaker, it was a question of tendering.

DR. WARRACK:

The specific question as asked, Mr. Speaker, is clearly a hypothetical one, and as I understand the rules of this House, then it is out of order.

Crown Solicitors

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. the Attorney General. I understand that in Calgary Supreme Court criminal work and appeals are handled through solicitors in the department. And in the City of

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-15

Calgary, generally, this work is either contracted out or hired out to a private firm or firms. Is any consideration being given by the hon. Attorney General to alter the situation with regard to Edmonton? I understand that the Edmonton operation is very much more expensive than the Calgary operation in handling these matters.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if in the earlier part of the hon. member's question he didn't mean Edmonton in place of Calgary? The position is in Calgary that the criminal prosecution and appeal work is done almost exclusively by members of the department, whereas in Edmonton there has been in effect for a long time the practice of having only part of that work done by members of the department, and a large part of it done by outside law firms. That is a matter I am looking into.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. the Attorney General care to table the difference in costs as closely as possible under the circumstances with regard to the operation in Calgary and the operation in Edmonton?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, that is going to involve, I'm sure, a great deal of detail. I wonder if the hon. member would put it on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Special Area Agreements

MR. NOTLEY:

I'd like to direct a question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Industry. This concerns the Canada-Alberta Second Special Area Agreement signed September 1st, 1971, under which terms the federal government was to fund large projects, the provincial government to make their incentives program available in the southern and western end of the special area. My question to the hon. minister is simply this: Why did the provincial government not communicate to the Grande Prairie Industrial Co-ordinator their position under this program, and the programs which the province had available?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member from Spirit River-Fairview's question, first of all the Canada-Alberta Second Special Area Agreement dated September 1st, signed by Mr. Speaker, and co-signed by Dr. Ross did not come to my attention until January. I quite agree that there is a breakdown of communication because in the Schedule it states clearly just what the hon. member from Spirit River-Fairview stated that the responsibility of large fundings in the DREE Program would be undertaken by the federal government and the provincial government would be responsible for others. This was not communicated to Grande Prairie, because of the breakdown of communication, but has now been corrected.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What specific steps can the hon. minister advise the legislature will be taken to prevent this bureaucratic breakdown from happening again, and more specifically, what specific steps are now being taken to acquaint not

9-16

ALBFRTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

only Grande Prairie but the other communities with the special area with the program the government has available?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to that, a change of government, of course, will affect it greatly. Secondly, in The Incentives Act, in which we are still functioning until the new program comes in, it is not clearly defined whether Grande Prairie will qualify, and this is interpretation. The other secondary question that the member asked was would we be projecting this information to other areas? Well, the only special area is Grande Prairie.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. minister misunderstood me. I'm not talking about other areas in the province. I'm talking about other communities in the special area, not just the City of Grande Prairie which has an industrial development commission and a coordinator, but the other communities in the area who are extremely interested in incentive programs that would be beneficial to them.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I think we have already answered it. We are communicating under the terms of the present act whether they qualify or not. It's a matter of interpretation, and in this particular instance with Grande Prairie it's questionable. And it will be so informed.

MR. HO LEM:

What is your position on the government's proposed \$50 million Industrial Incentive Program, inasmuch as you have criticized the previous government's incentive program?

MR. PEACOCK:

It will be in our Budget Speech, also.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister care to tell us why the communications broke down. Has he made a search and found why this has happened?

MR. PEACOCK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was questioned in this House on Thursday, I believe. We started the investigation then, and I suppose the reason for the communication breakdown was that the previous government hadn't passed it on to the people when they signed the contract.

Big Horn Reservoir - Recreational Facilities (cont)

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Premier. Could the hon. Premier advise this House as to whether the government has received proposals or propositions for the development of privately owned recreational facilities on the Big Horn Reservoir?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I can't give a specific answer to that, but I will give the hon. member an undertaking to look into it. And while I'm on my feet, to avoid any confusion regarding questions of government

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-17

policy, it clearly is the government's policy that with regard to any matter that the government is utilizing public funds with the private sector, the intention, of course, would be to utilize a tendering procedure. There are, of course, as the hon. member knows, cases and circumstances of exceptions which have to be taken from time to time. The policy of this administration is that you start with the concept that you will, in fact, have competitive tendering, and perhaps look even in the areas where it is not specific regarding services and supplies, and involves such other areas as the supply of professional services. Wherever we think it is feasible to do so, we try to look at an approach of obtaining competitive tenders. However, in saying that, as the basic policy, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear to all hon. members that, as members on the other side are well acquainted, there have to be a number of cases where exceptional circumstances arise and this practice can't be followed. I will look into the specific matter raised by the hon. member and try to report back to him.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, if I might add something to the question. The minister asked if there were any developments on the shore line, I presume, of the Big Horn Reservoir, and I would like to advise that a certain distance from the high water marks has been reserved by the Department of the Environment, and there are no leases or ownership in this area of the Big Horn Reservoir. This is reserved entirely for water management purposes.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, just as a point of clarification - it's not that aspect that I am concerned about - it's the question of development of privately owned recreational facilities in the vicinity of the Big Horn Dam involving publicly owned land and private enterprise.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe our time is up - perhaps the hon. member could ask his question the next question period.

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the Assembly that under the terms of The Daylight Time Saving Act and the plebiscite that was held last August, this morning the Executive Council issued a proclamation putting daylight saving time into effect as of 2:00 a.m. on the last Sunday in April, 1972.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to announce that in response to the concern expressed by the public and hon. members of this Assembly regarding the circumstances of our citizens who are experiencing a lengthy delay in receiving unemployment insurance cheques, I spoke with Mr. George Davey, superintendent of Treasury Branches, this morning and he has assured me that the Treasury Branches will immediately pursue the possibility of advancing loans to our citizens who are in these difficult circumstances. Mr. Davey advised me that the Treasury Branches will immediately be in touch with the federal government to ensure proper procedures are set up regarding the assignment of unemployment insurance cheques when they are ready for payment. I am pleased to advise the House that any loans which may be made will be at an interest rate of 7 3/4 per cent and will therefore reduce the abuse of Alberta citizens which may exist with respect to the delay in receiving their unemployment cheques.

9-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

MR. DRAIN:

Has the hon. minister also given consideration --

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member has a question with regard to this could he perhaps ask it during the next question period? There is no provision in the rules for a question at this stage here.

QUESTIONS

121. Mr. Wilson asked the government the following questions with respect to development of Lowery Gardens, in Calgary, of which he had given notice, and was answered as follows by Mr. Russell:

Question (1):

The present status of negotiations between the Government of Alberta and the City of Calgary regarding development of Lowery Gardens as a park?

Answer:

There are no negotiations presently underway between the Government of Alberta and the City of Calgary regarding development of Lowery Gardens as a park pending results of a study jointly by the Water Resources Division of the Department of the Environment and the City of Calgary to delineate flood way and flood plane areas of the Bow River within the City of Calgary.

Question (2):

Will the park be developed this year?

Answer:

Not by the provincial government.

Question (3):

Will a footbridge be built connecting Lowery Gardens with the north bank of the river?

Answer:

Not by the provincial government.

124. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following questions regarding cost of renovations of the Legislative Chamber of which he had given notice, and was answered as follows by Dr. Backus:

Question (a):

What is the total cost of renovations carried out in the Legislative Chamber?

Answer:

The total cost of renovations carried out in the Legislative Chamber is \$37,300.35. Please note this cost includes the cost of new furniture asked in the (b) part of the question.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-19

Question (b):

What is the cost of the new furniture in the Chamber?

Answer:

The cost of new furniture in the Chamber is:

84 chairs at \$174.50	\$14,658.00
10 desks at \$320.00	\$ 3,200.00
Speaker's and Clerk's Desks	\$ 1,370.00
Total	\$19,228.00

Question (c):

What has been done with the furniture that was previously in the Chamber?

Answer:

The old furniture is presently stored in vault No. 21 in the Legislative Building.

126. Mr. Zander asked the government the following questions regarding clean-up of the area flooded by water impounded by the Brazeau Dam, of which he had given notice, and was answered as follows by Mr. Yurko:

Question (1):

How much money has the Government of Alberta expended on the costs of clean-up since the area covered by water impounded by the Brazeau Dam was first flooded?

Answer:

1970-71 --	\$104,733.00	by Department of Lands & Forests
1971-72 --	\$ 64,396.00	by Department of Lands & Forests
1971-72 --	\$ 51,643.00	under Priority Employment Program.

Question (2):

Was this work done on an hourly basis, or was it contracted?

Answer:

All work, equipment hire and labour has been done on an hourly basis at government approved rates.

Question (3):

If contracted, who were the contractors, and how were the contracts awarded?

Answer:

Although all work was done on a hourly basis the following equipment was hired:

Summer 1971

1 D-7	Joesting Const., Lodgepole
1 3/4 yard crane	Carson Const., Rocky Mtn. House
1 tug boat	Carson Const., Rocky Mtn. House

Winter 1971

2 D-7	Joesting Const., Lodgepole
1 HD-11	L. Adams, Rocky Mtn. House
1 HD-16	A. Rodka, Rocky Mtn. House

9-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

2 HD-16

E. Campbell, Rocky Mtn. House

Winter 1972

1 HD-11

L. Adams, Rocky Mtn. House

1 D-6

Frank Williams, Rocky Mtn. House

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

107. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Hinman.

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

Copies of all correspondence, telegrams, communiques, etc. between the Alberta and federal government since September 1, 1971 to date regarding international sales of Alberta sulphur.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

109. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Hinman.

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

Copies of all correspondence between the Alberta government and the oil and gas industry or individual companies, firms or official organizations representing the oil and gas industry in Alberta regarding the international sales of Alberta sulphur.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would stipulate some time in respect to that motion so that either he could amend it or we could give consideration to amending it.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, we would be quite happy to have the correspondence since September 10th of last year.

[The amendment was agreed to, and the motion was carried without further debate or dissent.]

122. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Wilson.

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

Copies of all orders and correspondence, since September 10, 1971, from the Department of the Environment, the Department of Mines and Minerals, and the Departments of Lands and Forest to coal mining operators in the Canmore Corridor relative to changes in coal strip mining sites and procedures within the Corridor.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

123. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Cooper.

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

Copies of all reports showing the names, locations and field test data covering the last twelve months, on each natural gas processing plant where hydrogen sulphide and sulphur dioxide at ground level have exceeded the Department of the Environment standards and criteria.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-21

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

125. Mr. Ruste proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Buckwell.

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

Copies of all representations made to the Minister of Agriculture relative to the Tradition and Transition Report tabled at the 1971 Session of the Alberta Legislature.

[The motion was carried without debate.]

[Sessional Paper No. 125 was tabled by Dr. Horner.]

127. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Drain.

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

- (1) How many people have been prosecuted for non-payment of Medicare premiums?
- (2) By what criteria were they selected?

[The motion was carried without debate.]

[Sessional Paper No. 127 was tabled by Miss Hunley.]

128. Mr. Taylor proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. R. Speaker.

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

- (a) What amount of money has been given to a Mr. Ben Edwards and Aubrey Gibson by the Department of Health and Social Development?
- (b) Is this a grant or a loan?
- (c) What use is to be made of the money?
- (d) Who are Ben Edwards and Aubrey Gibson, including their qualifications for this work?
- (e) Why did the Government consider this contribution or grant or loan necessary?

[The motion was carried without debate.]

9-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Invitation to the Royal Family

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to seek the leave by motion of hon. members to consider Motion No. 15 standing in the Order Paper in my name in advance of the other motions.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier has asked for consideration of Motion No. 15 at the present time. Does the House agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I move that Motion No. 15 standing in my name on the Order Paper, seconded by the hon. Mr. Diachuk:

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.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion, the only comment that I would make, is of course that I think it would be highly desirable if this could be a motion of the Legislative Assembly and not just a unilateral action taken by government.

Secondly, I think all members are well aware of the difficulties involved in an acceptance of such an invitation, having regard to the many invitations that naturally Her Majesty receives over the course of the year from various parts of the Commonwealth. Therefore, we should not, of course, in any way get our hopes too high. This is not to say that we don't feel that it wouldn't be a tremendous thing for the people of Alberta if this invitation were accepted. We have worded it in the alternative, hoping that that might improve the possibilities of the acceptance of the invitation.

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take pleasure in seconding this Motion introduced by the hon. Premier, Mr. Lougheed, and briefly, I wish to say the occasion where we might be able to realize a visit from Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth, His Royal Highness, Phillip, Duke of Edinburgh, and the members of the Royal family, to our part of Canada, and particularly to Alberta would be very significant in the marking of the anniversary of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

This force has participated in the historical events of Alberta and the territory that was previously part of the North West Territories, but is now Alberta. So often in our nation we get excited about the historical events that we receive over the television and other networks originating in other parts of this North American continent, particularly the United States. This occurs because of the amount of coverage it has received, and we miss the historical events in our part of the country and Alberta because

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-23

of the lack of emphasis on these historical events. I speak very strongly on this as a member of an ethnic background. My own grandparents always spoke highly of Royalty because it was through a person, such as Queen Victoria, that many of our people from Central Europe originated in Canada. It seems that after 100 years, a great importance and significance is placed on any historical events. This really could add a lot to annual celebrations in our larger centres, such as the annual Calgary Stampede or the Klondike Days in Edmonton, and even the rodeos and other local community fairs in the province. The paper prepared for the hon. Horst Schmid by his department, that some of us managed to read, creates a lot of interest in this visit. I therefore endorse it, and second this motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition had the floor first.

MR. STROM:

In rising in my place to take part in the debate, I want to say, as I said the other day, that we on this side of the House certainly fully concur in the sentiments expressed in the motion. As a matter of fact, we would have been very happy, Mr. Speaker, to seconded the motion, just to have demonstrate there was complete unanimous approval for the invitation that is herein being suggested. I know we could spend a lot of time talking about the great days of the police work, and so on, but this is not the time to do so. We on this side simply want to reiterate again our strong support for the invitation that is hereby going to be extended.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a distinct honour for me to support the motion by the hon. Premier, and I would just like to say two or three things. First of all, we all know I am sure, that 1873 was when the act establishing the Northwest Mounted Police became law in Canada, and then in July of 1874 the trek across the Canadian plains was begun at Fort Dufferin in Manitoba. In September of that same year, 1874, the Force arrived in Alberta. I think Mr. Speaker, in this centennial year, it is extremely important, in 1973-1974 to re-examine the events and activities that have shaped our destiny. Part of these activities have been the activities of the RCMP. But, in addition, we must never forget the great part that the monarchy has played in our heritage. It is important to note in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that Queen Elizabeth II, on June 2nd, 1953, was appointed Honorary Commissioner of the RCMP. I would urge that all members support the motion of our hon. Premier.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, so that there is no mistake about the unanimity of the Legislature on this subject, I want to say very briefly that I support the motion introduced by the hon. Premier. First of all, I am very pleased that we are inviting Her Majesty to come to Alberta. I'm also delighted to see us take some time and pay tribute to the role played by the RCMP in the development, especially of Western Canada. They constitute a very, very important part of our Canadian identity, something that, in my view, Mr. Speaker, we are all very proud of, regardless of our party identification. So I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to join in with the other members who have entered this debate and urge the House to pass this resolution unanimously.

MR. BUCKWELL:

I would like to commend the mover and seconder of this motion, and say how much we appreciate the thought. And apart from Her Majesty, whether she accepts this invitation or not, I would extend

9-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

an invitation to all the hon. members, particularly the hon. Premier, to attend these celebrations in my constituency in 1974, and as you realize we haven't any members other than opposition members south of Calgary. It might be a great opportunity for the people of Southern Alberta to see the 'now' government.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I have only a brief comment to make. It stems out of a letter that I received in this morning's mail. It has to do with this resolution and I am strongly in favour of the resolution as it has been brought to us today, partly because of this situation.

The letter has to do with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. The resolution deals with the Northwest Mounted Police. The letter is a resolution from one of the towns in the south strongly objecting to the change in the signs of the R.C.M.P. buildings and cars.

"That the federal department, having jurisdiction over the same, be advised that the council of the town agrees that the sign on the buildings and cars should be changed from Police to R.C.M.P. again."

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the loyal opposition will, when Her Royal Presence is here, be able to -- and I say this facetiously -- encourage Her Royal Majesty, because of her presence here, to reinstate this idea of the 'Royal' Canadian Mounted Police.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, it is a profound privilege for me to be able to speak in support of our hon. Premier's motion to be able to express my own feelings regarding our Queen. If I hesitate now it is because I don't know what being a Canadian, what living in Canada, means to you who were born here. I can tell you one of the things it means to me. In a world where crowned heads are disappearing it means for one thing, the monarchy. Perhaps I come by this respect and appreciation for the Queen honestly, because Bavaria, where I was born, was traditionally a peaceful monarchy.

Did you know that the name of the first person mentioned in the charter granted by Charles of England, incorporating The Governor And Company Of Adventurers Of England Trading Into Hudson's Bay was a Bavarian Palatine Prince? It is, of course, today's Hudson's Bay Company.

Being quite objective about the monarchy, which would you rather have, a dictator who hasn't even tradition to restrain him, or a queen? A president, as in the United States, who must scramble every four years to win enough votes to keep him in office, or a royal head above the pattern of changing politics whose real wealth is the affection of her people? The monarchy is a visible reminder of our past, of the long struggle towards human betterment, a symbol of reassurance in an age that is frightening not only to us, but also to our youth. When everything is being swept away in a floodgate of change, people must anchor their faith in something unchanging. Not without reason is our youth picking up the beard styles, the ruffles, and the bows of what is still referred to as of the Victorian era, an era identified with a queen. Our present Queen, to whom the word gracious can most surely be applied, a model wife and mother, every inch a lady, gives our youth and ourselves a tradition with which they and we can identify, a formality and pageantry that adds richness to our lives.

So, when I think of the things that Canada has given me -- it may sound strange to your ears to hear it -- but this country gave me back a monarch. Perhaps, not until you have lived under dictators and tyrants do you really understand what this fully means. And

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-25

perhaps this is why, with deep appreciation, I speak in support of our hon. Premier's motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Premier close the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LOUGHFED:

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to respond to the spirit in which the motion has been received by all the hon. members for agreeing to moving a motion forward to the top of the Order Paper of Motions other than Government Motions. I would also like to say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that I appreciate very much his gesture with regard to the response to the motion, and, I'm sure, his understanding about the fact that the Deputy Speaker, in fact, introduced the matter into the House.

I would like to assure the hon. Member for MacLeod that I can't speak for the others, but as far as I'm concerned, I look forward to being there in 1974 at those celebrations. I gather that the hon. member should be well prepared, Mr. Speaker. It looks like he's going to have a fair number of visitors.

I also appreciate very much the remarks from the Member for Spirit River-Fairview with regard to the Resolution before the House. I think it's important that the Queen of Canada as such be recognized in this way in this Legislature, because I do suggest that if this motion does obtain the unanimous support of the members, it will do more than merely be an invitation. It will reflect to the people of Alberta, perhaps at a very important time, the high respect that the legislators of this province feel towards the institution of the monarchy and the important role that it plays in this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

Taking the motion as read, would all those in favour of the motion please say aye. Those opposed?

It is not usual, I know, for the Chair to say whether a motion is passed unanimously or otherwise, but in view of this special occasion, I think Hansard should record that the motion was passed unanimously.

Marketing Agricultural Products

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure indeed to have the opportunity of rising to present this particular Resolution to the members of this Assembly.

Be it resolved that a statutory obligation be placed on all provincial marketing boards to guarantee a fair share of the Alberta Market for the small agricultural producer.

Before going into the details, Mr. Speaker, let me first inform the members that I do not view, and hope, this particular subject will not be the basis of a partisan political debate. It is certainly not offered in that spirit. My own particular research started into the matter some time before the election and for some obvious reasons, the depth of my research has been somewhat curtailed since that date. I did, however, make a commitment to my constituents during the election campaign, that should I be returned

9-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

to this Assembly, regardless of my position in this Assembly, that it was my intention to urge the government to take some action to put a legal requirement on provincial marketing boards of agricultural products, to look after the interests of the small producer.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it's probably fair and reasonable to say that those of us who were here in years gone by, when some of the original legislation was introduced and subsequent amendments thereto that provided for the establishment of provincial marketing boards, agreed in principle with the legislation because of the recognized need for greater bargaining leverage on the part of agriculture producers in the market place. It was also assumed Mr. Speaker, that in keeping with that philosophy that if the boards were producer controlled that the best interests of the agriculture community in total would be served. And, I think probably, Mr. Speaker, in a general way, that hypothesis was a valid one. However, Mr. Speaker, in the ensuing years, and the past year or two particularly, there have been some actions taken, I don't say with any particular malice at all on the part of provincial marketing boards, but actions taken which have been in some instances, detrimental to the small producer. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, I think it can be safely stated that it was certainly not the intent of this Legislature that when the appropriate legislation was approved, such action should be forthcoming.

I think, to a large extent, Mr. Speaker, the situation that we witnessed in one or two cases is somewhat natural. In the first instance, it is almost axiomatic that producer representatives on the marketing boards almost automatically represent the larger producers. Because it's mainly the larger producer who has his livelihood tied up in the production of hogs, or eggs, or broilers as the case may be, and who has the direct financial and personal interest in the market, which prompts him to become interested in serving on a marketing board. So without any design or intention or predetermined plans, it almost happens logically -- and indeed if it is not axiomatic -- that the producer marketing boards themselves are dominated by the larger producers. And, in some instances, Mr. Speaker, the actions which one or two of the boards have taken would lead me to believe that the small producer is considered to be a nuisance.

Now I think we witnessed some debate in this House last year, in particular, and I know, being a member of the previous government, we were forced to take some action on the question of trying to find market outlets for eggs from smaller producers, because they found themselves almost literally frozen out of the regular market for their products.

Another piece of evidence of the concern I express, Mr. Speaker, was an action taken by the Hog Marketing Board last year, which was subsequently changed as a result of the actions or representations at the insistence of the Minister of Agriculture in the previous government. And I'm sure it's action that the present Minister of Agriculture condones, because the board had put in a ground rule, which in effect, stated there had to be a minimum-size shipment of hogs to the packing plants. I don't remember if the figure was 10 or 20, it was somewhere in that neighbourhood. What it meant was that if the producer wanted to market five hogs, he had to ship them into some trucker's depot in the city, in some cases it was right across the street from the packing plant, and then he had to pay a double transportation charge. He paid to haul it to the trucker's yard, and then he had to pay another transportation fee to haul it across the road into the packing plant. It was a very clear discrimination against the small producer.

We are also aware, Mr. Speaker, that the present Minister of Agriculture dwelt on the matter at great length, and I think quite properly so, in previous sessions in this Legislature concerning

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-27

Broilers Alberta Poultry Marketers. In that case small producers under cooperative legislation were compelled to accept markoffs on their products that were paid to the Co-op. The Co-op subsequently set up a huge production plant and literally froze the small producer out of the market.

Mr. Speaker, I think it behooves this Legislature to seriously consider the matter, particularly in view of the concern that everyone has, particularly rural members, for the small farmer, the difficulties he faces, to see that something is done to guarantee that the small producer is assured an outlet for his product, that he is assured a reasonable share of the Alberta market.

Looking at the size of the producers, the dominance of the producers in the market, I'd like to quote some very brief statistics, Mr. Speaker. These I'm not sure are exact for present conditions, but they were the situation as of a year ago, and I would suspect the situation hasn't changed greatly. Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, this is a question of the board being dominated by large producers. Eggs for example, in the province: 15 per cent of the producers in Alberta account for 80 per cent of the production of eggs. In the situation with broilers, 20 per cent of the producers account for 60 per cent of production. And with hogs it's about 20 per cent of the producers accounting once again for 60 per cent. I don't know what the situation is for beef because we don't have a marketing board and it wasn't a subject of concern to me at that time.

It is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, when one examines the statistics that the marketing of products, at least in those where there are provincial boards established and functioning, is clearly dominated by a few large producers - a comparatively small number - and as I stated previously, almost automatically, it's the larger producer that has the interest of serving on a provincial producer marketing board.

I would like to draw a comparison, Mr. Speaker, with a situation that exists in the oil business if I may, as compared to the marketing of agricultural products where there is a marketing board. I don't suggest there is a direct relationship between the Oil and Gas Conservation Board and the marketing boards of agricultural products, but in the oil business, Mr. Speaker, because of the market situation, for years it has been the policy of this government - and it has been carried out by the Oil and Gas Conservation Board - that every oil well in the province is assured a basic minimum quota - assured a basic minimum share of the market. And he is entitled to that whether he needs it or not. If his well will only produce 10 barrels and the market is 20 barrels, that's his tough luck, but he's assured of a basic minimum outlet for his product, and any share that is left of the market over and above the basic minimum quota is prorated to the larger producers on the basis of market demand.

But we have a situation in the oil patch, Mr. Speaker, whereas it's not the small producer that becomes the shock absorber on the market place. It's not the small producer who is squeezed out of the market if the demand for the products is less than the supply. I agree there is some difference between an oil well and trying to get an egg back into a chicken - don't mistake me on that particular subject - but obviously, Mr. Speaker, in agriculture, and taking eggs for example, very clearly when the supply exceeds production somebody has to get squeezed out of the market and gets hurt. I have a concern Mr. Speaker, right now the shock absorber in agricultural production, where we have these boards, is all too often the small producer, whereas in my mind, Mr. Speaker, thinking in terms of people, it should be the larger producer who has to become the shock absorber on the market and has the responsibility for trying to adjust supply to demand.

9-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

So very briefly, Mr. Speaker, this is the basis on which I present this particular resolution. I had looked into the possibility of introducing private bills to deal with the subject and as I am sure the Minister of Agriculture and a number of people on this side realize, it's a rather complex legal question to deal with. And so instead of trying to introduce bills as private public bills which may or may not be entirely practical, because of the lack of research that had to go into making the bills readily applicable, it seemed far more desirable, Mr. Speaker, simply to bring a resolution before this Assembly, asking the Assembly to give a general endorsement to this principle, and leave the government with a free hand in determining the manner in which the principle can be best applied.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would conclude simply by stating that I believe action such as this is in the best interest of the small agricultural producer in the Province of Alberta. I would also state that I present this not in any partisan political sense but rather one of honouring a commitment to my constituents and one of carrying on with a campaign in a particular subject, on which I had arrived at certain conclusions some months prior to the election. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MP. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the motion by Mr. Henderson, in which the crux of the matter was a guarantee of a fair share of Alberta markets for small agricultural producers, let me say at the outset that for perhaps two reasons my remarks will be very short. One is that I am not sure I can talk more than five minutes, which may be a matter of pleasure to members of the Assembly, and secondly, it seems to me that the matter has been well covered by the mover of the motion.

As I indicated, the crux of the matter is an attempt, by whatever means the government feels is the most practical and reasonable approach, to gain some sort of a guarantee of a fair share of the market for small agricultural producers.

I would say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that this member was not an enthusiastic supporter of marketing boards. I recall when the plebiscite was held across the province and a number of people in my constituency were, to say the very least, questionable supporters of the Hog Marketing Board and I would be less than fair to the Hog Marketing Board at this time if I didn't say that a number of those people who were rather questionable in their support of the Hog Marketing Board are much more enthusiastic with the board's operation. I don't plan to get involved and say why or why not this may be the case other than to say this, the Hog Marketing Board to date has been involved, as I understand it, in promotion and also in the actual marketing of hogs.

I compare that, and I do this with no disrespect to the board, to the situation that we presently have in the area of eggs. Once again the Egg Marketing Board and the plan basically was voted in by the producers across the province, some time ago. But here we have a different situation in egg marketing boards, it seems to me, because the board in fact is involved in the controlling of production and there are, at this time, several hundred producers, small producers on the waiting list attempting to get on the board quota. We are in a situation, as Mr. Henderson indicated, where something like 85 per cent of the eggs in the province are produced by something like 15 per cent of the producers. Then, when you add to the problem that at the annual meetings of some of the marketing boards, namely the Egg Marketing Board over a year ago, less than 50 people turned out to the annual meeting, you see the situation where naturally those people who have the biggest involvement financially, and certainly the biggest interest also, in the egg marketing business, are those

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-29

people obviously who are the most interested. But at the same time, when we have a situation of several hundred people on the waiting list attempting to get into a situation of marketing their eggs through the Egg Marketing Board, this, if nothing else, does point out the problem and I say the problem in its most stripped down form, as a basic right to a portion of the market as far as the small producer is concerned.

So without further ado, Mr. Speaker, mainly because I don't think I can last much longer, suffice for me to say to the hon. members of this Assembly, that this motion certainly is presented in a non-political point of view, stemming from the interest of the very small producer, an interest which many members of the House on both sides have already mentioned to date -- I might also say, an interest that the Minister of Agriculture has expressed a number of times in this Assembly, prior to becoming the Minister of Agriculture. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MP. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I find myself dealing with this resolution very much in the same position I found myself in last week when the hon. Member for Smoky River introduced a resolution respecting public ownership of power distribution. I said at the time that I would support it, but I felt it should go much farther. In respect to the resolution introduced by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, I can say the same thing, that I am prepared to support it but I think it should go a great deal farther. Certainly setting out at least a basic share of the market for the smaller producer would be a step in the right direction, but only a small step in dealing with the threat posed today by vertical and horizontal integration, a threat, Mr. Speaker, which jeopardizes the future of many small farmers in the province.

I'll be introducing a private member's bill later on in the session that will deal, in my judgement, more comprehensively with the problem. It will be modeled on the anti-corporate farming legislation now on the books of a number of American states.

But, concerning the resolution before us today, why should statutory limits be imposed? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker that the small operators should be protected if our rural way of life is going to be on the statutes books of a number of American states.

But concerning the resolution before us today, why should statutory limits be imposed? Well, it seems to be, Mr. Speaker, that the small operators must be protected if our way of life is going to be preserved at all. It is well and fine to say that we should have wide open competition. It is well and fine to say through bigness we'll have efficiency. But the net result of such wide open competition is that thousands and thousands of people presently operating farms will be squeezed off the land and will be forced to migrate to the cities.

The argument for bigness, of course, in itself is not a totally accurate picture when you look at agriculture. Certainly, it can be argued that a larger operator can make better use of capital, whether that be farm machinery in sowing grain in the spring, or taking it off in the fall, or producing hogs on a massive scale, or what have, I'm sure many members will agree with me, the available evidence shows that when you talk about the utilization of the land, when you make that your yardstick, the family farm, the smaller operation, clearly shows its efficiency, its superiority over the larger operation.

And Mr. Speaker, I think that when members consider that we live today in a world where two-thirds of our population go to bed hungry every night, rather than talking about the efficient utilization of

9-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

capital, we should be more concerned with the efficient utilization of the land. And again, this is where the small operation comes in. Again, this seems to me to be the strongest single argument today for preserving the family farm operation, but that operation will not be preserved unless we make reasonable moves on the legislative level to protect the smaller operator from the bigger operator.

I've heard it said that we should encourage bigness because bigness will mean a continuation of the cheap food practice that we've had over the past number of years. Frankly, I don't agree with this. Uncontrolled horizontal integration and eventual emergence of corporate farming will mean that instead of a cheap food policy we'll have a very expensive food policy. We'd be far better off, as I see it, too -- and this is digressing for just a moment from the resolution before us -- but we'd be far better off to subsidize the smaller operators to the point that they can continue their operations. You'd have a reasonable food policy, that is far preferable in my judgment to the inevitable result of the smaller farmers being forced off the land and corporate farming emerging which would be very, very expensive food indeed.

Controls are necessary if we are to maintain a balanced economy. When I spoke in the Speech from the Throne debate, I argued that we need a balanced economy in this province and in Canada. We need a viable private sector, and one of the most important areas where the private sector has clearly shown its superiority is in the production of food products. But that private sector as we know it today, dominated by thousands of individual farm operations, each making their judgments independently of one another. That private sector will be jeopardized unless we set out reasonable legislative controls to protect the smaller from the bigger.

I want to say, too, Mr. Speaker, that in looking over the many resolutions passed by the farm organizations in this province, it's fair to say that organized agriculture is deeply concerned about this problem and is interested in some form of legislative protection. I've talked for example, with members of the Alberta Hog Marketing Board who argue that we should go a great deal farther than the proposal made by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc and impose a strict limit of 5,000 hogs per producer -- not a case of sharing the market, but a strict limit, and I subscribe to that point of view too. Don't think that we should just share the market; I think we have to control the size of operations, consistent with the view that it is only by preserving the smaller family farm operations that we can have the kind of rural life that I think we want in this province, and that we can have the kind of agriculture operation that is necessary in this province.

May I say, too, that I am not pleased that this resolution isn't a little more comprehensive in another sense. I am worried that the effect of contract farming, in my view contract farming or contracts that in any way bypass provincial marketing boards, are extremely dangerous for agriculture in Alberta. It is my view that we should eliminate contract farming. Contract farming is piece work, and piece work would jeopardize the independence of the family farm operation.

We have, as we look around us Mr. Speaker, a number of rather threatening developments on the horizon. Just across the border from my constituency between Dawson Creek and Fort St. John a huge corporate farm is being developed, a farm which can produce 10,000 head of cattle in each year, and this I understand is to be doubled to 20,000 head. The farm is massive in area and I understand something in the nature of 10 townships are being considered. Now this is the sort of thing that frightens me. It frightens me because it challenges the whole presumption of the kind of agricultural economy which I believe we must defend and preserve in our country,

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-31

and that is an agricultural economy based on thousands of smaller and individual producers.

I'm pleased to see in this Legislature, in my view, a greater concern about finding ways and means of preserving the smaller operator, and I think it's fair to say that the government -- whatever its shortcomings -- is also seeking ways to defend the family farm operation. And to the extent, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution introduced today is a small step -- and to caution that it is a small step -- what we really require is legislation which will prohibit corporate farming; legislation which is modelled after the legislation in North and South Dakota; legislation, Mr. Speaker, that this Legislature will have an opportunity to debate at a later time, because I intend to introduce it in the form of a private member's bill. But nonetheless, because this resolution is at least a faltering step in the right direction, I'm prepared to support it.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc may be surprised to get some qualified sympathy from a representative of an urban riding. But I rise, because I do want to demonstrate that we do feel concern for rural problems, that we do recognize in Calgary, that one third of our economy is based on agriculture, and that in Alberta the lives of town and country are irrevocably interlocked. We are still a town with packing plants, poultry processors, a famous stockyard, famous bull sales, giant dairies, and we are a distribution centre for all of southern Alberta. Now most Calgarians are connected directly or indirectly in some way with the farm. If the farmer is prosperous, so are we. So the early attitudes of this government have the wholehearted support of all members, rural and urban.

We know that any dispassionate economist will agree that there is a dangerous imbalance in Alberta between town and country. It can't be good if more than half our population lives in two large metropolitan centres, while the vast area around is almost empty. Ten years ago there were 75,000 farm families in Alberta, now there are less than 50,000. Only one third of our huge province is settled and two thirds of it is still bush. And yet the first settlers arrived less than 100 years ago. They were still coming right up to the First World War, from Europe, from Eastern Canada, the United States and they were homesteading on the land. Now within such a short time, the pastoral way of life has gone for 85 per cent of the population. There are abandoned farm dwellings, dying towns all over the province. There may be other reasons, but the first and the most basic, most likely is economic. While we on this side can't be wrong in thinking of job-providing secondary industry in small centres, there must be an even more vital economic life force. I think we've got to recognize that it's axiomatic that few small towns will be prosperous if they don't have a healthy agricultural hinterland. You can think of specific examples like the town of Canmore, for instance, which had industry -- had industry since the beginning. It has good roads, good railroads, a beautiful place to live, surrounded by beautiful mountains, but its population hasn't gone above 2,000 for many years. The reason is it has no agricultural hinterland.

Another axiom I think, that we must accept, despite the zero population fanatics and the ecology faddists, few of whom every leave a main road, is that we are desperately short of people. Alberta has 255,000 square miles, twice as big as the United Kingdom, and yet the United Kingdom has 40 times our population.

Our domestic market is so small, it is not only poorly spread between the city and the country, it is very, very small. Any economist who hasn't let propaganda turn his head will tell you it is very difficult to develop viable secondary industry, or even a viable agriculture market beyond mass production of grain if you lack a home

9-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

market. Ontario and Quebec had most of the population of Canada from early times. That is why they now look on us and continue to look on us as underpopulated colonies to mine and exploit.

Next to the old fashioned and now unfashionable method of raising your own, the best way to improve a market is by immigration. I know that there are movements abroad that defy all logic, that reject this sort of concept. These are the very people who cry bitterly over unemployment, over the lack of job opportunities up to the high expectations of people under 25, over the reluctance of corporations, in the extractive industries to reinvest their profit dollars in more labour intensive industry. These are the very people who are in the vanguard of opposition to any project that makes any common sense. I know that the population explosion theory has validity in the fertile river valleys of Asia, pollution is a serious problem in Pittsburgh, but I can't take it seriously -- with all due respect to the hon. Minister of the Environment, Mr. Yurko -- I can't take it as seriously as he does, in an empty Alberta. I think we have got to express concern but I know in my heart that we can't live on scenery alone.

Not one of these faddists who scream would go back to the pastoral way of life if you gave him the land for free. They want to live off the state but they fail to realize that the state itself can't fulfill their high expectations without an expanding economy. That is where I come to the marketing board in the light of an expanding economy.

There are two ways to look at a marketing board. You can look inwards or you can look outwards. You might think, well, what does he know about marketing boards, he comes from the city. I might tell you that when I first moved in to the city district I represent, Mrs. Sadie Bushfield, whose family originally owned the farm that is now housing estates on the north hill was still there living in the original homestead. She was the sort of individual who built western Canada. In her lifetime, apart from running a farm and later a beauty salon, she raised eleven children of whom eight were adopted. I myself, at various times in my life, have been a farmer. I raised hogs, I raised sheep, I raised purebred Herefords, and I raised dairy cattle in two countries. One time I had the largest herd of Jersey cattle in Alberta and I certainly have always respected the record of the Pickard and Clark family from Carstairs. I still have an interest in some land. So for a "city slicker" I have some acquaintance with the problems of a farm.

I say that marketing boards can be looked at in two ways, inwards or outwards. Looking outwards, a marketing board stresses above everything else the paramount importance of expanding a market, seeking new markets, and increasing the returns available to the farmer. But if you look inwards, and you think of it only in the context of sharing out a dwindling market, you miss the boat. Unfortunately, this is the way most of them intended to operate. They concentrate on dividing up the existing wealth rather than expanding new wealth. So in this process of fair division, the market often dwindles. When Harry Hayes, Senator Harry Hayes, was federal Minister of Agriculture, we had a huge butter surplus in Canada. Well he brought it under control to the point where there are not very many dairy farmers left producing butter. We import it from other countries. The butter surplus disappeared with the tight control.

I'm sure that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is aware of the criticisms of the weaknesses of the Socialist system, of dividing up existing wealth, and all the pitfalls that are contained therein and all the pitfalls that are contained in the worst type of marketing board. They become arthritic, muscle bound, they get under the bureaucratic control of civil servants who lose touch with the producers. The expense of sales increases because there's an extra

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-33

middle man or a jobber, whatever you'd like to call the marketing board. They are never paid by results. They are never paid like salesmen are paid, on a commission. If they were, maybe the situation would be different.

The third disadvantage, of course, is that the tight controls and the quotas imposed by marketing boards to insure fair shares to the producer actually result in decreasing shares or smaller shares and an inflexibility which makes them incapable of adjusting to changing market conditions.

Now why do we have marketing boards? They are forced on farmers by the concentration of property in the too few hands of the processors. Now this concentration of wealth in too few hands is a reason for a lot of people taking the misguided path of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. The concentration of buying power by the wholesalers results in price fixing rings or unfair pressures to maintain artificially low prices imposed on the disorganized farmer. Even sales by auction which do introduce some element of competition in buying have only a minimal effect if only a handful of buyers are present. So you can understand why there has been some pressure for marketing boards. You'll understand why there's also some resistance to them. You'll understand particularly why cattlemen in western Canada don't favour compulsory marketing boards. This is simply the one area where free enterprise and competition has prevailed in an expanding continental market.

I am aware that when the trend goes to forward shipments, forward contracts, vertical integration that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview was talking about, when shipments go direct into the packing plants, the grading methods that take place after the beasts are slaughtered -- like rail grading of hogs where they are completely at the mercy of the packers -- then of course is begun the pressure for boards. The take-over of small independent packing plants by larger competitors, all this forces the farmer towards organizing a marketing board.

But there's never much need for organized marketing boards if the market itself is healthy and expanding and there is an opportunity for all to sell for a fair dollar return. Most modern countries, incidentally, now measure the back fat of hogs live. They don't believe in the rail grading process where you estimate the worth of a hog after slaughter in the butcher's. I've never even favoured the primitive grading method that they have now for distinguishing between lamb and other sorts of sheep. They break the leg, and if it's a greenstick fracture, they say it's a lamb, and the chances are it's a lamb from the day it's born to the day it dies. That's no way to sell mutton.

I don't want anyone to think, Mr. Speaker, that I am 100 per cent in opposition to the concepts of marketing boards. I believe in them if they are democratically controlled by the producers and if they are sales oriented. I only oppose them if they are like the ones we have known in the past which is a wet blanket sitting on the top of the whole industry, and they are only concentrating on poachers and sharing up the dwindling wealth.

People who are interested in marketing agricultural products especially on my side of the House, I think should be required to make a trip to Denmark, a country which has proved to be the most aggressive salesman of agricultural products of any small country in the world.

A few years ago I was travelling on a Western Airlines champagne flight from Seattle to Los Angeles, and I noticed that the menu laid great stress on Canadian bacon. And if our packers and marketing boards were as aggressive as the Danes we would doubtless be selling our Canadian bacon as a quality product all over the world. In fact,

9-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

you're probably all aware that the Danes have been selling Tulip Brand canned bacon in huge quantities in our Alberta market, and it's very superior quality bacon and until very recently, it was at a lower price than the local product. It's recently been raised. I don't know if this is because of protective tariffs or what.

But I tell you, that although I realize the bind everybody is in, and the necessity for having marketing boards at the present state of the industry, I have to be opposed to any statutory obligation or any additional red tape being placed on provincial marketing boards, which should be sales organizations rather than mere structures for allocating a share of a dwindling market.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the resolution before us I should like to speak briefly on the resolution itself, that a statutory obligation be placed on all provincial marketing boards allowing for a fairer share of the market by small producers. I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution as it's worded is the kind of thing that could be put into effect because of perhaps legal technicalities. However, I believe that the intent of the motion, as presented by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc is certain to ensure that our small agriculture producers in Alberta do have a fairer, perhaps a larger, share of the existing market. Certainly in that respect I would commend the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, and the seconder of the motion, for their thoughts in that regard.

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc also mentioned that he thought this shouldn't be a political debate. I'll try if I can to keep it from becoming one, but I know that the hon. member certainly had the opportunity over the years to watch his colleagues, who were responsible for the Department of Agriculture, allow small producers to be whittled down to a smaller and smaller share of the market.

The subject in my mind, Mr. Speaker, opens up the whole area of agricultural marketing boards both provincially and federally. Certainly within the last year, I think, probably all members of this House even those from the urban areas, are aware of the complications and the problems there were, and the federal government's effort to develop and implement Bill C176.

Getting back to the original motion and the marketing boards which are operating provincially here in Alberta, I think that we should examine them, perhaps one by one, as this motion is discussed today and on subsequent occasions.

First of all, in relation to the Hog Marketing Board, I think that regulations have been changed in that marketing board to the extent that small hog producers have an equal opportunity in a marketing place with large ones. That is the kind of a board that is only facilitating the marketing of hogs and, in actual fact, allowing the small as well as the large producer to get a fair share of the food dollar. There are no quotas or restrictions levied by that board that might allow certain persons to get a large part of the market, or vice versa.

With respect to poultry, Mr. Speaker, we certainly have a great number of problems in the Egg Marketing Board, and I would suggest the Broiler Marketing Board. I was talking, not too many days ago, with one gentleman who has a little over 5 per cent of the total production in the Province of Alberta. And certainly we'd only need 19 others like that and then we'd have only 20 farm families making a living out of the production of eggs.

The same holds true I think in the troiler industry, and I had occasion, Mr. Speaker, to read some of the speeches made in this House during the past years about the monopolistic position of

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-35

certain companies within the broiler industry. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that our new Minister of Agriculture, and I know he will, will entertain any thoughts that those of you on the other side of the House or on this side might have for getting some of that share of the market back to our small producers.

When you talk about the dairy industry, there we have a situation where we have a National Marketing Board which has been allotting quotas for industrial milk across Canada. I think most of the members, Mr. Speaker, are aware that there is a plebiscite coming up very shortly with respect to a dairy marketing plan that will return the responsibility for allotting of quotas of industrial milk to the Province of Alberta and allow us a fair share in the market place. I think it would be a good time to suggest that all of the hon. members should be trying to encourage people in the dairy industry to vote for that kind of a program that will in fact allow the Province of Alberta to allot industrial milk quotas, and it will allow us to have some new people who are now cream shippers brought into the field of industrial milk production.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to go back to the whole field of marketing boards and talk very briefly about some of the things that have occurred in the past two or three years. People in government, and perhaps farmers on marketing boards, have insisted that they in fact know what the demand for certain agricultural products will be in 1972 or 1973. One of the things we have to recognize in the field of agriculture is that we don't always know what the international, or for that matter what the domestic, market is going to be. I refer to the situation in regard to rapeseed. Some two and three years ago the hon. Minister, Mr. Lang, advised farmers that they should not increase their rapeseed acreage, and I think that he did it in good faith, knowing what the market was the year in which he advised them. However, farmers that year doubled their acreage of rapeseed and doubled their output, and in a subsequent year they doubled it again. Had we followed the advice that was given to us by the experts in the field of production and supply at that time we would have been short a considerable number of millions of dollars in Western Canada.

I think, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to talk about marketing boards and supply management then we just can't look in the Province of Alberta or in the Dominion of Canada. We have certainly got to look at the whole international picture. There was a very good article, Mr. Speaker, in the Free Press Weekly not too long ago where it said, "it's important to recognize that Canada is a part of the entire North American market when it comes to hogs and beef and a number of other commodities," and it would matter not whether we had dropped our production completely in the field of hogs in the Province of Alberta. The market and the price structure would have been much the same as it was during 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make some very brief comments on some of the remarks that have been made here this afternoon. The hon. member Mr. Henderson's statement that producers are generally representatives of large producers, I think, is very valid. It is one for which, in some method or other during the course of our discussions, we should try to figure out a way to have small producers who perhaps haven't got the dollars to spend to travel long distances and so on, represent themselves on the various marketing boards in the province.

I would also like to refer to some of the remarks made by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Pairview. He suggests that this resolution does not go far enough. He would like it to go much farther. As a matter of fact I presume that he would like to have all farmers taken over by that bureaucratic government in Ottawa. With all farmers under the direct control of a central government in Ottawa, perhaps provincial controls are not necessary. He also said

9-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

that farmers need controls -- require controls. Well I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is not right for us to stand in this legislature and suggest that the farmers of this province haven't got an ability to manage their own affairs, to suggest that this government should stand up and impose marketing controls, quotas and that kind of thing on farmers. The last thing, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers in this province need is a socialist on their back just looking for a free ride to an election year.

Mr. Speaker he has talked about 'no contracts', and I ask you -- what about the contract between the Canadian Wheat Board and the farmers? A contract was sold by this provincial government quite a number of years ago, and certainly that's an area where there is no possibility whatever for a farmer to sit down and discuss, not only the terms of the quota situation, but the price that he receives per bushel. I know, Mr. Speaker, that there have to be certain rules and certain regulations regarding contract farming or contract production in this province, but I have had the opportunity, as a farmer, of growing grass seed in that market and to sit down and talk with the person with whom I had written the contract when the contract had not expired, and get a change in the price and the procedure in which I would deliver the seed. And I would suggest that that's a lot more than you can get out of a national marketing board.

The hon. member incidentally is well aware of the commitment made by this government very shortly after September 10th. The corporation farming in the Province of Alberta is out, and it is not necessary to have any bills or legislation on the Order Paper that say no corporation farming is allowed in this province. There are certainly a number of ways at the present time in which the government of this province can rule out any corporation farming. A fine example of that, Mr. Speaker, is the firm of North American Integrated Food Products who came to Alberta back in September or October and said: We would like to set up a plant to grow 640,000 hogs a year; we would like to grow them and slaughter them and ship them, and the hon. Minister of Agriculture said to these people that the field of agriculture production of primary products is reserved for the farmers of this province.

Mr. Speaker, with those few words I leave the Legislature with the thought that I believe there are some 13 provincial marketing boards. I think perhaps they should be examined one by one to see which ones do, in fact, have production controls and are not allowing small producers into the marketplace. Thank you.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, may I rise at this time also to voice my concern about the marketing boards in this province? It is certainly not the controls that we wish to have at this time. The controls that we regulate within our boundaries certainly have no effect as they will affect the future of agriculture in the world today.

Certainly, I have to agree that all is not well with the marketing boards. Being a farmer myself I see within my constituency the Poultry Marketing Board as it affects the small producer, and I may say at this time there are very few that are now in the field because of the effects of the latest development in the poultry field. We find that 51 per cent of the total production of poultry products in the province is controlled by two or three producers. This leaves very little room for the other 50,000 people that wish to produce poultry products, because the quota system is there. I have to agree with the hon. Member for Smoky River that it is time that we examined these marketing boards, that we examine the quota systems as they have been placed within these boards.

I have to agree with the hon. Member for Wetaskwin-Leduc that perhaps we should have a look at all of the marketing boards as they

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-37

affect the small producers of our province. I am not in agreement with the operation of the Hog Marketing Board. Rumors have it that during the depressed prices of the early spring and summer, that some members of that board received privileges other than those given to other producers within the province. I don't know whether they are true or not, but I think it's time that we should stand up and be counted if we really want to get the welfare of the small producer in there. I think our minister has taken a very, very great step and it has taken courage and guts to do this. First of all, he said there are no corporate farms any longer in Alberta. I think it's time that we have to realize this, and I think that never before has a minister of the Crown, and especially in agriculture, taken this stand. May I congratulate him at this time.

I think myself that when we look at bill C176 and what effects it would have had on the livestock industry of our province, and knowing well the functioning of the other boards, it would have been disastrous, as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview said just a minute ago, that this large corporation is at his backdoor. This is exactly what we'll have if we don't wake up to the fact that we have to protect the small producer. In the similar manner as the former government of this province got rid of the smaller producers in the lumber industry, you have the effect now where the larger industry is dictating the price to the consumer, and I think it's time that we maintained a relationship so that we can keep the lower cost of our food prices in this province if we keep the smaller producer in the picture. Once he's eliminated, then the large corporations will dictate the price of butter and eggs in our grocery stores. I have producers in my area in the poultry production industry, where they have 1000 and 2000 hens. They can't compete because they have no quota. They can't get a larger quota and yet we have three producers who market 51 per cent of the total poultry products in this province. It is time that we have a look at this situation. I think that the minister has had a long look at it and if we are all patient and just wait awhile I think that he will clean up the mess, because I know that he is the man to do it. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOPER:

Just a brief thought on this motion, Mr. Speaker, the intent with which I fully agree. I would have liked to have seen a little stronger word used, a more definite word used instead of fair share, such as a percentage, but I realize that at this time that wouldn't have been possible. Possibly, according to my mind, the entire market for agriculture products now being so gradually taken over by the Agri business or Agri industry, whatever you should want to call it, should be reserved for farmers. I realize that for the time being they wouldn't be able to fill the need but they could possibly soon build up to it. But there is little advantage to the farmer, on the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Industry, and so on, finding new markets, new export markets, for agricultural products if that demand is going to be filled by other than farmers.

I believe that all marketing boards of agricultural products should set a limit, should set a maximum level for any one producer. This would make room and prove an incentive for many more farmers to derive some financial income from the egg, the cream, milk, poultry and hog markets. At this very moment the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission is considering limiting the maximum number of hogs to 6,000 for any one producer for any one year.

The Alberta Egg Marketing Board has no upper limit, and one Alberta producer markets 500,000 dozen eggs. Just imagine how much good, limiting the maximum would do. How many more producers would be given a chance to add to their farm income, if this were divided up. Indeed, one of the hon. members said, the egg producer is discouraged by the set-up we have. The trend seems to be to eliminate the bottom producer and make the big one larger. That's

9-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

the way it works at present, and of course, we all know what has happened to the chicken and broiler business over the years. It seems to have passed out of the hands of the farmer entirely into business.

No doubt you probably were all interested in the news item which appeared in the Edmonton Journal a week or two ago, wherein a big packing firm in Edmonton was fined for marketing 17,000 broiler chickens without reporting them to the Alberta Poultry Marketing Board, and that was probably just a very small percentage of what they actually raise. This number of broiler chickens, even 17,000 marketed by a dozen farmers would certainly have meant a nice source of additional income to legitimate farmers.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have to admit the trend to eliminate or discourage the small producer, is a definite one. We certainly can't close our eyes to it.

The Canadian Dairy Commission, not too long ago, eliminated the subsidy paid to the small cream shippers, who marketed less than 450 pounds of cream per year, and this of course, meant all the difference between profit and loss to the cream shipper. However, that move was short lived and subsidy was soon reinstated.

So, Mr. Speaker, the trend to large producers must be reversed. To accomplish this, the market for agriculture products must be reserved for the farmer if we are to preserve the family and the small farm. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. WAPRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to the resolution we have before us regarding a statutory obligation be placed on all the provincial marketing boards, to guarantee and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, the most important thing about agriculture marketing, and in fact, in the years to come, the most important thing about agriculture itself, is that agriculture become market oriented. For a very long time in the history of agriculture, it has been the case that agriculture and, if you like, farming specifically, as now a part of agriculture, was able to function very successfully with a production orientation, that is to say to look only at the soil, to look only at the climatic conditions, and other factors which affect production, decide on what to produce and after you get in the habit, continue to produce it and assume that there is some sacred right to a market for the product.

This has had its stimulations from time to time, particularly after the Second World War expanded markets available, Mr. Speaker, due to the Marshall Plan, refurbishing of Europe, and on the heels of this the problems of the North American effort to help restore Japan from its war devastation and the wrecking of the economy that occurred again in World War II. Then for a brief period in the early to mid 1960's there was a breakthrough made by the federal government led by the Minister of Agriculture, Alvin Hamilton, in the grain sales to Communist China. Each of these things prevented us from fully recognizing that we must, in agriculture, become increasingly market oriented, rather than production oriented. And to draw this distinction as clearly as possible, I'd like to suggest that the day is gone and the day will stay gone in agriculture, where we can basically choose according to only the production characteristics of our soil, of our climate, and indeed of our preferences, Mr. Speaker, and assume that the market is out there. That day is gone; that day has been gone for some considerable length of time, but it has taken a very long time, particularly in this province to realize that that day has indeed gone.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-39

What we have now is a situation in agriculture, Mr. Speaker, and in agriculture as a part of rural development in total where there is a great need for a market orientation of the agricultural product. We must not only consider the characteristics that influence what we can produce as we conduct our renewable resource management within the agriculture sector, we must also, but firstly and above all, consider what the markets are, and where they are. The idea then becomes just the opposite to the old time way of doing things in agriculture, mainly an appraisal and research of the market, then planning to meet that market to maximize the production that can give income to the farmers in Alberta, and so have the market to production orientation rather than just the opposite.

I would suggest Mr. Speaker, that in the statement, so far, and in the Throne Speech, and in my personal observations of the activities of the new Minister of Agriculture, Deputy Premier and Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Hugh Horner, that this reorientation for the Government of Alberta has just occurred.

The spirit of the resolution itself is certainly well intended and in the best interests of the individual producers in agriculture in Alberta, but some of the problems that come about are whether it's the best way to accomplish it, as it's a question of the means, rather than the end. We all want to maximize the incomes available for the agriculture producer in Alberta, and we want to maximize these on a fair and equitable basis, and the question is, how best to accomplish this?

It is rather interesting to me to reflect back a very short period of time, particularly in my own experience in the fall of 1969. The fall of 1969 was when the research was done on the broiler industry, the faults of which have been so properly put forward by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc. In the fall of 1969, there was a research report that was prepared, and kept under the table obviously by the government at the time, and only after a very great deal of reaching effort on the part of all sides and by all concerned, was it indeed revealed that we had unwittingly, or perhaps we had become policy-wise outwitted, into the ridiculous position that we had a virtual monopoly in an agricultural segment in Alberta. As a matter of fact, in the fall of 1969, witnessing the chaos in this mishandled situation, Mr. Speaker, was when I began to become interested in politics. This problem was rather badly handled and contrasts specifically with the intention of this particular resolution. Now that the hon. gentlemen from the other side, as well as from this side, have spoken with respect to supporting the spirit of the resolution at hand, since the policy of that time was in stark contrast to the spirit of this resolution, I look forward to the remarks of the former Minister of Agriculture in this regard.

In the agricultural marketing sphere which involves all of the functions that must be accomplished in order to move the product from the farm gate all the way to the final point of consumption, what in the literature is called the agricultural market channel, we have the entire set of individual marketing functions and we are very, very concerned, of course, about the market efficiency of how the product is physically moved through that market channel.

So, the marketing efficiency that we are talking about necessarily breaks into two necessary and essential components. One of these components of market efficiency, Mr. Speaker, is what we might call and is called in the literature of agricultural marketing, operational efficiency. Operational efficiency in living room language is simply the cost effectiveness of performing the physical functions of moving the product from the farm gate, the end point of agricultural production, all the way through the necessary functions to its being the proper product in the proper place at the proper time for the consumer who supplies the dollar that buys it. The recognition of that stream is a market orientation for agricultural

9-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

marketing and that recognition comes from what the consumer wants, where he wants it, and in what place he wants it, and then it is our job as agricultural people and agricultural marketers to supply that product, including producing it, at the beginning point of the agricultural channel.

How effectively -- and again I am still talking about that component called operational efficiency -- how cost effectively we move this product through the agricultural marketing channel depends on how we organize the physical components of the agricultural market. The organization can be divided between who does what job and the organization of the market facilities can also be divided between where they are in the geography of Canada or, in the case of international trade, in other countries as well. This, then, is the market organization aspect that is the physical nuts and bolts, the physical mechanics that must be handled in a cost effective way if we were to have efficient marketing.

Then we move on to how we handle the product within these particular physical facilities, and that, of course, is called market logistics. How well we do all of that is our measure of operational efficiency which I repeat again, is the cost effectiveness, Mr. Speaker, of moving the agricultural product through the market channel from the point of agricultural production to the point of final demand or final purchase on the part of the consumer.

There is a second part of marketing efficiency that I am anxious to mention. The second part -- and the second of two major components that comprise marketing efficiency -- is what is in the literature again called exchange efficiency. Exchange efficiency, to use living room language again -- there aren't too many things in this world that can't be explained properly in commonsense terms -- exchange efficiency is simply how well do the prices throughout the marketing channel for agricultural products reflect the necessary costs. How well does it do this?

This brings us to the broiler case, the case where you have, in fact, a monopoly situation, as was developed within the policy of the previous government's agricultural policy. In the broiler case so well developed by the hon. member in moving the resolution, we have a situation where you have a monopoly and therefore the individual business that's concerned with it can have a wide deviation between the price it charges and the necessary costs that it incurs in providing the agricultural marketing services. The width of that, or the gap between the price and necessary costs, when it's large, is an indication of a highly inefficient marketing system in terms of the exchange fissures, because it allows the kind of monopolistic market strategies that have been the case as we know in many parts of the economy from time to time and in the broiler instance in this particular part of Alberta's agricultural economy and also as well outlined by the hon. gentleman from Vermilion-Viking with respect to the case for egg marketing in agriculture.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have the operational efficiency and exchange efficiency that together comprise marketing efficiency and all of that must occur within the sphere of the kind of action that government takes. If you like the way that government does well, or does not do well, facilitate the agricultural marketing function, both in terms of the physical movement of the agricultural product from the farm gate to the consumer's doorstep, and in terms of the way that prices properly reflect necessary costs or, in other words, whether the profit margins and indeed the costs themselves are fair and equitable.

We have two cases before us, as mentioned by the hon. gentlemen respectively, in broilers and eggs, in agriculture in Alberta which are totally inadequate in this regard. Now out of that bench remark on suggestion, I'd like to applaud the spirit, the good and proper

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-41

spirit, of the resolution itself. I suggest that to have additional regulation to try to correct bad regulation in the first place, and the inadequate and inactive policy, is compounding mistakes with more mistakes. It's a negative 'keep people from exercising some of the rights that they might feel they have in the economy.' It's a regulations upon regulations, stifling, choking kind of suggestion, to add a new batch of regulations to try to counteract some of the mistakes that evolved from the previous batch of operations.

No, Mr. Speaker, I would very much suggest that instead of this, we have the kind of facilitative action for agricultural marketing in Alberta that shows the energetic leadership and competitive spirit that it takes, including rural development so that the rural areas of Alberta can better and more cost-effectively provide agricultural marketing services in Alberta. Let's do that. Let's know what these markets are that are available. Let's plan for these markets, and let's remove the barriers that are imposed when you don't have a transportation policy in Alberta. When you go to install electricity on your farm, you're completely at the mercy of the installer as to the cost. You don't have the natural resources in terms of rural gas, for example, that are supplied on an equitable basis to farmers in Alberta. No, Mr. Speaker, we don't have those things, and if we did have those things, we could, by offering a fair opportunity to compete, insure the very proper spirit and objective of this resolution.

The small farm can compete. What we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is not unwittingly rig the rules of the game against the small producer so that, in fact, the small producer is in a disadvantaged position, as compared with the large producer.

And incidentally, the same thing applies to small rural towns. We have to offer stimulation and incentive, rather than stifling them.

This will be my last series of comments on this particular resolution, because I'm sure there are a number of people who would like to say a few words about this, including the former Minister of Agriculture.

I think this also relates, as was pointed out earlier to national marketing boards on Bill No. 176. If there is any agricultural person or agricultural representative who is in this House who doesn't know that what I am going to say is true, it's because he didn't visit enough farms this summer. You pull into a farm, find that they have hogs and cattle, and you say, 'how do you feel about national marketing boards and the fact that your provincial government is all in favour of them?' and you've got a voter. Because they're right. We don't want that; we didn't want that. We would probably have national marketing boards effective in Alberta had it not been for the fact that there was a change in government.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise to address a few remarks in favour of the resolution before us. In so doing I do not want to pose as an expert agriculturalist, for even though I am the son of a farmer and was on a farm, I fear that modern agriculture is leaving me behind when I hear all the proponents of agricultural methods. Nevertheless, the fact remains that I believe in the family farm, and I happen to be one of the old fashioned types who believes in the small family farm. Now some people tell us in this modern age that you're a dreamer if you do that, because the modern agricultural operation has to be large enough to be what is termed an economic unit. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that an economic unit is to a great extent, a matter of attitude and opinion, because it depends to a

9-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

great extent on what our standard of living is, what would constitute an economic unit.

We have here before us a situation that is going to compound itself, because what we have is one control coming on top of another. Whenever we have controls enforced, very often it requires, later on, that other controls be enforced. The marketing board situation was brought about in the province by a great number of requests and pressures by farmers who today, having experienced the results of marketing boards, have in some instances reversed their desires and would like now to be able to take away the marketing board.

Like the hon. Member for Olds-Disbury, I have to express my feelings also, that I have never been really in favour of marketing boards. But now that they exist, we see some of the problems that come as a result of them, and this is what this resolution is calling for. I submit that it is a good thing that it was left fairly well open to the government to implement the request involved. Because when one comes to discuss what is a fair share of the market, this could create some problems, especially in view of the fact that there are many small producers as compared to a few large producers. One can never determine in advance to any great extent or any degree of accuracy what the small producers, as a whole, will produce, because there are too many uncertainties in attempting to project the annual supply. For that reason it would be hard to determine what the fair share or the necessary share of the market would be.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that probably the easiest and most practical solution would be the abolition of the marketing board, but this is probably not what is most desirable under the present circumstances. So however we look at it, we find ourselves sitting on the horns of a dilemma, and I hope that the leadership that is propounded by the present government will be put into action in this particular sphere, and we will see the results that will be favourable in assisting the small farmer.

DR. HOPNER:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part on the debate in this resolution after having listened very carefully to those who have gone before me. I am rather surprised that after the debate of Social Credit involvement with Bill C176 that they should come right back. I do appreciate however, the spirit in which the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc introduced the resolution, and so I'll try to be non-partisan as much as I can.

I think, though, that it would have been a good opportunity to have a philosophical debate in relation to the whole question of marketing, and I would hope that some time in the life of this Parliament over the next four years we could have a pretty definitive statement of NDP policy in this area. One of the things that has always confused me, Mr. Speaker, is that they said one thing out west in their provincial organizations, and the federal wing of the party took the exact opposite direction in relation to Bill C176. It has been an intriguing development that I hope that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview will be able to clear up for us in the future as to just where he stands on the question of compulsory enforced marketing boards on to the farmers of Canada and Alberta. Does he stand with the federal wing which wanted C176 very badly, so that they could have more control, or does he go more with his colleagues in Saskatchewan and Manitoba, in which they, for various reasons, fought C176 -- not quite as hard as certain other people but certainly they did?

In relation to the resolution as it is now formulated, Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that we can't accept it in its present wording for the very simple reason that when you start putting statutory obligations in relation to marketing boards I would like to ask the

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-43

House to consider very carefully what this does to our position as a province in which 75 per cent of the agricultural produce that we produce is exported outside of the province. I again want to hope that over the coming months and years, Mr. Speaker, we will get a pretty clear idea of the opposition's policy in relation to marketing, because I think it's important. And if we are going to have a reasonable amount of good debate in this Legislature in relation to what course is best for Alberta farmers, then I would hope that they would spell out their position very clearly.

Again I say to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, he had an opportunity today to enunciate that philosophy in regard to marketing and he disappointed me when he didn't outline it at all, but rather had some very vague remarks to make about contract farming. I rather suspect that the 'boogey man' of contract farming is going to get it in the neck from the NDP's from now on. I would, however, suggest to him and to other members of this Legislature that fair and adequate contracts may in fact be very helpful in the development of new markets, and in the development of new products for those markets.

I want to suggest to him that the growing of buckwheat, the growing of sunflowers, the growing of a number of new products in Alberta has been developed through the use of contracts in relation to their production. I am quite aware of their squeamishness in regard to contracts because we have had in the past too much control by agri-business in regard to the contracts that farmers have had to sign, primarily to get credit in relation to their operation, Mr. Speaker, rather than as an incentive to produce. But the bad contracts in agriculture are those where, because of the provision of credit by feed companies or others in the agri-business field, the contracts really seal the farmer in, and then I would agree with my hon. friend, that then that is a form of serfdom. But I want to suggest to him that if we can develop adequate forms of credit for our agricultural producers, then we have to look at a new and different kind of contract if we are really serious about expanding our markets.

I want then to go from there, Mr. Speaker, to dwell for a minute on the whole question of the philosophy of marketing, and it seems to me that we should take a stand in relation to the position that we want in this area. I think we could briefly outline it as being the one side where people are saying, "well, let's forget about trying to develop export markets, let's just produce for our domestic market in Canada, let's have Bill C176 or something like it to split up the markets between the various provinces, and let each province then become self-sufficient in each agricultural product."

I have said before, and I say it now very distinctly that if we accept this kind of a philosophy then there isn't very much hope for rural Alberta, whether he be a small producer or a large producer, because in fact there won't be that much production to be done that we'll need to worry about.

I want to say very clearly that we reject that philosophy of marketing, that we should constrict ourselves to the question of providing for the domestic market because if we don't have a growing agriculture we don't have an expanding market, then we are in really serious trouble as far as agriculture generally is concerned.

I want to say, of course, Mr. Speaker, that we agree with the idea behind the resolution. We think it's a worthy one. I want to say to hon. Member for Wetaskwin-Leduc that there are a number of things done since September 10th to try and improve that small operator's marketing opportunity and his justice and fairness in relation to marketing boards with that. I want to suggest that the removal of the names on the hog manifest and allowing the Hog Marketing Board to withdraw hogs from the ticker tape without

9-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

notifying the packers, were two substantial steps forward which the former government refused to do, even though requested to by the marketing board and by producers generally.

In relation to the whole question of the poultry industry in Alberta and in Canada, and the marketing boards that are associated with the poultry industry, I think that in this area, and we've been looking at it very closely, we expect to be able to announce some definitive policy as the session goes along. I think that that policy will be helpful to the small producer and will make a greater marketing opportunity available to him.

However, the situation still remains that if we put in a statutory obligation that a marketing board has to reserve a certain share of the market for small producers, I want to say immediately that not only do we run into constitutional problems if we are not going to allow our markets to be available to farmers outside of the province, we can hardly ask for and continue to get the markets that we need for our agriculture produce in other provinces. This becomes particularly important, Mr. Speaker, of course in our red meat production and where 75 per cent of our red meats that are produced in Alberta are shipped outside of the province. And if you look at the number of jobs that are provided in the towns of Alberta in relation to the red meats industry, then it not only becomes an agricultural problem, it becomes a general economic problem that affects the very life blood of the entire province. And so I say to the hon. member who introduced the resolution, that perhaps he hadn't considered the constitutional effect, the question of getting back to the whole area of putting up provincial boundaries, or barriers at our provincial boundaries. I say to him very clearly that it's been our expressed desire to remove any restrictions on our provincial boundaries so that we could then, without any difficulty, ask other provinces to do the same thing. We have now asked the province of British Columbia to re-examine their entire situation in regard to eggs and poultry and to have a look at the entire method because we, too, are looking at it and we think that the boundary between British Columbia and Alberta should be a free boundary for all agricultural products, and we intend to work towards that direction.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that it has been my impression in a very short time in executive office, that the easiest thing that you can possibly do as a minister of the Crown is to write out regulations or bills restricting people from doing things, and it certainly applies in the field of agriculture. The easiest kind of legislation to bring in is something saying people can't do this, that or the other thing or restricting them in their production. Surely in an expanding province like Alberta this kind of thing should be foreign to us, and surely we should be taking the positive approach to helping our smaller producers, as I would like to suggest that we are doing just that in Alberta. When has a government in any of the western provinces in the last 50 years or since Confederation, ever made the major commitment to its rural areas that this government has made in the Speech from the Throne? Mr. Speaker, it hasn't happened.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest that if I could get the hon. members to think in the terms of not how you can restrict people from doing things, but rather the kind of procedures you can use to help them to reach that same objective, that we would be doing a service for our farmers in Alberta, and I want to suggest that we would be doing a service to the general population. So that rather than setting on more controls, we look at the whole area of the family farm, that we are dedicated to preserving and improving, and improving their income in relation to the average income of other people in the economy of the province. So I suggest, hon. members, that I would really appreciate their advice in a positive way, in things that we can do to improve that position of the family farm. I think it's negative if all we're going to do is to say we're going to

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-45

save the family farm by restricting somebody else's production, or by restricting this, that or the other thing.

I want to suggest that I think there are a number of ways in which we can do it in a positive and forceful way. I think that, as I said earlier, the whole question of credit and the availability of it to our ordinary farmers, the smaller producers, is absolutely essential. And to get away from the kind of contracts that my hon. friend for Spirit River-Pairview talked about, the simplest way to do that is to make sure that the other types of credit are available and our farmers don't have to depend on agribusiness to get that kind of credit. Because once they do, they are locked in and then we have a return to the serfdom which was very prevalent in the 18th century.

Mr. Speaker, the other positive thing that we can do, not only as a government, but I'd like to suggest as members of this legislature, is to accept the fact that we do have marketing boards and to do what we can individually, and as a government to improve their marketing ability right here in Alberta -- too often, we as consumers, and as leaders in our communities, and that's what we are, sometimes put on banquets serving imported food from outside the country, let alone outside the Province of Alberta and Canada. All of us have a stake in this marketing situation, Mr. Speaker. I've tried to impress upon the Department of Agriculture, under the reorganization that we've been going through, that every single employee of that department is involved in the marketing thing, and has to become market oriented.

I know that we're going to have, and are developing additional specialists in the mechanical things of marketing, but surely every one is interested and I would like to suggest and ask for, the co-operation of every member of this Legislature in relation to the question of marketing Alberta produce. Not only in the exotic places like Japan and Korea, but right here at home in Alberta. And there are marketing opportunities right here at home, and we'd appreciate your help in developing those markets here in Alberta.

We intend, and have done as a government, also to expand our marketing ability at home and abroad. We have taken a number of steps besides the one I mentioned in relation to the Hog Marketing Board. We are having a detailed examination of the Egg Marketing Board at this time. The egg board, of course, is being supported by the government in its surplus removal program to assure a market for the time being for the smaller producer. We are developing programs in which we hope to be able to offer our marketing opportunity to the small producer throughout Alberta for a variety of agricultural produce and we will be making those announcements as the program is developed.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to call it 5:30 and move to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the hon. minister has leave to adjourn the debate and the House is adjourned until 8:00 this evening.

[The House rose at 5:30 pm.]

* * * * *

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

9-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE
(Adjourned)

MR. FLUKER:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate which marks the opening of the 17th Legislature, may I say at the very outset that it is indeed a great privilege and honour to speak on behalf of the constituency of St. Paul and each and everyone of the people whom I represent.

This debate marks a new political era in this province, an era which marks a new approach in its administrative affairs, an era which will mark a turning point in the social, economic, and cultural attitudes of this province.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election as Speaker of this Chamber. I know your decisions will always be firm and fair, reflecting the rare qualities which you possess, knowing that you will discharge your duties, bearing in mind always the importance of preserving our system of parliamentary democracy and the necessity and desirability for full and open debate throughout our future deliberations.

I also wish to extend my warm congratulations to my friend and colleague, the hon. Member, Mr. Bill Diachuk, on his election as Deputy Speaker. I see he is not in his seat tonight.

I was indeed impressed by the remarks of the mover and seconder, the hon. Member, Mr. Peter Trynchy of Whitecourt, and the hon. Member, Mr. Cal Lee of Calgary McKnight, both of whom spoke with such sincerity and eloquence. Their contributions to this debate can only be measured as an assurance of the important contribution they will be making throughout the future deliberations of this House.

I would also like to congratulate the hon. Member, Mr. Roy Farran of Calgary North Hill on his very moving speech concerning senior citizens and the steps this government is taking to improve their lot.

On behalf of the constituents of St. Paul, I wish to convey to all the members of this Assembly, sincere greetings and best wishes. My constituency is one which is greatly entrenched in the industry of agriculture and it is primarily to this that I will be devoting the major part of my attention.

The town of St. Paul, which is the central hub, is an active and vibrant community. It is famous for many achievements, provincially, nationally, and internationally. Perhaps it is most notable for its forward and ambitious projects undertaken during Centennial Year. Many Canadian communities spent more money, but none showed such originality or made as much of an impact as St. Paul. In fact, we are so forward looking in St. Paul, that we're already in touch with the space age.

The other major communities of Elk Point, Vilna, Ashmont, Mallard, and Lindbergh enjoy equally the benefits of people with initiative, drive and enthusiasm. Now with a government that will give us a little help, our people will show you that we have more get up and go than any other community in Alberta. My constituents have made it abundantly clear to me throughout my contact with them, that one of our major challenges is the survival and indeed the growth and enchantment of our rural and smaller communities and our rural way of life.

However, these goals cannot be achieved single-handedly. There must be a government which is sympathetic and dedicated to the spirit of promoting and developing this part of our very diverse society.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-47

And it is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I welcome the government's commitment to restore prosperity to the family farm. Any dispassionate economist will tell you that Alberta has a dangerous imbalance between its densely populated cities and its almost empty rural areas. And here we are in this huge province, only one-third of which is populated and two-thirds of which is still bush, and two-thirds of the people live in cities. The reason is obvious. The economic return to the farmer is too little to make agriculture attractive. Small towns suffer if the farmer suffers, and so does all of Alberta.

So this government has a two-pronged attack: a \$50 million fund to promote industry in small towns and a \$50 million fund to restore the family farm and to provide a meaningful life to keep our young people at home. These policies will do a great deal to overcome the deterioration which was allowed to occur in large part, by the complacency of the non-sympathetic approach of the previous Social Credit administration. And that administration which grew out of the 'hungry thirties' seemed to forget that another economic depression could be a thousand times worse if all our people were on welfare in the cities.

There are a number of matters, Mr. Speaker, of specific concern which require the attention of this government, which will, I'm sure be worked out within the framework of these programs (as well as others which will be adopted in the future) and conformity with the priorities as executed in the Speech from the Throne and previously by the Premier and his cabinet colleagues. First of all, I would name the relief of the property tax of the burden of our human resource programs; secondly, the guaranteed loans for such things as breeding stock to restore prosperity to agriculture. And never, might I say, has any province had a Minister of Agriculture so full of practical ideas as the hon. Member, Mr. Hugh Horner.

Now the area which I represent is blessed with more lakes than any other similar geographic area in the province. And the attraction of fishing and hunting will see a future tourist development that will be truly one of our major secondary industries. I would ask the government to give serious consideration to the development of more small parks in the area, and to advance a fish-stocking program which would encourage other varieties of sporting fish in the area.

Mr. Speaker, the area which I represent possesses some of the finest camp grounds in Alberta. Now with official recognition of the Yellowhead Route which is just adjacent to my constituency -- it's shown a 20 per cent increase in traffic in the past year -- we will be seeing tourists moving northward in an ever-increasing number. And I must compliment my colleague Mr. Robert Dowling, the hon. Minister of Tourism, for the excellent new information centre at Lloydminster, which I am sure will be directing people northward so that they may enjoy the potential that lies waiting for them.

Number four, I would say is to improve our rural road system, and bring all rural market roads up to at least secondary standards, so that our rural people can move to their market centres without difficulties in all types of weather conditions. And I might mention here, Mr. Speaker, the road from Elk Point to Lindbergh -- the 12-mile stretch of road leading to one of the cleanest and most thriving industries in our province, the Canadian Salt Mine at Lindbergh, a plant which produces 20 per cent of all the salt produced in Canada -- an industry that contributes some \$90,000 per year in royalties to the province. The former administration rebuilt the road three times in the last 20 years, but never saw fit to hard-top it. And with the heavy traffic load, this road becomes very nearly impassable at different times of the year. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this road is of such importance that it should be number one priority in our highway paving program.

9-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this government is faced with many challenges, as we enter the second year in the decade of the 70's. And all hon. members of this Assembly are faced equally with the overall challenges within this province and within their respective constituencies. In my opinion the challenge of the St. Paul constituency is the opportunity available to develop a hub of agricultural production, processing and distribution, capable of supplying agricultural products for a growing northern economy which will develop rapidly under my government.

And it is with a feeling of humility, pride and honour that I have been given the opportunity to participate in this debate and I do hope my remarks will give hon. members an insight into the potential we have in our constituency, as well as some of the problems and matters of concern which we face at this time. I look forward with enthusiasm to these challenges, and with optimism to a fresh new approach which this government is taking in so many areas. Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in taking part in the Throne debate and would like to extend the customary congratulations to the mover and the seccnder, and to you, Mr. Speaker, on your election to the high post which you hold. I would like to congratulate you on the very excellent way you have been conducting your office. I'm sure it's been in keeping with the highest traditions of Speakers throughout the British Empire and we can all be proud of that.

I'd also like to congratulate the hon. Premier of the province, and the members on all sides of the House who were elected at the last provincial election. It's an honour to be elected by the people, irrespective of the party to which we belong, because it also carries a responsibility in our society. And I'm sure that those of us who were successful in being elected or re-elected must feel a great deal of heavy responsibility upon our shoulders. While we may be happy to be sitting in this Chamber I think we have to remember those who were not successful at the polls who also wanted to serve. I think they deserve credit too.

I'd like to say that I've enjoyed the discussions in the Throne debate and I hope that the tradition of the Throne debate will ever be a symbol of the freedom of speech found throughout the British Empire and throughout our democracy. There are those who would like to limit the Throne debate, those who think that it may be a waste of time, that it is time-consuming, and sometimes we read editorials and hear speeches to this effect. With those I do not agree at all. I think it is the one debate evolved from the Mother Parliament of England in which any member can voice the thinking of his people, irrespective of how far to the right or how far to the left that thought might be. And this is freedom of speech. We may not agree with all those who speak, but I'm sure everyone of us would fight for the right of every member to have the right to say what he thinks on behalf of the people who sent us here.

So I congratulate those who have given voice to their various thoughts in the Throne debate and no one, if he is representing the thinking of the people who elected him, has any reason to be ashamed of the points that he raises if he raises them in sincerity and with a desire to serve the people of this province and of this nation of which we are all proud to be a part.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I look at the Speech from the Throne there are some very fine things in it of which I am very proud and for which I would like to congratulate the government and those who carry office in the government. The priorities that are set out are very excellent. I don't know of anyone who would quarrel with these priorities; - the protection of human rights - this is something for

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-49

which we are proud throughout the British Empire and in Canada; the difficult circumstances of our senior citizens - this is a symbol that how far civilization goes is determined by how we look after those who are unfortunate and unable to look after themselves in their senior years or in their very, very early years; the pressures of maintaining the family farm - problems associated with agriculture, which is the very backbone of this province; the facilities needed to support handicapped children - no man ever stands taller than when he stoops to help a crippled child - someone has said, and with that I agree. And the children who cannot help themselves certainly deserve the help of all those who are a little stronger. The overdue required reforms in mental health - I have visited the mental health hospitals in this province a number of times during my tenure of office, and I never leave without a heavy burden resting on my heart and mind. What more can be done, what can be done to help the people who are having mental breakdowns and physical and mental difficulties. Certainly it's a tremendous priority.

We have no quarrel with these priorities. They are fine.

In regard to some of the other items in the Speech from the Throne with which I want to deal, I may not be quite as happy as I am with the points that I have just mentioned.

Now in regard to the administration, there is one thing I think that the people of Alberta are going to expect, and it was voiced by the last speaker, the hon. Member for St. Paul, when he said the people were expecting some prosperity to return to the family farm. When a party is elected with a policy setting out hope to those who are -- well, with very little hope or not enough hope -- then there is a terrific responsibility to see that that is followed through, and I hope that we are not going to be in the position in this province where we raise the hopes of the people of the province and then let them crash to the ground a little later on.

I have been disappointed to some degree during the Question Periods in regard to the number of answers that we get in regard to decisions. About 90 per cent, I would think, of the answers are either -- "the matter is being investigated", or "we are studying a new direction" or "we are going to set up a study". The people will go along with that for some time, and I as a member am prepared to go along with that for a while. But this can't go on too long, I would remind the hon. members of the House, because the people are not going to put their confidence on studies and investigations and new directions. They are going to base their decision on results and on performance, and decisions have to be made.

If I have a particular criticism of the hon. Premier Lougheed's government it's that it is striving so hard to be popular that it is not making any decisions, and this can't go on too long. Popularity is fine in a Queen's contest - we all love them. Popularity is fine in many other things - but not in government. Popularity comes to government because of its performance, not because it wants to be everything to everybody. And sooner or later -- and I hope it's going to be sooner -- the government is going to have to make some decisions that are not going to be popular with everybody, as was the removal of the cost of Medicare to the senior citizens. There are going to be other areas where it isn't quite so black and white and where they are going to antagonize some people by making a decision. And I think decisions are a responsibility of government. The people are elected to govern and I hope that the desire to be popular is not going to stop the government from making decisions, because decisions are essential if this province is going to move ahead.

Now there are a few other items I would like to mention in the Speech from the Throne. In connection with the family farm - I believe it's in the interest of the urban people to maintain the

9-50

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

family farm just as much as it is in the interests of the rural people. I don't agree with this 'largeness of corporations' running farms, and corporations operating many sections of land and producing thousands and maybe millions of potatoes, eggs, chickens, and turkeys and so on. Because that will invariably raise the cost of food to our urban people. I have tried to persuade urban people for many years that there is a responsibility to keep the cost of production on our farms as low as possible, because every increase on the farm is sooner or later going to be reflected in the cost of living for our urban people. That's why I oppose those who say: let's put some more taxes on farm buildings," without removing any taxes from the land that is there now. It only means one thing -- more taxes from the farm -- more costs on production, and consequently the price of food must go up.

But, Mr. Speaker, the best guarantee the people of this province and this country have of getting our food, the vitals of life, at the lowest possible price is to have hundreds and hundreds of family farms, smaller units, economic units, where the husband and the wife and the sons and the daughters are prepared to work many hours a day in order to produce, in order to bring buoyancy to their own economy and buoyancy to the rest of the economy. And I don't agree with policies that are gradually eliminating the family farms.

Now I have every respect for the Hutterian Brethren, but I don't like them eliminating a number of family farms in this province, because that's what they are doing. Certainly, you can say they are good farmers and they are, and they are good people. I would fight -- as a matter of fact I offered my life at one time to have freedom of religion in this country, as did many others here and throughout our country. We want freedom of religion and I hope we never get to the point where we want to challenge that particular item. But a communal form of life makes it almost impossible for those who offered their lives, and the sons and daughters of those who offered their lives, to save this country from communism and fascism, from competing with the type of life that's carried on in a commune. It's almost impossible for the young person to compete because of the very nature of things. Eleven family farms in the last two years have been replaced, lost, in my own constituency through Hutterian colonies going in.

Those same Hutterian colonies could have gone into land in the north that was not yet settled and established their farms without displacing family farms that are so essential for the school system and the economic life of the community. But no, they want to settle in the heart of our marketing areas where we have good roads, where we have power, where we have electricity, and where we have gas. These are the things that they require. They want to have the use of our doctors - and they have. They want to have the use of our police - and they have. They want to have the use of our lawyers - and they have that, but they don't contribute to these particular forms of life. But the point I am making now is that out of the family farms in my constituency 11 family farms have gone, and they will never be family farms again. Has any hon. member ever heard of a Hutterian colony selling land? Never. Never. It's buying land.

Even the largest corporation that would take over land in this country, eventually those people will die and the land will eventually go back to other people. But once the land becomes a commune, once it becomes part and parcel of a Hutterian colony, it's going to be tied up forever, without anything ever going to the country from inheritance tax or succession duties, or anything else in that connection. It's taken out of the family farm concept. Certainly, it will still be in production, but this is dying away with the family farm and I think this is something we have to remember. While we want these people to have every freedom that's possible -- we're so free in this country we even permit a type of system that is contrary to our way of thinking -- the communal form

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-51

of life, we even permit that -- but I think we have to consider the rights of the majority of the people in these areas too.

During the free sessional meetings that I conducted in my constituency -- some 21 of them, with people from all political parties attending -- I have been doing this for years -- the people voted very heavily in favour of some control of the Hutterian colonies. They want them to have freedom of religion and freedom of life, but they want some control over the purchase of land. And I think this is essential.

Now another thing, some of the things we do make it difficult for family farms to remain. There are quite a number of fathers who would like to transfer their land to their sons and they're unable to do it. There is not enough money in The Farm Purchase Act. The administration of the act sets up difficulties. I know one man who is 52 and he was pretty well ridiculed by a member of the Board because he wanted to retire at 52 and transfer all his belongings on his farm to his 26- or 27-year old son, because he says, "If I don't he's going to get discouraged. He has a right to raise a family of his own on his family farm and he is not content to be just the 'son of the farmer'." I think we have to take a pretty careful look and increase the possibilities for those who want to retire to pass it on to their sons and daughters and sons-in-law, or other members of the family who want the farm, because it's in our interests to make sure that those family farms stay there.

Another thing that is discouraging some farmers. For some time now, it's been impossible for a farmer to get fire insurance on a house that doesn't happen to be occupied on farm land. I'm not at all happy with this policy of insurance companies. I think that invariably, there are some farm homes that are left unoccupied and today you can't insure them. The farmer can't take the chance of losing the investment he has in that home, even though it may be empty for the time being, or for a year or two. Eventually that building will be used, and it is too good to burn down. It is too good simply to take a chance on losing it. There is too much invested in it.

I think there is another item that discourages people from continuing on the family farm. I would like to refer to some of our towns. Again, we have a pretty definite promise from the government that it is going to revitalize our towns and this has raised the hope of many people in our towns and villages and our hamlets. This is good, providing we carry it through, but I hope it is not going to be simply words, because there's no secret way of pressing a button and keeping a town alive.

There are a number of factors today that are working against towns. And I think one of the things that revitalizes any town is to have some type of industry. You can do all you want - but if there is no industry there, no employment, a town is not going to be a very viable place. There has to be industry, and I include in industry, the farm hinterland, as somebody mentioned this afternoon. That's important, farm hinterland, that provides business in the town.

To a degree one must consider the effect of removing the school population -- the school grades entirely. I am talking particularly about grades I to VI. Maybe I to IX. When these are taken out of a town there is discouragement because people don't come in with their children and shop, they go to where their children are. The children also are inclined to go to the place where they go to school, so another nail is put in the coffin of the town.

Industry is the important thing. Many people say, what can we do about getting people to come into our town? There is no difficulty if you have an industry. The population of the City of Drumheller moved up without any difficulty when the federal

9-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

government invested money there in a prison. Hundreds of people came in, and were glad to come and live in the beautiful valley. They didn't want to live there without work, and you can say the same thing for any town. We need industrial development, we need jobs in our towns if we're going to make them viable and keep them alive. There was practically no one living in the Grande Cache area at one time in my memory, until an industry was started, and now look at the beautiful town that you have -- paved streets and shopping centres and a modern hotel, air conditioned and so on, a beautiful place -- because there was an industry, and because there were jobs. So I agree that we have to bend every effort in this province to get industry into this province.

That brings me to one of the reasons we don't have industry. One of the reasons is the freight rates, the freight rates between western and eastern Canada. Today you can send rapeseed to the east in the raw material form for far less than you can send the finished product to the east. Why is that? Does it take more space? These are things about which I agree with the hon. Minister of Industry. We need decisions, and we need co-operation with the Canadian government. It is time this province did have a fair deal in connection with freight rates which are discriminatory. If we're going to have industry in Alberta the way we should have -- or western Canada, if you want to put it that way -- we're going to have to have a change in our freight rates or we'll never reach the best potential we can get.

Now for some of the things that discourage people in small towns. I have a town in my constituency where you can't get burglary insurance. You just can't buy it. It's not the fact that the price is so high, you just can't buy it. This isn't fair to merchants in that town. One merchant lost \$2,000. through break-ins, and he is not getting a satisfactory deal. And just look at this! In January a man was caught for breaking-in and he was jailed. In July there was another break-in where no one was caught. In November, three were sent to jail, one for two years. This is the same one who broke out in January. He is out again, and he breaks in again. In addition the Magistrate orders a \$100 restitution. However, the case was appealed and the Appeal Court threw out the case and said he didn't have to pay restitution. In February, the market was broken into again, the same ringleader was given six months and he was out again inside of one month. Who is it who is taking the brunt? The merchant lost \$2,000. The only way he can get it is by increasing the price of the food. Well I think we need some protection for merchants in our towns.

Here is another item that our towns need. People put value on land. Land is an important item. In one of the towns in my constituency we need another sub-division. People just can't afford to buy the high-priced land, the only land that is left, and they need some government assistance to get another sub-division and some understanding and some action from the planning people as well -- so that they can sell lots at a reasonable price, so the sons and daughters who live there, who were born and raised there, who want to live there, can buy a lot at a reasonable price. Yes, there are a lot of things we can do, but industry is probably the main item.

I'd like to deal now for a moment or so with the matter of The Police Act. I don't particularly like The Police Act. I supported The Police Act in this Legislature last year because I think it is necessary to try to control the Mafia in this country. I don't think we should be encouraging the Mafia to move into Canada. According to our top police officers in this country, they're already moving in, and I don't think we want to wait until we get to the condition of some parts of the United States before we start taking action about the Mafia. I think we need a co-ordinated effort by every police force right across this whole country.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-63

However, I don't agree with the idea of a town of 1,300 being told it has to have the RCMP. I have every respect for the RCMP, but many towns want their own police force, and then again, if they have to take the RCMP or lose the government grant for their own police force at 1,300, what do they do when they have 1,550? Then must they start all over again? I think there should be a change made in The Police Act, whereby a town that's over 1,000 population can have a chance to discuss this matter with the hon. Attorney General, with the Police Commission and work out some proper program, so there's not going to be a loss of investment and a heavy expenditure thrown on the people.

Another thing that I disagree with in The Police Act and with the Police Commission, and this is probably the amendment to the regulation, and that is that a policeman cannot carry side arms. Why is it that we expect our police officers to keep peace, to keep order in this country, when we won't even let them carry side arms? The thugs carry side arms. They have to deal with people who have guns in their cars. And we say it doesn't matter how well trained you are. I know a policeman who has had nine years excellent training. Now he's not permitted to carry side arms. He's dealing with thugs near one of the metropolitan areas of this city. The RCMP in the same town carry side arms, and properly so. But we say to this policeman, you can't do it. One of these days we're going to have one of our men killed by some thug, because he can't protect himself. We need to have some realistic thinking in regard to this matter of side arms.

In connection with my constituency too, I'd like to say that along with the towns, villages, and hamlets, all of which have problems that need solutions, the Blackfoot Indians are my constituents. I would like to say that the Blackfoot Indians are making a bold attempt to fit themselves into white man's civilization. Their young people who go to the composite high school in Drumheller and elsewhere are excellent young men and excellent young women. They will make just as good Canadians as people from any other racial origin. Many of the Blackfoot Indians, like other Indian tribes, the older people, will have difficulty adjusting themselves to our way of life. They need understanding. I'd like to congratulate the Blackfoot Indians for re-establishing the buffalo industry in that area which is doing very, very well.

Would you tell me how much time I have, Mr. Speaker? I forgot to look at the clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

You have roughly about eight to ten minutes.

MR. TAYLOR:

I must leave a lot of my items then until the Budget Debate. And now I'd like to deal with one other item and that is one that is found in the Speech from the Throne on the bottom of page 3 in connection with legislative committees, and the item found on the bottom of page 5 and the top of page six in connection with MLA task forces.

To start with, I'd like to say that this side of the House agrees that MLA's should have an opportunity to work to their maximum degree. We are not opposed to that at all. We think MLA's should be spending a lot of time at their work, and spending full time. But we cannot agree with the payment of task committees because we consider they are simply caucus committees. In the first place, we say the task committee is purely a caucus committee. Every government has caucus committees. We had them and they did a lot of work. The Liberal government in Ottawa has them; the New Democratic party in Saskatchewan has them; every government has caucus committees. But

9-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

this is the only government that has presumed to pay those caucus committees out of public funds. With that we quarrel. We do not think this is right at all. In the first place, these caucus committees are carrying out research for the government and in the hon. Premier's own words the other day, they're going to help formulate government policy. Well, of course that is so, and we have no objection to these caucus committees. We have caucus committees too. We don't get paid for them and we're not asking for pay. We think the caucus committees on that side should be doing the work under the indemnity which they're already being paid.

A caucus committee versus a legislative committee? A caucus committee represents one side of the story. The Conservative party received 46 per cent of the votes of the province. What about the other 54 per cent? Those people need representation, too. The whole basis of parliamentary thinking for legislative committees is that committees be made up of members based on the number of seats each party has. That is a fair way. The government in that way always has a majority.

I say this is contrary to The Legislative Assembly Act. The Legislative Assembly Act doesn't talk about Conservative members or Social Credit members or Liberal members or New Democratic members. They are members. And the whole spirit of The Legislative Assembly Act is based on members of the Assembly and the equality of members. Members are equal -- equal as MLA's. Now certainly the hon. Premier of the province has the right to name as many people to a cabinet and as many people as he likes as Ministers without Portfolio, but as to the balance -- it doesn't matter whether they call them second layer, third layer or not -- they are still MLA's, just the same as the MLA's are on this side of the House. Representative government is based on that very point.

I suggest with regard to caucus committees, that when the government pays them out of public funds, it is showing contempt for the Legislature. For instance, how do you decide whether you have a caucus committee, or a legislative committee? How do you decide between legislative committees that are being appointed under this act and caucus committees -- task forces? I have been trying to check to see what the difference is. It's almost impossible to see the difference.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I hope this isn't so, but it might appear that this might be a device through which to raise the indemnity of the members. I hope we're not going to go around the mulberry bush in trying to get an increase for the members of the Legislature in an indirect way. Are we waiting for people to say, as one of our dailies said the other day? "If they are not getting enough, raise their indemnity". If we're going to, a year from now, rescind this Order in Council, in which there is payment made to task committees of the Conservative party only, and then say we'll increase the wages of everybody -- this is not fair to the people of the province. If the government wants to raise their wages, then they should do it directly and not in any indirect way. If this is a forecast of an increase of indemnity, again it is not right. We think that Order in Council should be scrapped now and scrapped right away, because it is a misuse of public money. We are paid, and the back-benchers of the Conservative party are paid an indemnity. We knew what it was before we stood for election, and that is what an MLA should be paid, unless he is appointed by the Legislature, under The Legislative Assembly Act, and I claim that Section 14 of The Legislative Assembly Act refers to members, and that authority given to the cabinet was to carry out the appointment of committees that had been approved by the Legislature, not that had been set up on one side of the House only.

The caucus committees are carrying out Progressive Conservative party research and this could destroy the whole basis of our type of government if they are paid out of public money for this work.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-55

As one of The Journal writers wrote in his column in the paper the other day, that it is a "well-intentioned error," but he went on to say that the whole thing might be construed to do away with opposition members. Well, if you don't want an opposition member, if we don't want opposition, the people of the province can decide that. But if they elect opposition members, those members have to have the same equality as any other MLA, and I would beseech the hon. Premier of this province not to make a mockery of representative government by treating some MLA's, the back-benchers of the Conservative party, differently from the MLA's of the New Democratic party and the Social Credit party. We don't want payment for the work we do as MLAs in our caucus committees. We're not asking for it, and we would refuse to take it and we object to this misuse of public money in connection with this particular item.

Mr. Speaker, in view of what I've said, I would like at this time to move an amendment to the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. And I move, therefore, seconded by the hon. Member for Fort Saskatchewan, Dr. Buck, that the following words be added to the said address:

We respectfully submit to His Honour that this Assembly regrets the action of the Alberta Government in misusing public money to pay government task forces which are nothing more or less than Conservative party caucus committees.

MR. SPEAKER:

Dr. Buck.

DR. BUCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, hon. member. In rising to speak on this debate, Mr. Speaker, I do it with great feeling, because I feel it is a matter of great principle that has been brought up to the members of this House this evening. But I shall be reserving some of my comments for later in my speech. In speaking, Mr. Speaker, I shall be speaking to the motion and the amendment as is my privilege. And in spite of what was said in the Conservative cradle, The Edmonton Journal, the other day about the Throne Speech being around and around, telling everybody what's in your constituency, and everything except how you make -- I believe it was -- jelly, I feel it is a duty of every new member to hear from the other new members and the sitting members at least once in four years the extent of your constituency, the problems, the industries and all related matters. In responding to that duty, Mr. Speaker, I would like to tell you very briefly that my constituency, the constituency of Clover Bar, surrounds the eastern proximity of the city of Edmonton. It used to include the largest hamlet in the world, Sherwood Park, but that is now a new seat represented very capably by the hon. member, Mr. Ashton.

I still have a few more pleasant words to say about the hon. member. The industrial complex which is in the county of Strathcona is included in that constituency, the town of Fort Saskatchewan, with its large refinery of Sherritt Gordon, refining nickel which is brought down from northern Manitoba. As well it has a large fertilizer complex with investment of approximately \$100 million and employing between 1,200 and 1,400 people. We have the Dow Chemical plant, Inland Chemical producing sulfuric acid, Johns Manville plant producing fibre-glass products, a brand new Chevron plant, a liquid carbonic plant, Thiopet and the provincial government institution, the provincial jail. I shall be speaking about this a little later.

Going east is the Lamont area which is one of the original Ukrainian settlements, a rich agricultural area, and a model hospital complex, consisting of an active treatment hospital, auxiliary hospital, nursing home and senior citizens' home. Going further

9-56

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

south includes the agricultural area of Tofield, Fingman, Hay Lakes, New Sarepta -- these are some of the communities in the area. They are basically agricultural, so all the products or all the problems that people have in agricultural areas also apply to mine.

I am proud to have an agricultural background so that I know the problems of agriculture just as well as all the other members who represent agricultural constituencies. I am very pleased to see that the hon. Minister of Agriculture is trying to revolutionize his department. I'll be looking forward to the show when he walks on water, because according to all the other members on the other side of the House, he is going to be walking on water, and I truly and sincerely wish him the best of luck.

In the Tofield area we have a game preserve with which the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests is well acquainted -- the Beaver Hill Lakes area, and as far as I can ascertain, hon. minister, the lure crop project that was established by the previous government worked out very, very well. I did get one complaint -- some of the goose hunter said that the helicopter that you had flying around, hon. minister, seemed to be scaring the goose shoots -- so if you can rectify that they will be very happy. I will have a few words of wisdom for you later, sir.

Another area that is unique in my constituency is Al Oeming's game farm, which is world-renowned and which I am proud to have in my constituency. This is a project that was developed by free enterprise because of the enthusiasm and the dedication of one man and one woman, and I feel that this is a credit to this man and this woman, and a credit to Alberta.

I have a federal park, Elk Island National Park, which is basically a habitat park and has not been developed, and I hope that it stays that way. The provincial park of Miquelon is in my constituency -- most of it -- it borders on the constituency of the hon. Member for Camrose, so any problems that arise in that area I am sure that we can both help solve.

The hon. Minister of Highways is away this evening, but I am sure the hon. Member for Camrose will try to ascertain if the program of 'Roads to Parks' will be carried on, as was established by the previous government, and I do hope it will be, because there are areas -- we have started programs and I believe, hon. members, that regardless of which side of the House you sit on -- programs that are good should be continued. It is quite obvious that the hon. Premier and members on that side of the House did not think that some programs were good, and in this so-called 'Concern for People' they removed the Human Resources Council which I think was certainly detrimental to the good of the people of this province. I believe it had a job to do. I believe it was doing a good job. But that is their problem. That is their decision, and I hope it is for the better of the people of this province.

I shall be mentioning Cooking Lake later. The hon. Minister of the Environment will, I am sure, be glad to hear about that.

Now in speaking on the Throne Debate, Mr. Speaker, it's not what it contains that bothers me -- it's what it didn't contain. Because the 'now' government was supposed to provide new directions. They gave us 199 promises, but now we find these 199 promises have changed the new directions. 'Now' is 'when' and I think the cartoonist who came up with that caption had a very, very valid reason for saying 'when', because I have to agree with my socialist friend from the NDP to the left, and say even Manitoba and Saskatchewan when they came in late in the year had a fall sitting. But our Conservative friends said, "Oh, we're not ready." I know they're not ready, because they had this thing sprung on them -- they didn't even think they were

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-57

going to win -- so how can you be ready if you don't think you're going to win?

But in these 199 promises we have 'new directions', we have 'studies', we have 'reviews'. I would like to know, what happened when the hon. leader of the party opposite said that we were going to have the school portion of our taxes removed from real property -- and now suddenly we are going to review it. Mr. Speaker, I would hazard a guess and say that this is going to be 'reviewed' until they call a snap election in 1974 -- because I don't think they ever had any intention of implementing this policy, Mr. Speaker. I think they were just genuinely trying to mislead the voters of this province when they made a statement like that.

Mr. Speaker, when we have these new directions, I would like to see these new directions going ahead -- not backwards -- not up for more review. We can certainly give them a little more time, because after all, they do have a difficult job trying to come up to what the previous government had set for them -- a high standard of attainment that they would have to try and come up with. And I realize this takes a little bit of time and we are going to give them a little bit more time. But the people of the province are starting to ask questions. And as a matter of fact, the act over there reminds me a little bit of a Broadway play -- 'General Doolittle and his Donothings' -- because that is exactly what they have done. They've done nothing. And Mr. Speaker, the people of the province are starting to ask "why?" and they are starting to ask "when?". I believe it is our duty as Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition to get this government moving.

We have a small problem, and I don't admire the problem that the hon. Minister of Telephones has, because when the hon. leader of the government said that we are going to let Edmonton extend to its natural boundaries, you suddenly find yourself in the very embarrassing situation of forming the government and having to go through with these policies -- the cheese becomes a little more binding, Mr. Speaker, and you have to make decisions that will satisfy the rest of the people of this province.

We don't hear too much from the hon. members representing the Edmonton city ridings and we should hear something from them, Mr. Speaker, and I'm looking forward to hearing their views on this matter. Mind you, I don't know how long this next mediation report is going to take, because they didn't like the recommendations of the first one that told them the only way to solve the problem was to buy out Edmonton Telephones. We want to hear some of these answers from the hon. members across.

We also would like to have these full bargaining rights for the people who live in my constituency and who work in the provincial jail, because these things were promised. They were promised in a bill. If that's not misleading, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what misleading is.

We have a new Bill of Rights, we are proposing a new Bill of Rights, then all of a sudden we have censorship. This seems very incongruous to me. I sat and listened with disbelief when the question came up. Is this in direct contradiction to what this all-encompassing Bill of Rights is supposed to represent? And when you've been taken in like this, Mr. Speaker, you start wondering, well, are we going to get these new directions? What type of a government is it that we are going to have to put up with -- only for four years, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad of that.

I certainly felt very, very, deeply for the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, Mr. Farran, when he was a little bit embarrassed when they wouldn't take the top off the municipal assistance of \$38 million. He was quite embarrassed and I was very embarrassed for the

9-58

ALBEPTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

hon. member, because when the promises had been made they brought a bill in, they were going to remove it. Then they fumbled around a little bit and to save the hon. member more embarrassment the hon. Premier goes ahead and says; "Fellows, we'll be good guys, we'll give you an extra \$4 million." And he doesn't even tell the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. So I would like to see these hon. gentlemen get together. This is supposed to be a big team; this is supposed to be leadership. Let's see that leadership; let's see that organization, so that the people of the province can see this leadership and organization and these new directions, because Mr. Speaker, I think these new directions are backwards. It's not a Progressive Conservative government -- it is a regressive Conservative government.

No wonder, Mr. Speaker, the Civil Service feel uneasy, when the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests says "We've got too many of them we should turf a few out". And then when they say: "is this government policy?" he says, "Oh no, this is my own personal opinion." Well I wish that they would get together and find out what is government policy and what is personal opinion. But then when you hear a second member of the front bench say that, now there is confusion and I can understand the confusion, Mr. Speaker, because when you can only get 22 of them in the front bench and you promised 49 - you have a problem - you have a very, very big problem.

But, Mr. Speaker, they tried to solve this problem. They tried to solve this problem by saying: "Look fellows, we'll dip into the cookie jar." And the way we'll dip into the cookie jar, Mr. Speaker is this way; they have set up caucus committees, task forces. I feel very, very strongly about this matter, Mr. Speaker. It is a very small point to them, but to me and the people of this province it is a very big point. It is a matter of principle and it does not matter if it's only five dollars, \$5000, or \$5,000,000 the principle is still the same, Mr. Speaker. It's a misuse of public funds.

I have had the privilege of sitting on several legislative committees, Mr. Speaker, when legislative committees meant something. Why we even had one legislative committee that had Social Creditors, Conservatives and a Liberal on it, Mr. Speaker. Now we lost the Liberal because he went to the Tory party, but, I mean, you can't have everything. But that's when we had committees that were looking at both sides of the picture, not caucus committees, Mr. Speaker, who are looking at the Conservative or the Tory side of the picture. This is open government? This I say, is closed government. It is the direct opposite of what the hon. members across have been trying to tell the people of this province, when in their righteous indignation they say they are going to have open government. I would like to see that government open to everybody, Mr. Speaker, not just to the Tory party. All I can see, Mr. Speaker, is that this is going to be government of the people, by the Tories, for the Tories, Mr. Speaker, not for the good of the people of this province. And I shall stand in my place, Mr. Speaker, and I shall fight in this House. And I say to the hon. Premier that he can save a lot of embarrassment; I think he can uphold a very, very sacred principle if he would rescind this order.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the record some of the members who are on this task force, and the Order in Council, dated February 16, 1972, O.C. 219/72, and the hon. members can read this, so I'll put in this one section.

"A member of a task force shall be reimbursed for reasonable disbursements actually expended while engaged in business of the task force, for subsistence and accommodation, for travel other than a private automobile, or an allowance of 11 cents per mile for every mile travelled by private automobile. All expenditures on behalf of task forces shall be paid out of Appropriation 1902, subject to approval by the Chairman."

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-59

Mr. Speaker, in reading through this I find that the MLA Task Force on Agriculture is: Co-chairman, Marvin Moore, Co-chairman, James Miller; Gordon Stromberg, Rudolph Zander, John Batiuk, Allison Fluker, Frank Appleby, Donald Hansen, William Purdy, Leslie Young -- they had better save themselves because it's a long list Mr. Speaker, and they'll be played out -- Julian Koziak, Ron Gitter, Catherine Chichak, Jack Cooksen.

Mr. Speaker, in order to help cut further with incidental expenses, there is an MLA Task Force on Decentralization of Government Operations. Allison Fluker is the chairman, Donald Hansen is on this one, James Miller, Marvin Moore, Gordon Stromberg and Frank Appleby.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there must be another Order in Council because they have left out the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, Roy Farran, but there must be another one because I believe he is on some task force on taxation, and so it goes, but in reading through this list, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be something missing. We don't see the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, nor any of the hon. members from this side of the House, the Social Credit Party. Mr. Speaker, this is nothing but a political tool, and I say if the Tories are going to have their members running around the country gathering information for their Tory caucus I suggest that they get it out of the funds from Bay Street in Toronto, because that's what they are doing, they are gathering this information for their own use. And if they want it for their own use -- they say it's for the betterment of the people of this province -- I disagree, I disagree with the principle. I say that if they are going to do that they can come up with their own money because I don't want it taken out of my pocket because I am a taxpayer of this province, and I object very strenuously, Mr. Speaker.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members across the way are fine fellows. We don't disagree with that, but I don't agree with people who are dipping into public funds.

Now, they may be close within the light of the law, but it is immoral; Mr. Speaker, I say the morality is wrong because the intent is wrong. And I would like to say once again to the hon. Premier, I have great respect for the hon. Premier because he is the leader of the people of this province, and I would say to him that if he wants to do this with honour, we'd be very glad if he'd withdraw the task forces and withdraw the Order in Council. I thank you, Mr. Speaker, for being able to address this Assembly.

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, may I now speak or did you maybe want to take a vote on the amendment? This is the first kind of amendment that I've ever heard in my life.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please continue with the debate.

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, sir, I rise to speak on behalf of the Vegreville constituency which I represent. The constituency of Vegreville located east of Edmonton, comprises approximately 2,400 square miles; it is a predominantly rural constituency, situated in the rich agricultural region. It is a region that has, over the past number of years, been distinguished several times by the selection of master farm family awards. The urban areas of my constituency are small villages to the largest centre a town with a population of 4,000.

9-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

Mr. Speaker, as the past speakers have, I would also like to congratulate you on behalf of my constituency, on being the unanimous choice for your high office. I believe that your abilities and capabilities warranted this selection. I would like to congratulate all the members of the Legislature, both on this side, and on the other, for being elected on August 30th. You are the people who have been selected to represent your constituencies and at the same time as a Legislature to try to make Alberta a better and happier province to live in.

I must congratulate and also commend our hon. Premier. He has also won an election, and I believe because of his appeal to the people of this province, many of us, if not all of us, had much easier sailing during the campaign. I also would like to commend him on one particular issue that I believe is going to make history. In 1965 the Conservative party in Alberta was almost a dead issue. Yet, within six years, he was able to revitalize the party and form a government of it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend all those who have already made their maiden speeches or debates on the Speech from the Throne. I have found most of the presentations informative; there were a few that were amusing, and a few that were confusing. I was indeed dismayed to hear the hon. Members for Drumheller and Clover Bar today, and the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen yesterday, be so concerned about the remuneration that was paid to those on the task force. There are several reasons. There is no indemnity paid for that; it is just mere expenses and after what happened last September 9th, when the government that had set guidelines of 6 per cent for the teaching staff in Alberta raised their Deputy Ministers by 35 per cent, these task forces were set up, so that we'll be able to save some of that money to pay for those expenses. The reason for the task forces is that this is a team of 48, and the elected people are going to be working for those who elected them. Furthermore, when you look at the payments that will be made to these task forces which have replaced the commissions that have been paid by the previous government, with allotment of a quarter of a million or half a million for each particular commission, there is going to be a considerable saving to this government.

As I have mentioned, these speech presentations were indeed very gratifying. When the hon. member for Calgary Mountain View spoke yesterday, his presentation attracted me very much. As he continued to speak, I kept thinking of an incident that happened in one of the churchyards here in Edmonton a couple of years ago. The parishioners of that church had the habit, when they left the church, instead of going home, they gathered in the churchyard to chat with their friends, their neighbours, their acquaintances, and on this particular Sunday it was no different than any other. While they were chatting, the minister too, after he unrobed himself, came and joined the group. While they were conversing, the minister said to the group he was with: "how did you like my sermon this morning?" One of the ladies said "It wasn't bad Reverend, but it did remind me of a steer with real long horns, a point here, a point there, and lots of bull in between."

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Vegreville constituency over the last number of years have become increasingly disgruntled with their government. Dissatisfaction was limited not only to the main concern of agriculture, but it was expressed in other areas as well. My many years in the public service as a school trustee and municipal councillor, have made me aware of the dissatisfaction of the people and more often than not, I agreed with them. Due to my position, I was made aware of the discrepancies and injustices prevalent in the normal functioning of the previous government and that is why I sought office on the provincial level, so I could express my views against the government's deceitful and misleading tactics and practices, particularly in the Department of Highways.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-61

Mr. Speaker, when one considers that ours is an increasingly mobile society, we must consider the condition of our roadways as of prime concern. I would like to draw the attention of this House to Highway 16 east. As part of the Yellowhead Route, this highway is considered as one of the busiest, but it can also be considered as one of the most dangerous. I would refer to a section between Mundare and Vegreville where the road is narrow; it has no shoulders, it has sharp curves, and extremely deep ditches. Mishap after mishap, fatality after fatality -- the condition of this road has been critical for a dozen years, and yet the only action that has been taken on it is that it has been surveyed for improvement, and every so often the pegs have been exchanged for new ones, to show an appearance of a bustling activity. Yet to date, there has been nothing accomplished. You may wonder why, Mr. Speaker. It is the common knowledge of the people of that area that the road was going to be rerouted, even though opposed by the entire area. It was said that the road would not be routed with the popular will of the people and residents were told that if opposition continued, there would be no improvement and this is what has materialized.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that when a major highway is going to affect the entire life of a community, then the people of that community should be given a chance to voice their opinions and concerns. I think it is folly that an entire town is going to suffer and be disgruntled just because one particular person is going to insist that his advice be followed to the exclusion of advice from all others.

Mr. Speaker, even of more concern to my constituency is the grid road system. Back in 1966, the hon. Minister of Highways had directed all the municipal districts and counties in this province to form study areas for the sole purpose of establishing the need and the location of a grid road system, otherwise known as a network of major secondary roads. After this had been done with an expenditure to the municipal districts and counties of nearly half a million dollars, this plan lay dormant for the last five years. Until last year, the government made an allocation of \$8 million towards the grid road system.

Mr. Speaker, back in 1966 the approximate cost of a grid road system in Alberta was slightly over \$400 million. Now, if \$8 million is going to be an annual allocation, I suggest that it's going to take over 50 years for a grid road system to materialize in this province. I wonder how many members in this House would be able to hold out that long to enjoy a grid road system in Alberta. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there never would be a grid road system on a piecemeal job such as that. I believe that if this government sees the need of a grid road system, then every effort should be made that this be acquired, not in 50 or 60 years, but in the minimum length of time, even if it means the financing of it over the next 15 or 20 years. This way, the people that are going to be paying for it are at least going to have a chance to benefit from it to some extent.

I would also like to direct your attention, the distrust of the people in the constituencies northeast of here towards their previous government. Back in 1970, the Department of Highways had announced its intentions to build a bridge to replace the Pagan Ferry. After there was a considerable amount of controversy, the hon. Minister of Highways called a public meeting for Smoky Lake, for the sole purpose of receiving petitions and briefs and hearing suggestions as to where the location of the bridge should be. Several hundred people attended that meeting in Smoky Lake. However, very shortly after, it was discovered that four days prior to this public meeting the Department of Highways had the County of Lamont heavy equipment working at the place selected for the bridge and where it is being built at present -- working on the approaches. This shows that the selection was made before that meeting. I think that when the hon. minister said that the choice of the location of

9-62

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

the bridge will be the people's decision, I think he spoke well, only he omitted telling which people's decision.

Mr. Speaker, it is situations such as this that have aroused the legacy of distrust of the people towards their government. The people at present are viewing their government with suspicion and extreme caution. This is the legacy of distrust the present government has inherited, and we must dispel it quickly if we are to regain the cooperation and confidence of the people of this province in this legislation -- in order to provide a more meaningful, responsive and helpful government.

I might also mention a contingency grant road in the province there in the county of Lamont which was started back in 1964 and to those of you who may not be aware what a contingency grant road is, the previous government had been making an allocation (and for the last three years it was \$50,000 to each municipal district and county) for the building up of a main road. And as long as that \$50,000 lasted the construction carried on, whether it was a mile or two or six miles. The County Council of Lamont had wished that they could get a contract such as this. They saw the hardships that the farmers were facing, so they felt that if they could acquire a contract like this, they could maybe make a few dollars and reduce the mill rate by one or two. The County Secretary and myself as County Reeve, had been delegated to go to the Department of Highways with the hope of acquiring this contract. However, our mission was fruitless and discouraging. The district engineer told us that we should not be going into any business like this; that our equipment was far too old, and several other things. This discouraged our council, and we never again tried or looked for a contract such as this. However, that same year, upon investigation, I found that the county just directly south of us had received a contract from the government and for \$50,000 they built four miles; they gravelled it and they had \$9,000 left. In the county of Lamont, the contractor that built it built two miles of road and gravelled it, comparable road that the county otherwise did. So it shows you that there is enough reason to be suspicious.

However, it is worthy to note how inconsistent the policy of the previous government has been, when one county could receive such contracts and others couldn't. It would also be worthy to note, Mr. Speaker, that when the County Secretary and myself as the County Reeve, approached the District Engineer, the reception that we got from him was not fit for a dog. I might say that this particular person still holds that position, so it clearly shows what kind of reception the previous administration were affording, and the treatment they were giving the people of this province. I still know that there are others who feel the same superiority and I would only hope that when the Provincial Treasurer is bringing down his budget there will be a comparable amount for housecleaning materials!

Mr. Speaker, may I indirectly deal with the problems of roadways and two other related issues. One is insurance rates which are considerably higher for young men under the age of 25. We are well aware that these young people are using our highways more than ever before and we are also aware that these young people are more knowledgeable about driving conditions. Some of them may be just starting on a career of their own, some of them may be completing an education, and some of them may be starting a household of their own. These are the young people who can ill afford the higher insurance rates, yet the insurance companies are discriminating against them.

I believe that the rates of insurance for the young men under 25 should not be any higher and should only be increased when their proven negligence results in accidents.

Another issue that I would like to bring up is the suspension of a driver's licence for traffic violations, particularly suspension of

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-63

licences for drinking violations. I know this is in the Criminal Code. However, there is a concern on the provincial level because I am aware that many people are dependent on their vehicle to maintain a livelihood, and the suspension of their licence would definitely disrupt that livelihood and force these people to social assistance or welfare. Thus the people of the province and the government would be saddled with an extra burden. I suggest that if people are being charged with this, perhaps they should have their drivers licence limited. The suspension should be limited so that they may use their vehicle for work. This way they would be punished if they could not use it for pleasure. This way they would be able to maintain a livelihood and at the same time, not rely on the already overtaxed government social assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the major concern of my constituency is still in the area of agriculture. Over the past years the farmers have been facing increasingly difficult times and many of them have been forced to leave their land and go into the urban centres to look for employment. Along with them, many businessmen from the smaller areas have also been forced to go along with the farmer. If one would only look, or spend an afternoon driving through the countryside one could see to what extent farm abandonment has reached.

One of the main reasons for the plight of the small farmer is the failure of the marketing boards, and through them the failure of the former provincial government to create markets for the disposal of the produce of the smaller farmer. These boards have failed to stop or curb the overproduction of large egg farms or hog ranches. Yet it is these large operations not only within our province, but outside the province, that have flooded the Alberta market and have made it virtually impossible for the small farmer to sell his produce. For that reason he has had to disband his small scale operation. Yet it was this very small scale production that served to tide the farmer and his family over the hard times when the crops were poor or perhaps couldn't be sold. And now, even that has been taken away from them. No wonder they have to leave and move into the urban centres.

I believe that the high-handed action of the previous government has not served to create confidence in the rural community. I know for a fact that district agricultural offices throughout the province have served the farmers well, and many times have assisted in various facets of farming. Last year the town of Two Hills was notified that a new district agricultural office was to be built. When the townspeople, consisting of the Town Council and the Chamber of Commerce, saw that this building was going to be located in a disadvantageous location they made representation to the official responsible, and they were bluntly told that if they didn't like the location they could get by without the building. There was no further representation.

Many times the farmers have to pay considerably more for services, and I would refer to a section of The Municipal Act which forbids rental of municipal machinery to farmers even if it is standing idle. Yet these farmers through taxes have paid for that machinery. I know of a particular incident right within my home area where the equipment was standing idle because of a rain. A farmer a quarter of a mile away had requested the use of a bulldozer to back-fill a basement around a house he was building. He would have needed that machine for half an hour, and at government rates it might have cost him ten or twelve dollars. The road foreman could not go just because of the stipulations in The Municipal Act. This particular farmer had to hire a construction outfit 27 miles away. They brought the machine by lowbed, and they billed him \$80. This is just one example of how many times the farmer pays extra for services which could be alleviated. And you wonder why the farmer is so deeply in debt.

9-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

I would like to mention the assessment. Here again I believe that there is discrimination. Over a year ago the government or legislation had provided that summer villages -- the owners of summer cottages -- be exempt from a portion of their tax, which is two-thirds of their tax, because these summer villages are used only one quarter of the year. I don't oppose the idea too much if someone has a cottage or a house along the lake front where he can take his family occasionally, but I do when you see that these aren't houses or cottages; some of these people have mansions worth \$20,000 and \$30,000. If they can afford that I think they should be able to afford to pay their full tax. Otherwise I would go along that they be exempt, but maybe the farmer too should be given a concession. He seeds his land in the middle of May; he reaps his crops by the middle of September. The following eight months his land stands under four feet of snow. Maybe he, too, should pay only a portion of his tax.

Mr. Speaker, we all enjoy favourable weather conditions. Warm and moist weather makes our crops grow, the grass grow, pastures grow. However, it is these favourable weather conditions that sometimes create hazards, and I want to draw to your attention something right within my constituency in the Bruce area two years ago when a tornado hit. Many of the farmers suffered extensive damage. Some of them suffered a total loss. Yet the government assistance was non-existent because the government felt that there was no necessity for assistance. Now I just wonder why these farmers have to be singled out and suffer under weather conditions over which they had no control.

Along with this I would like to call attention to the crop insurance policy which aims at reducing benefits to farmers if it is felt that their yields are lower, due to mismanagement. With that I can go along. However, in this particular area of Bruce there was a tornado followed by hail the following year and again by a frost. These people had a reduction in their benefits, and the policy even had a provision whereby after three years of benefits they could be banned from subscribing to insurance. I think this is unfair, and that this government should look to reviewing the crop insurance and trying to make it much more fair to the people.

Just the other day the hon. Member for Highwood mentioned that almost all the people in Alberta have telephones. Well, there are many more because I think on the program this year 9,000 will be getting rural telephones. I can agree that the communication process in this province has been enhanced. However, a time has come when telephone service must be improved, and here again I have to refer to the rural areas where many of the rural people because of the boundaries set in, must pay long distance telephone tolls to phone to their neighbour across the road.

I believe that telephone boundaries should be done away with and the area exchange should be used. This way anybody in one telephone exchange could, without paying long distance tolls, use the exchange bording his own, without any extra cost. This way it could be of much more advantage to all of them, and I'm sure that even if there would be an increase of half a dollar to a dollar a month per subscriber in Alberta, it would be well worth it.

I know we all realize that our telephone rates in the province have been and still are low in comparison with other areas. However, everybody doesn't feel about it that way because just recently a Texan was visiting in Edmonton and he wanted to phone home so he went to the AGT information desk and asked the receptionist how much it would cost to phone home. And after she looked on the schedule she said, "\$3.65." This Texan said, "Oh my God, \$3.65 that's a lot of money. Back home in Texas for half a dollar you could phone all the way to hell and back." The receptionist said, "Yes, but that's a local call".

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-65

Mr. Speaker, another area of vital concern to us, and to me as a rural representative, is that of education. The increased demands on our schools have created difficulties and problems for us in many areas. The school foundation program which had been set up to assist in the financing of education over a decade ago, has not served us properly over the past few years. While tax allocations have been the same, the grants coming back to our schools have been smaller because they have been distributed in proportion to the school population. And since there has been a relatively steady decline in the rural population, this means that we are receiving less, yet are expected to improve our educational facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it should be a basic ideal of the 'now' government that all children, regardless of where they live, should have equal opportunities to develop their capacities, even though it is generally agreed that children coming from the rural areas suffer set-backs because they do not have the materials that children in the large urban areas have. There are indications that there are many brilliant young students coming from the rural areas, yet their talents may not be recognized or developed as readily as they would be if they were in a city school, and I believe that the parents in rural Alberta must have the assurance of wide educational opportunities for their children.

Mr. Speaker, one of our platform priorities was to remove that portion of the education tax from the residential property tax. This has been received with approval and is looked upon with keen anticipation. I believe that some segments of the population have already fulfilled this obligation of paying for education, particularly the senior citizens. They have paid, not only the education for one generation, but for two generations, and some of them are on the way to paying the cost of the third generation. These are the people who maybe find it hard to exist on their life savings or on their pensions without being asked to pay additional tax for education. Since there are many senior citizens in my constituency, I am sure that this will be accepted well, and will be a benefit to many.

Another two issues that I would like to bring out, that have been brought to me on numerous occasions, are a few of the sections in the Municipal Election Act. Section 10 of the Municipal Election Act provides for anyone who has been resident in a municipality for one year, regardless whether he has ever paid taxes or not, to be eligible to run for council. Yet Section 11 signifies that if anybody is in arrears of \$50.00 or more he is disqualified as a candidate. I think that this is unduly harsh. Somebody may have been paying taxes for many years, but because of some difficulty is disqualified from running. I think that some of these people may make good councillors and I believe that being a taxpayer he would have a vested interest and maybe would make a better councillor than one who is not a taxpayer.

Another issue I want to draw to your attention is a situation that arose in the town of Holden this past year, where the mayor and three of the councillors were unseated from office due to a conflict of interest. These are the men that had borrowed money from the local bank and reloaned it to the town for an addition to their recreation centre. And knowing my constituency as well as I do I believe that these people did very well by doing this, because Holden is one of the urban centres in my constituency with one of the poorest recreational facilities. I think that these men deserved gold pins for all the work that they put in, yet because of a technicality of the Municipal Act they were unseated. I think that the punishment was far too severe. They will not be able to seek re-election for two terms, which will be six years. Yet compare that with just two years ago when two members of the legislature were unseated right in Alberta for a similar conflict of interest, and were able to seek re-election almost immediately. Maybe there was no

9-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

other choice that these gentlemen had, other than to be unseated. However, maybe it's a point for us to look at. It's high time that we had some of the antiquated laws changed under which the government has been operating for many years.

Mr. Speaker, more and more of our tax dollar is being spent on social assistance and welfare, and in the rural areas fewer people are contributing a greater portion of this. I think that social assistance is a blessing, when definitely needed. But the programs and policies which have been used in the past channelled people into welfare. I know in particular, of one family where a man, a wife, and six children had received benefits up to \$5,600 a year, tax free, without working. And yet on the other hand, any man with a family of exactly the same size, earning \$4,200 or more must pay income tax. Many times some of these people, once they go on welfare, find it much more comfortable to sit there rather than put out their efforts to seek employment. Many of them start considering social assistance is a right, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a luxury that this province can ill afford.

Mr. Speaker, up to now I have been discussing what many would consider practical affairs, issues that affect mostly the financial way of life. But, I feel that our government must give serious consideration to the cultural values of the people, and give recognition to the arts and crafts of different nationalities.

Here I wish to direct the attention of the hon. members to the Heritage Park near the entrance of Elk Island Park on Highway 16 East. Even though this is not directly located in the Vegreville constituency, it holds a considerable amount of interest to the Vegreville constituency and constituencies all over the province. First it will be a means of attracting people to that area, and second, there are many people who have valuable and precious artifacts that they are willing to donate to the park for display, and in this way they would have an vested interest in its success. But, perhaps most of all, the park will help to preserve a way of life, a heritage from the first pioneers of that area. It will stand as a tribute to the hardship faced by the first Ukrainians who pioneered that area. It will tell the story of their work, their customs, their culture, and music.

I would also like to bring to the attention of members of the House, who may not be aware, that William Eleniak, the first Ukrainian immigrant to reach Canada, back in 1891, settled, farmed, and resided until his passing a few years ago, just a couple of miles away from this Heritage Park, and I'm sure this will stand as a tribute to his descendants which number in the hundreds or maybe even in the thousands.

I would also like to bring to the attention of the House that the cultural group in Vegreville is planning to hold a cultural festival this year. Now, if this should materialize, this will be the first time in the history of western Canada, any place west of Winnipeg, that such a cultural festival will be held. So I am going to mention that, since it is a part of our history, if these organizations come to our government, I would urge that our government give recognition and support, maybe both moral and financial.

Mr. Speaker, in addressing the House I have ranged over a wide variety of topics that are of direct concern to the constituents of the Vegreville constituency. I would like to thank the hon. members for giving me their attention and also I would like to leave these issues that I have brought up as a challenge to the government, and it is my hope that that challenge can be met to the satisfaction of the people. Only then will the government of the people have succeeded. Mr. Speaker, I thank you.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-67

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I was wondering if I could ask the hon. member a question for clarification.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member agrees, although actually his speech is over, but his time isn't over.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the response certainly would be that my questions are always reasonable but, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member if I heard him correctly in stating that the salary increase for Deputies was 35 per cent?

MR. BATHUR:

I said approximately, if you take \$8,000 or \$9,000 over 21, it's close to that range.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would present some of his information, table it in the House so that I could have that detail. Certainly I have never. I don't quite understand his calculations.

MR. SPEAKER:

I don't know of any procedure to cover what the hon. member is suggesting, but perhaps he could get the information privately.

The hon. Member for --

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I didn't want to be intolerant. The last hon. member was speaking on the motion, and Rule 42 sub-clause (b) states except when an amendment is a substitute motion, a member speaking on the amendment other than the mover and the seconder must confine his debate to the subject matter of the amendment. I say, I don't want to be intolerant of new members, but I would like to bring this rule to your attention, otherwise we may not discuss the amendment at all.

DR. HORNBER:

Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to the point of order that the hon. member has raised. Surely after he allowed the seconder of the motion to range all over the ball park, and out into several left fields, the hon. member from Drumheller surely can't ask the House now to start restricting speeches in relation to an amendment on the Speech from the Throne. I would say to your Honour, that in my view, on an amendment to the Speech from the Throne, in fact, it is quite in order to debate both the amendment and the original motion.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I'm drawing your attention to the rules under which we operate, and it simply says, "if a member is moving or seconding the amendment, he has the right to speak both to the main question and the amendment in one speech." The reason for that is that he does not have the right to speak a second time. But a person, such as the hon. member for Vegreville, who has now spoken apparently on the amendment, would have the right to speak again on the original motion, and that is why the speeches from the

9-68

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

time the seconder finishes must be confined to the amendment. I simply draw this to your attention. We're not going to try to be rigid on this rule, but it is the rule, and it's the rule under which we operate, and the hon. member should know that. If you still want to give them the scope, we'll certainly not raise serious objection.

MR. SPEAKER:

I must agree with the references made by the hon. Member for Drumheller. I, without boasting, was aware of the situation, but I felt that if the House wished to tolerate a certain latitude, under the circumstances, that I should not be the one, and perhaps we could see which direction is taken by the next speaker, and if any of the hon. members feel that the debate is straying too far afield from the amendment, perhaps they could make some reference to it at that time.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, well we certainly don't want to be intolerant of new members at all. I think we can however, point out the rules, so that the hon. members will know what the rule is.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I thought that the contention of the mover of the amendment was that these Task Forces covered a whole range of government activities.

MRS. CHICPAK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to thank the hon. member in the Opposition for being tolerant with us and since I'm rather new, I appreciate this tolerancy.

Mr. Speaker, although I spoke to the Assembly on Tuesday last, it was only with respect to the motion on provincial parks. I consider it an honour and a privilege to have the opportunity to address the Assembly during the Throne Speech debate.

First, Mr. Speaker, I must thank my constituents in Edmonton Norwood for having had the confidence in my ability to serve them well, and as a result I am here today. May I join those who have preceded me in this debate and congratulate you on your election to Speaker of the Assembly. Your ability to have mastered so early in the session the knowledge required in the role of Speaker, and the complete unbiased with which you have ruled thus far, is most commendable. I also wish to congratulate our hon. Premier and all the members presently elected to this Legislature.

I must say, I feel somewhat like a new bride embarking on that great institution called marriage, full of expectation and new challenge -- that's a promise -- a sincere dedication to succeed. I wondered for a time whether my colleagues who are in this Assembly for the first time as well may likewise have felt a little like a new bride. But I have to say that the performance of my colleagues, since the opening of this 17th Legislature is more like it's well after the honeymoon.

I noted that the hon. member for Clover Bar, while speaking, complimented the members on the government side as "a bunch of fine fellows." I would like to draw to the attention of the said member that the government side has also two very fine ladies.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I humbly apologize to the hon. member.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-69

MRS. CHICHAFF:

Your apology is most sincerely accepted. The hon. member of the opposition will soon learn not to overlook the female members on this side of the House.

As a member for Edmonton Norwood, I feel a very deep sense of responsibility to provide that kind of strong, effective representation on behalf of my constituents which they are entitled to. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, I'm extremely pleased with the record of performance of this government since the election to office on August 30, 1971. The problems and concerns of the people of Alberta are many, and this new government recognizes these concerns. And so the problems of the people of Norwood are many.

One that comes to mind is the plight of the senior citizens. I realize that this appears to be an area of concern throughout the province, but I feel Norwood needs just a little bit more consideration. Information provided shows that in the city of Edmonton alone, there are over 26,100 citizens over the age of 65. Out of this, 10.3 per cent reside in my constituency of Edmonton Norwood, but it is interesting to note that, as well, there is not one single senior citizen's home in my constituency.

What providence it is for the senior citizens at least to have had the new government elected in Alberta last August 30th. Finally the human race is beginning to count for something of value.

This government's action in the removal of health premiums and cost of drugs for these citizens has to be of great assistance. The further consideration in the change of driver test requirements has to be a benefit to many. I feel certain that this privilege will not be abused. This government's plan to move quickly, with a program of providing more senior citizen's homes, nursing homes and auxiliary hospitals is keeping in line with those new directions set forth on which the Progressive Conservative Party in Alberta was voted into office. I feel confident that the senior citizens in Norwood will no longer be the forgotten people.

Mr. Speaker, looking at another age area, there is a sense of challenge for new programs, innovations and opportunities to be developed by this government for the citizens of early retirement age, or those who have been replaced or displaced from their jobs for one reason or another. The citizens in the age bracket of 45 to 65, what of these people? As the days pass, I receive more and more pleading calls from these citizens asking that I use whatever influence I have or may have in this government to have instituted some employment programs or directions for them. They turn to us with perhaps some degree of panic and urgency, for they indicate the former government was hard of hearing on this point. And so I hope the cabinet committee charged with this responsibility of innovating employment programs have their hearing turned up to full capacity and will keep this matter in the proper area of priority.

Considering our youth of today, the dire need of facilities for handicapped children didn't spring up over night. Some of the parents in my constituency with severely handicapped children have been on the urgent waiting list for three, four, and more years. What new facilities have been made available in recent years, other than the addition at Red Deer? Virtually none. Strange that the old Misericordia Hospital had little value but high costs to the former government since mid 1969. The 'now' government in a few short months is doing something about this grossly neglected field. Facilities in other areas of the province are being readied for the handicapped, as well.

I wish, at this time, to suggest broadening the scope of handicapped children, this handicap being somewhat different. I

9-70

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

refer to children with special learning disabilities. These are children that will probably never qualify for university entrance, but can be trained to carry out some meaningful jobs and be employed. Such special schools, as L.Y. Cairns Vocational High School and W. P. Wagner have to be recognized by the government for the specific use for which they have been designed, and therefore, surely cannot be held in the same category of general education schools, and thus financed under the same structure. The young people who require the guidance and training offered in such special schools have but two directions in life. One -- success to a point where they can obtain employment or self-support and experience a measure of enjoyment in living, as is generally acceptable by our society. The second direction is to be a drop-out, a failure, a law-breaker, an undesirable, a charge on the public purse. I believe it will be the second direction that these young people will fall into if the governments of the various levels do not direct more attention to the special needs of these people and provide the type of assistance required now.

Considering education and the facilities, I am pleased this government has seen fit to expand on the school upgrading program for 1972. It is hoped this program of upgrading will be further expanded and carried on on a continual basis throughout the province wherever advisable and the proper priority will be accorded such a program. Just on a point of interest, I would like to comment that I have in the Edmonton Norwood constituency, some nine public and separate schools. All nine have come under substantial upgrading programs. This upgrading program was commenced as a pilot project in 1970, only after the Parkdale Parent-Teachers' Association made extensive representations to the former government. I would like to outline briefly the need for such a school upgrading program.

The Department of Education has set out an educational program to provide individualized instruction, independent study, research and counselling service. Schools constructed in the 1960's and 1970's were designed, including facilities, for implementation of the progressive type of educational program. Where does this leave the older schools in so far as providing facilities, and giving students an educational opportunity equal to those in newer schools? The older schools which have not yet been upgraded lack some of the following facilities: none or extremely limited library facilities and study rooms; limited or no lab science facilities; limited or no arts such as music, instrumental, choral or drama; no counselling room or counsellors; no lockers or shortage of same; no fire escapes or insufficient number of same; limited or no indoor gymnasium facility; limited or no home economics and shop facilities; inadequate and improper lighting; overcrowded classrooms. The above is a list of very basic requirements, all of which facilities are available in newer schools.

A study of inner city schools carried out by the Edmonton Public School Board indicated a higher percentage of the students served by older schools come from culturally deprived homes than is the case for students served by the newer schools. To a great degree the indication is that the income level of these families is such that it does not permit those children to obtain through outside agencies cultural education which is lacking within the schools they attend.

I believe such deprivation of equal educational opportunity breeds within a child a complex of inferiority and inequality. A life pattern of second grade citizenship is produced, continuing such social ills in our society as are presently being battled.

Mr. Speaker, the lack of up-to-date facilities in these older schools affects as well the availability and number of quality teaching staff. That of course, is not to say that existing teaching staff are of any lower quality than teaching staff in newer schools. Teaching staffs in schools that do not have adequate facilities and

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-71

equipment are certainly working under an extreme handicap. And it is an impossibility to provide the type of educational program required for the times in which we live.

I have no doubt that it is beyond the capacity of local schoolboards to upgrade older schools to the extent that is required, and the provincial government must take a measure of responsibility therein. I strongly believe that health of the mind is education of the mind. And such education is to a great degree the responsibility of our government, as well as the provision of facilities for such education. Certainly in a democratic society all students have a right to as nearly an equal educational opportunity as it is possible for the Department of Education and for our government to provide.

I would like to go on to say that as years pass and our educational needs change, the schools which are presently new will become to a lesser or greater degree outdated, and will no doubt require upgrading. With a continual upgrading program we can prevent the task from becoming suddenly insurmountable. Although I speak of schools in Norwood I have no doubt that this situation exists and has existed for many years throughout the province.

Mr. Speaker, this government's determination regarding order of priorities based on human needs is consistent with the Progressive Conservative Party's basic principle of 'people before party'. Our prime legislation, The Alberta Bill of Rights, places action on the spoken word. One would have to be extremely naive to charge this government with being guilty of paying lip service to the people of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, the legislative programs laid out by this government are programs which required such attention and action for many years, but it appears that this was not to be granted until now. My colleague and the hon. member for Calgary McKnight in his eloquent address in reply to the Throne Speech outlined in some measure the new manpower concept of this government, and I will not take time now to review again these new challenges. Of course, I am particularly interested in the initiative taken in manpower. It is a major area of concern in a nation. We can educate, but in the end we must have employment and suitable conditions for employers and employees to work together in. I feel a tremendous challenge to serve on the task force in this area of manpower.

Speaking of government task forces, the hon. members in the opposition keep repeating themselves in criticizing this government for not including them in our task forces. These task forces have been organized to work as a total government of 48 members in giving the best planning and programming to Albertans as offered during the election campaign by the Progressive Conservative Party of Alberta. I do hear some rumblings from the opposition side, and I would like to ask them this question. Are we to understand that the opposition members wish to join the ranks of the Conservatives to help us implement our policies and directions?

Mr. Speaker, as I review the Speech from the Throne, I find that our Premier and his council have worked hard and diligently to give consideration to all citizens of Alberta, be they rural or urban. I believe the appointment of the various legislative committees will help make this government more accessible to Albertans. However, I wish to bring to your attention an area which may otherwise be innocently viewed as of lesser importance, and that is the area of recreational facilities in the urban centres. This is not to take away from the existence of such needs in rural centres. However, taking into account the concentration of the populace in the major urban centres I feel somewhat justified in bringing this matter for thought.

9-72

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

Recreational facilities are of course, generally planned by municipal bodies and community organizations, but grants are made available by our government. I would ask this government to take special note that all of the north-east area of the Edmonton of Edmonton -- the south boundary of which is the North Saskatchewan River and west to approximately 124th Street -- has no major recreational facility to accommodate small leagues such as the Jasper Place Arena and Coronation Park area have. As a result the young people in minor league sports have to travel as far as Sherwood Park or Jasper Place to participate in their respective sports. Due to the shortage -- and Fort Saskatchewan, hon. member -- due to the shortage of such facilities in this north-east area the minor league teams at times have to travel five and ten miles as early as six and seven o'clock in the morning in order to meet their sports activity schedules. These are children with ages as low as eight and nine years.

I would like to ask that, when grants for sports facilities are made available, consideration be given to the importance of satisfying the need in the north-east area of Edmonton. Location of these facilities in the Norwood constituency would be preferable, this being a central point of the area.

Mr. Speaker, being a woman it is natural that I should have concern with regard to the attitude of man toward the equality of women in our society. This is not to be construed as being an endorsement of the extremists of the liberation movement, but rather that I feel that inequalities exist, which are discriminatory to women in practice, attitude and legislation.

Let me just cite a very few of such infractions: pay scales differ as to sex in areas of employment; attitudes on ability as to men and women; with respect to mortgage applications women are subservient to men; economic disadvantages in marriage breakdowns; education courses listed which encourage enrolment in courses which emphasize special interests of one sex, that is shop versus home economics; parent encouragement for physical activities more directed toward boys; child care allowances not permitted to working mothers; unfair representation on boards and committees. I hope that from the many submissions by various women's organizations and groups this government will bring forth worthwhile policies that will be in keeping with The Alberta Bill of Rights, those things that cannot be legislated, so that at least they be changed in practice and attitude.

Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of this Assembly, I would not want to suggest that women should be provided with a special pedestal, but only just consideration and treatment, unless of course, on an individual basis you feel she has, in your eyes, earned that privilege of being on a pedestal. By the way Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, thank you for all the pedestals.

In concluding my address I wish to say that it is most commendable, Mr. Speaker, that this government had the courage to open the doors of this Legislature to its citizens completely by permitting notetaking, recording, filming and the Hansard publication of the proceedings in this Assembly. We are prepared to be accountable for what we do and say here. Perhaps now, by means of film and publications of the proceedings, if they are completely and frequently used in the classrooms of our schools, our young adults of tomorrow will be better informed and may participate more actively in the democratic processes of choosing governments, and keeping such governments working to a maximum for the people as this government is now doing. Without hesitation, Mr. Speaker, I say that the wisdom, clear thinking and ability for efficient administration of our leader and our hon. Premier will unfold itself many times over to Albertans in the ensuing years to the benefit of all Albertans. To be in the wings of wisdom, in the court of clear thinking, under the umbrella

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-73

of such administration, and to usurp the values of each, and for all that to become a greater person for the benefit of humanity, my goal will be fulfilled. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. MILLER:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member asks leave to adjourn the debate. All those in favour would you please say "aye". All those opposed say "no". I declare the "Noes" have it

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, this is a privilege to represent the people of southern Alberta and to voice my sentiments with respect to the amendment and also the motion -- which it seems is being allowed.

I am grateful for the opportunity to represent the constituency of Taber-Warner. This is a wonderful opportunity to enlighten the Assembly, the hon. members of the people of southern Alberta, the people of the south, of their ability, their loyalty to Canada and also their loyalty to the former government as the solid south.

I wish to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your election as Speaker of the Legislature. It is an honour to be chosen to fulfill such a high office, and I am sure it takes courage to accept this appointment which is so demanding. But as you have already demonstrated your strength in 'trying' it follows that that which we persist in doing becomes easy to do, not that the nature of the thing changes, but our 'power to do' increases.

Mr. Speaker, it would be remiss if I failed to acknowledge the wonderful improvements to this Assembly. It looks so clean and so colourful. I'm impressed with it. Also these fine new chairs remind me of the ones we had before, and the upsetting experiences many of us had with them -- and I mean that literally. I suggest the renovations should be continued and lessen the obvious contrast between the new and the old.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech was a disappointment to me because I expected more, but it was a well prepared effort. In my opinion it lacked originality, and the 'now' image was nowhere to be found. Where were all the promises of this new government that were made to the people of Alberta? Where is evidence of action, thrust, leadership, of which we heard so often. Already some of the news media are referring to the past government as "always dependable and providing leadership in good government for many years" unquote. I will only say, you can mislead some people part of the time but you can't continue to do it all the time.

As MIA for the Taber-Warner constituency these past few years, there are a number of improvements which I have suggested and I have enjoyed seeing the steady improvement. I, being so persistent, the former Minister of Highways said to me on one occasion, that every time he saw me he thought of Highway 36! I will be happy to try to protect this image to the new minister, and I am sorry he is not in his place tonight, because I would like to say in the interest of the south, this highway is important. It is also important to the central and the northern parts of the province to have this road completed, and especially at the southern section from Taber to Warner which connects with the hard surface. The basic grade has been completed with the exception of a few miles, six or seven, and I am delighted with the announcement of the new minister which he released through the PC's annual convention at Taber, that Highway 36, the section from Taber to Warner, would be completed in 1972. I

9-74

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

wish to thank the hon. minister for this announcement on behalf of the people of the constituency that I represent, even if it did come from a political party. This road will be a saving to all the people of the south because it is a shorter route to the north and the east -- which industry and tourism will appreciate, I am sure.

It was also good news, Mr. Speaker, to learn that the \$35 million hog processing plant may be located at Taber. What a tremendous stimulation this will be to all engaged in the production of coarse grains, supplements and the production of hogs -- adding at least a thousand new job opportunities. Should this become a reality, it would be located on more than 250 acres of land directly over the main sewer line, with power and gas near and the entire operation adjacent to the junction of Highways 36 and 3, which serve all directions. This would be a tremendous stimulation to rural Alberta, and I encourage the hon. Minister of Agriculture and all others associated with the enterprise, to make it a reality.

While rejoicing in the hope of another industry with its new found market, I'm sorry to report that other areas of production are not so healthy. As you know we are an agricultural area, and produce tremendously in every field. We're not healthy because of over-production and the depressed market. The demand for fresh and powdered potatoes as I have referred to before, in questioning, is discouraging to the producer. Some might even experience bankruptcy, not for lack of produce, as I have mentioned, but for having too much of one kind. Do members of the Assembly know that growers in the factory area were, in 1971, paid to plough under at least 580 acres of potatoes, rather than harvest them, because of the depressed market for both fresh and powdered potatoes as well as the imbalance and lax import regulations for goods coming into Canada? In previous years we heard stories in this House of the hungry thirties and how great the volume of potatoes was that was dumped into the ocean by the United States government while thousands of people went hungry. It was an impressive story and I've heard it several times, and seen pictures of it. I don't know to what extent the people of Alberta were suffering for lack of potatoes last fall or are at present, but I do feel that we could have helped both the grower producer and the people, if Albertans had been buying Alberta goods instead of buying from Idaho, Washington, Oregon, and California.

Mr. Speaker, we must have a better deal in tariffs for Canada. For the Assembly's information, there is a great disparity in the potential trade relation in agricultural produce between Canada and the United States. For example, 450,000 hundred weight of table stock potatoes may enter the US from Canada at a tariff of 37 and 1/4 cents per hundred weight. After that the duty doubles to .75 cents per hundred weight, which makes it almost prohibitive for us to ship. At the same time, the US potatoes may enter Canada the year round with no limits, without increasing the tariff from 37 and 1/4 cents per hundred weight. For your further information, the US quota for Canadian potatoes includes those shipped to Peru and Puerto Rico -- not Peru, just Puerto Rico -- most times, the Maritimes fill the entire US quota in this respect. Actually Western Canada benefits very little from the US market for potatoes.

Mr. Speaker, under the existing tariff regulations, we are not getting a fair deal. We must insist on equalization. To achieve this we must have help from the various provincial departments in putting pressure on the senior government, as well as an additional means which I will try and suggest later. But when processing plants close in Vauxhall and Taber, (and I understand Taber has already given notice to the staff), as I mentioned before, there will be at least 200 people unemployed.

Now to continue in another area of agriculture, that is, vegetable processing, I would like to enlighten the hon. members in this regard. The frozen and canned vegetable industry is shrinking

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-75

in Alberta. Year after year there are fewer acres planted. This is due to several reasons which are as follows: The nationalization of packing plants in Alberta; more extensive advertising; advertising campaign in the west for eastern brands; lower freight rates from the east to the west, not enjoyed in reverse; the absence of Alberta-packed goods on the shelves of merchants in the province that are labelled "Alberta packed". It would appear there is an effort to phase out the vegetable processing in Alberta in one way or another. A real example is when Canada Packers bought out Alberta Canning at Magrath, stripped it of its equipment and offered it for sale. Cornwall Canning, Mr. Speaker, is owned by the same company, and if they continue to reduce their acreage and the pack each year, we wonder if the same fate will befall the Taber plant. This was the first successful canning plant in Alberta without government support, and has had the longest successful record. We hope it will continue for several reasons, and only to mention a few -- the soil conditions, the greatest amount of sunshine in Canada per year, irrigation. All helped to produce an excellent produce with heavy yields.

Southern Alberta does well in row crops. The yield is consistent and the quality is excellent. Sugar beet growing and vegetable production make a wonderful crop rotation on lightly irrigated soil. Farm and business leaders set up this program more than 40 years ago. We want it to continue and ask our government to help us prevent any plan to phase out the vegetable production in favour of eastern Canadian varieties, which take advantage of the lower freight rates coming west and undersell our Alberta products.

A survey was taken by the vegetable growers of southern Alberta, and it was discovered that, on a given day, certain canned vegetables processed in eastern Canada were selling in Lethbridge at less than at the place of origin, which was at least 2,000 miles from Lethbridge. This is only accomplished by a large national advertising attraction, as well as reduced freight rates operating in favour of eastern goods which the west does not enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is serious and deserves our full consideration. If we really want a united Canada, we should try and get rid of these inequalities. Let us continually point out the disparities which discriminate against the west and recommend a change which would result in greater prosperity and a more unified attitude as Canadians.

I was impressed with the hon. Minister of Agriculture today, when he said we can help improve markets for Alberta goods. I'm in full accord with that and I believe that we should have started it long ago.

Products of various kinds produced in Alberta, would enjoy greater patronage if there was a program sparked by the Departments of Industry and perhaps Agriculture, which would compile a list of Alberta-produced goods bearing the label 'Alberta made'. I then suggest, in addition to that, a unified program, or a souped-up program, for the people of Alberta to buy Alberta produce. Members of the House may be interested to know that canned goods in the southern canneries are not labelled Alberta, but they are labelled McDonald's Consolidated, B.C. We do not object to this labelling, but we feel that Alberta should be included for identification to assist patronage of goods grown and produced by Albertans. Remembering the words of the minister today, I add this to it -- what Alberta makes, makes Alberta. I am suggesting, buy Alberta goods.

I endorse the decentralization of industry to towns of rural Alberta, wherever adaptable. By this I mean, where essential services are available, or can be made easy, where people of the area have an interest in the project and some know-how to help the industry succeed.

9-76

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

With respect to social development and social assistance, I have another suggestion for that. Perhaps it's not new, perhaps they're intending to include it, but I believe the role of government is to help people help themselves. This could be accomplished in so many ways, especially in the area of social assistance. Those able to work should be given meaningful work to do. I feel strongly that costs and abuses will continue to mount until the entire program is decentralized to the local authority to screen service-development-workout-programs convenient for the needy. As I mentioned, for those who can work, there are plenty of things for them to do. Excluding the cities (I know very little about them), the present regional administration program is too far from the people it tries to help -- who need help. It demands too much of a social worker's time in travel and too much paper work to depend on the applicant's answers and questions -- applicants whom he likely will not check on again for a year. Is there any wonder there are abuses? However, the picture would change if it were administered on the local level or through the health unit, with responsible, experienced people in charge.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about saving the family farm and the family business. You don't have to be farmers to try to get your children to take your business if it's thriving. They're begging for it. If Canadians in general would convince the senior government that the problem in Canada is inflation, that everything we eat, wear, use in a marketable condition continues to increase except for that which is produced on the farm. If this point was impressed and necessary action taken, the family farm will save itself. Everybody likes to get out in the open, and especially those who have been raised on a farm. They love it. And I'll say again that the family farm will take care of itself if farming is made profitable. Right now, it's been far from it, for a long time.

I'd like to say, in conclusion, a little bit about people and the environment. People and industry are mainly responsible for the pollution, we are told, of streams, rivers, lakes and eventually the ocean. Since this is an accepted fact now, and the levels of purity are being established, it is hoped that we will gradually restore and surpass levels of purity in the past. But this year, I've been concerned about the amount of snow around, and the amount of run-off, and yet no provision has been made to control the terrific floodwaters that will be running to waste that we could be saving. Let us also keep in mind, as we are thinking about this, that dilution reduces pollution when streams are kept to ample rate levels of flow. This constant level of flow can be established by the construction of control dams on the waterways. Too many of our rivers are without such controls, running in flood conditions during the spring and early summer; the remainder of the year at rates of flow far below the needed rate to assist in the abatement of pollution. A prime example will be this year, I'm sure, when the record flow of the Old Man River will reach flood conditions in southern Alberta. Purity records would rise sharply on this river and improve water conditions, lowering the treatment costs to all the towns and cities from the Crow's Nest Pass to Medicine Hat, if at least one dam was constructed to control the flow of the Old Man River and stop the waste of water. This year, will really, I suppose, be a record because of the amount of snow that has fallen in the mountains and the amount of snow that has fallen in the southern part of Alberta.

I appreciate the opportunity of bringing these thoughts of my constituency to the attention of the members of the Legislature. Here is where we can become informed about every part of the province of Alberta. And as we consider projects, as we consider budgets, as we consider the Throne Speech, and as we consider every constituency and every member's problems in the Legislature, I hope that they will give some consideration to the Taber warning. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-77

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I think it's about time we dealt with this amendment. And I would like to put our position forward very clearly in relation to the speech of the hon. Member for Drumheller, and that wandering monologue we got from the hon. Member for Clover Bar. We're really very pleased on this side of the House that in fact he can make a speech, because in the four years when he was a backbencher, and I use that word advisedly in relation to the former government who never heard from him. . . And that may be part of the reason we heard from him today, Mr. Speaker, in relation to this amendment that has been moved by the hon. Member for Drumheller. I want to say to both hon. gentlemen that I resent particularly the language of the amendment. When you start talking about misusing public funds then it would seem to me that the hon. member should either put up or be willing to put something else up in response to it.

Initially, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just put on the record a little editorial from the Red Deer Advocate that I think kind of sums it up rather nicely. The heading of the editorial is "Out! Remember! Good grief! Is there anything as unreasonable as a Socred out of Office?"

For days in the Legislature southern Alberta Socred MLA's have been howling because they have been left off government task forces, named to examine half a dozen provincial problems. If the Socreds were smart they'd establish their own task forces to propose solutions to any problem they can identify; that is what an opposition is for. Reasonable cooperation, yes, but Albertans handed direct responsibility for coming up with new answers to the Tories, not the Socreds. The responsibility they gave the Socreds was that of making sure that the Tory ideas -- not the formation of them, but rather the presentation of them -- passes hard scrutiny.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Drumheller has been in the Legislature for a fair length of time. We really feel sorry that he and the other aspirant to leadership on that side who seconded the motion, failed to take advantage of their position in relation to MLA's when they had government for 36 years. I can recall coming in here, Mr. Speaker, into this Legislature and into this building, and was appalled at the treatment that MLA's were given, and the treatment that this Legislature was given. They called them into session, Mr. Speaker, for a six-week session in the late winter, and everything was wrapped up in six weeks and there weren't very many night sessions. Unfortunately, there weren't very many people in opposition in those days.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. minister speaking on the amendment?

DR. HORNER:

Very much so, Mr. Speaker. I'm speaking directly to the amendment. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to get into the Throne Speech debate at all until this amendment came along.

When they talk about an amendment which accuses the government of misusing government funds, then to me, Mr. Speaker, the whole role of the MLA comes into question. The whole role of what they did as a government with regard to the MLA comes into question because out of that lack of doing anything, we now have an amendment. As an editorial writer says: "Good grief! Is there anything as unreasonable as a Socred out of office?"

9-78

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

You know the real problem, Mr. Speaker, is that they are not quite used to the idea that they are now the Opposition - that we in fact have the responsibility for formulating policy in this province, and that we as a government say that we are a government of forty-eight members of this Legislature, and we intend to keep it that way.

For the hon. Member for Clover Bar to mouth words like 'immoral' and high sounding other phrases that he just found out about I am sure - I want to say to him very directly that he is here on sort of sufferance because his constituents almost turfed him out the last time.

The ability of this present government to save money by using MLA's surely has to be fairly fantastic, and the scrapping of some of the old war-horse commissions to which the former government was sort of committed (in appointing their former cabinet colleagues and having a nice sinecure) investigating the tax situation in Alberta with an initial budget of something like a quarter of a million dollars. That work is now going to be done by a task force for about a tenth of the cost, and a far better job is going to be done.

Mr. Speaker, there is no way, there is just no way that the hon. Member for Drumheller can defend that previous Royal Commission or whatever it was he appointed his buddies to, and then say to us that we are misusing government funds by saving the government two hundred thousand dollars.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

DR. HORNER:

Surely - surely - well, that's a fact, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. member will have lots of opportunity to examine the estimates and then sit in Public Accounts and examine them as well. And I hope that he will, because he may get some of that education that he has lacked in the last few years.

There seems to be some lack of hearing in regard to hon. members opposite, Mr. Speaker. They seem to have failed to have heard the voice from Stettler announce pretty clearly and very specifically that the people in the Stettler constituency increased their support for this government, in spite of the distortions, in spite of all of the ranting and raving that my hon. friend for Drumheller did down there on everything from one to another, and I could go on at great length on that. As a matter of fact I have in my desk a copy of the famous advertisement that they ran in the Stettler by-election which was nothing but a collection of distortions and untruths with which they tried to mislead the people of Alberta. I say that directly, without any fear of contradiction.

And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Stettler are not going to be misled by the kind of distortion that the hon. Member for Drumheller is well known for. They showed that during the election.

[Interjections]

Well, the hon. Member for Drumheller can go on and try and distort as he likes to do in relation to these things, but I would suggest to him that if he wants to become knowledgeable in his new role in opposition that he should spend his time - and they should spend their time - in their own task forces using some of the money that is allocated to the Leader of the Opposition's office, to do the kind of work that the editor of the Red Deer Advocate suggests that they do. There is no restriction on how they can look after their expenses in that office, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-79

amendment is just totally unacceptable to the government. We reject it completely - we reject the language in it. We say to them, they are in opposition; let them grow up and start to be one, and give us some constructive thoughts in this Legislature instead of this nonsense that they try to pull in this manner.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself strictly to this amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question, question!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my remarks strictly to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, task force members may be within the limit of the law, but people who have invoiced the Legislative Clerk's office for reimbursement of expenses know full well, if they have a conscience at all, that they are accepting funds for work that they were elected to do in the first place. They knew what the pay was for Legislative Assembly members when they ran as candidates, and they had no business running if they were not prepared to serve without looking for additional funds, even before the first session was called.

Now there are several 'outs' for those whose conscience is bothering them - the most drastic of which would be a disclaimer or resignation. Section 51 of The Legislative Assembly Act says: "For each Session of the Legislative Assembly that is first held in any year, there shall be pay to each member of the Legislative Assembly attending the Session (a) a sessional indemnity allowance of \$4,800 and (b) an expense allowance of \$2,400 for expenses incidental to the discharge of his duties as a Member of the Legislative Assembly". I submit, Sir, that task force work is incidental to the carrying out of their duties. It doesn't say the Lougheed team members shall be paid more. It says \$2,400 shall be paid to each member. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, extra payment for task force expenses constitutes immoral, political chicanery.

Mr. Speaker, I fear this government is more interested in public relations than people. There are no back benchers in the Lougheed team.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right!

MR. WILSON:

I'm glad you all agree for you have the euphemisms front row, middle row and top row; in my opinion a better name for the latter two would be the expense account row.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe that television doesn't start until tomorrow, perhaps the hon. gentleman --

9-80

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

MR. WILSON:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

MR. STROM:

On a point of order, this man has made a request for the adjournment of the debate. He is being taunted by the members from the other side that the TV wasn't on. He's taking them at their word and now they won't stand by their word. I say that he has a right to move the adjournment of the debate and they have to respect it, in view of the statements they just made.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am prepared to put the question on the adjournment of the debate, although I have doubt as to whether it's in order, since the rules require that there must be some intermediate proceedings. It also states that a speech is not an intermediate proceeding. Now I realize the matter is of some doubt, at least it is to those who have had more experience in the House than I've had, but I'm prepared if the House wishes to put the question.

MR. STROM:

Just speaking to the point of order. I would suggest that we are in a state of confusion, because what were we discussing? I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to rule whether we were discussing the Throne Speech, the main Throne Speech debate or whether or in fact we were discussing the amendment. I suggest to you that what we were discussing at the time that there was a refusal of adjournment, was the Throne Speech, not the amendment, and if you are going to make that ruling, sir, I suggest to you then that the ruling must be that we must conclude the Throne Speech Debate tonight.

MR. SPEAKER:

I don't know of any authority which would require us to conclude the Throne Speech debate tonight instead of on Friday afternoon, but the amendment, I should say in passing, will have to be put no later than 5 o'clock tomorrow, under the rules.

Now dealing with the question of whether we have been speaking to the amendment, there is no question at all that the rules as pointed out by the hon. Member for Drumheller, require that debate following the moving of an amendment must be confined strictly to the amendment. I mentioned at the time the point was raised that that was my understanding of the rule and indicated some willingness to apply it. The hon. member, however, if I may, without causing debate, took the position as I understood it, that he was merely raising the rule for the information of the House. Since it was not invoked with respect to any of the three speeches which followed, I did not apply the rule, but I agree that it may get us into a bad precedent, and should not be taken as a precedent. I would therefore suggest to hon. members that in the continuation of the debate on the amendment, we should, in fact, follow the rule and might I also refer hon. members to Annotation 170 in Beauchesne.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order in regard to the adjournment, if the intervening speeches were not an item of business, it would really mean that we could not adjourn tonight, because that is all we are going to have is speeches on the Speech from the Throne; the very fact that a member continued to speak for five minutes constitutes intervening business. And on that point I would suggest that last

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-81

night we agreed to the adjournment about 10:15; surely to goodness the government will now agree to an adjournment of our member at 11:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member leave to move the adjournment of the House. All those in favour say 'Aye' and those opposed say 'No'. I declare the 'Noes' to have it.

I am sorry I intended to say the adjournment of the debate rather than the adjournment of the House.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, the devious expense accounts for Tory backbenchers working on so-called task forces, is an insult to the citizens of Alberta, I submit, in view of the concerns which they expressed in their Speech from the Throne. The speech proclaims a policy of open government, but we learn that the results of the extra money paid to these people to do what they were elected to do, will not likely be made available to the public. I can only suspect that their reports will serve, sir, as Tory press releases and promises for the next election. Meanwhile, we will just have to look at it as 25 more names on the welfare roles.

Mr. Speaker, this is a shameless system that has been set up -- that amounts to a raise in pay for some members of this legislature. I am unalterably opposed to the taxpayers of Alberta having to pay for research for the Progressive Conservative Party. It is a flaunting of the traditional system of democracy in Alberta.

Prior to the election, the Lougheed team promised open government with no fat. Since the government was elected on August 30th, the Lougheed team has expanded the Cabinet, they have increased pay for the Ministers Without Portfolio, they have hired more executive assistants, and now delivered a sugar pill to Tory backbenchers.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak any more on this principle, than what had already been said in the Legislature before, nor had I intended to speak on the amendment tonight, until some of the remarks and actions that have been produced at this point.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwccd said that we would be naive if we considered that the things spoken by the hon. members of the government side of the House, were only a mouthing of words and not things to be put into action. But I wonder when I see the actions and hear some of the things that have been done tonight, whether or not she may have been mistaken.

When I see the hon. members suggest that we cannot close the debate and then two minutes later sixteen members from that side go out of the House, this indicates to me something that they really don't mean. They want to continue the debate. And something more, I think that when the hon. Minister of Agriculture took the editorial from the Red Deer Advocate, there is nothing in the Red Deer Advocate that one could take that much exception to. The Red Deer Advocate is not talking about what we are talking about at all in the amendment and the Speaker of the House did well to raise the question whether the hon. member was speaking on the amendment or not. The amendment has to do with the money that is being paid and to the principles of the caucus committees, and so it is no wonder that hon. members in the bottom row, and the middle row, and the top row found it necessary to thump their desks hard in order to bolster their courage in trying to twist the situation. The Advocate has missed the boat

9-82

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

completely and they were trying to drum up some courage by taking a reading of it.

Now the hon. member said that we weren't used to being in opposition, and insofar as I'm concerned, I think he is right, we're not used to it yet, but I think we'll get used to it just as quickly as hon. members on the other side get used to being in government, probably sooner. There is a great sense of responsibility that accrues to being in the government as well as a privilege, and I think that probably the discussion on the Bill of Rights later, will bring that up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I simply wanted to stand up in my place, and say that it's one thing to say something, and it's another thing to really mean it. Sometimes in this House we get wrapped up in our enthusiasm and the old human nature shows through; I hope that it won't show through too far.

I mentioned earlier that I had an uneasy feeling that there was a distinction being made between government members and opposition members, and I believe that we are having more and more grounds to believe that this is the case. Unfortunately, there is a distinction being made between representatives, and it is at the taxpayer's expense, and I for one will have to stand in my place when the time comes in support of the amendment that has been made tonight. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this amendment, I must say that during the course of this Legislature, there will be many times when I will sharply differ with my colleagues on this side of the House, but in respect to the amendment which is proposed tonight, I want to say that I am very proud to support it. I believe that the proposal as enunciated by the government is a dangerous precedent -- a precedent that will in fact make two classes of members in this House, and Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Agriculture can carry on with all his very considerable eloquence, but as I look across this country, as I look at other Legislatures, as I look at the parliament of Canada, I see no precedent whatsoever to justify paying caucus members of a political party in government for research for work that they do in the form of caucus committees.

Mr. Speaker, this is really a very very important point. It's all well and good to talk about being a government of 48 members. We've heard that every government in Canada claims to be a government composed of all its members on the government side of the House. And other governments in Canada are equally sincere in involving their backbenchers in the role of forming the pulse. Nowhere, nowhere is there a precedent for this proposition of paying members for their work in caucus committees, and Mr. Speaker, this proposal is completely inconsistent with our parliamentary system as I understand it anywhere in Canada, anywhere in the British Commonwealth of Nations.

Mr. Speaker, even the suggestion that we should categorize members between government members who are backbenchers, and members of the opposition, in my view is an insult to the voters who returned opposition members to this Legislature. Regardless of what the government may think of the opposition members in this House, it has an obligation to respect the people who have returned us to this Legislature.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-83

Mr. Speaker, what disturbs me even more when I hear the hon. Minister of Agriculture speak, is an apparent failure to understand that the government has every right to expect their back bench members to work and provide information to that government. The role of the opposition in our parliamentary system is just as important as the government's and that caucus committees for the official opposition, or for that matter, the great amount of work that I do as an individual member should be recognized too. I find it rather hard to understand why the government doesn't recognize this. And I find it hard to understand why the hon. Minister of Agriculture doesn't understand it either, or doesn't seem to understand it. If I recall the history of this country, one of the reasons that the Liberal Government which was elected in 1935 and was soundly defeated in 1957 by Mr. Diefenbaker -- one of the reasons they were soundly defeated, was because they forgot the role of the official opposition and the importance of that role in a parliamentary system of government. One of the reasons that the hon. Minister of Agriculture was so successful in his early entry into politics in this province and in Canada, was because he was in a party led by a great parliamentarian such as Mr. Diefenbaker, who, while this government may not understand the role of the opposition, he did.

I can understand proposals made to enlarge the function of members of this Legislature. Had the government said that we will appoint an all-party legislature committee, Mr. Speaker, to examine how we could enlarge the responsibilities of members of this Legislature, then I could have risen in my place and I could have supported that government. I could have supported that proposition, because I think we are all concerned about making sure that the individual members of this Legislature, irrespective of what side they happen to sit on, play a meaningful role in the determination of government policy and in the determination of those acts, those bills and those laws which will guide the lives of the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, there is no proposal about an all party legislative committee to examine enlarging the responsibilities of the individual members. Instead, we have a government which comes in and says "we're going to give our own members more responsibility." Then they get rather annoyed when they take a blindly partisan approach in the first place, Mr. Speaker, and as a consequence of the partisanship, revoke a partisan response of this side of the legislature.

Mr. Speaker, may I simply close by saying this? I believe that, at this very important time in Alberta's history, when we have a new government, a government that is talking about new directions, perhaps they should stop for just awhile and ponder what they're doing, and consider whether it wouldn't be more prudent, whether it wouldn't be more in keeping with the type of government that they talk about if they set aside this outrageous proposal, and perhaps consider the appointment, as I suggest, of a legislative committee itself, to study enlarging the role of individual members on both sides.

I close, Mr. Speaker, by reminding my hon. friends across this Assembly, that during the campaign, a great deal was said about people before party. Perhaps, when they assess their response on this issue, Mr. Speaker, they should consider that slogan, and if they do, then they'll drop this ridiculous nonsense and we can all get on with the job of deciding collectively how we can make this Legislature work in the interests of all Albertans.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

9-84

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

MR. KOZIAR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hadn't intended to enter into the debate on the amendment, however, I feel that I must in view of the comments made by a couple of the gentlemen opposite. The suggestion that there is no precedent for these payments I find revolting in view of the contents of The Legislative Assembly Act. There are provisions in the Legislative Assembly Act, Section 14, which read as follows -- I feel that for the benefit of the members of this House, this Section should be read,

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a member of the Legislative Assembly (a) serving on a commission or committee appointed either by the Legislative Assembly or by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, or (b) serving as a delegate to any meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association may be paid such sum of money for travelling expenses and subsistence in connection therewith as the Lieutenant Governor in Council deems proper. And the receipt of any such money does not render that member ineligible to be a member."

Now the suggestion that the actions of the members on task forces who have incurred expenses and who request reimbursement of these expenses is immoral, is contrary to the legislation of this Assembly passed some years back. There is further provision in the act, the suggestion, of course, that the members of this Assembly are paid a sessional indemnity plus expenses of \$2400 for the work which they've performed in the function of elected representatives, and the suggestion that they are limited to the receipt of those funds is also contrary to a further section of the act, Section 59 which provides for the payment to the members of the Legislative Assembly who sit on legislative committees. There is provision there for a reimbursement of expenses, plus a payment of \$25.00 per day in additional indemnity for the business of the committee. There is a further provision in the act which, in a sense, discriminates, because as a member of this Legislative Assembly representing a constituency which is part of the City of Edmonton, I am not entitled to receive the \$15.00 per day expense allowance over and above the \$2400.00 provided that perhaps a member from Drumheller might receive and I do not. Now, I don't begrudge them that figure. I don't begrudge him the \$15.00 because he lives out of town. He deserves it. He expends that money in coming to this Assembly to represent the people of his constituency.

Now I feel that I can take part in this debate because my name appears on two of the task forces; the task force dealing with manpower training and retraining, and the task force on agriculture. Mr. Speaker, I have taken part in the deliberations of both task forces. I have spent a lot of time and a lot of effort on both task forces, and the time that I have spent, the effort that I have spent does not permit me to make any claim for an expense allowance. My name does not appear on any claims for expenses as a result of any of the work which I have performed on any of those task committees, nor am I entitled to receive any expenses or allowances as a result of my work on those two committees, because I have not incurred any. I have performed work without incurring expenses, and the reason that no expenses have been incurred by myself is because I'm a resident of the City of Edmonton. There are members of this Assembly, who, in the performance of their duties on these task forces must incur expenses, because they do not reside in the City of Edmonton, in the same sense that the Legislative Assembly Act provides for the \$15.00 a day additional expense allowance to those members of this Assembly that reside outside the City of Edmonton.

I feel that the amendment that's been raised and some of the arguments that have been proposed are strictly a tempest in a teapot. I think that if the gentlemen opposite are sincere in the comments they made earlier in the debate on the original motion on the Speech

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-85

from the Throne, that they wish to be a constructive opposition and not obstruct the business of this House, that perhaps they will agree with me that the suggestions raised by some of the hon. members opposite and some of their speeches on the particular amendment are nothing more than a tempest in a teapot.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. And my point is that I believe my honour has been impugned, and impugned on a false premise. These characters on the other side are probably engaged in a put-on, but I want to make quite certain that other people are not taken in by this put-on. They've insinuated that I have in fact received pay. This is my point. I've got to explain --

MR. LUDWIG:

Point of order! On a point of order; point of privilege is not a point of debate. The hon. member is out of order in debating on a point --

MR. FARRAN:

I've got to explain -- they've insinuated that I have received pay - I must explain. . otherwise you don't know what you've done or do you? Mr. Speaker, it is a point of privilege. You should know.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. I would suggest to the hon. members that they allow the member some latitude in stating his point of privilege.

MR. FARRAN:

I'll tell you the facts then. You have insinuated that I have received pay as chairman of a task force, and I tell you that's a lie. You probably know it's a lie, but perhaps you are incapable of adding up or distinguishing between out-of-pocket expenses and pay. My out-of-pocket expenses -- and I've been working full time since September -- have been around 400 bucks. For two months I had to pay a stenographer out of my own pocket; I've had to take various bodies to lunch for which I have not been reimbursed -- including the Alberta Health Insurance Commission -- when we were figuring out the cost of relieving senior citizens of Medicare premiums. I've done a full time job; I've had to sell my business. This experience may be enriching and rewarding --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order please. I wonder if the hon. member would state the point of privilege and try to avoid the appearance of debate.

MR. FARRAN:

Alright. Well just to clarify this last bit, I'll tell you that this enriching and rewarding experience has not been enriching and rewarding in the sense they insinuate.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to say a few words on this amendment I must state in reference to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Agriculture that there's only one thing worse than an opposition that can't realize that it is no longer in the government, and that is, a government that cannot realize that it has a responsibility to the people of this province.

9-86

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

I wonder what the hon. Mr. Diefentaker would say in the House of Commons if the Liberals tried to pull off a stunt like this. It would be interesting. He'd blast them all to wherever they belong. And the more I listen to this debate and exchange across the Floor here, I'm beginning to feel there is a very major difference between the standards and the morality of the Social Crediters and the Tories, and that is a major difference that will be remembered in the days to come.

I'm not as lost as the hon. Minister of Agriculture usually is. I have a talk here, Mr. Speaker, that I prepared, not with relation to this issue, but it's very much on point. I prepared this talk eight years ago but it deals with morality in politics and I think that it's time that it was given to the hon. members opposite because they have forgotten what faith the people placed in them, and it's up to us to let the people know what is happening. And under this topic that I wrote quite some time ago, and which is so appropriate today seeing who's opposite us here -- here is the way this thing reads:

"This is a vast subject that could not be adequately dealt with in a short speech. However -- [laughter]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Does the hon. member propose to read the speech?

MR. LUDWIG:

I intend to quote from it, Mr. Speaker.

"Morality, politics and ethics have been a subject of many speeches and much writing for a great number of years, and although I do not hope to add anything new to the issue, I hope that I can bring --"

[Interjections]

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to proceed, and the hon. members treat morality in politics very lightly, which is another basic distinction between them and us.

"I hope I can bring to your attention some of the factors required to be taken into consideration in the decision which a public representative is obliged to make. Rousseau made this remark -- "Those who would treat politics and morality apart will never understand the one or the other."

I believe that that is a problem that the government of the hon. Premier Lougheed and his colleagues is having difficulty with. It's a matter of what standards you subscribe to. They feel it's all right to get elected to office and appoint a great number of people to run around retrieving information. It has to be remembered that they are all members of a political party, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, in this House that I don't trust this kind of a setup -- to go around and tell us that they are acting in the best interests of the people. As other members have expressed, I believe that they are acting in the interests of the Conservative Party, and they are entitled to do that, but they are not entitled to receive pay for it. Now they are entitled to their opinion and I'm expressing mine.

I believe that we require in this House a constant vigilance on behalf of the public to assure the people of this province that this government will behave in keeping with the trust placed in it. There are a number of responsibilities of the person who is elected, but I would like to deal with what I believe explains my position on this issue very briefly, and is on point with what is happening here.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-87

"Innate integrity is certainly a basic criterion for public office." And I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that what is happening here - what the Tories are doing, does not fall into the classification of 'innate integrity.'

"Gross dishonesty is less the problem than the steady erosion of ethics by pressure and demands from groups, and local pressure, and from a political party. There is at present considerable expression of opinion as to whether we need a legislative code of ethics or whether the individual conscience is a sufficient guide."

And I am saying if the hon. Premier and his colleagues are so obsessed with caucus committees that they have made a very good point perhaps to set up one more to see if they can bring down a code of ethics for the government.

"I believe that there is a need for a rededication and a redeclaration of those things we stand for in order that we can rise to higher plateaus and not backslide to lower standards by treating lightly even the slightest deviation from the straight and narrow on the part of our elected representatives."

I believe that this is advice that they will have to listen to either in the House or out of the House, and as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview stated, that perhaps the hon. Premier can stand up and display a bit of magnanimity and withdraw from a situation that would prove very embarrassing to him.

"It is only through knowledge of one's responsibilities to the public and the application of a high standard of ethics in the discharge of one's duties in public office that confidence in human decency and human dignity will be preserved."

And I am saying that it almost appears to be that a new morality has come into this House, and the public has to be defended. It is the responsibility of the members on this side of the House to express their opinions even though they don't agree with us opposite. We are entitled to do it. We are doing it here, and Mr. Speaker, we will do it outside the House until the hon. the Premier sees the error of his commitment and backs down, as he has been requested to do.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the remarks from the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View tonight in that he waited eight years while he sat as a government member and ignored, in that eight years, the subject of morality. All of a sudden he happens to stand up and say: "Mr. Speaker, I just happen to have a speech with me tonight on morality." I think it was very timely, but I think tonight we have witnessed a political exercise in this Assembly. There have been accusations thrown and bandied about and I think it has been an exercise in futility. It has been petty and nit-picking and I would suspect that it is merely party jealousy on the other side. Because they had 36 years to use their government members effectively, and because this government has found a way, all of a sudden their noses are out of joint, Mr. Speaker. You know, Mr. Speaker, they sound like a bunch of spoilt brats and somebody should take them out and spank them.

Surely they can find something that they can debate that is more relevant and of more significance in Alberta at this time, than the subject they wish to pick on tonight. In talking about immorality, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the hon. members witness what we have had to do as a government in the past six months sitting in the

9-88

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

Executive Council, in having to pass \$65 million worth of special warrants for what appear to be budget estimates for this year, that were prepared last year. It would appear that a fair portion of that \$65 million appears to have been deliberately underestimated.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! I think that if I may make an observation; on both sides of the House we have this evening come rather close to the limits of parliamentary language and imputing motives to members on the opposite side of the House, and I say in all sincerity that we should attempt to withdraw from that borderline and get back into an area where we are certain that the language is parliamentary and that we should not be imputing the motives of hon. members on one side against hon. members on the other side of the House.

MR. WERRY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, we'll deal with the question that was raised by the hon. member for Spirit River-Fairview. He talks about a pay increase; the hon. member for Calgary Bow says that there is a raise in pay. I think it's been clearly demonstrated tonight, Mr. Speaker, that this is merely to pay for those out-of-pocket expenses that are incurred by members who are working on committees and I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that these committees will be bringing in reports that will be of direct benefit to all the citizens of this province.

For four years we sat on the other side and watched the previous administration solving their problems. Their way of solving them was to appoint study after study after study and none of these studies was ever implemented.

Now in respect to the hon. member who seconded this amendment tonight, Mr. Speaker, I think I would like to point out to him that when we campaigned in August it was on a platform. First of all we identified the problems and we called them challenges. The second point was the new directions that this government would take if they were elected to office. Those new directions would not be implemented overnight, but it would be a four year ongoing program that we would welcome to meet the challenges of this diverse province over the four years that we will have the pleasure of representing this province, and for many more years to come.

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, as a new member to this Assembly, I have been rather disappointed in some of the approaches that the members of the opposition have taken in less than two weeks. It certainly indicates to me the lack of originality that the former government had, and also clearly indicates why they are the former government.

I want to speak to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, who suggested that this could be a precedent, and I want to assure him that our new government will be setting a lot more precedents before too long.

What we are asking your acceptance of, is to be given some compensation for expenses, out-of-pocket expenses, which we will incur, some of us more than others, outside of our constituencies. I think if you do some calculating, those members of the Assembly opposite, each of us, and I include you people, we are each responsible for about \$17 million a year, if you divide by the total volume of money that has to be handled in this province. I don't think that any corporation would ever expect its members to disburse this amount of money or funds without some reasonable compensation. We're asking merely for expenses. Many of us are members who have small families. We are asked to go into cutting constituencies. We

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-89

are asked to sit on these special committees, and I think that even at the local government level, it would be highly unusual, and I have spent some time in local government, that expense and cut-of-pocket money would not be acceptable to the people. And I think that we have spent sufficient time debating this point. And I think I speak for the members on this side, that we are prepared to let the people decide whether we're right or we're wrong, and we will not leave it entirely to the wisdom, or lack of wisdom, of the former government.

MR. DRAIN:

There was one thing about this debate that I enjoyed very much, was the hon. Minister of Agriculture relegating himself back to the role of opposition House Leader. This at least made it worthwhile.

No one disputes the right of this government, which was duly elected and given a mandate by the people of Alberta, to govern and thus fulfil their functions. Certainly in doing this, it is proper and right that they involve all their MLA's in the processes of caucus committees and in the accumulation and assimilation of information on party programs. Traditionally, under the British Parliamentary System, the role of the MP, or the MLA if you like, is to vote supply to Her Majesty the Queen, and represent that specific area that he comes from. Certainly we have expanded this role to a considerable degree since that time. However, basically the government is the members of the Executive Council who are the government, and around this is the satellite role of the MLA, irrespective if they be on the government's side or the opposition side.

Now, in involving the MLAs and all of the 48 members in the areas of government, what is basically being done, is underlining the prerogative of the MLA in emasculating their role in caucus and in government in disagreeing with government policy. I am not suggesting nor insinuating that there is any vast sum of money involved here, but there is a principle and the basic principle is this, that a party, separate from government, is using government funds in a manner that casts a dark cloud and a shadow that comes down over the Legislature of the Province of Alberta, and I suggest Mr. Speaker, that if this role, this sad role, this dark role, this discriminatory role, is not reassessed, that this will be an evil day, and a day that we in this province will look back on and wonder about, as our rights are gradually eroded and the government on your right, Mr. Speaker, becomes more and more autocratic in its self-defined role of greatness; so I urge all of the hon. members to join with me in supporting this amendment and I am confident that my representation to the hon. members on the right will be properly heard and heeded. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make my debut on this motion. I think it's very important. I had call, as an MLA, to bring some of my constituents, some farmers who were having trouble, to Edmonton. The task forces weren't out in my area, and I have problems too -- I have 6000 or 7000 people with problems; who do I present them to? I arranged for a delegation to come in and put a little fire under the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I asked for an appointment to see four hon. ministers; now the hon. Minister of Tourism set up an appointment, and I appreciated it. But the hon. Minister of Agriculture, the one we wanted to see most, was not here. And I had waited over 40 days to come to see him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we came 250 miles for that particular meeting, and he was in Stettler bolstering the party. Now I know they are busy people with many obligations to meet, but I really felt that maybe, after 45 days --

9-90

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

If we are to be fair, regardless of which side of the fence we sit on, and I mean this with sincerity, any task force should represent all corners of the province. The new directions don't just stand for the Conservative party; the province of Alberta is a big province, and its borders define the area that they are governing. So I feel very strongly, when I say to the new members that this front bench is buying your position in the next election, and if you don't follow their dictatorial approach, they will replace you -- the dollar signs are cut. Thank you.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I didn't plan on getting into this debate until my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, who I say is a master at distorting things, got into the act, and Mr. Speaker, I'm going to stick strictly to the amendment because I hope to take part in the motion later on.

I don't know, by the way, Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Red Deer Advocate. He probably is a pretty good fellow, but I wonder if he got the facts straight. I wonder if his editorial tomorrow wouldn't start out like this, instead of 'Out! Remember!' it would be 'In! Remember! Good Grief! Is there anything as unreasonable and greedy as a 'now' Conservative in office?'

We've heard a lot about section 14 of the Legislative Assembly Act by the hon. member from Edmonton Strathcona. I noticed he mentioned \$25. He knows perfectly well, if he picked up the \$25 on this task force, as mentioned regarding expenses -- the hon. member for Calgary North Hill was mentioning them -- he would be out of his seat, and he knows that. All we've had in this House, and from the party opposite, is an abuse of section 14. That's all it is, is just an absolute abuse. I always get a kick out of my friend, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, because he's always ranting and raving about how he did in Stettler and how he did everywhere else. And I love his bedside manner. I always notice that whenever he starts to lose an argument, or has a very weak argument, he raises his voice, and tonight was no exception. He's done it before in this House. The other night, inside and outside this House, he was telling us about how much activity we're going to give the new members, in particular the backbenchers on the other side of the House, and he was trying to tell us that they had given great responsibilities in other areas. He even mentioned the fact that one of his members who happened to be the same party as he was in the House of Commons, tried to introduce a bill, and his own party wouldn't listen to him and talk it out. It was the government who finally introduced it, his own government. But the poor member that tried to introduce it -- which did do a lot for the farmers -- [Interjections]

No, I'm not mixed up again.

Mr. Speaker, as soon as I can get the transcript from Hansard, I'm going to get up on orders of the day and table it. [Interjections.]

That's all right. The Minister of Agriculture can bulldoze the new members over there, but there are some of us that have been around for a little while, and we question some of his tactics. He knows perfectly well that it's morally wrong to take advantage of section 14. It was never set up to pay the expenses of any political party. That section is set up so that when any hon. member is put on a legislative committee, in the ordinary sense of the word, this is when he gets his money. Sure they can abuse it.

[Interjections.]

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-91

We'll let the public decide that. I get a kick out of some of the logic, Mr. Speaker, that I heard tonight. They seem to think that if you rob a bank, and you tell the judge you only took \$5,000, and there's \$5 million in the bank, "you shouldn't do anything to me." This is the logic we've heard tonight.

I'm afraid that the hon. member for Calgary North Hill -- and I don't think that anybody ever mentioned his name, but he must have a quilt complex because he jumped up -- I think he was using a privilege motion in saying that somebody was trying to abuse him. Nobody even mentioned him. But I noticed he said later that he sold his business and I understand he cried all the way to the bank. If this government stays in office much longer, he'll probably say "thank God I did sell my business."

I just got up here, because we read from an editorial, from this poor fellow in Red Deer, and I'd like to meet him some day. I don't know where he got the facts.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring it to your attention, that somebody left this in my mail box and there's no stamp on it.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, I've always felt that we should do everything possible to assure the people of Alberta that we are operating with good moral standards in this legislature. This may be technically right, or even legally right, but it's not morally right, and as I said earlier, we'll let the people decide.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose, like many of the others tonight, who didn't expect to get into this debate, I'd like to say a few words. I think the hon. members as well as yourself, Mr. Speaker, know that this is a rear guard action, that we know exactly what the result of the vote is going to be, but we are doing the best we can to impress upon the government, and our own constituents, just exactly what, and how we feel in this particular situation.

The government have, and we quite realize it, new concepts, new ideas. I suppose if they hadn't had new concepts and new ideas, they wouldn't have been elected. I heartily agree that these things are needed. No one ever gets to the point where he knows everything. I was rather amused at my good friend the hon. Minister of Agriculture during the debates, and I thought he was the last one in the House that would ever have this affliction, but when his own members congratulated him, his neck actually got red. He blushed, and I never thought my good friend would blush. He has mentioned, and he possibly is right, that the action that the government has taken in this caucus committee has no parallel in other jurisdiction, and they are striking out anew with a new concept altogether. Maybe this is good, maybe it is not.

But I'd like to mention two or three things before this can get out of hand. The hon. member, Mr. Farran, made a plea, and quite justifiably so, that he was actually cut of pocket. I would think from the time that he was on the committee that is all that he received, and I would think that he probably is out of pocket. But there are other members in this House who said they accompanied the hon. Minister of Agriculture to Ottawa. Who paid for that? Who authorized that? Is it authorized? Did the hon. minister authorize it? I'm not saying that if he'd have said to me "will you go?" -- and I doubt that he would -- that I would have said "I'm too busy and I can't go." But when we're going to have these task forces, if the task force comes into my area, are they going to have the decency to come and say, "Would you arrange for an appointment, we would like to meet some people," or are you going to end up going to the defeated

9-92

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

Conservative candidate and the constituency executive in that area to get your ideas? Because if this is so, you might just as well stay here, because the sum total of what you know here is exactly the same as you would find all throughout the province in your Conservative constituencies. But I am concerned about this idea, and it's not a light one.

The other day a member was talking about hogs, and what a wonderful system they had in Denmark. I think it was the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Say, the Agricultural Task Force would decide well let's all go to Denmark and see how they raise these wonderful hogs. There's nothing stopping them from going. There's nothing stopping them from going any other place in Canada. How could you stop any other task force who says let's visit every Legislature in Canada and see just what the rules of the House are, see how the Speaker is dressed, see whether they have a bar upstairs or downstairs, see where they have red carpet, or if they have Hansard, or if it's as good as ours. There's nothing stopping them, but it's only going to be government members. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that in fairness -- and I say this in fairness -- you have left it to the legislative committees which you, in all honesty, are going to appoint with every contentious issue that you can, because you will not make a decision.

I asked the hon. Premier yesterday, what about the Treasury Branches? Now you say, well this is government policy and a task force will look into it or an executive committee will look into it. I suggest to you that every depositor in the Treasury Branch is like the voter on August 30th, because you didn't expect to get in, and we didn't expect to lose. You see, it's just like that. You say to us today that we left the treasury bare, we expected to get in. We didn't expect to come back to a bare treasury, but the people of this province fooled us, and they fooled you. What I am trying to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, is this. If we're not careful and if we don't have a legislative committee which represents all the people in the Province of Alberta -- every depositor in the Treasury Branch will be like the voter on August 30th, when he takes his little bit of money out, and puts it in the bank and you've got no Treasury Branch left because people don't trust you.

I'd like to ask how many of the front bench have an account in the Treasury Branches or do business in them? I doubt that on your side of the House, there are ten members that ever use the Treasury Branch, and yet you are going to be the champions of the people. I say this about the Treasury Branches, because I have my money in them, the bit that I have, and I'm in a bad position, as you know. MLA's can't even borrow. We might have \$10,000 in the bank, but in the Treasury Branch you can't borrow \$5.00.

But I'm concerned that we should have a legislative committee. I know that the government is going to make the policy. You're going to have the overwhelming majority on this committee, but it would be a committee of all the people that are represented in this House, all the people in the province. Yes, this is the policy that we want the government to follow. Or if the government says this is the policy from this committee that we are going to follow, then the people have the confidence of all the people that are represented in this House. So I am concerned. I'm concerned that when the task force for agriculture comes down to our area, and you haven't got a member there who knows the first thing about irrigation, I'd like to know who you're going to go to. Are you going to come to the various boards, because this is one of the complaints that we've had in these task forces? They flit from here to there, now they're here, now they're there, and now they're back in Edmonton.

So I suggest to you we know, and you know as well as I do, as responsible MLA's and responsible people in this room, what the ultimate outcome of this vote is going to be. But we are trying to

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-93

put up a fight, not to embarrass the government, but to ask the government to reconsider what they're doing. And the implications -- I don't think you realize the implications of this. As one member mentioned, it is not the amount of money, it is the implication concerning the confidence the voter has in his elected representative. If he feels that his representative is getting a little at the bank, he has every right to feel that way, therefore, you put the onus on all of us. We are not asking for money on this side. We are not asking you to take us into your task force; this would be ridiculous. We didn't ask you when you were in the opposition to come and sit on our caucus committees. Why should you ask us? But, all we're asking is, if you're going to do it, you're paid exactly the same as we are, and that should be enough for all of us.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, as the MLA for Sedgewick-Corcoran it's a real privilege to speak to this amendment. As I think of this amendment I feel a little like the soldier who finally made it to the front lines. He looked out across and then back at his commanding officer and said: "Why, the enemy is as thick as peas." His commanding officer said: "Yes, now go ahead and shell them." Well, I think this amendment or these paying caucus committees need some shelling; they need some riddling.

I held many pre-session meetings throughout my constituency, and the question of paying MLA's came up a number of times. I was told in no uncertain terms that they were not in favour of raising the wages of MLA's. Now I don't know if they realized that members of caucus committees would be receiving pay, but they will realize it in a day or two, I'm sure of that.

There have been a lot of tricky words and phrases used in this debate today. I think I will use one myself and the people will realize what I'm talking about. They haven't really caught on as yet to what 'new direction' means and the word 'now'. But the one that I'll use is "Tory times are hard times" and I'm sure it's pretty hard times when you have to pay your caucus committees. I'm reminded of a young fellow who went to his boss and said: "I would like a raise" and the boss said, "no, I can't give you a raise." "Well," the fellow said, "there are three companies after me" and the boss thought to himself, "well, maybe I'd better give him a raise." So he said, "OK, I'll give you a raise. By the way, what companies are after you?" The fellow replied, "the water company, the light company and the utilities." I wonder if that's the case on your side.

Well, I'm quite interested in the new direction and I'll suggest that my next move is just where the new direction is going to take your party and the province.

MR. HO LEN:

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak to this amendment. As previous speakers have stated, we pretty well know the outcome of the vote on this amendment, however, I would like to have my comments recorded.

I feel that the position that the government finds themselves in is most embarrassing. I think that they're a little uncomfortable. But I say that I don't feel sorry for them, because they are the authors of their own problems. They have tried various techniques -- heckling, pounding of desks and so on, but this doesn't work; to me this indicates a combination of unfairness and Conservative oligarchy.

9-94

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

I feel that they are very arrogant in their feelings towards the opposite side, and in this particular issue that we are discussing we are talking about two classes of MLA's. There are the Conservative MLA's and then there are the others. I feel that as an elected member of this Legislature my responsibilities are just as important to me as their responsibilities are to them, and I would like to remind them of that. I am very disturbed at the attitude of some of the members, because they think that the election is still on. They think that this is a popularity contest. As far as I am concerned the popularity contest ended on August 30th, and we are here today.

So let's forget about all this nonsense and get down to some serious business of our government. For instance, look at the example which was made by the government side refusing to adjourn this debate, so what happens? Everyone marches out when our speaker takes the floor. To me this reduces the credibility of the government.

Now as a new member, Mr. Speaker, this type of political manoeuvre is a real eye-opener to me, and it's distressing, it's disturbing, and if this is the way that they are going to carry on I would like to meet them at the polls long before the four years.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Edmonton Kingsway.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I intended to speak on this amendment. These task forces represent the people. They represent the government of this province. These are government task forces, Mr. Speaker, carrying out research and direction for this government, and selected by this government, which is the choice of the people of the province of Alberta. It is not misuse of funds - it is action for the people of Alberta.

Let me give you one example. As chairman of one of these task forces -- and I have not received one penny yet, not yet, not one penny for any travel allowance or anything, and this is over six months -- (I recall this \$65 million that the hon. Minister of Telephones talked about) were, as chairman of one of these task forces there was some \$14 to \$18 million that I picked up myself. I think that I can justify the existence of these task forces just on that one item alone.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this -- I welcome any reports from anyone of the opposition -- the members opposite -- but let it be known here and now that I don't intend to chase them. If you want to give reports, bring them to us -- we'll evaluate them and we will present them to our government for action if they are good and sound. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Drayton Valley.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to enter this debate on the amendment, but certainly those members must feel a sorry lot when they consider that in the past 36 years they have not involved their members of the Legislature in the formation of their policies.

I will draw to the hon. members' attention, the Maynard Commission, for which the former Executive Council secured an Order in Council for a quarter of a million dollars to study exactly what was mentioned here before, which is going to cost less than 10 per

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-95

cent of the total. The chairman was to receive \$30,000 plus expenses, and all other members \$26,000. Now do you really think that those people over there on the opposite side -- and I think the people judged them on August 30th -- can give the reason why they cannot explain to the people why these millions of dollars were spent on research that was never implemented? If you are going to value dollars, gentlemen on the other side -- for goodness sakes, you are getting more than your dollar's worth of value on the few dollars that you are paying out for your train fare, or plane fare someplace, or a meal off and on.

I think it's time that these gentlemen on the other side realize they have been living in a society where money was plentiful. Our government realizes that there isn't the money to permit us to allot these millions of dollars for research. We can't afford it, but yet these very same gentlemen are standing on a section in The Legislative Act which can permit this. I think the people will judge this government as well as it has judged the former government -- on its performance. I think there is not much they can say, when the former government spent millions of dollars on research and never implemented one iota. This government has immediately implemented some of the task force reports before January 1st, 1972.

MR. MCCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, my name was one of the four listed with the expense. My total was \$98.50 for the past six months work, 1000 miles of travel. Many days away from my office, not on my constituency business, but on task force business. Our task force replaced the main arm commission, which was set up with a budget of \$250,000. We realized on this side of the House, and our leader realized, that the quality of people he had here to do the same work on government pay without hiring somebody who had to come in from outside. Now with this, there is no reason why this same type of work couldn't have been done in the past. The only reason that I feel that it wasn't done is perhaps they didn't have the calibre or the quality of men to do this dedicated type of work and bring out all these points and systems -- go over whole systems of taxation, go over whole systems of assessment. This takes experience and it takes a lot of understanding. I don't think they have had it in the past and I don't think they have it now.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, it certainly is my privilege to make some remarks on this debate. I would like to say first of all, that this is my ninth session in the Legislative Assembly. I recall my first session -- at that time I recall a number of delegations that I brought to Edmonton, a number of trips to Edmonton, two or three times a month, plus a number of days away from the school at which I was teaching. I totalled up my expenses at the end of the year and I found that the \$54,00 indemnity that was provided for MIA's was completely depleted. I spoke to some of the people in the Cabinet and to Mr. Manning, and asked, "What is the rationale behind the indemnity for a member of the Legislature?" The definition was made very clear to me at that time. I understood it very well and supported the definition of indemnity.

Indemnity was to look after out-of-pocket expenses. Those were expenses that were incurred by us as MLA's or members of the Legislature and certainly we were to take care of the responsibilities we took on. In those nine years, each year we had a number of caucus committees, that is Social Credit caucus committees. I was on a number of those committees. We did a lot of work, we looked at a lot of legislation and spent a lot of our own money in doing that type of work.

9-96

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

So really, Mr. Speaker, the idea of caucus committees for the government is nothing new. They have taken responsibility in the past, done it within the indemnity that was provided for members and certainly have done a very responsible job. I think that that is the principle; that is the definition of indemnity that should be adhered to in this Assembly.

I was very interested in the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture. Certainly, he made a couple of good points. He talked about appreciating saving and doing things like that; that's great. That's his responsibility. He talked about having a responsibility to form policy. That's great! That's the responsibility of government. But one of the things he attempted to do, was to drag across the floor, and drag in front of us as members of the Assembly, and before the people of Alberta, a red herring, in trying to say that we as Social Crediters just want to be on the caucus committees. He agreed with the editorial. As has been pointed out earlier in this debate, the man who wrote this editorial was possibly someone from the Premier's office who screens each one of the press releases and helped to draft this particular editorial, because I wouldn't want to say the editor of that paper has any Conservative leaning at all -- but it's completely slanted in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, the real key that should be understood is that we on this side of the House really don't want to be on committees. We can form committees of our Sacred caucus. We feel that it's great that the Conservatives form their caucus committees, work hard, bring in ideas and are going to be a very responsible government. But we don't feel there should be monies provided for those caucus committees which certainly could very easily be called Conservative committees.

I think there is a big difference between a caucus committee and a legislative committee. A legislative committee is one that is open to the public and accountable to the public as a whole, and it can be paid. The Conservative government at the present time is attempting to make their caucus committees legislative committees, and I agree with them also. One of the differences they are making is that their caucus committees are not open.

The Premier has stated earlier in the House that the information these committees collect is not open to the public scrutiny, not accountable to the public as a whole, and I think that is a real difference.

One of the other items that compares them to a legislative committee, however, is that both the caucus committee and the legislative committee are receiving money from the funds. But under the legislative committee there's accountability; under the caucus committee, or the Conservative committee, there is not accountability to the public, because those reports are not placed for public scrutiny. And I think Mr. Speaker, that even as responsible as the members of the government wish to be, there can be actions taken that are political and for Conservative purposes, and that is an abuse of the responsibilities they have to the people of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I have noted is whenever something has to be taken from the view of the public -- or there is a hatchet man -- or there is a man who has to stand in for the Premier, the Crown Prince of this Assembly is brought into action. And Mr. Speaker, I say that with good authority, because each week as I read the Time magazine, I note the certain political progress across Canada. Last week we note in Time magazine they predict that a Crown Prince is on the horizon for the Province of Alberta, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Crown Prince has a responsibility to examine the steps he and his other colleagues have taken in their actions, whereby they have made it possible through the Lieutenant Governor in Council to make payment to a Conservative

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-97

type committee, a committee that is not being legitimized or authorized by this particular Assembly.

There is only one other point that I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, at this point in time. I would like to adjourn the debate. I would like to make a point on that particular aspect. I feel that this debate is very crucial: I feel that this matter should have discussion before the people of Alberta. In light of that, I feel that adjournment at this time should be agreed to by this Assembly.

As one of the members indicated earlier, we would like to have this aired on TV and talked about on TV -- certainly we would. I would like to challenge the members across the floor, that they don't want us to do this. They would like to talk after midnight when most of the people of Alberta, who are very sensible, go to bed and don't watch late TV. I think that if this issue is not that much of a concern, if the Lougheed government is completely confident in the decision it has made to pay its committees, and if it feels that there is no conflict between a political committee and a legislative committee that is responsible for making policy and is very open, then they should be able to discuss this matter tomorrow when the House opens. Certainly at that time I think we could make our statements very clear and let some of the people in Alberta judge; I challenge them at this time to do that, Mr. Speaker, and I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

[The motion was denied on a voice vote.]

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, just as an example of the rights of the people and freedom of government -- open government --

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly wouldn't agree with the hon. member's thinking, but I do agree with the choice of the colour of the suit he's wearing today. That's about the only thing.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Another red herring!

MR. GETTY:

But why would anybody want to put this political exercise that the opposition is trying to put through tonight in front of the people? They should be ashamed of themselves even to be going through this. It either is a put-on or it isn't, but it looks like a put-on to me, because if it isn't, the insinuations that you can recognize and some of the comments made by the member for Spirit River-Fairview and the member for Drumheller and the ones from whatever it is -- the fellow over there -- are ridiculous; they ought to be ashamed of themselves. The hon. member for Calgary Bow -- what a sight he was over there, Mr. Speaker. I could recognize the fact that he was upset. I think he was taken in by the 55 to 10 when they went into the last election, and he thought he'd jump on that bandwagon and he found it had a lot of flats. He ended up you know, he just picked the wrong party, I guess, Mr. Speaker, and now he's pretty upset about it; bitter I guess, a lot of sour grapes -- I can recognize them when I see them. In any event, my colleagues whom they are talking about as mis-using funds -- I find it completely offensive, and my colleagues have been remarkably restrained. I thought the hon. member for Edmonton Strathcona made the points well and sincerely.

After all, Mr. Speaker, our members were all elected as members of a government -- that's what we are. I've heard them talk about

9-98

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

discrimination. Well, there has been some discrimination, fellows, and some discriminating people did it -- the people of Alberta on August 30th. The discriminated -- they took you out of here and put you over there, and now you're bitter about it and I recognize that -- [Interjections] -- well I'm glad they're listening, Mr. Speaker. It's late and I'm glad they're paying attention. Mr. Speaker, it should be very clear what the issue is here -- definition of government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No!

MR. GETTY:

Is it -- well, is it strictly a Cabinet? Is that what government is? Or is it the government members who were elected on August 30th, 1971 to govern this province? All the self righteous baloney with which they try to confuse that issue -- we have our members elected by the people of Alberta to govern this province, to form government policy, not merely to hear about it from the cabinet, as I suppose happened in the past. We were elected a government of 48 people, and we're all very proud of that. We're all working, researching, looking up facts, all across the province, in some cases outside of the province. We're turning it into government policy.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, after that work is done, we can come up with the best possible legislation. Then they have a role if they ever recognize it, then they have a role -- scrutinize that legislation, and in the meantime, stop playing these phoney political games. Do the job that the people put you here for, and that is to scrutinize the legislation, try and be a responsible opposition for a change, but not with this offensive thing that you put in here tonight.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the people of Alberta are clear on the issue. They won't be led astray by the distortion -- our members are not being paid, they have not been paid. The number of times I've heard that on the other side -- it is complete distortion.

Mr. Speaker, the issue again, I'm sure the people are clear about it, is that we are a government of 48 members and we intend to stay that way, despite what the opposition would like to tell the people.

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn debate.

[The motion was defeated on a voice vote.]

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. House Leader? How long does the government intend to sit this morning? Is there no answer?

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Speaker, I hadn't planned on taking part in this debate. I want to thank the hon. Members for Lacombe and for Ponoka for their very kind remarks. I appreciate it very much.

They may be talking about expense accounts, but I'm talking about representation. If the Conservatives would have placed fins on all the people of Alberta that voted PC, we could stock all our rivers and lakes with suckers.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-99

Since the Lougheed government set up these so-called task force committees, I must admit that it's been a real concern to me, not only to me but to the entire part of Southern Alberta. We are concerned because the Lougheed government has not considered any representation on these committees from the southern part of Alberta, south of Calgary. I'm not going to backtrack on what I said in the House on Friday; it's nothing less than discrimination, as far as I'm concerned, to southern Alberta and the opposition MLA's. The hon. Minister of Telephones asked tonight, why should we be concerned about such a small thing. Maybe it's a small thing to him, but it's quite relevant to me; there is no representation from the southern part of Alberta on these task force committees. I want to reiterate what I mentioned on Friday. Is this democracy? Is this open government? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is not.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate on the amendment which was moved yesterday, it's not my intention to take too much time, but I think we should keep the record straight.

One of the speakers, tonight or yesterday, said that we have never been involved in task forces. This is right. I have served in the Legislature now for 12 years, this is my 13th year, and during that period of time, I have served on quite a number of committees. We have called them caucus committees. Maybe we're quarrelling over words, whether they are called caucus committees, or task forces, but from listening to the discussion from members on the government side, it would appear to me that task forces are simply caucus committees, and so I don't think we should be quarrelling about the words 'task forces' and 'caucus committees'.

But I want to say that I have served on a number of committees, and never at any time have I been paid for even out-of-pocket expenses. I live some 200 miles from Edmonton, that's a matter of 200 miles from where I live to Edmonton and another 200 miles to go back, which is 400 miles. Now I realize that it's not anybody else's fault except my own as to the choice of where I live, and so it requires 400 miles.

But over the period of years, I have served on a number of committees and I want to refer to one committee in particular. We called it the Health and Welfare Committee and listening to the debates (I'm not trying to refer to previous debates, Mr. Speaker) I am very proud as a citizen of the Province of Alberta to know that we have in the Province of Alberta the nursing home program. When I think of the time, and I'm not attempting to take credit for the work of this committee, although I was a member of the committee, we had a large number of meetings, I don't want to say how many, I don't remember how many; it's a number of years ago. But this thing was given very excellent study by the committee. Today, I don't think there's any member in this Legislature would disagree with the statement when I say that we have the finest nursing home program in the province of Alberta today that you can find any place in Canada and any place in the United States. This is the result of a study committee. And I'm only pointing this out. I understand that there's hardly a day passes that representatives from other provinces, representatives from other parts of North America, come into Alberta to examine our nursing home program. And I'm convinced there are many people on the government side of the House very happy with the present nursing home program. I have listened to a number of these speakers say that they would like to have more nursing homes in their respective constituencies, and to this, I say, this is just an example of what a caucus committee can do.

Now, if you just want to call it a task force committee, this is fine, and I don't quarrel with the fact that governments have caucus committees or task forces. As a matter of fact, I'd be very much

9-100

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

surprised if a government did not have a committee, whether it was called a task force or a caucus committee. What I am quarreling about is the fact that these committees are paid for their expenses and their research for their own government policy. This is the point that's under principle.

I know when I was first elected, and I have always maintained this view that the only promise I ever made to the people was that I would attempt to serve the people to the best of my ability, irrespective of whether they voted for me or whether they didn't vote for me. And this is the reason that I'm here. This is the reason that I'm here to serve the people of my constituency and if I serve on a caucus committee on which I served for a number of years, I feel it's an honour and a privilege not only to represent the people of my constituency, but also to use whatever ability I do have on these particular committees.

Now, if you'd like me to carry on and mention some of the other committees that I've served on, I'd be very happy to delay the House that much longer. My only point in speaking to this debate is to keep the record straight that we have had caucus committees for years, and as far as I'm concerned, I've always thought that they had a very useful function. But we are quarreling with the fact that these committees are paid for doing research for their own government ranks and this is the point that's at issue, and when governments pay their own caucus committees, then it really relegates the member of the opposition to a second class citizen. As was mentioned before, I always feel after a general election, that the people in the constituency vote for this candidate or that candidate, and I want to say quite frankly that the conservative candidate in the recent election in our constituency is a very fine gentleman and would have made a wonderful contribution to this legislature. We never at any time, yes, we disagreed with policies, but never at any time did we disagree on our friendship.

When I look back over the last number of years, I think possibly after each election, I've been on a better understanding with the other candidates than I would have been even before the election. Now here we are sitting in the legislature and following the election, we know how a government is formed. In this particular case we have 75 members in the legislature. The group or the party having the largest number, forms the government. We know this. The Lieutenant Governor asks the leader of that particular group to form the government. The others who are not part of that group which is forming the government is forming the opposition. So before an election is called in the province of Alberta, we have 'X' number of candidates in the various constituencies in the province. And once we're elected, we're elected to do a job firstly for the province of Alberta, and also for your constituency. Now you can reverse the priorities if you like, but you have a dual responsibility. So once you come into this legislature, you take the oath to serve to the best of your ability.

And if you're selected to serve on a caucus committee, then I think it is an honour and a privilege to be able to serve on that committee and be able to improve if at all possible, your government legislation. And let me say again, go back and look at the nursing home program. We have a wonderful program in the province of Alberta. The patient today pays \$3 a day for per patient day bed in the nursing home. The government pays \$6.50. For semi-private, I believe, it's an additional \$2, and for a private room, an additional \$3. But in all fairness, this is a wonderful program in the province of Alberta, and it's resulted from a caucus committee. So Mr. Speaker, in bringing my remarks to a close -- my hon. member says to keep going -- maybe I should now start and talk about some of the other committees we've served on too.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-101

But in all sincerity I believe it's an honour to be here. I've always considered it to be an honour to be here. It's always been an honour to serve on these caucus committees. And they have served a very useful purpose. And I haven't any doubt in my mind that some of the committees that are now called your task force committees will be serving a useful purpose. They'll be bringing forth legislation which in many cases, I'm sure we on this side of the House, will be supporting. But we are quarreling with the very fine principle of paying members on that committee for doing research for their government members when that should be considered part of their normal responsibility as being elected to the government. I thank you.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, before this debate closes, I would like to make a few points. I want to assure the hon. members on the other side of the House that I'm not simply rising in my place to try to fill in time. I'm hoping there are some points that I can make that will be worthy of consideration. I want to say too, Mr. Speaker, that they may question the motive of our members, and that's their privilege if they want to. I don't intend to argue that right. I think that's the privilege of every member in the legislature to place whatever assessment he wants to on anything that is said by any member who sees fit to speak in this House.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I have always taken my responsibilities very seriously as an MIA. I believe that every MLA tries to do this. For example, I had an invitation that I received quite some time ago to appear in my own constituency last night. And I was there to fulfil that responsibility. I was south of Medicine Hat last night at 10:30. I drove back to Edmonton by car. I did not get any mileage. I did not get any payment for time and I didn't expect to get any special payment for that responsibility. I was merely trying fulfil my responsibilities as an MLA.

I certainly believe that everyone who aspires to high office must face his own conscience as to how he will best serve if he is elected. And I have said on many occasions, Mr. Speaker, that never do I feel that any member -- and I don't care on which side of the House he sits -- is adequately paid for the work that he does. And I want to make that very clear. I say I don't care which side of the House they sit on -- I care not which party they represent -- I say that the sacrifices that they will be called upon to make from time to time cannot really be covered by money. I think the hon. leader of the Government will recall that I suggested to him very early in his taking over the responsibilities of government that I felt that one had to approach it almost with a missionary zeal, recognizing that there was an impossibility of setting up the pay schedule in such a manner that any person would feel that he was being adequately paid. I still feel that way. And I think that that is the way that we must leave it.

Now I listened very carefully to the hon. Minister of Agriculture and we are certainly giving him a lot of attention this evening -- maybe more than his remarks deserve, Mr. Speaker. But I feel that I simply must refer to a point or two that he made. He suggested -- and I marked it down here -- that we were 'howling' because we were left out of task forces. Mr. Speaker, nothing can be further from the truth.

I think that if anyone heard me, for example, make my statement on election night they will recall that there was no bitterness on my part whatsoever. I accept without question the decision of the electorate, because they are supreme in our province. And it must always be so. And I care not whether I sit on this side or whether I sit on the other side, I still have a responsibility to the people who

9-102

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

elected me, to serve them to the best of my ability, and to provide the kind of service that they expect of me. And certainly as far as I am concerned -- and I am sure that this goes for my colleagues on this side of the House, we are not howling. Maybe we have raised our voices in trying to make our points a little stronger, but we are not howling because we were left out. We are talking about something that we believe is a point of principle, that if we sit in our places and say nothing we have failed in our responsibilities as members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

Because, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the responsibility of an opposition is to provide a critical surveillance of any matter that is brought to this Assembly, whether it be by the government side of the House or by any member on this side of the House. It is not our responsibility, Mr. Speaker, to bring in policy directives. That is the responsibility of the government, and I certainly do not quarrel with that whatsoever.

I recognize too that there are a number of ways in which they will gather the kind of information that they want. There are a number of methods that they may want to use in order to more adequately serve the people of this province and I won't quarrel with this. I simply say that the principle of paying members of their caucus, for paying them extra for fulfilling their responsibility as an MLA is wrong in principle, Mr. Speaker. And I'm thoroughly convinced of it or I wouldn't be rising in my place to take part in this debate.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture said he was appalled at the treatment given the MIA's. I didn't know that he had sat in on any of our Caucus committees. I didn't realize that he was as knowledgeable as he was leading us to believe that he was. He was talking about something of which he had practically no knowledge whatsoever. But in trying to stand up in his place and speak as though he was the most knowledgeable man in this House on the practice and procedure that our party followed while we were in power, I would suggest that he didn't know what we were doing or he would not have been saying what he said tonight.

I say that we could have been much more generous in our treatment of our own MIA's in regard to space, facilities that were provided in this Legislature, though I say too -- and I say this in all respect to the former leader of this party, the hon. Mr. Manning -- that I can't think of any man in this province who had a greater concern for the expenditure of a dollar and a greater concern that it be spent in a manner that would not provoke any opportunity for any citizen of this province to be critical of the way in which we handled it. And Mr. Speaker, I say that I tried to follow in that tradition. Because to me it is important, it is not simply trying to find ways and means of paying us more money, for the reasons that I have already given.

Someone suggested, and I believe that it was the hon. Minister of Agriculture, that we are here on sufferance. Mr. Speaker, I can't agree, we are here because we are elected by our constituencies and there is no member of this House that is here on sufferance; we are here duly elected by our individual constituencies.

The hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs seems to feel that all he has to do is to rise in his place and make statements and they become the gospel truth. I suggest that this does not make it true, simply because he rises and states it. And he made some silly statements this evening -- talking about sour grapes, discrimination. And then he came up with this gem, he says the issue is a definition of government; it is not. The issue, Mr. Speaker, is a matter of providing special payment for caucus committees. That is the issue. And somehow or another, willfully or otherwise, the members on the opposite side have convinced themselves that they can get away with

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-103

it. And I say that they can win the vote without any question. We have realized that from the beginning. But, Mr. Speaker, we have considered it important enough to move an amendment to the Throne Speech, to provide an opportunity for our members to stand in their place and speak on the issue. We would have been happy to have presented our case over the TV, had the members on the other side seen fit to go along with an adjournment, but now I can only conclude that this is their way of providing a closure movement and this is in fact what they are doing. I'm not arguing their ability to do it and their right to do it if that's what they want to do.

But I suggest that in looking at this issue, again may I restate there is no bitterness on our part in being left out of Caucus Committees. There is no howling on our part. They are missing the issue altogether, and it is the issue of payment from public funds for work that I think more rightfully falls into a political category and should come out of other funds.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose we could continue and raise a number of other points. I was very interested in the remarks of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview when he suggested that this is one time when he is able to agree with us on this side, and there may not be too many times that he can do it. I would have to say, too, that this is one of the few times that I will be able to rise in my place and commend him for a very excellent address, because he agrees with us. But you see I'm honest enough to say it. These others think it but don't say it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I say this, that certainly there is a point of philosophy that we cannot agree on, but we are not discussing philosophy, we're not discussing political differences in that manner. We are discussing the principle, and I must keep hammering it home. It is the principle of payment from public funds to caucus committees which is absolutely wrong.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, in participating on the debate on the amendment, I think the first comment that I would like to make is in response to the observations made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition with regard to our view to bringing this matter to finality tonight. I think the main reason and the main response that we had to the motion, and the reason we came to the conclusion that it was necessary and essential that this matter come to a conclusion, was the wording and the imputing of motives which were set forth in the unfortunate wording of the amendment. There is a matter of sound debate here. There's a matter of principle that is involved, and I would like to express my views upon it.

However, it is unfortunate that the matter raised, that is, the matter of principle, was raised in the way and in the form it was set forth in this amendment by the implication of imputing of motives. It was implied in relationship to the government. For that reason the government felt and considers without any question that it has no doubt in its mind that this matter has got to be brought to a conclusion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in trying to assess the matter that is before us, and trying to look at the various arguments that have been presented on both sides, there is very much an important point of principle here.

If I could take the more restrained views which have been presented on the other side, I think I sense what they are saying. They are saying that government is Cabinet and that the rest of the members are therefore to be treated in an exactly equal way. Mr. Speaker, that's my reading of the argument, in principle, that has

9-104

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

been made on the other side, and I would appreciate an opportunity to present my views.

I believe very strongly that we have three or four parts of that that should be brought into focus here. First of all I think we have the clear legal position that this government took, that was described so effectively by the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona. And he pointed out another point which I think is significant, and that is that under The Legislative Assembly Act at the moment, there is provision, if you like, that discriminates in relationship to providing an additional allowance for those members who do not reside within the City of Edmonton. A very valid position, I agree. In fact I hope some day we might even have some important debate about the compensation of members that represents ridings of a very far-flung nature on an expense basis. But that's a matter for future debate.

I think too, Mr. Speaker, that he pointed out in his remarks with regard to that, that we were clearly talking about a situation and the task forces that he was involved in that he as a member in the city of Edmonton on the government side did not incur expenses and hence did not make a claim for them. He clearly pointed out -- as I think was very eloquently developed by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley and the hon. Member for Ponoka -- the work they have done on this task force, the fact that they have dealt clearly with expenses, and clearly with out-of-pocket expenses.

Now, let me move from this point, Mr. Speaker, if I could, to the issue. I think the issue is that those on the other side feel that government is Cabinet and all other members of the Legislative Assembly outside of Cabinet should be treated in an entirely equal manner. Now I happen to disagree in fundamental principle with that, and my principle, I suggest -- without imputing motives on either side of this Legislature -- I feel equally strongly about the principle. The principle as I see it is this. Under the parliamentary system in an election, the party that elects the most number of members is called upon to form a government. The decision on August 30th of 1971 was by the people of Alberta and was that that party was the Progressive Conservative party of which I was privileged to be the leader. But the day after that election on August 31st, in my view there was a government that consisted equally of every member here, and then on September 10th there was sworn in an Executive Council. I took the view then, for a number of reasons, but one reason in principle, Mr. Speaker, is that every single member here is a part of the government, and, to the extent that they're involved in the formulation of government policy -- yes, there is a difference between the members on either side of the House. If we were going beyond the law of the Legislative Assembly Act to pay an indemnity to the members of these task forces -- and I think you could make a pretty good case for it -- but if we went beyond that, then I would have to move to the other side of that argument and the point of principle that I sense the hon. Member for Macleod was bringing up. But we didn't, and we dealt clearly on this matter with the question of paying the expenses within the law.

I've thought long and hard about this decision, because I recognized, as has been mentioned, that in a way it was an interpretation that had not been the practice in the past in this province about looking at government. I don't look at government as merely the Executive Council; I look at it as the members that ran under a banner of a party that was voted upon. And the people in a given constituency, voting for that Progressive Conservative candidate, weren't voting in a different way than the people who voted in another constituency for a Progressive Conservative candidate that happened to end up on the Executive Council. The reason for that happens to be obvious because there's another part of the parliamentary system as I understand it, and that part is simply this -- the members the other way would be the quickest I think, to

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-105

move on this -- if at any time on a vote that is clearly a matter of government policy as distinguished from a free vote, if the members who are members of the Executive Council on this side cannot bring the members who are with them on this side behind them on that vote, and they're defeated on that vote, they have lost the confidence of the whole House. Now, for that reason, Mr. Speaker, it is essential as I see it, that the formulation of the policy, that is, the policy of the government as it comes forth, must be formulated by the members on this side of the House. They must be a part of that, and I think in the past, without casting aspersions, the concept of going outside the elected members to hire specialists, and experts, that in my view was unwise, because the elected people -- I feel very strongly about this -- the fellow, and this applies to both sides of the House -- the person who has stood up on the public platform and taken, if you like, the abuse or the flak -- or to use former President Truman's expression, to have taken the heat and haven't got out of the kitchen -- then I feel that that elected person has a much greater feel for what it is the people want.

So we made a decision and recognized that it was a departure from past practice here, but I feel very determined about the decision. That decision was, that the members on the government side, not just in the Executive Council, were going to be involved in the formulation of policy, that their deliberations and their reports were going to be considered as though they were part of the Executive Council and from that we bring it forth here. On the other side, when we present it -- and there are going to be times when I hope we will hear, over the course of this Legislature, some very constructive amendments and improvements, particularly from those members on the other side with their experience and their background in the administration of government. I am going to look forward to welcoming it.

For those members who would like to look at the question of the involvement of the MLA, we have specifically set up in the Speech from the Throne, six, and maybe there should be more. The hon. Member for Macleod has raised another question. Maybe there should be more legislative committees, but there have been six that have already been declared in the Speech from the Throne that will involve the members in a legislative sense.

I conclude by saying that it is my view, in the parliamentary system and the way a government is formed, that a government is a government of all the members that are elected under the banner of that party that secures the most number of seats in an election. I don't intend to continue with the distinction that has been the case in the past.

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, I just don't know how many speakers there are left on this side of the House. I don't know whether this could be classed as a filibuster or not, but I feel that we, on this side of the House are merely filling the role of an opposition, a role of a responsible opposition, the type of opposition that the members on the government side of the House who were MLA's last year and the year before that, when sitting on this side of the House would have given to us had we been the government.

The government has interjected a new practice into our legislative system, one with which we don't agree, and we are merely voicing our opposition to it. We don't like it and we have taken this means to let the government know about it.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I do resent greatly some of the insinuations made from the other side of the House regarding those whom we call backbenchers, of the former Social Credit government. No one knows better than I the services that these men

9-106

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 14th 1972

rendered, because for eight years I was chairman of the Social Credit caucus. I know the work that they put into it, I know the feelings they had towards it, I know how conscientious they were. During that time too, there wasn't one piece of legislation that came before this Legislature, that didn't first go before that caucus and was debated by all the members there. At least they had the opportunity to debate it clause by clause, word by word, practically. So they were filling a responsible role to the people of Alberta.

We had our way of doing things and you have your way of doing things. I can assure you that every member we have had in the past carried his weight in the caucus and carried his weight in his constituency. I know of three men, three members, during the past number of years who, like my fellow colleague and publisher from Calgary, Mr. Farran, gave up their businesses in order to put their full time on the work of an MLA. One of those members we still have with us, the hon. Member for Hand Hills Acadia, Mr. French.

MR. SPEAKER:

If there is no further debate, the Motion moved by the hon. Member for Whitecourt and seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight is that an humble address be presented to His Honour the hon. Lieutenant Governor of Alberta as follows: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present session.

And the amendment moved by the hon. Member for Drumheller and seconded by the hon. Member for Clover Bar is that the following words be added to this address:

"We respectfully submit to Your Honour that this Assembly regrets the action of the Alberta government in misusing public money to pay government task forces which are nothing more or less than Conservative party caucus committees."

All those in favour of the amendment, please say aye. And those opposed please say no. I declare the 'Noes' to have it.

[A recorded vote was called for.]

MR. SPEAKER:

I'm sorry, the bell doesn't work. If I may.

[The Speaker tapped his waterglass with his pen.]

Possibly the hon. members could take notice of the improbability of there being other members lurking in the corridors, and if the House wishes, we'll observe the usual three minute interval, otherwise, if there is unanimous agreement, I would propose to take the sense of the House now.

[The House divided as follows:

For the motion: Messrs.

Anderson	Drain	Sorenson
Barton	French	Speaker, R.
Benoit	Ho Lem	Strom
Buck	Ludwig	Taylor
Buckwell	Mandeville	Wilson
Cooper	Miller, D.	Wyse
Dixon	Notley	

Against the motion: Messrs.

March 14th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

9-107

Adair	Fester	McCrimmon
Appleby	Getty	Miller, J.
Ashton	Ghitter	Minieley
Backus	Hansen	Moore
Chambers	Harle	Paproski
Chichak, Mrs.	Hohol	Peacock
Cookson	Horner	Schmid
Crawford	Hunley, Miss	Stromberg
Diachuk	Hyndman	Topolinsky
Dickie	Jamison	Trynchy
Doan	Koziak	Warrack
Dowling	Lee	Werry
Farran	Leitch	Yurko
Fluker	Lougheed	Zander
Totals:	Ayes - 20	Noes - 42]

MR. DOWLING:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Now may I just say one or two things. I should like to suggest that the House might express its appreciation to the pages who have stayed with us through this. And even though the hour is late, I should like to mention to the House that the lights which have been put in for the purposes of TV and the blue screen up there are rather more obtrusive than was expected. I would ask the hon. members to bear with the situation, since this is very much on a trial basis and if these are found to be objectionable in actual use, perhaps we could advert to the matter later.

MR. LOUGHEED:

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

[The House rose at 1:10 am.]

