

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, March 23rd, 1972

[The House met at 2:30 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

Conduct of Members

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a point of privilege. Yesterday, during the course of debate the hon. member for Calgary Bow raised a matter that, when I thought about it further, I felt involved a matter of principle, Mr. Speaker. It had to do with the importance of the individual MLA in this Assembly. The suggestion by the hon. member was that we should at all times be directing our attention to the Chair despite who may be speaking and where the member is seated.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that, when we participate in debate in this Assembly, our remarks should be directed to the Chair. On the other hand I feel, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you would be the first to agree, that the Speaker is the servant of the Legislature, not the master of the Legislature. For that reason I feel that, as much as possible under the circumstances, we should give full and undivided attention and full respect to the member. Whether the member sits where the hon. Member for Drayton Valley does or where the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest does, I think it is in order that we pay attention and direct our attention to the member speaking, unless, Mr. Speaker, you or the Assembly directs otherwise. So I would like to raise this point of privilege and bring it to the attention of the House and also, Mr. Speaker, for your response.

MR. SPEAKER:

For my response? This is a matter for the House. I have really no response to make and no feelings on the subject at all.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, may I comment on the point brought up by the hon. Premier? Over the years while I was Speaker, and previously while the hon. Peter Dawson was -- in particular the hon. Peter Dawson made it a point and a tradition in this House that the hon. members do not turn their back on the Speaker's Chair. I feel personally it is an affront to the Chair for everyone to turn his back on the Speaker because all remarks ought to be directed to the Speaker. If the hon. members will watch the proceedings in other Houses, they will see that the members there do not turn their backs on the Speaker.

16-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I want to rise in response to that. I have been in other Houses too and I have observed the practices there. I would have to take issue with the hon. member for Calgary Millican. I feel it is a matter of respect to the individual MLA. I think it is important that the individual MLA, particularly due to the seating arrangement, not be bound in the position of forever speaking to the backs of his colleagues throughout the course of his time in the Legislature. I think if the hon. members want to leave it this way it can be a matter of personal preference. I do not want the matter to be left in the air, I feel so strongly about the importance of the individual MLA. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that as long as remarks are always directed through the Chair it is no affront to the Chair.

MR. TAYLOR:

If I could say a word on the point of privilege. I know of no rules either in Beauchesne or in parliamentary procedure dealing with this particular item. I think it's a case of respect for Mr. Speaker, and for all members. Frankly, I don't know whether you can show greater respect through your face or through the back of your head. I think you show respect through your attitude, and some members must speak to the backs of other hon. members. This is contingent with the fact that some of us are in the back seats, some are in the third seats, some are in the front seats, and so on. I frankly cannot feel, while Mr. Speaker is representing in a way Her Majesty the Queen, there is any disrespect if I happen to turn to listen to someone in the other corner, so that I can see his facial expression and enjoy his talk more. I really cannot see any disrespect. I certainly show no disrespect when I turn to listen to the members in the back row and to my left, and I'm sure the Cabinet shows no disrespect to Her Majesty the Queen, or to Mr. Speaker, because they turn to watch the facial expression and better enjoy the representation of the speaker. I really think the thing is summed up in our attitude. I think we're all respectful of you, Mr. Speaker, and of each other, and I would prefer leaving it to the personal preference of each individual member.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, if I may just add a word to what has been said by my hon. colleague. I certainly don't take issue with what the hon. Premier has said in regard to this point. I also want to make it abundantly clear that, in my opinion, the decorum of this House is an example, I am sure, to many, many Legislatures, and in fact, to the House of Commons. It has been my privilege to attend there on a number of occasions, and I must confess that if I were to judge it on the basis of attitudes, which I think is the important matter, Mr. Speaker, I would be very concerned. I have always been very proud of the conduct of this House, and I have on many occasions referred to it outside of the Legislature as one that we can be very proud of. I would hope that, whether we happen to be working at our desks when a member speaks or doing something else, it would not necessarily be interpreted as disinterest in what is being said. I can say to the House that even though I may be reading or writing, I am very much aware of what is being said. I think, too, when we remain in our places for the length of time we do, it is difficult just to sit in our seats twiddling our thumbs. I close by saying I hope that we will be able to continue with the respect and the support of the decorum we have enjoyed in this House.

DR. HOFNER:

Mr. Speaker, if I might speak for just a moment. I certainly agree with the hon. Opposition House Leader in relation to the attitude in the Legislature, and I would like, having had some

March 23rd 1972

ALEEFTA HANSARD

16-3

experience in other places, to suggest to you that you are not the servant of the Queen, but rather, the servant of this House; the Queen is represented in our Legislature by the Lieutenant Governor. Certainly, it isn't disrespectful in my experience to turn one's back on the Speaker if it is necessary to do that to pay attention to the speeches of hon. members. There have been occasions when speakers deliberately turned their back on the Speaker, so they don't notice when he wants to interrupt them; that was in common use in the House of Commons. However, I do agree very much with the thought that we should pay attention to the representations made by the members of this Legislature, and the best way we can do that is to turn and face them, and watch them give their deliveries so that we can take full advantage of their representations.

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder, rather than have a prolonged debate on this matter, whether we might resolve it in one of two ways. One might be to have a motion to refer it to a suitable committee, and the other might be to indicate some generality of consensus with regard to the suggestion that it be left to the individual preferences of the individual members.

MR. WILSON:

As the one who brought up the issue, I would just like to say that my concern was of the dignity and the prestige of your position, and if you feel that no disrespect is being shown to you, sir, I would be happy to go along with your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER:

With the greatest respect, I don't think it requires a ruling from the Chair. And as I say I have absolutely no feelings on the matter whatsoever, because I don't think it interferes with my duties one way or the other, as a servant of the House.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 28: The Apprenticeship Amendment Act

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being The Apprenticeship Amendment Act. The change in this Act will remove the conflict and insure that apprentices are entitled to the same basic right as other employees. With these amendments, an apprentice will have the right to join a trade union and the bargaining agent can negotiate on his behalf with his employer for the terms and condition of his employment.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 28 was introduced and read a first time.]

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask that this bill be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there a seconder for the hon. minister's motion?

MR. LEITCH:

I will second the motion.

16-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent.]

Bill No. 34 The Sexual Sterilization Repeal Act, 1972

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Sexual Sterilization Repeal Act, 1972. The object of the bill is to repeal legislation which provides for voluntary or involuntary sterilization of psychotic or mentally deficient people, which problem we feel constitutes a violation of basic human rights, and is an anachronism.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 34 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, that Bill No. 34, The Sexual Sterilization Repeal Act, 1972, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent.]

Bill No. 29 The Manpower and Labour Act

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to introduce a bill being The Manpower and Labour Act. Because we are familiar with The Labour Act, I shall refer briefly only to the new function of Manpower. This is a major bill, Mr. Speaker, and I will be two or three minutes in introducing it. The basic principle underlying the Alberta Manpower policy is that employment is essential to the development of individuals and families, and that employment opportunities should be available to all citizens of the province. Employment should provide the major source of income for an individual or a family. Employment contributes to the well-being of the total society and enables the society not only to raise the physical living standard --

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. minister debating the bill or is he giving the contents?

DR. HOHOL:

Just the contents.

MR. SPEAKER:

As I understand it, the rules provide for the contents of the bill to be summarized.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I believe on first reading it is appropriate, especially in the case of a significant new bill of some substance as stated by the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour, to outline briefly what the purpose of the bill is. I don't believe he is engaging in debate which is quite properly held on second reading. With a major bill of this kind I would submit that a few more minutes of introduction and explanation is appropriate.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I think it is quite essential, particularly for the hon. members on this side who have

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-5

not seen the bill, to have the main principles set out by the hon. minister or hon. member who introduces the bill. It then gives us something to work on immediately in regard to the principles which will then be debated under the second reading of the bill. I do think that the discourse should be to set out the principles only, the main contents of the bill, without entering into any item of debate, or trying to say why that particular item is included.

DR. HOHOL:

Thank you. Employment contributes to the well-being of society as a whole and enables society not only to raise physical living standards but also makes possible the many activities which enrich our lives. Every Albertan who is physically and mentally capable should have the opportunity to participate in productive employment. It is therefore necessary to improve employment opportunities, increase the ability of Albertans to take advantage of these opportunities, and reduce the risk of unemployment --

MR. TAYLOR:

On a point of order, the items that are now being given to us I think very excellently illustrate what you just suggested should not be done. What we want to know are the main points without the reasons for those points at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER:

My understanding is that it is not permitted under the practice and the rules to discuss government policy on the introduction of a bill, but only the contents of the bill, since there is no opportunity for a debate.

DR. HOHOL:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of this bill might be outlined as follows. To ensure the availability of adequate information regarding manpower resources in Alberta by conducting, commissioning or instituting such research studies as may be necessary; to co-ordinate the activities of other departments and agencies of government that would facilitate the development of a comprehensive manpower program; to co-ordinate the operation of federal programs relating to manpower policy within the Province of Alberta; in conjunction with the Executive Council, to establish operational guidelines to ensure that a comprehensive manpower program is developed; and to develop such other programs as are necessary to facilitate the implementation of a comprehensive manpower program for Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there a copy of the bill?

DR. HOHOL:

Yes, that is the one.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 29 was introduced and read a first time.]

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 the staff and 110 boys from the Salesian Junior Boys School in the city, known as St.

16-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

Mary's Boys Home. This school is one of the outstanding educational centres in the province of Alberta. The teachers are not only highly trained but are also dedicated to their work, and it has been a pleasure through the years to see the tremendous change and tremendous contribution that the Reverend Fathers and Brothers have made to the lives of a great number of boys who attend this school from all religious faiths. Today, I am going to call out the names of the staff and the boys, and as I do so I wonder if they would rise -- I think they are in both galleries; Rev. Fr. Louis Liberati, who is the director of the school, Rev. Fr. Claude, Rev. Fr. Larry, Rev. Fr. John, Brother Bob, Brother Vic, Brother Bob, and Brother Richard, and of course the 110 boys. If they would stand now, and while they are standing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the Bantams and the Midgets of this school have had an outstanding season this year in hockey. The Bantams have been unbeaten throughout the entire schedule. The Midgets are in first place in the Knights of Columbus League in the city.

There is one other outstanding thing about this school that I would beg leave to mention, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the son of our respected Speaker is a member of the student body.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you, Sir, and to this Assembly through you, 60 Grade VI students from the Holyrood School in the constituency of Edmonton Gold Bar, which I represent. These students are here today with those who impart knowledge to them, namely their teachers; Miss Fran Losie, Mr. Ivan Holmgren, and student teachers Mr. Ed Wilkins, Mr. Dan Bouwmeister, Mr. Al Bauerline and Mr. C. Bartlett. They are seated in the public gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask that they stand and be recognized.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I also introduce to you and to the hon. members of the House a man who gave most of his life to the welfare of the people of Alberta through the Department of Highways. I refer to the man who retired as office engineer just a year or so ago. Mr. A.C. McClellan, P. Eng., is in our gallery, and I'm sure we are very happy to have Mr. McClellan visit the Legislature today.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MISS HUNLEY:

I wish to file a reply to Question No. 118 which was requested by the hon. member for Hanna-Oyen.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the 66th annual report of The Alberta Department of Education for the period of July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1971.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report and accounts of The Alberta Resources Railroad for the year ending December 31, 1971.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table three documents. The first is in reply to Question No. 131, requested by the hon. member for Macleod; secondly, copies of the terms of reference of The Alberta

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-7

Grain Commission, and thirdly, the annual report of The Alberta
Emergency Measures Organization.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, approximately a week ago the hon. Leader of the Opposition raised a question regarding a report, the report of a Special Joint Committee of the Senate and the House of Commons on The Constitution of Canada. At that time he requested whether it would be possible to obtain a copy for each member of the House; as I advised him that day, we had one copy delivered last Friday, but we have now been able to obtain copies for all members; I am now tabling one with the House.

ORAL QUESTIONS

Teachers' Right to Strike

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Education, and ask him if the officials of the Department of Education did present legislation to the meeting between the teachers and trustees we have referred to on a number of occasions which, had the legislation gone forward, would have made it impossible for teachers to strike?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I sent to my hon. friend a letter of about seven paragraphs which dealt in full, I believe, with that issue. I think the letter speaks for itself.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure there must be some confusion in the hon. minister's mind, because in the letter it talks in terms of the Election Act which would remove the teachers' right to strike. If I didn't make myself clear, I have been referring to the School Act.

MR. HYNDMAN:

For the Election Act then, if the hon. gentleman reads the School Act, the letter will be sufficiently explanatory.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, if I were to conclude from the letter that the hon. minister was not aware that officials of the department presented possible legislation to this joint meeting, would that be a fair assumption? -- that the hon. minister did not understand what was going on?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman can draw such assumptions and conclusions and understandings, as he wishes. The letter is self-explanatory and I leave it at that point.

Foreign Takeovers - White Stag of Canada Ltd.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Premier. Does the government consider the announced proposed sale of White Stag of Canada Limited to a Canadian subsidiary of a foreign country of

16-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

sufficient importance to take any action or fully investigate the matter?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I dealt with a similar question from the hon. member for Wainwright yesterday, and would respond to this in the same way, except that having noticed the announcement the hon. member refers to, we certainly will make an inquiry with regard to it. Insofar as any policy position with respect to the provincial government, I think I've answered that and I think the Hansard record of yesterday will show the position.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In this particular situation, Mr. Premier, in light of the fact that there were \$12 1/2 million in sales last year for this company, and their previous announced intention was to offer some of the common stock to Canadian shareholders, I was wondering if you might not feel that this particular situation might require more than the usual policy position?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I didn't make myself clear. I did recognise the point that the hon. member was making. Because of the magnitude of what was involved it did require some degree of specific enquiry by the government. But having said that, and having undertaken to make that inquiry, I want to make it clear that, insofar as a basic policy position on this question is concerned, the answer that I gave yesterday in the House is the answer that will stand.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Village Lake Louise

MR. NOTLEY:

I would like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. The question is simply this: In the light of the statement yesterday by the Leader of the Official Opposition in the Government of Canada respecting proposed talks between the federal and provincial government on the Lake Louise project, has that statement changed the government's position with respect to making a definitive statement in this House on the Lake Louise project?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, since I have been dealing with that matter in the House, I think the hon. member might notice there is absolutely nothing different between what the Leader of the Opposition from the federal House said and our statement in the House. I could refer to it for him, if he hasn't got one before him: "Government to government discussions with Ottawa must take place relative to this issue and other national park policies." So there is absolutely no difference in the two stands.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Does his reply indicate that neither the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Stanfield, nor our hon. Premier is taking any stand on the issue whatsoever?

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-9

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs give us an indication as to when these meetings might take place, and whether or not they would be open to the press?

MR. GETTY:

Would the hon. member expand on what he means 'open to the press' -- between ourselves and Mr. Chretien, and have the press there too? Is that what you are talking about?

MR. WILSON:

Yes, Sir.

MR. GETTY:

Well, I'm not quite sure, Mr. Speaker, exactly when the actual meeting will take place. I can say it will be before the federal government makes any announcements on it. However, whether Mr. Cretien or ourselves feel that that would be something that you would invite the press to, I would doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, whether we would gain any benefit from that at all.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In the event then that it wasn't open to the press, would the provincial government's official position be made public before the meeting started?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The hon. minister says government to government discussions will take place on this issue. When can we expect a statement in this Legislature on the matter?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, one of the things the hon. member doesn't seem to realize is that this is an issue of considerable magnitude, one in which there has been a tremendous amount of interest expressed by Albertans. We have obtained all of the various reports that were given to the hearing that the federal government held. We have some six or seven departments involved who are also assessing the impact of this in Alberta. All of these things must be taken into account, Mr. Speaker, and then we will be able to carry on meaningful discussions.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister tell us how and when Albertans might be able to know what the government's position is?

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the hon. minister give the House some assurance that before the end of this session, after the departments have had an opportunity to review these submissions, we will have a statement on the government's position?

16-10

ALEEPTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the hon. member is really listening. I've said that there is a great deal of work going on, and a great number of briefs have been delivered and are being considered. As soon as that material has been assessed satisfactorily we will be able to carry on discussions with the federal government, and presumably, it will soon be clear, Mr. Speaker, sometime after that, what decision has been taken.

Remission of Educational Property Taxes for Senior Citizens

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the government prepared an accurate total of those 65 and over who pay property tax, and the remission required to eliminate the 30-mill educational tax?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the amount that was put in the current budget, the one that is before the Legislature for its consideration, covers what we think will be the total call for that particular program. The numbers were arrived at through various statistics and records that were available to various agencies in government. Naturally there is a fairly high degree of guesswork for this, because it has to be done with averages and it has to be done with samplings, but a task force on municipal-provincial financing, together with the Department of Municipal Affairs, has attempted to make an accurate assessment of those kinds of figures.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is it not possible that the government could underestimate by as much as \$7 million?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is referring to the estimates for the Homeowners' Tax discount program which can be estimated accurately because it's been going on a number of years, and because you know of the increase in rate each year, within about 3 per cent. I've been assured of this by departmental officials, so we cannot on this side accept an error of 50 per cent in that program, one that has been going on for several years. With respect to the new program, we do recognize that it had to be done on averages and samplings, that it is based on a sliding assessment scale, not on a fixed lump amount per household as the other program. So the two things are quite different.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. If a person is over 65 years of age and owns a duplex, does he qualify, if he lives in it, for the 30 mill reduction?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, for any members who are familiar with the Homeowners' Tax Discount Plan, they will have no trouble in assessing the guidelines and principles of The Senior Citizen's Shelter Assistance Act, because I have said several times that it is really an extension of that program and is based on the same principles. So it does apply to the portion of the building which constitutes a household, and there's one grant per household.

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-11

MR. DIXON:

Just so that I'm clear on it, Mr. Speaker, a further question to the hon. minister. In other words, the only part that you're going to allow the 30 mills on is the portion that the person actually lives in, not the balance of the duplex? The reason I ask you this question, just for your clarification, is that we do not make this restriction. He can be in a \$100,000 house and qualify, but if he's in a \$35,000 duplex he would only qualify for a portion of it. Is that correct?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is attempting to engage in debate. I have said many times that the bill will be introduced; there will be full and ample opportunity for anyone to ask questions or debate the merits of any clause in the bill. The principle involved - and I'll repeat it again because some members seem to have trouble grasping this -- when you're 65 you stop paying the education foundation levy on the residential portion of the property in which you live.

MR. DIXON:

Then I'm correct is assuming that if this man --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order.

MR. DIXON:

Just a moment, Mr. Speaker. My question is this and all I need is an answer to it. Is the hon. minister saying to me that regardless of the size or the value or assessment of the building, if a person lives in that building - for example if it's a million dollar apartment - he gets that portion written off because he's 65?

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder if we could postpone further questioning or quasi debate on the point until the bill is introduced.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Village Lake Louise (cont.)

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs with reference to the Lake Louise project. If the decision of the government is not made known prior to the meetings with the federal government, what assurance will the government have that it is representing the thinking of the majority of the people of Alberta?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the majority of the people of Alberta put us here to represent them.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the majority not expect the government to let them know what the decision is then? This is all we're asking.

16-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Several weeks ago, when I asked him whether or not an environmental study had been commissioned on the Lake Louise project, he said that discussions were taking place with the federal government, if my memory serves me correct. I wonder if he could advise the House on the state of those discussions and whether he has anything specific to report on this very important aspect of the project Lake Louise proposition?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, if my recollection serves me right, I don't believe the hon. member is right in what I said. I said that my department had sent a wire to the hon. Jack Davis asking, amongst other things, whether or not an environmental impact study was done in connection with this project, and furthermore what his department's stand was on this particular project. I can advise the House at this time that I have not received any answer from the hon. Jack Davis, but I do have a copy of my wire here which I'll be pleased to table if the House so desires.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the absence of action on this matter from the federal government, is the provincial government considering an ecological study itself?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the provincial government is not considering an ecological study in Banff National Park. This area is under federal jurisdiction.

Intestinal Bypass Surgery

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health. My question relates to the tragedy the Ontario Coroner's Department are investigating in Ottawa at the present time concerning the problem of several patients who have died after undergoing surgery for overweight. As this operation is being carried out in Alberta hospitals, I wonder if any direction has been given to the hospitals to cease operating for this particular ailment until this investigation is completed, or if orders haven't gone out, I wonder what the government is going to do to protect the public on this issue?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's question is very much a matter of doctor and patient relationship. I would think the publicity in regard to the Ontario case is as well known to overweight people in Alberta as it is to the rest of us who are more trim, like the hon. member and myself, and that the coroner's inquiry there will probably also serve as a caution to the medical profession. Certainly, we would want to have a report in due course on the findings made by the enquiry in Ontario. I hope that every caution is exercised in the meantime.

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-13

MR. DIXON:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. minister and I could both qualify for the operation, I am a bit concerned. I was wondering about the fact that we have a number of tragedies here in Alberta as proof that there is something wrong. This is my concern. What is the government going to do about it?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I don't mind looking into it, based on the information given by the hon. member in his question when he said the same situation obtains in several cases in Alberta. These cases had not previously come to my attention.

Suffield Experimental Station

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of the Environment and he may not be able to give us the information I would like. I would like to know if his department looked into the ecological problems that may arise with the training manoeuvres at Suffield Experimental Station. I know this is federal park, but your department may have looked at the situation.

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we had some contact in connection with this problem. I did meet with an official from the Department of National Defence to discuss this particular situation. I did request that my department should be given the opportunity to provide an observer and an advisor, being one and the same man, during the course of the manoeuvres. In relation to some of the sensitive ecological areas in that part of Alberta, we would then be able to prevent the destruction of archaeological sites as well as the more sensitive ecological aspects. I think that since that time, the federal government has made provision to place out of bounds some of the more sensitive ecological areas, and in this regard I have some correspondence, including a wire from the minister involved, indicating that these areas were being set aside.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Are there any plans being made to use some of this area, or the areas bounding this area, as a provincial park because of the particularly peculiar ecology in this area?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, there is not at this time, although the suggestion has come forward from some of the local people in that area.

Milk Market Sharing

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture. Is your department considering any changes in the Alberta milk market sharing plan?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, no it isn't at the moment, because that plan is before the producers of Alberta.

16-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

Special Areas Agreement - DREF

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has he completed the information for Mr. Marchand at this point?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker. We haven't completed all the work. There are some finishing touches which must still be conducted before we are able to send what has to go to Mr. Marchand.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. minister advise us as to when that work will be done? I think there is some urgency.

MR. GETTY:

Because of the importance of the work, Mr. Speaker, it is progressing as quickly as possible. And the minute we are able to complete it, it will be sent.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I believe, was on his feet first.

Farm Machinery Testing

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has the government given any consideration to establishing a farm testing service, or perhaps in conjunction and co-operation with the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, to set up a farm machinery testing bureau?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we have had some discussions with the hon. Ministers of Agriculture in Manitoba and Saskatchewan to develop a farm machinery testing service. At the present time, we have agreed to set up a technical committee of the agricultural engineers in our various departments to work together to see whether we can or cannot set up a joint program.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has any consideration been given to making representation federally, with regard to compelling farm implement manufacturers to put roll bars on new tractors?

DR. HORNER:

I can't answer that one exactly, Mr. Speaker. I will ask my technical people whether or not they have made that representation. They have been in touch with Dr. Barber, who was heading the Royal Commission on Farm Machinery. They have also been in touch with federal officials in relation to the testing operation.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister would be prepared to specify whether any changes are anticipated in this

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-15

year's Farm Machinery Act to cover a loss of farmer's income during a breakdown of farm machinery during the warranty period.

DR. HOFNER:

Mr. Speaker, it is not intended to make any changes in The Farm Machinery Act at this session of the Legislature. However, we are moving ahead with representatives from the various farm organizations, the machine companies and the dealers' organizations, to set up, within the department, an appeal procedure, whereby farmers can appeal and whereby the committee, so structured, would then report to the minister. We would like to do this for a year to get some experience in relation to what further can be done to get this kind of assistance for the farmers of Alberta.

Village Lake Louise (Cont.)

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs in regard to the Lake Louise Village? Is it difficult straddling the fence and keeping your ear to the ground at the same time?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, having never tried it, I don't know.

Crown Land Disposition

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. As the government and the hon. minister have announced that they are looking favourably upon the restriction or prevention of the purchase of deeded land by non-Canadians, I was wondering if this restriction is going to be carried to British subjects and new Canadians.

DR. WARRACK:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the hon. member to ask the question again. The reason is I thought I responded to that question yesterday, but in respect to Crown land.

MR. DIXON:

When I heard the question you said deeded land and this is the reason I asked. It would be deeded land, because the government deeded land or leased land. The leased land is already covered under the act, but you went further, Mr. Minister, on deeded land. I was just wondering if this restriction were going to be applied to British subjects and new Canadians.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, my response was with respect to non-deeded land, that is to say Crown land that is land owned and administered by the provincial government through the Department of Lands and Forests. I was not responding with respect to deeded land, or private land, or patented land, which are three synonyms used, of course, for land that is privately owned.

DR. BUCK:

After I asked the question I just happened to see it in Hansard, and it was to deeded land that you did answer the question. That is what my question was yesterday.

16-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad I had the opportunity to clarify the answer.

Athabasca Tar Sands

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Is the Bechtel Company managing the Syncrude Project?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, as managing contractor.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Are they responsible for hiring the technical people such as engineers?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they will be engaged in doing that and I might also add that we have arranged for meetings with them to make sure they comply with the conditions that were attached to the Syncrude project.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. What type of guarantees are they giving to fulfill their commitment? Could I have a little further explanation on that?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a rather difficult question to answer as to the fulfilment of guarantees. We have no legislation dealing specifically with those types of conditions, so I don't think there is a specific situation where you can say there is a guarantee.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I have another question. What will occur then if the Bechtel Company breaks the commitment?

MR. DICKIE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, first I might say the conditions are with Syncrude, and the situation is that we will have to meet with them to determine the conditions, to see if there is any breach and then we can proceed from there.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, one more question. Has the minister or the government a regular reporting system to the department? If so, what would that reporting system be?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, there is a reporting system set out in one of the conditions, that they will report periodically. It is four times a year to the government on the situation in respect to the employment and also the people that will be engaged on the project.

March 23rd 1972

ALPEETA HANSFED

16-17

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary to the hon. Minister in relation to this project. What financial participation in this project will be available to the people of Alberta as was promised on one of your television shows?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I might say again that one of the conditions that was attached to the Syncrude project was a participation by Albertans. The terms and conditions of that participation haven't been worked out at this time.

Cooking Lake

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport. Is the government still operating the Cooking Lake Seaplane Base?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it still comes under our jurisdiction but there is not enough water in the area at the present time to be of any use.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary question Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this to the hon. Minister of Environment. In view of the report that was handed down by the Conservation Authority, is a project going to be undertaken this year to raise the water level in Cooking Lake?

MR. YURKO:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would examine the budget closely, I think he would recognize that there is no allocation made for this particular project. Nevertheless, the authority is making some recommendations to the government and it will then be a case of surveying the water management projects within the entire Alberta province to give this project some priority with respect to other much needed projects.

DR. BUCK:

I did examine the estimates and I just wanted to see it in writing.

Athabasca Tar Sands (cont.)

MR. DIXON:

I would like to direct a further question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals regarding the Athabasca Tar Sands. Has the Japanese investor or the Japanese government recently shown a renewed interest in investing the Athabasca Tar Sands?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, in respect to the Athabasca Tar Sands, the Japanese have been contacting us and have expressed an interest in that. We have explained to them that our first approach was to deal with the Syncrude project. After the disposition of the Syncrude project we then proposed to review the existing oil sands policy. As hon. members will recall, that first came into existence in 1962; it was revised in 1968. We feel the development policy needs a further revision now and we have indicated that to them, and as soon as that revision is complete we will advise them further.

16-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Have the Japanese come up with a new process for developing the sands other than the two conventional methods by Syncrude and by Sun Oil?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, if they have come up with any new type of process they have not advised myself or our department about it.

Crown Land Disposition (cont.)

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, and in order to ask this question I must make a very short statement, Mr. Speaker.

The Province of British Columbia has a policy of not selling forest reserve lands. This has been the policy of the former government in Alberta. Do you see your department changing this particular policy?

DR. WARRACK:

I believe that question was substantially asked a day or two ago, and on the last supplemental I did not promise that we would not make any changes with respect to Crown land dispositions. However, I would like to assure the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest that we have not made any change in that policy that he enunciated as of this time.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the leave of the House to revert for a moment to Orders of the Day regarding a change in the opening time of the House next Tuesday. Every year, Mr. Speaker, and this year is no exception, the Western Stock Growers Association hold a luncheon and display at the Edmonton Exhibition grounds, which is on next Tuesday the 28th, and it has been the custom for the House to start one half hour later - at three o'clock. I ask the leave of the House to consider this oral notice to be adequate notice, that the House start at three o'clock so that we won't have to put it on the Order Paper for written notice.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. minister wish the House to make a decision on the point now, or merely to give notice?

MR. HYNDMAN:

No, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be sufficient indication from the House that notice and a formal motion on the Order Paper is not now necessary. I only wanted to bring it up because if that was not done, the hon. members opposite might have half an hour in which to get into all sorts of trouble next week when we are not here.

March 23rd 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

16-19

QUESTIONS

141. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following questions to which replies were provided by Mr. Peacock as indicated:

(a) Is the Provincial Government planning a study on transportation:

Answer: A study is now underway.

(b) Who is carrying out the study?

Answer: LaBorde Simat Ltd.

(c) What is the purpose of the study?

Answer: To review transportation problems facing Alberta and to determine how transportation can be turned to more effective advantage in promoting the economic development of the province.

142. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following questions to which Mr. Hyndman provided the answers as indicated:

(a) What is the cost of publishing the booklet entitled "Share It"?

(b) How many copies of this booklet were printed?

(c) Where was the booklet printed and by what firm?

(d) What is the circulation of the booklet?

Answer: There have been two printings of the publication "Share It" and a third one is now underway. It was printed by the Queen's Printer on its own premises.

Printing	Date of Order	No. of Copies	Cost
1st	December, 1971	1,000	\$696
2nd	January, 1972	1,000	\$299
3rd	March, 1972	2,000	\$570 (est)

The initial distribution of this booklet was to:

- (1) All senior officials of the Department of Education.
- (2) Education reporters or editors of all dailies in the province.
- (3) Editors of all provincial and some national educational publications.
- (4) The secretary of each Home and School Association in Alberta.
- (5) The information officers of most major educational organizations.
- (6) 100 copies to the Recreation Branch of the Culture, Youth and Recreation for distribution within that department.
- (7) All executive members of the Alberta Federation of Home and School Associations.
- (8) The president or executive secretary of such organizations as the Alberta Chamber of Commerce, The Alberta Federation of Labour, School Business Officials of Alberta, etc.
- (9) All regional offices of the Department of Education.
- (10) All school superintendents.
- (11) All school board secretaries (with copies for board chairmen).
- (12) Secretaries of all municipal districts including counties, villages, towns, cities.
- (13) All members of the Alberta Parks/Recreation Association.

16-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

(14) All MLA's

Following the initial distribution, the Department of Education was flooded with requests for additional copies from school superintendents, Home and School Associations, municipal secretaries, recreation people, school principals, etc. A short while later many requests for sample copies were received from school systems across Canada as a result of mention in a national publication "School Progress". A copy of the editorial page of the March issue of that publication is attached.

University instructors in both Education and Physical Education and Recreation have discovered this publication and we have had two requests for class lots of this booklet.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

129. Mr. Taylor proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Benoit;

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

(1) What is the insurance rate of the Canadian Underwriters Association in the four territories of Alberta for the year 1972 for a 1971 Chrysler owned and driven by a driver over the age of 25 with no accidents or convictions during the last years for:

(a) Third party liability (minimum limits)

(b) The accident insurance benefits to minimum limits as set out in the 1971 amendments to the Alberta Insurance Act; and

(c) Collision, \$50 deductible?

(2) What are the rates for the same vehicle for a driver under 25 with no accidents or convictions during the last three years?

(3) What are the Alberta rates of Federated Insurance for the same vehicle and driver noted in part (1) and part (2)?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move an amendment to that motion, seconded by Dr. Hohol.

The amendment would be to substitute the word "three" for the word "four" where it appears in clause (1). And to strike out the words and numbers "1971 Chrysler owned and driven by" where they appear in the middle of clause 1, and to strike out all of clause (c).

Mr. Speaker, the reason for moving that amendment is that there are now three territories in Alberta, and not four as referred to in the Motion for a Return. And the reason, Mr. Speaker, that I proposed striking out the remainder of the motion is that under The Alberta Insurance Act there is no requirement for the filing of rates with respect to collision insurance. In my submission, as there is no requirement for the insurance companies to file those rates with the Automobile Insurance Board, they should not be the subject of a Motion for a Return.

[The amendment was approved, and the amended motion was passed without further debate or dissent.]

143. Mr. Taylor proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark.

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-21

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

- (a) Did the Government of Alberta support the removal of agents and stations from towns and villages in Alberta pursuant to RTC Order No. R-10653?
- (b) If so, what towns and villages were involved?
- (c) If so, did the Government contact the local governments and chambers and farm organizations in the said areas before supporting the CPR in their application?

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a reply to Motion for a Return No. 143, as requested by Mr. Taylor.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Provincial Parks

The following motion was proposed by Mr. Farran, and seconded by Mrs. Chichak:

"Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta consider the establishment of Provincial Parks in Calgary and Edmonton, and other cities.

The following amendment has been proposed by Mr. Drain, seconded by Mr. Notley: That the motion be amended by adding at the end thereof the words "and in towns".

(Adjourned Debate)

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests after taking over his department on September 10, 1972, viewed the present park system and found that the province did not and does not have a provincial parks policy. Back in 1963 a three-man board made up of the Director of Lands, Forestry and the Technical Division, was to set up a study for a parks policy. What happened to this committee?

In discussion with the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, it is anticipated that a parks policy will be established. What should be looked at in the present parks in Alberta? I would say, how many miles from our major cities and towns? What facilities would be offered? What types of parks should they be, recreational or wilderness? Should more parks be added to the province before the present parks are completed? What day use fees charged? I hope that more ideas may come forward.

At the present time in Alberta we have 44 provincial parks and 24 historical sites, comprising approximately 130,000 acres.

The question in regard to the resolution is what type of parks would be required in the cities or towns. Do we want man-made lakes, or river valleys developed into picnic areas, hiking trails? What is the cost going to be for land within the city?

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood had merit in establishing a park at Big Lake outside of Edmonton. But, Mr. Speaker, I know this lake and it would cost considerable money to backfill around the lake with sand, build a road into the area, and then the lake level fluctuates greatly during the season. The lake, if developed, could

16-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

be used only as a canoe area or for row boats, as I believe we require more lakes without the noise hazard of power boats.

The Stony Plain constituency has two provincial parks, one at Lake Wabamun, which at times has had upward of 40,000 people present on a Sunday afternoon. But I believe people are discouraged by the lack of facilities -- no swimming pool, only the lake which is unfit to swim in by noon on a Sunday. Boats use Moonlight Bay for boating and water skiing, and the area is not large enough. Boaters should move into the main body of the lake.

As I mentioned earlier, Alberta has 24 historical sites. The history of Alberta must warrant more of these historical sites. We can use the example of the area west and north of Edmonton. St. Albert has an area that dates back to the 1880's. Lac Ste. Anne has many sites which could be designated and there are many more of these sites throughout Alberta. The cross-section of parks in Alberta covers the complete province. But we have many parks that are not completed, and the reason for their not being completed is because a lot of our provincial parks have been political issues. Each time a general election was held new parks sprang up. Last year, four parks sprang up in the province, but only in name, no development was done.

Parks in Alberta should offer varied services such as scenic, historical, recreational, picnicing, camping, confectionery, boat rental, boat launching, sewage disposal, designated swimming, fishing, walking trails. Out of the 44 provincial parks only 19 have the services I have outlined.

I would stress to the hon. minister, that before any further parks are started, the other 25 be completed. Some of our provincial parks have a history behind them, and I would like to make them familiar to some of the members.

Dinosaur Provincial Park was formed approximately 12,000 years ago, and back in 1884, J. B. Tyrrell found the first dinosaur skull in the banks of the Red Deer River. This park contains approximately 22,000 acres, but a large area is restricted to the public.

Writing On Stone Provincial Park is situated on the Milk River and contains about 1,100 acres. The history of this park dates back to the days of Chief Sitting Bull when he left the States, crossed the Canadian border, and camped in the Milk River area.

The second North West Mounted Police Detachment was built in 1889 in this park area. The barracks no longer remain, and I often wonder what our cultural heritage is missing by not preserving our history.

The history of Sir Winston Churchill Park dates back to 1779, when David Thompson built the original Fort Lac la Biche for the North West Company. It contains 590 acres and came into existence in September, 1952, and became known as Big Island Provincial Park. In 1965 an order in council was passed to rename the park, Sir Winston Churchill Park in tribute to a great statesman.

Another park with a history is Miquelon Lake Provincial Park. The first white man to live in this area was Matthew Cook who lived on the shores of Buffalo Lake. He also knew Miquelon Lake well. The area was always well supplied with buffalo, but it came to an end in 1875 by needless killing, and even when the Buffalo Ordinance came out, the first gallant conservation effort, it was too late.

Another step was taken in 1889 by the father of the Western Canadian forestry, E. F. Stephenson to establish a forest reserve because of the great influx of homesteaders, and by 1892 he managed to save a large area of the plain by the establishment of the first

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-23

Alberta permanent forest reserve known as Cooking Lake Timber Reserve. Many more attempts were made to save the area and in 1915 a ministerial order established a water reserve in this area. In 1921, Mr. Alf Varley, a dedicated conservationist, was placed in charge of this bird sanctuary.

Mr. Speaker, the point I wanted to make for reviewing the history of some of our provincial parks is, are we protecting enough of our historical sites in Alberta? Before I close, I ask the hon. members to consider the following points: protection of our provincial parks and historical sites; completing our present parks in Alberta; a complete parks policy; no further provincial parks because of political pressures; if parks are placed in the major cities, what types, and can provincial budgets stand the extra load? Thank you.

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few brief comments on this amendment. I will certainly say that the amendment will make the motion much more acceptable than the original motion. However, I would have to question the feasibility and the economics of establishing parks in centres such as our large cities and our towns. I think one can realize that the cost of land to put this type of a facility within our city limits, or within our towns, would almost be prohibitive.

For example, in some of our parks we have, as the hon. Member for Stony Plain just mentioned, 2,200 acres of land. If one was thinking of something like this for the cities it would certainly be prohibitive to put parks in this type of an area. Most of our parks at the present time are on Crown land or else on land that is leased from other areas which has not created much of a burden, as far as cost, for parks in this province. I heard the hon. Member for Calgary North mention the figure of \$3 million to put a park in Calgary. Mr. Speaker, our entire budget for parks last year was \$2 1/4 million, so it would certainly not look to me as if it would be feasible to establish a park in some of these bigger areas.

Also there would be the problem of pollution control in parks. We have a problem to control pollution within our cities. I do realize that this motion is asking only to look into a park policy or look into the feasibility of putting in these parks. I would like to say, how is the province going to establish priorities? Are they going to put a park in Calgary, are they going to put a park in Edmonton, are they going to put a park in Grande Prairie or are they going to put one in Lethbridge? If I go down to my constituency which town or village are you going to put it in? Are you going to put it in Brooks, are you going to put it in Tilley, are you going to put it in Duchess, Bassano? How would the province be able to establish priorities on putting parks in these centres?

I think it would be prohibitive to get into this area. I think if we do have any extra money we can put into parks, as the hon. member for Stony Plain has stated, maybe we could develop some of the existing parks that we have. For example, put access roads into these parks. I think that would be a great asset. If we could put some more money into the vote for access roads instead of developing new parks within the cities, I think that would be much more acceptable to the people of this province. If a person wants to add more money or if this department wants to add more money in our parks department, possibly they could do it in the form of a recreation grant on a per capita basis. I think this would be much more acceptable.

Another concern I have is the utilization of the parks in these centres. As it was mentioned, possibly at times it would be a problem for some of our older people or some of the people that don't

16-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

have automobiles to get to parks. However, I think when one is anticipating going to a park, I think you want to get away from the hustle and the bustle and the noise and pollution and get out into the fresh air. I think our citizens, no matter where they live, would sooner get out to the rural areas where they see some of our game alongside of a lake and can do some fishing. I would question the utilization of parks in these areas.

In the constituency I come from, I have three provincial parks involving 2,500 acres of land. This is a lot of land. I don't think the province has spent very much money in acquiring land. I know in one of my parks of about 180 acres at Tilbrook, they acquired some land there at a very nominal fee. We have a park that we call the Kinbrook Park. The Kinsmen from Brooks established this park and then turned it over to the province to administer. It's very successful. As I pointed out before, we need roads to these parks. We put a road out to the Kinbrook Park and it doubled our tourist trade out there, tourists visiting the park, by two times, just as the result of the road. We do intend to expand the park out there at no cost to the provincial government. We are negotiating a deal now with the Eastern Irrigation District to trade Crown land for some land that the Eastern Irrigation District has adjacent to this park in order to extend the boundaries of this park. I think this is feasible because there's no money involved. We don't want to get into this high cost of land.

Also the Dinosaur Park, which the hon. Member for Stony Plain has mentioned, is in my constituency. I certainly don't think that this park gets the recognition that it should. The hon. Member for Drumheller, who is not in his seat today, always takes claim for the Dinosaur Valley in Drumheller. But, Mr. Speaker, I want to assure you the true Dinosaur Park is at Steveston in my constituency. If the hon. Member for North Hill finds any Dinosaurs that are on roller skates, we can get our hon. Minister of Highways to pave the road into the Dinosaur Park. He could then send the dinosaurs on roller skates down to the Steveston Dinosaur Park.

I do think, hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, that we should look into the possibility of making this park a national park. I think of the nature of the park, and it's certainly of national interest. And I would certainly like you to investigate the possibility of making the Dinosaur Park a national park, because I think it would be a great asset to the people of Alberta and the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the importance of recreation. I think it is getting more important all the time, and I realize the fact that we are having more and more consumers, and less and less producers. So I think we have to look into this area, and again I say we have to be practical. I don't think we should be loading our government down. I know they have lots of responsibilities that are important. I also want to congratulate the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests for making the remark in the House that he is going to improve the services in our parks; this is going to be much appreciated. However, when the budget came down, and I saw the vote was cut, I just don't know how he's going to improve it, but I'm going to be looking forward to having some improvements in my parks, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to enter the debate this afternoon with respect to the amendment and the original motion. First of all, I would like to say I commend the original motion as moved by the hon. Member, Mr. Farran, and seconded by the hon. Member, Mrs. Chichak. Their motion, I believe, was intended to resolve a particular problem that exists in both the City of Edmonton, and the City of Calgary. On the other hand, the amendment in my view broadens the intent of

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-25

the original motion, so as to effectively render unacceptable the motion as it now stands.

There are perhaps a number of reasons why the problem of providing access of persons to provincial parks is different in the Cities of Edmonton and Calgary, our two large metropolitan areas, than it may be in any other areas in Alberta. First of all, I would suggest the very size of the Cities of Edmonton and Calgary, both in terms of population and density of population, make it difficult for persons in these cities to travel to the provincial parks in a reasonable length of time. Often when they do arrive at provincial parks which are near one of these cities, they find an overcrowded situation which is just not acceptable to those who wish to spend a week-end of leisure time.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we do have great numbers of low income groups within these cities who do not have the transportation facilities to travel to existing parks outside of the two major cities. I have been told that there are some areas within the city limits of Edmonton which could be used for the development of a provincial park. Even if such an idea does not become a reality in the near future, it seems to me that it would be the proper time to begin studies, planning, and perhaps land acquisition.

With respect, Mr. Speaker, to the amendment to the motion of developing provincial parks in towns, there are a number of reasons why I do not believe that this is a feasible or desirable direction to move in at this time. Provincial parks, in my opinion, so as not to upset the delicate balance of nature or the ecology, should be large enough to the extent that the actual camping grounds and related recreational facilities do not take up more than a small percentage, perhaps as small as 20 per cent of the existing area. Few, if any towns in Alberta, have room within their boundaries for a properly conceived provincial park. Many towns in Alberta are presently within easy driving distance of existing or planned provincial parks. In that respect, Mr. Speaker, I would relate to my own constituency, where any resident in my constituency can visit an existing provincial park within a relatively easy 45 minutes to one hour drive at the very most. There again, existing planning provides for certain percentages of newly subdivided land in towns and municipal areas, for municipal park or playground area. Certainly, it is my opinion that within the towns themselves these kinds of parks, municipal parks, are sufficient to meet the needs of the people.

Financial assistance for these kinds of parks has, from time to time, been forthcoming from the provincial government. And certainly, I think that kind of assistance should be continued.

Any thought, Mr. Speaker, of creating small provincial parks of the nature of one to ten acres in size in Alberta towns, in my opinion, would destroy the concept and the idea of provincial parks as we know them today, as specially well controlled areas.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, what we need in the rest of Alberta, aside from the two metropolitan areas of Edmonton and Calgary, is an extended, high priority program, involving the further development of existing provincial parks adjacent to towns and smaller cities. We need development of new parks in areas where we already have land assembled, plus a land assembly program looking ahead perhaps 30 years to the needs of the people of Alberta in this important area of providing leisure time and recreation facilities.

I want to emphasize once again, Mr. Speaker, it is my view these parks should be provided, not especially within towns, but adjacent to, within easy distance. Another thing I think we should be doing in the very near future, as a government, is developing a provincial parks policy in this province that would take into account a number

16-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

of things -- some of the issues have been debated in recent years in this Legislature -- whether or not we should be allowing resource development in our provincial parks; whether or not there should be a harvest of natural resources in provincial parks; whether or not we should be hunting big game animals and fishing in provincial parks. As I mentioned before, some kind of determination of the actual percentage of provincial parks that would be used for camping and related facilities, and possibly, Mr. Speaker, the consideration of a buffer zone around the provincial parks in this province that would have a limited development area.

I want for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to relate to the hon. members of this Assembly, the short history of one provincial park, which happens to be in my constituency. I refer to Williamson Provincial Park, located 12 miles west of Valleyview on the south side of Sturgeon Lake. This park was developed over a period of about the last five to six years, and it is now fully completed. The entire park is about 40 acres in size, and all that area, practically every inch of it, is used for overnight camping, day use picnic area, beach area and boat launch. The occupancy during the summer season is so high -- I believe it is the highest of any park in Alberta in relation to its size -- that the park itself is in danger of being destroyed. There is no limitation whatever on the number of people who may use the park in relation to overnight camping. During the past two summers people have been jammed into a very small camping area, which in my view, is totally unacceptable in relation to the concept of what a provincial park should be like.

I believe that in developing a provincial parks policy we should probably take a look at some of the things they are doing in the neighbouring province of British Columbia, where a very small percentage, in many cases, of the total area, is designated as overnight camping area, and individual numbered stalls are allotted for each camper. The whole park is laid out and designed to hold possibly 320 overnight campers, and when it reaches that level no more are allowed in.

You then have a situation where you limit the control and use of overnight camping areas in provincial parks. At the same time, in those areas you would have to allow the use of a picnic area by anyone who so desired. Now some of you may suggest that we don't want, in fact, to get into a situation where we have to limit the number of people who come into our provincial parks, but I suggest we have only two choices. We either have to begin a policy of limiting those who enter provincial parks on an overnight camping basis, or we see a situation such as the one I have mentioned in relation to Williamson Provincial Park, where in the past two years the park itself, and the concept of the park, has been partially destroyed and comes into severe criticism by the general public at large.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to re-emphasize that what we need in the rest of Alberta, in my opinion, outside of the two major urban areas, is a rapid development of provincial parks within easy distance of towns and smaller cities. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should recognize, just as we have recognized some of the problems in rural Alberta, that in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary we do have a special problem. It is my contention therefore that in order to provide direction to the Minister of Lands and Forests and to this government, we should revert to the original motion of providing a provincial park in the City of Edmonton and one in the City of Calgary. Perhaps later in this session with respect to our interest in developing parks in other parts of Alberta, we can have a further discussion on high priority development of provincial parks adjacent to towns, villages, hamlets and other cities in the province. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

March 23rd 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

16-27

MR. SPEAKER:

We have a three-way tie.

MR. KING:

I'm only learning very slowly, Mr. Speaker, that when I get up I should stay on my feet until you have made your decision.

I would like to make a few brief remarks this afternoon about the motion which is before us. It speaks, first of all, about provincial parks to be established in Edmonton and in Calgary and in the other cities of the province, and of course, the amendment before us provides for the establishment of provincial parks in the towns. I think that one thing which it is well for us to remember, with respect to the development of parks for the people of the province, is that the citizens of the city, and particularly I think, the citizens of the two metropolitan centres, have faced a peculiar financial problem. That is, in all other parts of the province the development of parks and recreational facilities has to a very considerable extent been shared by the provincial government through the Department of Lands and Forests and the Parks Branch, that the people in the rural areas have had many of their parks developed by the provincial government. Such has not been the case in the large metropolitan centres where the establishment of a parks and recreational policy and program, and the financing of that program, is primarily and almost entirely the responsibility of, not the provincial level of government, but rather the local level of government.

I might suggest in this regard, one legitimate reason for the consideration by the provincial government to moving into the metropolitan centres for its development of parks. I might suggest further that this does not have to be done unilaterally, but might be done in cooperation with the municipal government in that we might not have provincial parks, or municipal parks, but jointly funded or jointly administered or jointly funded and unilaterally administered provincial-municipal parks inside the boundaries of the city. One of the members opposite made a point with respect to the development of parks in metropolitan centres that I think should be considered, and that was, the presumed high cost of land acquisition. I might suggest that to a certain extent, this would be mitigated if the provincial government could co-operate with the local municipalities in the development of parks. point of fact, the cities, at least Edmonton and Calgary, have land reserved for park and recreational use which they control and which is not being developed for lack of financing.

The finances associated with the cost of developing a park are not nearly as great as the financial burdens imposed by the purchase of the land in the original case. In the City of Edmonton, for example, situations that come to mind, one of which I mentioned on an earlier date, include the conversion of the exhibition grounds into a provincial or provincial municipal park. This is a very real consideration for the City of Edmonton at the present time because of the feeling of the Edmonton Exhibition Board that their land is too small to accommodate their future growth. They are thinking of an alternate facility for themselves and that would free the present Edmonton Exhibition Grounds for an alternate use. In addition, the city controls large areas of the river valley system and the ravines which flow into the river valley and, as I mentioned earlier, the primary reason that these park lands are not being developed is not the unavailability of the land itself, but the unavailability of development money at the present time.

In addition to the consideration of parks within the city limits, which is of course the primary concern of the resolution, there has also been reference made to the development of parks immediately adjacent to the cities. This too is important, primarily for the reason mentioned by the hon. member opposite that eventually

16-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

you are going to run out of useable space inside the city limits. You must then concern yourself with the possibility of devoting cheap land adjacent to the city to park use. One of the things that would be important in this respect in determining the success of the development of such a park system would be the development of low cost mass transportation. I don't mean rapid transportation necessarily, but mass transportation, even if only on a periodic basis.

The Beaver Hills, approximately 20 - 25 miles southeast of Edmonton, are the highest point of land between Edmonton and Winnipeg. They were, at one time, covered with some of the finest tree cover in the province. As an hon. member has mentioned, they were at one time reserved for park land. The settlers, in about 1898, burned the trees in the hope, correct as it turned out, that if there were not any trees to preserve, the federal government would give up control of the land and it could be converted to farm land. When they had a large forest fire, which history tells us was deliberate, the federal government did indeed convert that forest reserve into farm land.

But the interesting thing about the Beaver Hills is that it contains three lakes well known to the people of the area; Cooking Lake, Hastings Lake and Miquelon Lake. If you are familiar with the recent history of the City of Edmonton in the 1920s' and 1930's, when there was enough water in Cooking Lake for it to support a seaplane base, it had some of the finest beaches in the area and was very popular with the citizens of Edmonton. Trains ran on a regular basis to Cooking Lake every Sunday afternoon taking people out in the early afternoon for picnics and for an afternoon at the beach and then returning them to the city in the early evening. There are pictures in the archives of the province showing these trains, two and three abreast as they were leaving Edmonton, filled with the citizens of Edmonton, who at that time did not have private transportation, and who were all going to this area to enjoy a Sunday afternoon.

I would suggest, with respect to the people of my constituency, for example, many of whom are older, retired or not of sufficiently high income to have private transportation of their own, and with respect to the people in the city who are the people most in need of a parks and recreational development, anything outside of the city would have to be considered in the context of the development of some kind of mass transportation as well.

One of the scenic spots southeast of the city that I forgot to mention was "Euck's Neglect" and at this time I would like to bring it to the attention of the person after whom it was named. There is a lovely ravine southeast of the city, which is about 13 miles long and goes into Cold Lake. The people around it, for some years, have been trying to interest their MLA in having it developed as a park, and haven't been meeting with too much success. I would like to commend that area of the hon. member's constituency to his attention.

I would also like to suggest the development of a parks policy for the metropolitan centres. As for the province as a whole, it must be on a consistent basis; decisions should not be made on an ad hoc basis. I think any consideration of the development of parks primarily for the use of the citizens of metropolitan centres should include a consideration of the nature and the intensity of the use; the level of technology which would be allowed in the park -- and I heard one reference to row boats in preference to motor boats, something I personally would prefer. It should also consider specialty of interest.

One of the people in my constituency, prior to the last election, came to me with what I thought was a good idea and one that should be commended to the members of the Legislature and the hon. minister. He suggested that there might be developed a park in which

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-29

the provincial government would make land available, in which small parcels of land would be leased or sub-leased to different ethnic groups and organizations. This land could be developed into a chronological illustration of the coming of the peoples of many different ethnic origins to Alberta, the contribution that they made to the present state of Alberta, and their aspirations for the future. It was his contention of course -- I think a very good one -- that simply by providing the land and parcelling it up within the park, and making it available to ethnic groups, we could develop something which would be very valuable for ourselves and for future generations. Such a park might particularly be developed in conjunction with the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation, which I am sure would have an interest in it.

And in mentioning the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation, I would like to conclude by suggesting that a provincial park might not, perhaps, have to be a piece of ground, that it might in fact be a physical facility. The example which brought this to my mind was the development of Ontario Place by the government of the province of Ontario, in Toronto, or prior to that, Expo '67, which, while it was a piece of ground, it was primarily the physical facilities that went onto that ground. I would think that for the metropolitan centres, if you're talking about recreational or entertainment facilities, or leisure facilities provided by the provincial government, we might get away, at least on an experimental basis, from the idea of parks being ground, and develop the idea of them being a physical facility. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, followed by the hon. Member for Highwood and the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking to the amendment and the amendment only, otherwise I understand I would close the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe it is not a sub-amendment before the House, merely an amendment.

MR. FARRAN:

I am speaking to that amendment. I know we have a small park called Big Hills Spring Park about 14 miles west of Calgary in the riding of the hon. Minister of Highways. It is a little park about the size of a postage stamp. We have another little park called Carseland Park, which is a bit of river bottom left over on the Bow River about 25 miles east of Calgary. And then we have Kananaskis which is 60 miles away on a very unimproved road. We have hopes that one day the new administration will put that road into better shape so the people of Calgary may be able to get to Kananaskis Park without getting stuck. But we are looking for a park close enough to be reached on a city bus line by children and pensioners and other citizens who lack transportation, stenographers, people who work in the city core.

I was prepared to accept the alteration proposed by the hon. Member for Drumheller and we incorporated that in a motion. His words were 'and other cities'. Now there is the amendment by the hon. member for Pincher Creek, that adds 'and towns'. I'm just terrified there is now going to be a sub-amendment adding villages and hamlets and improvement districts. As the member for Rocky Mountain House and my beautiful colleague, the hon. member for Edmonton Norwood would tell you, if you stretch the girdle too far your elastic will break!

16-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

AN HON. MEMBER:

Have you tried it?

MR. FARRAN:

I can give you another analogy if you don't like that one. Don't kill the whiskey with over-dilution of water. People in the smaller centres are closer to the fields of the countryside than the dwellers in big cities. It's all very well for the hon. member for Bow Valley to talk, he's got three provincial parks apparently, and lots of fresh air and green fields around him. We haven't in the city. I have personally because I live on the edge of the city, but most of the people who live in the City of Calgary haven't -- they live in a concrete jungle; they live in the centre of vast subdivisions, mile after mile of project homes.

In other countries large cities have had parks donated by kings, or by presidents, but we haven't had that sort of country from the beginning. Our cities haven't had the financial resources to do what should be done, and if the capital costs are considered prohibitive to the province, as the hon. member for Bow Valley suggested, how much more are they prohibitive to the city?

The City of Calgary's total combined debt is in excess of the total debt of the province of Alberta, even after this present budget. I tried to tell you when we started this round last week that the cities tried to do it by density transfer, by swapping land in return for greater density with the developer, and this ruins the principle of the park. The park then gets hedged in by high-rises, and only those people in the high-rises use the park. The press claims that we do an annual ritual war dance over the rural areas, that we all run around talking about the pioneers and the importance of the family farm. This is what they were saying in the paper the other night. Now please remember the cities, they do exist. Remember how many people we have in the cities. Now we're in favour of the family farm -- we're in favour of a proper balance between town and country, but we do exist in the cities and we don't like getting the short end of the stick all the time. As the hon. member from Calgary Mountain View was saying the other day, if this motion went through, they would have to have a park for every one of the other cities or towns or villages or hamlets and the improvement districts, therefore, it can't be accorded. But if you are reasonable people you don't take that approach, otherwise nothing will be done in Alberta. You'd have to have a seed cleaning plant in every village in the province; you'd have to have a facility of every type; liquor vendors in every improvement district.

The point is that we from the cities are very conscious of the needs and problems of rural areas. Please be conscious of ours, even though the rural members may form the majority in the House. The hon. member from Smoky River is a rural member and he is very sympathetic and he understands our point of view.

The hon. member from Fort MacLeod sent me a note. And it read like this:

"Hon. member. I am concerned with your quiet attitude over the last several days. We miss your usual zeal in question period and debate. I trust you are feeling well."

I also read in the Edmonton Journal that I practise the ancient Irish trick of trailing my coat in a position of provocation. Well I can tell the hon. member for Fort MacLeod that there is a little more to this story. There is a great song in Ireland about a schoolmaster named O'Toole, where a gossoon learned reading and writing, and it finishes with the words, 'and I'll belabour you with my shillelagh, if you tread on the tail of my coat'.

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-31

In conclusion, I'd like to read a much more sombre, or should I say, important letter into the record. It's a copy of a letter to the hon. the Premier from His Worship the Mayor of Calgary on this subject. This is what he said:

"Dear Mr. Premier:

provincial Park for Calgary

The initiative taken by Roy Farran with respect to provincial parks in cities such as Calgary and Edmonton is most welcomed. These two cities, in particular, contain something like six out of ten Albertans and their people make an economic contribution of far more than \$6 out of every \$10 collected by the government. Furthermore, while there are many advantages to living in a city, ready access to large areas of open spaces is regrettably restricted and a provision of such areas for public use, even when they're physically available in private hands, involves financial commitments beyond the reach of your hard pressed cities. Mr. Farran's proposal would, if implemented by your government, be of enormous benefit to future generations of Albertans, and after all, isn't it only fair to put some of the provincial park money where most of the people are, especially where the poor people and the youngsters can get at them without joining the highway autocracies?

Sincerely,

Rcdney."

The Mayor may have a few blind spots but he's right on target there.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the hon. member a question. Are you speaking now on the amendment? You're talking about cities, we're talking about towns.

MR. FARRAN:

Yes, but I've already dealt with the towns. I'm prepared to accept the towns, accept the amendment provided that the consideration given takes second place to the consideration of the cities.

The amendment is a doubtful one, the motion is a good one, but I could go along and will vote for the amendment rather than lose the whole shooting match.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, parks come in all sizes, shapes, and forms, as do the speeches concerning parks and some of the speakers concerning the speeches. I rise to make just one or two comments and I hope that I will not repeat any views that have been given already. One of the reasons for my rising is the remarks made by the hon. Member for Stony Plain who went to considerable length to point out that the province had no policies with regard to parks. I take exception to his statement and in so doing I wanted to quote, Mr. Speaker, only three brief paragraphs from a paper that has been tabled from time to time by the previous administration entitled "Administration of Public Lands". This one happens to be October 1968. I don't have a more recent one with me. There is a brief section here that I wish to read. It says:

"provincial parks are established for the pleasure, recreation, and general benefit of the inhabitants of the province and for the maintenance and production of native plant and animal life

16-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

and for projects of geological, ethnological, historical, and other scientific interests. In order to carry out these objectives, the department has for several years been classifying lands and reserving those lands which are considered to have these types of recreation potential. This was done so that such lands would not be sold or disposed of to private individuals, but retained for the general public. Until recently, there was no scientific classification of lands for recreational uses. However, in the last two years, (and this was written in 1968), under the assistance of the ARDA Program, a more scientific approach has been taken for the classification of lands for recreational purposes. The parks division has a planning section which works out detailed plans for the most efficient use of each park according to the objectives in establishing each park."

There are other things that are said about the administration of public lands in here, but I will take the time only to draw the hon. member's attention to the fact that there have been park policies. Whether they have been exhibited far and wide or not, is a matter to be debated. But they do exist, and have existed. I trust and hope they will continue to exist with continued expansion in the days to come.

I do want to make only one other remark or two with regard to the amendment, I believe that as the hon. Member for North Hill has already suggested, the amendment may not be as worthy of our attention as the main motion itself, because many towns have, besides their own local parks, and most of them have a local park of some kind, very often they have provincial campgrounds either within the town limits or very close to the small town.

As has already been pointed out, it is not such a problem for the small towns as it is for the cities. But I do want to express my personal favour of the motion because of the need of this situation, in our area particularly. In the cities there are a number of people who can't afford to go great distances to the existing provincial parks. Unfortunately, close to the two largest cities, there are no provincial parks of any great size. But as far as we're concerned in our area, which is not too far removed from the City of Calgary, one of the greatest reasons for having a provincial park within the City of Calgary, or very close to the City of Calgary, would be to take the travel pressure off of the countryside around the city on the week-ends.

Here is a real problem, Mr. Speaker, and one that a provincial park within or very near the larger cities could help to alleviate. This is something that needs to be looked at carefully. We need to get along with our city cousins, we country people. And city cousins need to learn how to get along with their country cousins, too. Somehow there has to be an educational program or a plan whereby we can get the people together, but on an amicable basis. Unfortunately a lot of country folks don't appreciate having their land trespassed upon and run around upon by those who get out of the cities. But those who live, as has been expressed, in the concrete jungle need some opportunity to get out where they can get away from these buildings. And certainly a provincial park in the area would be a real help.

So, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment, I wish also to express my favour of the motion itself. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-33

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member opposite for Spirit River-Fairview moved the amendment to include 'and in towns', and I'd like to speak on this amendment and relating a bit to the main motion as well. I have no great quarrel with the amendment, but I would like to bring to the attention of this Assembly for consideration, matters which probably have not yet been proposed. Some have, but perhaps not clearly understood.

First of all, perhaps we should bear in mind that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests has indicated that an overall provincial parks policy will be developed, so that all areas of the province will have a fair assessment of park needs as well as the types of parks required. However, we have to consider whether there is any sense of urgency with respect to the need for development of provincial parks and priorities as related to the major urban centres, Edmonton and Calgary. The need and priority must, of course, be based on the people and concentration in number as to locality. The needs must also be considered in relation to availability of such amenities as may be normally provided in a park.

In speaking to the amendment I would like to bring three matters to view. The population density of the town is generally not high. The accessibility to recreational facilities such as lakes, walks, cycling, picnicing and hiking is generally relatively easy. And as the population density is not very high, the degree of urgency for towns cannot be as intense as for the two major cities of Alberta.

Under the City of Edmonton parks program, the City of Edmonton had formulated a program wherein by 1981, it had proposed under its master plan of 1968 to have some 12.1 acres of open space per 1,000 population. This is approximately 85 people per acre, not much room for recreation. On such calculation, please note that the projection takes into account a population of 500,000 people, but we already have reached that population in size and this urban centre cannot cope with the recreational needs of the high density populace.

An advancing technology, resulting in shorter working days and longer vacations, has led to the increase in leisure time. Again, the low income level of approximately 84 per cent of the urban wage earners, certainly is prohibitive to their enjoying a recreational program that requires many miles of travel in order to utilize such recreational facility.

I have listed a number of towns with major larger parks in the area. I will just go through a very few of them. There are some 49 provincial parks in Alberta. Out of these, some of the larger towns that have parks: Fincher Creek, Seebe, Crimson Lake, Medicine Hat, Hinton, Newbrook, Camrose, Spirit River, Wetaskiwin, Grand Prairie, Lac la Biche, McLennan, just a few that have parks around them, of approximately a thousand or more acres.

Agreed, some of them are developed to a lesser degree than others, and perhaps that is a program for consideration. However, my point is, the majority of the towns are not too far removed from some provincial recreational facility. Surely it is hoped that the hon. Member for Spirit River, when he moved the amendment to the original motion, did not intend that a provincial park be established in every town in the province.

I would, however, be agreeable that in the formulation of provincial parks policy, the matter of establishment of such parks in towns have some criteria set out. The open-ended motion as amended can certainly create an open door to many demands which may be completely out of context with the advisability and the ability of this province to cope with.

In the absence of a provincial parks policy, and this government's indication to develop such a policy, I would like to

16-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

suggest the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview and his seconder withdraw his amendment at this time, but perhaps bring it back for consideration, if necessary, after a provincial parks policy has been established, and the hon. member opposite has had time to study such a policy -- [Interjection] -- I didn't miss it, I just didn't want to take the time to read the rest of them, but if you like, I can table all of them. And I can give the size in acres.

Continuing with my talk, I do again express the urgent situation in the two major urban centres which requires early consideration. Again in order to have a total comprehensive park near the city of Edmonton easily accessible, requiring a very short bus trip and which would allow day trips at a small cost, an area that lends itself to such a development is needed. I feel we have one of the most suitable areas for such a development at Big Lake.

Perhaps I should outline some of the points as to why I have suggested the area of Big Lake. First, to answer the question I am anticipating is in the minds of some of you, I want to make it clear that neither I nor my husband has any interest in the area.

Now, points pertaining to Big Lake. Some research and reports have been made regarding the Big Lake area by government departments and other agencies. Natural features such as lake, beach development, natural wooded areas, wildlife are non-existent. Land is generally of rural use, is not urban developed, and therefore, land costs for the acreage which would be required for a park should not be exorbitant. Drainage control should be of little problem in connection with the Sturgeon River, with a minimal amount of dredging and damming, so the water level could be raised and controlled. Backfilling would not be necessary, as was raised by the hon. Member for Stony Plain, as it would be intended to have the lake enlarged by controlled flooding and damming.

The area is such that it would lend itself for development to provide an active recreation area, year-round activities, leisure trails, beautiful garden areas, retention of some wildlife area, and all this accessible to the citizen on a lower income level, or the senior citizen or the handicapped.

This as well, would relieve to some degree the human congestion of city parks along the river valley, making these parks a little more available to the dense populace of the centre core of the city.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree that the hon. member may finish?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MRS. CHICHAK:

I would like to say that we are not promoting parks for the sake of parks, but for the sake of the concentrated multitude of the populace in the two major centres, in relation to the magnitude of the leisure time problem and the ability of these two centres to be able to cope with it.

This government has given priority to many programs which will benefit rural Alberta through its agricultural programs, incentives for secondary industry establishment in rural areas, and others.

I agree that rural Alberta has too long been forgotten, and the priorities are not as they should be. I do ask, however, that you let us have at least a sliver of the pie, and so, perhaps an amendment at this time is somewhat premature. Thank you.

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-35

MR. COOPER:

I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member begs leave to adjourn the debate. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Bill No. 200
An Act to Amend The Legislative Assembly Act
(Second Reading)

MR. HENDERSON:

I move that Bill No. 200 be now read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any question about the Bill having been printed and circulated?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of Bill No. 200, I would like to make a few very brief comments and I assure you they will be brief. I think it is fundamentally a question of principle and one either favours the proposition in principle or does not. I think it is a safe statement to make that at the time of the last election in this province there were an increasing number of people expressing dissatisfaction with the --

DR. PAPROSKI:

I wonder if the hon. member would start again because I didn't hear the first part at all.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that I will have no trouble making myself heard in this Assembly; it is this hardware we have in here. I am always amazed Mr. Speaker, that the American government has figured out how to send a man to the moon, televise live television pictures back, transmit them to people all around the world, but I have yet to see a reliable PA system anywhere, including this Legislature. So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude that the best bet is to ignore the fact that the PA system exists since it is apparently unreliable.

Mr. Speaker, I was saying that I think fundamentally, so far as this Bill is concerned, it is a question of principle. Either one favours such a move as this or one does not. It can also be stated that if this Assembly considers action such as this it will certainly be a precedent in Canada. At the time of the last provincial election, there were an increasing number of citizens who were expressing dissatisfaction with the uncertainty as to the procedure by which election dates were determined in the province. Some of the people expressing that dissatisfaction were rather prominently situated among the front benches of the gentlemen seated opposite. But I think in fairness, Mr. Speaker, while not stated publicly, there were also expressions of concern and dissatisfaction emanating from some members representing individuals on this side of the House.

16-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

We are also witnessing the same thing on the federal scene which Canadians are looking at as somewhat unsatisfactory, where we have a game of cat and mouse as to when the next federal election will be. In the British Parliamentary system it has been a cherished tradition of the government to have some latitude within constitutional limitations, in that case five years in Alberta and in Canada, in determining when they should have a general election.

Most provinces, Mr. Speaker, have somewhat of a tradition as to the frequency with which they hold general elections. In Alberta for many years, barring one or two unforeseen developments in the last couple of decades, it has been every four years. Our sister province of B.C. has followed, in my recollection in recent years, the practice of having an election every three years. So the citizens of this province and others are accustomed to having elections at fairly regular intervals. This amendment would simply formalize the declaration of elections at fixed intervals. I want to say however Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill, I make it very plain that I for one do not favour a departure from our responsible form of government, and that I, for one, do not look with particular favour on a republican form of government, such as they have in the United States. So in drafting the bill, Mr. Speaker, while suggesting that the election be fixed at four year intervals on the second Monday in June commencing in 1975, we have also tried to make allowance for the possibility of defeat of the government on a motion of non-confidence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, should the government accept legislation such as this, there is no doubt that it does remove some of the discretionary political advantages enjoyed by government. It would seem logical to me, Mr. Speaker, that before someone starts trying to play games in the Legislature, with a view to trying to trick the government into a defeat on a procedural or a technical matter, we should not allow this to happen. If the bill should be adopted, if we are going to vote in this House on a matter of non-confidence, every member should know well in advance what it is that he is voting on.

I think one example of the type of thing that one would not want to get into, if we accepted this in principle, is the exercise the federal government went through at the time Mr. Pearson was the Prime Minister. I believe he was on vacation in Bermuda or some place, and there was a Committee of the Whole -- maybe the hon. Member for Barrhead knows the details better -- but the way I interpreted the news, the government had been defeated on a money bill, or an estimate or something like this, a tax matter. It basically was a matter relating to financial policy, and traditionally when the government loses a vote of that type they have traditionally been considered as having been defeated. Well, in that instance, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Pearson rushed back from his holidays and said: "Fellows, we didn't mean that, it was all just a little bit of a slip-up or a mistake, so let's start the game all over again." So they went back and started the ball game all over again and decided they hadn't been defeated.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to accept elections at fixed periods, if we are still going to provide for retention of the responsible form of government that we enjoy, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that every member in the Assembly, if he is voting on a matter that may defeat the government, every member of the Assembly on both sides of the House should be fully aware of it and fully consider the implications of the vote that he casts on the particular matter.

So, with that in mind, we have a clause in the bill which would require 48 hours notice to be given on a vote of non-confidence. This would mean, for example, even in the Throne Speech Debate, that if the opposition decided they were going to introduce a motion of

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-37

non-confidence they would have to formally serve notice it was coming up.

I think also it would preclude the possibility of games being played, for example, in approving the estimates, where it's not unheard of for the opposition to move that the minister's appropriation be reduced to one dollar. Traditionally, of course, it's a vote of non-confidence.

With this particular approach it would provide, unless it was specifically declared well in advance, for a more realistic evaluation of the estimates in somewhat more of a non-partisan atmosphere than may have been the case in the past. And the Legislature would have the latitude to increase or decrease appropriations without the implication that it is a matter of non-confidence in the government, unless specifically declared otherwise in advance.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that very briefly sums up the thinking behind the bill in introducing it. If this House should consider it, it would no doubt be a precedent for any province of Canada, and also I'm pleased to say that having the opportunity of rising in my place and saying a few words on this particular bill is also a precedent in this Legislature. Thank you.

MR. NOTLEY:

I am very pleased to rise in support of the bill. I am equally pleased at the point made by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc that this is not really inconsistent with our system of responsible government. I don't think any of the members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, could, in good conscience, support this bill were there not provision made for elections in the event of a want of confidence motion being passed by the Legislature. I think we all recognise that the system of responsible government, which is part of our British parliamentary tradition, is one of the most workable systems of government anywhere in the world. But there are certainly ways and means in which we can make our governmental affairs more representative, make them work better, and I submit that a fixed term of elections will, in fact, do that for a number of fairly important reasons.

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc quite correctly pointed out that there is no precedent in Canadian political history for this proposal. But it is my understanding that in Australia they have elections every three years, where the House of Representatives is elected for no more than three years, and I believe there is a fixed election date, although I could stand to be corrected on that. But I think that we do have a precedent, at least in the Commonwealth, on this matter.

We certainly have a precedent at other levels of government; for example, our municipal level of governments now have fixed election dates, and we all acknowledge that this is working out quite well. The fixed term and the specified election day will, I think, eliminate the political cat and mouse game that the hon. member referred to. This is something that may intrigue politicians, Mr. Speaker, but it doesn't really impress the electorate. I don't think the electorate are any more impressed at the guessing over the upcoming federal election than they were last spring and summer over the naming of the date for our last provincial election.

I think that, more important, it would eliminate elections that are held clearly on the basis of political expediency. We all know of many cases in Canadian history where the electorate have been put to the unnecessary expense of an election, for no good reason at all, simply because it happened to be in the political interest of the governing party to call a snap election. Perhaps they were in a

16-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

position to catch the opposition parties off guard, but this kind of political expediency is not, in my judgment, especially important or basic to our system of government.

Admittedly, the proposal as advanced by the hon. member would equalize the balance, if you like, between the government and opposition parties in our society. But I don't think that is a bad thing. It seems to me that there is a great deal of merit in everybody, the government and the opposition, knowing when the election will take place -- and most important of all, I submit that this will create a greater public interest and awareness in politics. I think that the cat and mouse timing of elections tends to retard political interest.

People tend to be election oriented, and I think it's fair to say that in the United States today, Mr. Speaker, although the presidential election will not take place until November, there is a great deal of political interest in that country. There is probably much more involvement by the citizenship of that country in their political process now than there is in Canada, even though we may very well have a federal election in June. It seems to me that if we are concerned about involvement, if we're concerned about getting the people actively interested in the political process, if we mean what we say when we talk about being an open government, talking collectively about all the members of the Legislature, not just the members on the government side of the House as such, if we mean these things, then it seems to me we should take whatever measures are prudent and reasonable. These measures must be consistent with our system of government to make it possible for people to become involved in the political process.

Now the fixed term, as the hon. member has pointed out, with the specified date, won't rule out the calling of an election when a specific want of confidence motion has been passed. One thing that I think it will eliminate is the calling of elections at times that are obviously inconvenient for many of our citizens. I should say to the hon. members of this Assembly that it seems to me there are two months in the year when it is not wise to call an election. I am referring to the month of May when most of our rural people are involved in spring seeding, and the month of September when they are involved in harvesting. You can't have people actively interested in the political process if they are so completely preoccupied, as we know our rural people are in these two months, with making a living and looking after their economic well-being for the year. During these busy seasons they simply cannot take the time to go out to meetings, to become fully conversant with the issues of an election campaign.

The only concern I have about the bill as proposed by the hon. member is the suggested election date itself. My view is that we would probably be wiser to have an election date towards the end of June or perhaps in November, as the United States has, so that we completely avoid the hectic spring and fall times of the year, and the impact that this has on our rural populations.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc has introduced what in my view is a thought-provoking piece of legislation, one which I fully support, and one which, as he has already pointed out, will create a precedent in Canada. Surely this is the kind of precedent that we can all be proud to have our province set. Thank you.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. somewhat rookie Member for Calgary Buffalo, who as was suggested by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, has slayed all his dragons, I don't intend to slay any

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-39

dragons today, and I thank you for the opportunity of being able to speak to this bill.

Firstly, I would like to submit to the hon. member who presented this bill that I think the bill sets forth an area we should all well consider. I can well recall the past election when all of us got ulcers worrying about the time when the election would be called. I think there were four or five preferable dates we all locked at, we all were organizing for, and were all very disappointed as that day would pass us by, and we got ready to organize for the second time around. It could be said that the source of the motion is somewhat unusual, inasmuch as I would much have preferred this motion to have been law a year ago, rather than after the last election, considering all the difficulties many of us faced.

However, I would suggest that the motion does leave areas we should consider, for there are many advantages from the point of view of what is contained in this bill. I think even from the point of view of the organizational aspects of the people who must organize an election, not only of the candidates, but also the people who must organize the actual day to day working of the election itself, the enumerators and the clerks, there are great difficulties which are faced, particularly when an election is sometimes called during the month of August. I think that the difficulties relating to enumeration, evident during the last election, were somewhat related to the difficulties of getting organizational assistance and enough enumerators to do the job.

I think also, there is great difficulty if an election is called for an inappropriate date. I can think in terms of August which is a very difficult time for an urban dweller. I also think those who worked on the election during the month of August found it was unusual if there were not four or five doors where the people were on vacation and we found no one at home.

On Occasion, I am sure, we went almost a block where people were not at home. I think the calling of an election during the month of August, as is presently the prerogative of the government, is indeed difficult, because it is not fair to the voter from an urban centre who does not have an opportunity to vote. I think many Albertans were disenfranchised by virtue of the fact the election was called in August, because they were not available to vote.

I also think, in terms of this amendment, that we must also consider the nature of the advance poll. I believe the length of the advance poll must also be considered because it was too close to the election, and as a result the advance poll did not really accomplish anything for people who were on vacation two or three weeks before.

I also concur with the point of view that when we look in terms of the jockeying around done when the government has the right to set this date, the electorate gets a little fed up with the games played as to when the election will be. When will we plan on it? When are we going to go to the polls? And for those who get involved in an election in a working capacity, when will they get down to work and get on with the job? I think last summer was another indication where Albertans were getting somewhat tired of the jockeying around of the election date.

However, with all of the advantages of setting a definite date for an election, I think there are many other aspects that must be considered, and I would like to hear from the other side their views in this debate.

Firstly, the date itself that has been selected - the second Monday in June. Why was that date selected? I would appreciate hearing more comment on that as it means we would be electioneering during the month of May. During this period the weather is somewhat

16-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

unpredictable, and it may be that the road bans could still be on. That brings us to the problem, when is the appropriate date for the election? Should it be at another time as suggested by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, possibly November, or at an earlier time in the year? The inflexibility of the date presents many problems. For example, if we are forced to have a provincial election on the second Monday in June, what then would be our position if the federal government called an election at the same time and during the same period? We would be in a position, an inflexible position, whereby we would be having our election along with the federal election, and heaven knows the problems that would arise by having two elections at the same time. It would be so confusing and difficult that certainly the electorate would not have a fair opportunity. I think we must consider the fact of that inflexible position. We must also look at it from the view of when we may have a minority type of government in this province. What would be our position if there were a minority government, similar to that in the recent Pearson years, when possibly it would be advantageous to clear up a number of matters and to get government on the right footing? Or to overcome the stagnancy in government that can happen in a minority situation, whereby the wheels of government are not turning rapidly enough? It may be advantageous under those circumstances for an election to be called. If government is not doing its work, and if government feels that they must have a mandate from the people in order to overcome the difficulties they are facing, then the determination of an election date specifically every four years would preclude the government from taking action to go to the electorate on an earlier occasion if they felt it would be appropriate to do so.

It certainly must be considered as well that certain issues may arise, about which the government may feel they should turn to the electorate. The example in Great Britain must be considered of the entry of Great Britain into the Common Market. Certainly, we must consider issues which may arise in this province whereby the government feels that if it is going to make a very dramatic move, it should go to the electorate first for an endorsement of its point of view. The only way the government could do this properly is to proceed by way of an election. Of course that would be precluded by fixing the date and by the inflexibility of it all.

I would suggest that although I can see many advantages, as so ably expressed by the two members speaking to this motion this afternoon, I would still like to hear some additional debate with respect to this bill on the matters that I have raised, concerning the inflexibilities that would arise and the many difficulties that could accrue by virtue of that inflexibility. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a comment or two with regard to this matter. I'll try not to repeat what has been said. Taking my cue from two or three of the questions that have been presented by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, I would like to suggest a possibility with regard to a general federal election. I don't think that at any time a province has set a date in advance, which is not too often, that a federal government would want to have its date coincide with the provincial election. There is another aspect to it as far as I can see. Other provinces following the lead that might be given by Alberta might set their dates in the springtime. The federal election would eventually be set for a fall date, or something of this sort. In the United States, it is set in a different way. They set it every two years for the state and every four years for the federal and they have set their dates so they coincide with one another in a favourable manner. I think these are details that might have to be worked out before this particular bill was completed. But hopefully it would work.

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-41

What I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, besides being in favour of the principle of the bill, I have some details I want to deal with, but I can't do that in talking to the principle of the bill. I favour any attempt that is made at any time to abolish as much of the partisan aspect of politics as possible, so we are left with our time and our money and our energy to spend on the actual governing that is necessary for the good of the people of an area. I favour any step in the direction, however small, that tends to do away with the extremes in party politics we experience. What I am going to say is not new, nor is it the first time I have alluded to it in this House, but I do want it to be understood that I am prepared and presume will in the future make further recommendations along this line with regard to doing away with party or partisan politics.

A lot of people consider that in the Commonwealth parliamentary terms, responsible government makes reference particularly to party politics, thinking ideally of the two-party system, but of necessity of more than two parties. We see this in a number of countries where we have as many as 12 or 14 different parties. This does create considerable problems. I see this as one way of doing away with this idea. I can see us going farther sometime along the way. When I think of the situation we have at the municipal level, where we do not have party politics, where men and women are nominated, and out of those who are nominated a certain number are elected. They constitute the government, and out of those who are thus constituted comes a government for the people.

We are familiar with the republican method in the States where a president and the House may be of another party. This doesn't work all that badly for that country. They are still carrying on. In fact, we live, by the expressions of some people, in constant fear that they are so successful they will take us over some time. We are repulsed by the thought, but nevertheless, the fact remains that we are always thinking about it. If I had my way, I would like to eliminate party politics. I would like to see it done by having the dates set, and people elected to constitute the government. Out of this government the Premier could be elected and then his Cabinet chosen. Or else, he could be elected separately from the elected representatives and he could choose his government out of those who had been elected.

I think that there are lots of advantages in this thinking, because when we discuss all kinds of subjects in this Legislature, we have to remember that it is very seldom we differ on the issues we discuss on the party lines. I need only to cite one issue that is bound to come before us time and time again, until it has been resolved, if it ever is. I refer to the Village Lake Louise issue. I venture to say that if we could analyse the thoughts of the members of this Legislature, we might be divided back and forth this way and that on issues of this sort. You might have to draw the line a little zigzaggy but it would take in some from all sides.

Hon. members know that almost any issue that could be brought up before this Legislature would divide the members into different groups. So, if we had honest government, and we were representing the people who elected us, and we were standing by our own convictions and principles, we would find there would be all kinds of opposition within this type of government, without having to worry about the party lines besides.

Hon. members, as I draw your attention to this, I remind you that there are other possibilities. I favour this possibility with one or two details which I want to discuss later when the bill comes into Committee of the Whole to be discussed in detail. I draw your attention to this, because I think it is a very good idea to minimize the partisan and party politics of our province, so that people have the opportunity to govern more effectively. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

16-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to have an opportunity to take part in this debate, first of all for the reason which has been mentioned by the hon. member opposite, that it is, in this Legislature, an historic occasion. This is the first time the opportunity has ever been provided for a member's bill other than a government bill to receive consideration of some depth by all of the members of the Legislature and before the public.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak as well, because of the nature of the bill, which is a very interesting one and which has some recent history in the politics of the province. I think that the primary advantage of the bill is that it attempts, along certain lines, to put all of the people involved in the political process, including members of different parties, and the organizers of the election under the chief electoral officer, on a more equal footing.

I think the validity of this observation is demonstrated by the origin of the bill, and I say this in an attempt simply to be factual, that the bill has previously been advanced by other hon. members of the opposition; that the hon. member opposite, and his colleagues, when they formed the government prior to August 30th, did not consider the problem to be of sufficient consequence that it should be dealt with, but very quickly have realized --

MR. HENDERSON:

Just as a matter of clarity, was there a bill of this type introduced previously? I am not trying to debate it, I just want to know. I got the impression that the hon. member said it had been previously introduced.

MR. KING:

No, Mr. Speaker. To clarify the position, I am simply making the comment that a bill of this type has been suggested publicly in the past, including through the newspapers, radio and on television. Presuming that the hon. members opposite read the newspapers and listen to the radio, they must have been aware of the public nature of the suggestion.

I did not want to get involved in this; I am just saying there seems to be an appreciation of the symptoms of a problem when you are in the opposition. And I think, probably, the problem we are dealing with is that some people have more time than others to prepare for the election.

The questions which I would like to ask are related to whether or not, in the desire to improve the equity of the situation, this is the best possible way of doing it. The bill seems to me clearly to change the fundamental nature of the operations of the Legislative Assembly. Responsibility, as it is used in terms of responsible government, is not a word which can be defined loosely or can be used in any way that half a dozen different hon. members might want to use it. The Legislature of Alberta is responsible, not by virtue of its connection with the Crown, not by virtue of the dimensions of the room in which we meet, not by virtue of the fact that the Executive Council sits with all the other law makers of the province in a single Assembly. We are responsible rather, by virtue of the fact that the people who make the laws must take the immediate responsibility, the public responsibility, for the failure of those laws, or the failure to make good the promise of those laws.

Now in contrast, Mr. Speaker, we have the American situation, which I do not mean to denigrate at all, when I say that it is different by virtue of not being responsible or being non-responsible. The President and his Cabinet, regardless of the number

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-43

of laws which they propose and which may fail to pass Congress, remain in power for a fixed period of time, four years at the most, six years for senators. In other words, the fixed term of their office is a fundamental difference between a responsible and a non-responsible government. The definitive condition of responsibility is that the government must accept immediate responsibility for its failures or its inaction.

Now this creates, I think, a major problem in terms of this act; not a problem which I say we cannot overcome, but a problem which I say has to be considered very carefully. There has been included in the act provision for a vote of non-confidence. That is a situation in which the opposition determines whether or not the members of the Legislative Assembly go to the people for a mandate on an issue. But the procedure has in effect been turned topsy-turvy by the discriminatory nature of the bill, because the bill gives this option to the opposition while removing it from the government. The bill specifically excludes -- at least my understanding of it, and perhaps the hon. member would like to correct me on this -- the opportunity for the government to resign on a matter of major public policy on which they want a vote of confidence from the entire population of the province. And I think that this must surely be the case, for if the bill provided the opportunity for government to resign on a matter of major public policy, then of course, the whole purpose and intent of the bill would be thwarted.

As I think was correctly pointed out by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview -- although he lumped all of these occasions together under the heading of political expediency, which I would like to say they are not always. Indeed, there has been and I feel there will continue to be, the occasion on which the government will want to place its fate directly in the hands of the people on certain of these issues. This must remain a prerogative of the government, and in my view, some kind of an accommodation is going to have to be found in the terms of the bill to provide for this kind of thing. Otherwise, we are not a responsible government, the kind of government that I would like to be a part of.

Now, there seem to me to be other disadvantages or areas of real concern. One of the things that has become increasingly apparent about the American system of politics, and particularly fixed term elections, is the rapidly escalating cost of elections, including everything that leads up to the primary fights, or the contests between the primary and the election itself.

Also the bombardment of the public has in the view of many political scientists and sociologists in the United States, achieved exactly the opposite effect suggested by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview: that is, basically, the people in the United States today pay less attention to politics, in direct proportion to the length of the time that ensues from the beginning of the campaign, the declaration by a candidate for the presidency 18 or 21 months prior to the election in which he wants to fight.

I would suggest that a fixed term election for which people can prepare one year, or a year and a half, or two years in advance, is going to work to the disadvantage of many individuals who desire to be involved in politics, and particularly, I think, it's going to work to the disadvantage of the party of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, because one of the complaints that I have heard constantly from many of his supporters, at the time of election and immediately after, was the impossibility of their financial situation supporting a long-term campaign.

Having raised these points, and having asked for comments from any members about ways in which these problems could be overcome, I would like to suggest a couple of alternatives, one of which is presently before the House. If a bill such as this is symptomatic of

16-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

a problem that can be described as the unequal amount of time in which people have to prepare for elections depending on what their party position is, then I think that there are two ways in which you can make all of us in this Legislature and outside more equal on this issue. One would be simply to lengthen the period of time between the calling of the election and the holding of the election.

There are of course, immediate adverse reactions to that. But in point of fact it achieves exactly the same thing as is proposed by this bill. The bill proposes, in essence, that everyone should be given four years to prepare for an election. I think that we could strike some kind of a medium or a compromise by suggesting 54 days, as is the case with the federal government, or 45 days, or 60 days. Some such intermediate number would put people on an equal footing, put parties on a more equal footing, provide a greater length of time for the machinery to be set in motion, and yet would spare us from what Americans, for example, have to endure in their nine, and their ten and their twelve month campaigns.

The second thing which might be considered in terms of this bill is the second bill on the same order suggested, moved or introduced by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, to limit the expenses or resources of all of the parties equally in some kind of proportion to the population of the constituency, or the province, or the duration of the election. Now, I think that too would, under certain circumstances, be a contribution to achieving the kind of thing which the hon. members want. I think in terms of all of the suggestions put forward in this and subsequent debates, we can perhaps work up a procedure which will provide the equity which is at the basis of the introduction of this bill, without destroying some of the fundamental concepts that I think are threatened by the particular sections of this act. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I have been accused of ad libbing on my remarks, and thus, having not made any preparation whatsoever to debate this bill, this is precisely what I intend to do in this particular instance.

A very able presentation has been made by the hon member for Edmonton Highlands. We look at this particular bill as such. It would appear basically to tie everything up in a very neat package, except it would permit the mechanics of organizing elections to evolve into a much simpler area than presumably exists.

However, in looking at this bill, no one can but subscribe to the good intentions as outlined. Thinking on the basics of parliamentary procedure, and realising there may be many options and reasons why, or why not, a government should continue or discontinue the process of governing we may evolve our political system into a five or six or seven party system. This could well be; we see splinter parties starting up in various areas of Canada, all with their own intentions. It could be conceivable that we could arrive at a situation such as they have in Italy or in France, where a government functions only on the basis of the sufferance of various splinter groups, which, in many cases, would have an agreement in policy but not necessarily one that would be the policy of the governing party. Hence the options would be for the government in an instance like this to resign and seek a reendorsement by the people.

I also concur in the thinking that there would probably not be any lull in campaigning procedures, having regard for the fact of human nature and the strange motivations of politicians to get themselves re-elected. I would conclude that we would stretch our election campaign out for probably two years or something in that order, making the election and electioneering prohibitive and far too costly for the average person to go along with. Instead of arriving

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-45

at a fine and complete package in this bill, there are many obstacles. I believe that the prerogative of the government is to govern, and it is the right of the government to resign and go to the people on any specific issue that they regard as important, and in which they seek the endorsement of their people. This is a right that has been built into our British tradition.

Hence, Mr. Speaker, I propose to vote against this bill.

DR. HOERNER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal briefly with the bill. I think the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands has done an extremely able job in outlining the situation in regard to the bill. I would like to put before the House some of the views that I have in relation to the idea of set elections.

I was a little bit amused by the hon. member for Spirit River-Fairview talking about political expediency and the question of setting of elections. I don't know whether it is considered politically expedient to do a poll of all the province and then decide where you are best to run or whether you should run in your home riding. I do not know whether he considers that political expediency or not.

The other thing that I was not very sure of, was whether or not this is NDP policy and whether he had consulted with his colleagues in Manitoba and Saskatchewan and that we could see this as a forerunner of things to come in our sister provinces to the east of us.

There are a number of things that concern me in relation to the bill and they relate to what the hon. member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest has just talked about. There is the fact that we would have an almost continual election campaign, because once you have a set date everybody then works towards that date: that is what happens in the United States, where you have an almost continuous political campaign geared from one election day to the next election day. Down there, of course, they have alternate year voting for part of their senate and congress and so they are in a continual political campaign at all times. I don't think this is necessarily a good thing and I think it would detract from our system of government as one compares the two systems. We shouldn't give away the advantages that our system has by trying to take over one of the things in their system. Perhaps you really have to look at the whole matter rather than one little part of how we run our elections.

In relation to the American situation, of course, you also have the question of their primaries, and I'm not sure whether the hon. member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc and the hon. member for Spirit River-Fairview agree with the American system of perhaps having primaries for the leadership of their parties. Perhaps that is one way in which the hon. member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc might reach that position if we had a change and a primary. I think in general in Canada and in Alberta, governments have said that when they are elected they are instituting a four or five year program, and it seems to me that should be good enough. All of us, of course, in the heat of political indecision are very anxious to know about election dates and so on. Sometimes I think if I had a record of all the things that I've said on political platforms all around the country, I may have even agreed with this on occasion, but on sober second thought I don't. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, and the other side, I'm not really asking you to accept this, but that is the conclusion I arrived at a number of years ago.

Because of a number of things that happened over the years in other elections, I'm convinced there are occasions when it's absolutely essential that the government has the right to go to the

16-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

people on a contentious issue. We must also recognize that while we are all elected by our constituents, the views and the feelings of the constituents might change in between elections or in between set elections in which they might feel very strongly an election ought to be held to decide on a matter. I want to suggest to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that his constituents might decide that sooner than some of the others.

I suppose some of our legal people should have a look at the question of the constitutional analogy of this -- the question of whether or not one province can have set election dates without interfering with the constitutions of others, and without interfering with the right of the federal government to call its election whenever it wants to. Surely we would have a massive amount of confusion if the federal government decided to have an election in June as well. I can't really imagine what would happen on that occasion, but it would perhaps be more like the American elections where they tell me you have a ballot that is about 24 feet long and you have to keep marking all the time.

As I was saying a little earlier the governments generally, when they get elected, announce a four year program. This is the outline of the government's program, as our government has said, for a four year stretch, and I think it's pretty well known, that at the end of the fourth year we will have an election sooner or later, within a year. It seems to me that's not so -- I know how the hon. Member for Clover Bar feels, but he was a little bit uptight last summer too, because he apparently didn't know when it was going to come. But, as in a lot of things in government, the more rigid you are, the more rules you have. In my view, it isn't the best way to have government, and this at least, allows some flexibility within the five year program. Certainly as the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands has said, the question of whether or not the government has the right to go to the people is really the crux of the bill, because otherwise all the bill is doing is just shortening it from a five year period to a four year period.

The interesting thing, and I would be really interested to hear from the hon. Leader of the Opposition, because I can recall last session, where there were rumours of an election, an epistle came out of the then Premier's office saying that, no really he didn't have to have an election until some time three months after the five year period was up. I think we should really hear, Mr. Speaker, from the hon. member --

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, may I just make a point of correction there. There was nothing that came out of my office signifying as to the extent that we could carry on. That was something that came from somewhere else.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, then maybe it came from the so called "whiz kids" of the day. The other person we should hear from on this matter is the hon. member for Calgary Millican, because he had some very strange views as to whether or not we needed an election, that they were such a good government they should just carry on indefinitely. Of course the people of Alberta didn't agree with the hon. member for Calgary Millican. At that time, that was one of his views and it was also kind of strange coming from the then Speaker of the House that this should be the situation. If we're really serious about improving our election procedures, I think there are a number of things that perhaps have priority in relation to the kind of elections we have. I think one of them is far better enumeration and perhaps some sort of permanent voter registration, so in fact we don't have the kind of enumeration that has gone on in the past.

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-47

I've been in a number of elections now on both sides of the fence and it seems to happen regardless, because we don't have the time after the announcing of an election to get good enumeration. I think if we really mean what we say about democracy and participation maybe we should look at and do a review of the system in Australia where there are fines if they don't vote. I'd like to see somebody at least review that situation to see what effect it has had on the political situation there and whether or not it is worth while.

The other thing I'd like to comment on very briefly, Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member for Highwood's rather naive description about how we could run this like an afternoon sewing circle without party politics. I want to suggest to him very briefly, Mr. Speaker, there are policies needed in this province and the only way that you can get them is to band together in a party to put forward those policies so that you know they're going to be implemented.

I'd like to adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker, in view of the time.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:26 pm.]

* * * * *

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

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to revert to the Introduction of Visitors.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Speaker, we have with us this evening 52 young men and women of St. Albert Air Cadet Squadron No. 633 and their supply officer Claude Carrigan and other leaders. Their driver is Ed Savoie of the St. Albert Lions Club, who form the civilian sponsors of the Squadron. Over the years this proud squadron has distinguished itself in many areas of cadet training, and has brought home honours to the town of St. Albert. In the year 1968-69, I believe, they were named the top squadron in Alberta. Thursday is their regular meeting night and I am pleased to see the cadets who receive outstanding training and citizenship visit this Assembly tonight. Would the St. Albert Air Cadets stand and be recognized by the members of the Provincial Legislature?

16-48

ALEERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

BUDGET DEBATE
(Adjourned)

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues on both sides of the House, I congratulate you on your election. While this is a sentiment I might not have offered with such universality a few months ago, like each of you I realize that when the electors registered their decision, we assumed a common objective that transcends the partisanship of our respective offices.

Mr. Speaker, I will perhaps be permitted to present some of the philosophy which shaped the character of our program. What I place before you is a rationale of both our problems and our opportunities in Alberta, for it is only from such a vantage point that we can accurately gauge if our initiatives will achieve the goals we have set for ourselves.

As the singular statement of our purpose, we believe that our province must develop an expanded base of economic activity, with the accentuation on the creation of employment. We further acknowledge that if this growth does not occur, Alberta will drift into the category of a "have not" province, with all the attendant difficulties that accompany a regressive economy. High unemployment, lower tax base, larger social welfare costs, and a gradual loss of our talented youth, are indeed all symptoms of a society which has failed to generate opportunity.

Our natural resource industries have for more than 20 years contributed in a meaningful way to our prosperous economy. It is understandable that the buoyancy of agriculture and the large petroleum contribution to our public treasury created a sense of security that permeated our assessment of the present and our outlook for the future.

Allow me to make it clear that I fault no one for such an interpretation of our apparent well-being, for so general was the attitude of self-satisfaction that all but a few succumbed to its influence.

But, Mr. Speaker, the cyclical performance of agriculture in recent years, and the failure to add to proven oil reserves, must surely establish that our golden egg was little more than gold plated, and that our sense of security was indeed imaginary. There have, of course, been a number of bright spots in our economy during the past year which should not go unnoticed, and for which we on this side of the House claim little credit.

As an example, permit valuation for the construction industry exceeded \$567 million in 1971 for the first time in history. While the total of all manufactured shipments rose to a new high, increases in most sub-groups were almost masked by declines in others. Labour income was up 10 per cent during the year to \$3.5 billion, due, in a large measure, to an increased labour force, higher rates of wages and larger number of employed over the 12 month period. Retail sales were close to 8 per cent higher than the previous year in 1970.

As encouraging as these figures may appear to be, we must, in analysing them, be cautious that we do not place these gains out of their proper perspective. As my colleague, the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals has reported, revenue from mineral production exceeded the 1970 figure, but mineral reserves of oil and natural gas were lower. While construction was higher, primary metal industry recorded a 27 per cent decline. In terms of employment, the most significant figure is that only 8 per cent of our total labour force was employed in primary and secondary industry.

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-49

In short, what these figures tell us is that our economy was kept afloat by mineral exploitation, service industries, retail merchandising, a demand for housing, and institutional and office accommodation. Now, as important as these indices are, they commit us to ask the question, what will our balance sheet record in future years, if our minerals are depleted, our construction demands satisfied, and our retail sales curbed through a lower purchasing capacity of our people? It may well be a fact such a possibility may be unlikely in the immediate future; however, I suggest that we are unlikely to escape from the reality of any of these projections materializing in the years ahead.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this administration, like the many that have preceeded it, is well aware of the reasons which have contributed to Alberta's low profile as an industrial province. While we are slowly developing sources of investment capital and a number of financial institutions, we are, nevertheless, still dependent on outside sources of capital to finance our commercial and industrial corporations. While we possess some of the finest academic universities and colleges in Canada, we continue to lose many of our more talented graduates to larger metropolitan areas. Transportation, capital funds and qualified people are the basic ingredients of any successful industrial formula, and it becomes our task to resolve this equation.

The government, like its predecessor, is still confronted with the inequities of a freight structure which penalizes our exporters so unjustly. As in the past, our conventional banking institutions continue to provide us with branch office facilities and lending capacity far below our requirements. Similarly, our federal government is able to withdraw from our provincial income vast sums for the support of a federal system. Yet Ottawa does little to contribute to our membership in this federal state, and has exempted many areas of the province from benefits that are available. It is little wonder that my colleague, the hon. Mr. Getty, expressed the view that we in Alberta are getting a little tired of being identified as just one of the prairie provinces by the federal government. Surely it is not too much to expect that after more than a century of confederation, our national government should be able to recognize the individuality of our province, for our problems and our opportunities are easily distinguishable from either Manitoba or Saskatchewan. It is all part of the continuing philosophy of a decade or two ago, when our principal assets as a country were regarded by our foreign friends as cold weather, mounted policemen, and ducks. I regret to say that these people have educated themselves far more about our land than have our federal authorities in their tunnel vision of this great province.

Any analysis of our economic posture must also include some consideration of those influences that penetrate the Canadian industrial scene as a whole. Canada's trade relationship with the United States less than a month ago had reached a point of near impasse. We now learn that after prolonged negotiations many of the irritants have been resolved at the senior civil service level. The report of these negotiations, however, makes no reference to the proposed Domestic International Sales Corporation, commonly known as DISC. For we in Canada have much to fear if this legislation is enacted.

I don't know how concerned this House might be, but DISC was designed to force Canadian subsidiaries of American firms to locate in the United States. And there can be no doubt that unless our federal government negotiates the withdrawal of this bill, we will witness an exodus of foreign corporations from this country.

The recent monetary crisis has not left our exporters untouched. Many Canadians, perhaps, have hardly noticed that during 1971 their floating dollar was actually revalued upwards by approximately 8 per

16-50

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

cent, with the result that Canadian products became less competitive by a like amount. While the American markets will remain firm for those raw materials of which they are in short supply, such firmness is not likely to carry over into a highly processed product.

Added to this is the more general and growing Canadian realization that the European Common Market is basically a protective and self-contained unit, desirous of reducing imports as much as possible in favour of regional producers. The fact that Britain and other countries are now joining the ECM has the double effect of reducing the imports of a preferential buyer and of making Canada non-attractive to American investors, and to those firms which had set up plants in Canada to take advantage of empire tariff preferences.

It is true that most other countries were forced to revalue their currencies upwards in terms of the American-Canadian dollar. And to this extent, Canada is in a more favourable position than in previous years. But, for the immediate future, it is also true that those countries are experiencing relatively serious economic difficulties, which will have to be overcome before Canadian exports can be increased substantially.

Since half of Alberta's manufacturing output is exported from the province, any pronounced slowdown in economic activity in other parts of Canada must necessarily affect the provincial sales in shipment of these products.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to create the impression that someone else has created all these problems. As a people, I believe we are inclined to rely on this crutch of self-pity much more than we are entitled to. As an example, some of our corporate citizens accepted the penalty of distance and the shortage of capital -- and where mountains had to be moved, they moved or circumvented them. Atco Industries and Foremost Tracked Vehicles are but two of these companies that demonstrated their ability to overcome the limitation of domestic markets by selling their products abroad. They are recognized around the world.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no question that we face many continuing and new difficulties in the development of our industrial potential. It is equally true, however, that our strengths outweigh our weaknesses, for we are rightly described by many knowledgeable economic authorities as that province most likely to succeed. It, therefore, becomes our task to set a course that will stimulate and give direction to our commercial, business, and industrial communities, so that together we may achieve our common purpose. To reach this goal, it is important to state in brief terms our objective, and then to place before you the individual thrusts of this program. In simple terms, I believe our purpose can be described in the following language.

Our first criterion is to satisfy that each initiative will focus on the generation of new employment. We hope to encourage an entrepreneurial environment in both rural and urban areas in which business and government will work together. We seek a more diversified economy, centred in the secondary and tertiary sectors throughout the entire province, to facilitate and stimulate the achievement of the rural development potential. We must succeed in achieving a more competitive transportation position. Greater access to capital pools must be provided. Resource processing within the province prior to export is yet another objective -- you have already heard that with regard to the Syncrude program. We will endeavour to expand our external markets. We propose to offer a more effective utilization of our research and development facilities. We must not overlook, in our planning, assistance to individuals and to small companies. We must maximize the available federal programs to supplement our provincial endeavours. And finally, we must ensure

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-51

that our role is designed to coordinate, not replace, the individual initiative of the private sector.

I am certain that a majority of our people will concur with this statement of objectives. How we formulate and implement policies to achieve our purpose then becomes the most critical consideration which I now place before the House. It naturally follows that until legislation of the department has been tabled I am obliged to discuss certain aspects of this program in broad and general terms.

One of the most vital programs in Alberta's industrial offensive will be a new act appropriately described as the Alberta Opportunity Fund.

You will note in reading the bill that it not only broadens the terms of the Alberta Commercial Corporation, but that it will also provide new hope for small industries, and particularly those located in rural areas of our province. Our Premier and this government consider this a priority. For every Albertan it will provide a more flexible access to capital, and will encourage commercial ventures offering a high degree of job opportunity in relation to capital and investment. It is intended to motivate a greater degree of research and development, which in turn should increase productivity and improve technology so important to our competitive world.

The bill's provisions emphasize the importance of promoting Alberta services and products to maximize their marketing and export potential -- projects and facilities which enhance the tourist potential of our province also qualify. And for our youth, it will offer employment and business experience for the creation and expansion of student business enterprises.

The Alberta Opportunity Fund has been designated to accommodate a broad spectrum of our people in a manner that will challenge the initiative of those who in the past were obliged to stand still because of the limitation of their capital. We believe that it will inspire some to expand their facilities, others to improve their technology, and yet others to generate new and exciting industries within the confines of our province. The fund will provide capital loans, not grants, for opportunity is not grasped through handouts. Rather it is won by accepting both the opportunity and responsibility of borrowed money on reasonable terms. The effectiveness of this act can only be measured by the ability of the people who administer it, the related support activities already launched by our department.

The very designation of my office, The Department of Industry and Commerce, illustrates the government's fundamental belief that industry and commerce are indeed inseparable. From this position we consider it advisable to restructure within the government the Cabinet input and the personnel of the department itself. We also believe that the private sector must be encouraged to enter into a much closer association in the planning and implementation of our program.

Our first action, therefore, was to invite a number of business and industrial leaders to form economic advisory councils in four regional areas of our province. Their task is to evaluate both problems and opportunities in their respective areas, and to review and recommend improvements in our industrial development programs.

From the government's standpoint, we considered it necessary to form a ministerial marketing committee embracing agriculture, industry and commerce. Our purpose in grouping two ministers in a single marketing initiative is to ensure maximum coordination between the departments, and will enable us to focus much larger and combined efforts on the merchandising of Alberta products abroad.

16-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

The formation of a Cabinet committee on the environment is also an important new alignment that will be of great assistance to this department. The committee, consisting of my colleagues, the hon. Mr. Dickie, the hon. Mr. Yurko and myself, will permit us to deal with ecological considerations related to industrial development, and hopefully we will be able to avert potential problems before they develop.

We have also expanded our internal staff, for quite obviously the thrust of our endeavour requires not just new people, but rather experienced personnel who could contribute to the program the day they assumed office. Two notable additions have, therefore, supplemented our staff: an assistant deputy minister with broad trade and marketing and federal government experience; and a marketing director recruited from a senior position in the private sector. We have retained the service of all other personnel within the department.

A number of divisional responsibilities have been added to our department with the purpose of relating their function more closely to industrial development. Others already contained within the department have been reshaped to orient them to the same objective. As an example, the Alberta Resources Railroad has been transferred to my portfolio and we now have a study underway to evaluate its future.

The Bureau of Statistics and the Economic Research Branch are now engaged in providing more meaningful statistical and research data for industrial and manpower consumption. Economic forecasts, accurate knowledge concerning the gross provincial product, an industrial inventory of companies in place, all form part of this new alignment and assignment.

The Alberta Research Council has also been added to the department. This group of well trained professionals has been charged with the responsibility for providing research and development pertinent to small industries within our province. We have asked the council to act as a coordinating body utilizing all research expertise in government, industry, the universities, and NAIT and SAIT.

The previous administration considered the establishment of provincial offices abroad as an important adjunct to the marketing of Alberta products. We concur in this judgment and add to it new positive directions. Our new approach will be a flexible one, utilizing to the fullest all federal offices and, where in our best interest, employing representatives, either by contract or by appointment.

It is our belief that if we are to achieve our overall objective, our foreign offices will play a major role in this success. It is apparent that many world markets are literally lost by default, in that as a province we are just not identified with foreign buyers.

We also believe that this new dimension of expanded facilities must be supplemented with aggressive trade missions and trade fairs, so that we will be literally merchandising our products in foreign market areas and encouraging reciprocal visits to Alberta. Our underlying objective is to encourage our people to become more trade oriented, and if we provide the facility we are optimistic that they will respond.

Mr. Speaker, having placed our own house in order, we are now confident we can accomplish many things. We can more effectively market Alberta products. We can offer more meaningful aids in the field of research and development to industry, but most important, we can more intelligently attack the obstacles that have frustrated our progress in years past.

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-53

As an example, it is our contention that the combined talents of our advisory councils and the input from our professional staff will assist us to resolve our rail and air transportation difficulties. We will not just approach federal authorities with old shop-worn complaints, but will rather make a concentrated attack equipped with current and forceful arguments.

We recognize it is unlikely that the logic of our case, no matter how well presented, will immediately alter the fixed attitude of the railway companies. However, we propose to recruit the widest possible support for our cause from every ally, be it in government or in industry.

In this respect, we have joined with other western Canadian provincial governments in a common assault on a number of matters that have represented obstacles to our economic growth for so long. I am indeed pleased to report that our government will host the next meeting of Western Provincial Ministers of Industry later this year.

This past month I attended the inaugural meeting of the Pacific Transportation Council, a body represented by British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan, and whose purpose it is to provide an over-view of all physical facilities associated with transportation in western Canada.

In addition to government participation, the council membership includes railway companies, commodity specialists, and the many people engaged in the management of bulk facilities. While it is too early to gauge the effectiveness of this new body, there can be little question that our province must concern itself with the physical movement of products. And I believe the council will serve a useful vehicle to achieve this purpose. We are now equipped to examine our internal and external air transportation requirements, and I shall report to the House on our progress in due course.

We are reviewing conventional sources of capital development funds to supplement our own program, and we hope we will have a detailed paper on this subject in the very near future. As a matter of policy, we have clearly stated that we welcome foreign investment in our province, without regard to its nationality. We insist only that the recipients of these funds perform as good corporate citizens in the best interests of Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, the record to date clearly illustrates that we have little complaint from the resident foreign companies. We believe that Alberta must look towards the development of large petrochemical complexes, which, in turn, will necessitate considerably expanded processing and manufacturing in our province. It is axiomatic that the construction of these plants must satisfy certain conditions in the interests of our people. But we must not lose sight of the contribution they will make to our economy, and in fact, the whole Canadian economy.

Now the capital requirements for such a development will be large, and we believe should be jointly financed by Albertan, Canadian and foreign investment, if necessary. We have stated that we are not opposed to a federal government examination of foreign investment entering Canada, so long as the senior government, through regulation, does not hamper our access to the needed capital. All through these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I have alluded to our concept of developing secondary industry with the attendant necessity of creating jobs.

Our objective measured in terms of shipments from Alberta would set a desirable ratio of 60 per cent of our exported products emanating from the primary industries, and 40 per cent manufactured by secondary industry. We believe that in order to reach this target, our policies must be positive in nature, and we recognize

16-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

that our success will depend to a large extent on the cooperative endeavours of government and the private sector alike.

We recognize that there is no panacea in achieving our aim. The primary initiative to either succeed or fail still remains with those companies and individuals actively engaged in the development of our economy. Our role in government is to guide, motivate, and provide assistance where it will help most, in such a way, we believe that we will be creating a climate of opportunity, and I am sufficiently old fashioned in my view of government to believe that that is our primary obligation.

Is it enough to accomplish all our hopes and aspirations? Before those of you whose duty it is to criticize say no, let me quickly concur that we on this side agree. We accept that in one single legislative program it is not possible to leap over all the obstacles that have restrained our industrial growth for many decades.

However, what we do suggest is that this mix of program will facilitate the creation of employment, and set a course that will in time resolve even the more challenging problems that confront us today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, it is with some fear and trepidation that I follow the last speaker. He has certainly accredited himself and his party in his delivery of his eloquent speech, with a good deal of meat in it. I look forward to digesting it a little more thoroughly when I have had a chance to peruse it some more.

This may be one of my shorter speeches, Mr. Speaker. I knew the hon. members would be delighted to hear that. I will not make any attempt to match the previous speaker in eloquence. I am taking a warning that was probably delivered to people like myself, by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo last night, when he warned about lack of research and taking it off the top of your head. I don't have too much to take off the top of my head, no matter how you look at it. I haven't done all that much research and I am not a financial expert -- I don't have to tell anybody in this House about that -- so I'll have to contain my remarks to a few thoughts on the principles of the budget speech that are reported.

I found it, Mr. Speaker, an interesting budget speech, and I think it was the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs who said it was a creditable budget. To me, it seems to be a questionable budget, not that the content of it is necessarily questionable, but I have a lot of questions to ask. To me it seemed as if I was more interested, not so much in what the budget says as what it doesn't say. For that reason my thoughts now will be brief because I have many questions to raise at the time we discuss it in the estimates.

Some departments have received substantial increases in the amounts to be spent, but the overall estimates of expenditures is not a great deal different from that of the estimates of expenditures last year. So if some departments have received a good deal more, it means that some others will have received significantly less. The question that we have to raise is who lost out and why. Of course this will all come out in the estimates.

The speech was rather quick, as were some of the members who spoke on the budget speech, to mention the alleged shortcomings of the previous administration in underestimating some of the expenditures. But very little was said in the main body of the speech about the fact that when the overall estimates were figured

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-55

out, there was some balance left over rather than being short. The total estimate results were in our favour. I must withhold any criticisms of some of those things at this point until we have some more questions.

There are some interesting things. For instance, in the matter of tourism. I can't help but think that in the past year, since I came into this Legislature, we first had the branch of tourism in the Department of Industry and Development, and at that time tourism was progressing, I think rather normally, in the province. Then, under the pressure of circumstances, the department was renamed the Department of Industry and Tourism, and now the department is going to be renamed the Department of Industry and Commerce. Tourism will no longer be at the departmental level, but will be a branch under the Executive Council. However, it is graced with a Minister without Portfolio which will give some added significance or strength.

I'm not so concerned, Mr. Speaker, with what departments some of these facilities or branches are concerned, nor am I particularly concerned with the fact that there is a special department for each and every facet of our economy, as I am that the job gets done, whatever way it's to be done. So I am looking forward with keen anticipation, with a slightly increased budget for tourism, to see how that money will be spent.

In most departments so far as the estimates are concerned, there have been no spectacular changes, but there is one department that I'm concerned with, about which I have spoken in this Legislature several times. That is the Department of Lands and Forests. Without drawing the hon. members' attention to specific figures, it is enough to say that the '72 estimates are somewhat under the forecast expenditures for 1971-72. This bothers me, because some people have said that the present Minister of Lands and Forests is very unhappy with what he found in the department when he took it over. I'm not sure that I can concur with him in all of his unhappiness, but that's a matter of opinion. But I have been deeply concerned with some shortcomings by way of parks expansion, by way of fish and wildlife supervision, and this sort of thing in past years, and have been constantly urging that greater sums be given to this department. However, I note that it will be what I consider short-changed again this year. It is possible that the government in its long-term planning may be taking a look at making some changes in this area in another year, but here is one department that is very important, so far as I am concerned, in our activities in this province.

Mr. Speaker, there is no statement I have come across that clearly delineates how the government arrived at some of the forecast figures, or how close they will be to the actual estimates when the year is finished, and I'll be looking forward to seeing what comes out of that in the questioning in the estimates.

I think that I should not conclude these brief remarks that I make without speaking again about projections and predictions and estimates, for there are a lot of them in this budget -- and that is what the budget primarily is for. I don't know whether I didn't make myself clear, or whether I had put members to sleep before I started to speak on it and they only heard part of it, but two or three members chastised me for a lack of vision in suggesting that there should be no planning for the future. I hope I didn't say -- and I'm looking forward to the time Hansard comes out to see whether I said it or not -- that there should be no planning. What I intended to say was that no matter how much planning is done, it is impossible in these days in which we live to predict accurately or project to any length of time, with any degree of accuracy, the figures that are necessary, or which we deem necessary in our society today.

I think we need to do all the planning that we possibly can, but I think that the time and the circumstances are such that we cannot

16-56

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

rely on predictions and projections into the future. We have to try, but that is the best that we can do, because we can expect that a good many of our projections and predictions will go astray and the result will be, in some cases, rather hazardous.

Now Mr. Speaker, having said that, I want to say again that I found it a very interesting budget speech, and I hope that the discussions that follow in the estimates will be equally interesting and penetrating. Thank you.

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move at last, seconded by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, that we revert to Orders of the Day to consider Government Motions on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Education has moved, seconded by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, that we revert to Orders of the Day to consider Government Motions. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Russell, that you do now leave the Chair, and that the Assembly do immediately resolve itself into a Committee of Supply for the purpose of considering a Resolution for the granting of interim supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER:

Taking the Motion as read, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Supply will now come to order for the consideration of the following resolution:

Resolved that a sum not exceeding \$449,979,469, being the aggregate of

- (a) one-fourth of the amount of the items set forth in the Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1973, as laid before the Legislative Assembly at the present Session of the Legislature, except Education Department Appropriation 1303, and
- (b) one-half of the amount of the items set forth in Education Department Appropriation 1303 in the Estimates for the

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-57

fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1973, as laid
before the Assembly at the present session of the
Legislative Assembly

be granted to Her Majesty on account, for the fiscal year ending
the 31st day of March, 1973.

Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration
the following resolution and begs to report the same.

[Mr. Diachuk then read the resolution.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Taking the resolution as read, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister has moved that the resolution be read a second
time. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Russell, that you
do now leave the Chair, and that this Assembly do resolve itself into
Committee of Ways and Means to consider the ways and means of raising
the supply to be granted to Her Majesty. Mr. Speaker, His Honour the
Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has been informed of the subject
matter of this motion and recommends it to the consideration of the
Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER:

Taking the motion as read, do you all agree?

16-58

ALEERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Ways and Means will come to order for the consideration of the following resolution:

Resolved that toward making good the supply to be granted to Her Majesty for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, the sum of \$449,979,469 being the aggregate of

a) one-fourth of the amount of the item set forth in the estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, as laid before the Legislative Assembly at the present session of the Legislature, except Education Department Appropriation 1303 and,

b) one-half of the amount of the item set forth in the Education Department Appropriation 1303 in the estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1973, as laid before the Legislative Assembly at the present session of the Legislature,

be granted, as interim supply out of the general revenue fund of the province.

Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is it all agreed as moved by the hon. minister?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has had under consideration the following resolution, and begs leave to report the same and move it again.

[Mr. Diachuk read the resolution.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Taking the resolution as read, do you all agree?

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-59

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be read a second time.

MR. SPEAKER:

It was moved by the hon. Premier that the resolution be read a second time. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 3

The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1972

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if all hon. members shake their heads like I do every time we watch the process that we just went through. Yet I understand that I am probably the person who provokes that process most. For the benefit of all new members, and I think we have many, we must go through that process each time a money bill is introduced. In this case the money bill I beg leave to introduce is The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1972, and the resolution was read out to you. I might just say that all hon. members probably know that the fiscal year end of the province is March 31, and that as of March 31, the funds of the province all legally expire for the current fiscal year we are working on. In view of this, it is very necessary that we have interim supply granted by this Legislature by March 31, which is the end of this month. Otherwise I am sure all hon. members will appreciate that many of our citizens will be adversely affected, citizens on social assistance, many other citizens, as well as our valued public servants in this province who would not get their pay cheques. I therefore move first reading of The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1972.

[With the agreement of the House, Bill No. 3 was introduced and read for the first time.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, the government asks for the unanimous leave of the Assembly, notwithstanding rule 592, to move to second reading of the said Bill, The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1972 at this time.

[Leave being granted, and upon a motion by Mr. Miniely, Bill No. 3 was read a second time.]

BUDGET DEBATE (Adjourned)

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, six years ago I had the pleasure of meeting our hon. Premier. At that time I said that Mr. Lougheed would one day be Premier of this province, and I thought at that time what a challenge it would be to work with him. Peter Lougheed has always advocated open government, and, when elected, getting all government MLA's involved. The appointment of non-executive council members to

16-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

task forces has been a tremendous boost for the individual member. I know that I am here to do a job, and likewise, am expected to get the job accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, I represent the Stony Plain constituency west of Edmonton, and this constituency has not had a voice for years. They know what open government is, but now that we have open government, they ask, "How much dare I use my elected representative?" The answer to my constituents is, "You elected me, use me, I will work for you."

As of October 1, 1971, I opened a local MLA's office in the town of Stony Plain. This office, Mr. Speaker, is open to the public one day a week and the response has been overwhelming. People now have a place where they can meet their elected representative. On one of the previous evenings, when the hon. Member for Smoky River presented his maiden speech and endorsed the hon. Minister of Agriculture for his competence in looking after the Department of Agriculture, getting fresh ideas, weeding out 1936 funny money ideas, the opposition side attempted to outvoice the hon. Member for Smoky River. And that is why they now sit on the other side of the House. It is evident that they should have been listening instead of talking.

The largest industry in Stony Plain is agriculture and this industry must be protected. Let me reassure the hon. members that it will be by the hon. member who sits on the right side of the Premier. Who else could fill the bill? Not very many have so many new ideas and strong thoughts on agriculture, not only for Alberta and Canada, but for our export markets. Keep it up, Hugh, you're doing a tremendous job. The hon. minister has helped the farmers in my constituency by extending the guaranteed loans for female cattle into the Stony Plain constituency. Many of my farmers have taken advantage of this and now have sufficient cattle that will next year boost their farm income.

Mr. Speaker, the Stony Plain constituency has many industries, and to name a few will help acquaint members with the area west of Edmonton. Calgary Powers' two thermal plants on Lake Wabamun; Alberta Ccals' two coal mining sites in the Wabamun area. Portobuilt homes in Spruce Grove; Temple Saw Mills in Stony Plain; a drilling mud plant in Onoway; and many small industries situated in various parts of the constituency.

The highways in this area are not as good as the previous administration would lead us to believe. We received correspondence at a community meeting a few years ago in regard to highway 16 west and it was addressed: "Re: Highway 16 east". The people along this highway were then given the impression that there was no highway 16 west. I wonder why this was not given recognition. I know why - because of the poor design and the unsafe entrances into a lot of my towns which have caused unneeded highway deaths and many thousands of dollars in property damage. Highway 43 north is in about the same shape. Can you see, Mr. Speaker, approximately 20 school buses leaving Onoway and entering the highway at a crossing which, in my opinion, is unsafe? This crossing is half way down a hill with the speed limit on the highway of 60 miles an hour. This corner requires an overpass, or the hill cut down to allow a maximum amount of vision. This type of hazard is also evident at the Wabamun turnoff and the volume of traffic on No. 16 west warrants work on this overpass. This constituency has only 32 miles of four-lane highway, with only two completed overpasses and a third under construction at Winterburn. This highway needs other overpasses at Devon corner, Spruce Grove, Stony Plain and Wabamun. The highway also requires continuation of the four lanes to at least Seta Beach, and four lanes must be started to No. 43 north. The grid road system must be expanded and this constituency needs at least two good high grade roads connecting Highways 16 and 43.

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-61

Mr. Speaker, in my constituency I have one of the wealthiest counties in the province, but because of high expenditures they require additional money, and I was only too pleased when the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs increased the grant by 10 per cent. It was a fair increase, despite the overall financial position of the province. I hope that both the counties of Lac St. Anne and Parkland will receive their fair share, along with the towns of Spruce Grove, Stony Plain and Onoway.

The County of Parkland, as of January 1st, 1972, allowed the City of Edmonton, without opposition, annexation of approximately one and a half miles west of 170 Street, and from 118 Avenue to the North Saskatchewan River. But now the city wants more. Mr. Speaker, this time there will be opposition, and if required I will aid the county in every way possible.

I am very pleased to have one of the very first school community buildings in Alberta; this is in Spruce Grove. I must commend the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury for his contribution, while Minister of Education, for seeing that this school became a reality for Spruce Grove.

Mr. Speaker, I have other school problems. There are only three high schools in my constituency. Children are being bused 40 miles, and this, for a rural area, is totally wrong.

We have expanded too fast in the centralization direction and should and will have to give some thought to the decentralization of our school system and to bringing the teacher to the student. I speak of three high schools, but if the previous administration had had their way this constituency would have ended up with two. The attempt to phase out Seta Beach High School was totally wrong, and it was only through the election of a new government and an Education Minister who had the insight to consider and agree with me that the Seta Beach High School was retained.

Mr. Speaker, the design of school buildings is totally wrong, and the resolution that was before the Assembly on Tuesday of this week pointed this out. Let's stop wasting the taxpayer's dollar and start building schools to educate children, not to allow certain groups to experiment with the tax dollar.

I support the elimination of school tax from property tax. Many of the aspects I have spoken about will cut the provincial budget for schools, especially community school use, school design and decentralization of schools.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the small businessmen who are now located in rural Alberta should be given an allowance to aid their industry, and may I suggest that our telephone system be changed so that these people could receive a reduced toll fee.

The hon. Minister of the Environment, Mr. Yurko, has a firm hold on the environmental problems that exist, not only in rural Alberta, but in the urban centres. My constituency of Stony Plain is an area that is under question, and the Department of the Environment has taken, and will continue to take, a serious look at Lake Wabamun.

In February of 1970 the Conservation and Utilization Committee of the Department of Agriculture, (now the Department of the Environment) started working to co-ordinate the various studies and research projects on this lake, in order that an integrated long-term development plan for the area could be formulated, consistent with government policy of preserving it as a recreational site. A task force was subsequently established, drawn from staff members of the provincial and federal governments, the University of Alberta, and the Edmonton Regional Planning Commission. This group includes among its members men who have been carrying out the various research

16-62

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

projects on the lake. The cost is high in all cases and would add to the cost of power produced.

Expenditures on remedial measures, such as chemical herbicides or weed cutting and removal, were both used last summer, and this year the weed cutting operation will be expanded to one more harvester and two more barges. I believe with the help of Calgary Power, the provincial government and interested cottage owners, that Lake Wabamun will be saved as a recreational site.

Mr. Speaker, I will dwell on recreation for a minute. The hon. Member for Calder has the same thoughts as I have, that we require more covered ice arenas. The hon. member stated that in Edmonton the cost of a covered shell is approximately \$116,000 without any annex. This cost, in my estimation, is high. A community in my constituency, Wabamun, recently built a covered ice arena with a 100 x 30 foot annex, with change-rooms, office, kitchen facilities, for a total cost of \$112,000. Where is the difference? Has the city not enough scrutiny when these contracts are being awarded?

A parcel of land last fall was offered in the Winterburn area by the Stony Plain Indian Reserve to the City of Edmonton for the building of Omniplex. This was turned down by the city -- land that was not costing any money. It appears they want high priced land in the centre of Edmonton. Edmonton needs Omniplex and needs it now.

The budget is excellent, balanced, and a new outlook for Alberta. The capital requirements of the government have been planned well, and have been planned as all good businessmen plan, by balancing the operating end, and by long-term borrowing for capital projects. The highlights of the first Progressive Conservative Budget is a budget that will long be remembered by a large number of people in Alberta. This will be more evident for 27 members of the opposition, including the NDP member.

I have never seen so many dejected looking faces as I did on March 17th, when the hon. Provincial Treasurer brought down his budget, stating it would help senior citizens, agriculture, handicapped children, and many more people. The shock of such a well planned budget was a greater shock to the opposition than the jar they received August 30, 1971.

I wonder why in years before, the former government did not place more emphasis on agriculture. The family farm was in trouble, but with the increase of over 46 per cent over the 1971-72 expenditures for family development, increases of 124 per cent from the 1971-72 for an agricultural marketing thrust, and the new Agricultural Development Fund, agriculture will once again be our leading industry. I can see that with the new importance placed on agriculture our young farmer will stay on the farm, and rural Alberta will start moving again. It will not stay stagnant, as was evident before.

At this time, all the members on this side have seen this pamphlet. This was put into the hands of all farmers in the province by every rural candidate. For the record I will read what the Premier said:

"It is essential to Alberta agriculture to have a provincial government with new attitudes, and new directions. Agriculture is not merely a livelihood for many Albertans, it is a way of life.

A Progressive Conservative government would be dedicated to the preservation of the family farm and to improving farm income. The Department of Agriculture would become a key government department and would aggressively involve itself in marketing and sales.

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-63

A Progressive Conservative government would not be defeatist in its approach, and would not turn over responsibility to the Ottawa government. We cannot promise easy solutions, but strong leadership and a determination to try every available avenue. This is the pledge that the Alberta Progressive Conservative Party can make to the farmers of Alberta. We have more farmer candidates than any other occupation, and each of them joins me in this pledge."

The challenges were: a market emphasis must be achieved in Alberta agriculture; the Alberta government must accept that it has a joint responsibility with the federal government for the prosperity of agricultural producers in Alberta; high priority must be given by Alberta to programs that improve cash income for farmers; ownership of land should remain with Alberta residents, and the preservation of the family farm must be an objective of government policy; a balance must be struck between government assistance and the farmers' desire to control their own industry as free enterprisers; a billion dollar farm income should be our target in Alberta.

And, Mr. Speaker, I can say that at least 90 per cent of this has happened since August 30th.

I did a study this year on the T & T Report, and that report stated that 14,000 farmers in Alberta would have to leave the farm and another 18,000 be upgraded. That, Mr. Speaker, is a large percentage of rural Alberta. Let me reassure the hon. members that I did not agree with the consultants who were hired to do this study at a cost of approximately \$100,000. I wonder if the consultants did not receive their direction from the previous Social Credit thinking. When the election campaign started, Social Credit said: "Let's save the family farm", but I did not see any literature setting out their facts of how this could be accomplished. The only literature I have seen is what I read here a minute ago, and this was placed in the hands of all farmers by all rural candidates and by a man who knew rural Alberta, a man who went out to meet the people, who didn't let the people come to him. Our Premier, Peter Lougheed, has saved Alberta from a floundering debt, and has planned new directions for Alberta, and once again our rural people will have a choice of life to look forward to. With the Premier, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and 46 government MLA's working together, agriculture in Alberta will lead in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the remarks made by the hon. Member for Macleod. Reading between the lines of what he said, and knowing he is from a farming area where most farmers farm townships, half townships, and sections of land -- but my constituency is made up of the backbone of Alberta farmers, who farm half sections and quarter sections. These are the farmers who keep the agricultural industry going and I say that the farmers in southern Alberta who are farming these large crops are exploiting the rest of the rural farmers in Alberta.

I challenge the hon. Member for Macleod to go into my constituency of Stony Plain, or the constituencies of Barrhead, Smoky River, Drayton Valley, Camrose, Stettler, or any rural constituency which is made up of the small farmer, and make the statements that he made in the House the other night about small farmers.

Our senior citizens have at last received a break, a deserving break. They are the people who built this province with sweat, tears and many hardships. Why so long forgotten about? I will tell you why! A very arrogant approach towards senior citizens was used, with no forethought for their future. The previous administration did with senior citizens what a farmer does with an old animal, let it out to pasture to die. A very unreal approach for your folks and mine.

16-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the hon. members from the opposite side must have had parents, but the way senior citizens were treated, it is a good question. Premium-free coverage for medical drugs, optional health services, a \$50 grant for renting accommodations, and the exemption from 30 mill property tax will aid the senior citizens.

A few weeks ago I had the pleasure to be present at a function in which a member from the former government did some speaking during the evening. With very much interest to me, he stated that within the government, when he was a member, there was a division between the Executive Council and the backbenchers. In fact he said there was a blanket - a communication gap. Well, Mr. Speaker, there's no blanket between the Executive Council and the other MLA's in this government. In fact it's an honour to belong to such a team, a team that is involved in government, a team whose members can see a Cabinet minister when matters warrant, a team that meets in open caucus, and a team that wants to do a job for Alberta.

Taking the average age of the government members, I would say that we have a very young group. We have inherited a large debt and a few white elephants. One is a \$125 million railroad so that our coal could be shipped out of Alberta. Herbert C. Hoover once said "Blessed are the young, for they shall inherit the national debt" - so true in Alberta. We have, Mr. Speaker, a young group of government MLA's who have inherited a debt, but who are ready and willing with new ideas to pay this debt off. Thank you.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, first may I say it's a real privilege for me to follow such an enthusiastic speaker, with so much steam. I am, Mr. Speaker, deeply honoured to have this opportunity tonight of addressing the hon. Premier, the hon. ministers of the government, and members of this Assembly as the Member for Calgary McCall. This assignment is, for me of course, a real pleasure, and at this time I wish sincerely to congratulate the efforts of another new member in this Assembly for what I consider an outstanding contribution, for his preparation and the delivery of the budget address. Speaking again as a new member, and solely as such, I do appreciate all the more the efforts put into this budget by the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, and I do so sincerely, may I now make some introductory and explanatory remarks as to my role as the MLA on this side of the House on the subject of the budget address? I consider it my responsibility and my duty to the citizens of Alberta to:

(1) Endeavour to be alert and informed at all times in regard to all aspects of government spending.

(2) Keep an ever watchful eye on the various reserves, both natural reserves and monetary reserves that the previous government has so carefully built up through the years, and to make sure that these reserves are not squandered nor wasted, but spent wisely.

(3) See that the present government continues to improve on the Social Credit programs in the field of social legislation, a field in which the Social Credit party has given outstanding leadership to Alberta, and I hope that Alberta will remain as a leader in this field in Canada.

(4) Retain and improve the good provincial and municipal relationships which have been established through the years by the former government, so that the municipalities will continue to receive the maximum benefits through such good relationships. Examples of these are recreational programs funded by the province and operated by the municipalities, provincial grants for various

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-65

types of municipal programs such as health, road building, pollution control, and various other programs designed for the youth and for all citizens of this province. All these programs, I feel, will offer us a solid foundation wherein the municipalities and the provincial government can work hand and hand, thus providing more responsibilities and incentives for the municipal governments to take a more positive and active role in the affairs of our government.

(5) Constantly and if necessary, prod the present government to continue to encourage good, sound industries to establish offices and plants throughout Alberta. Thus: (a) to increase the overall productivity of our province, in order that we may attract additional money into Alberta to buy Alberta-made goods and products; (b) so that more new industries may share in the tax load that is presently being levied on a relatively few established Alberta industries; and (c) apart from these important points just mentioned, but equally important, if not more at this time, to provide for job opportunities for Albertans for the present, and for the years ahead.

I would now simply suggest to the government that we on this side are a strong sincere opposition party, a party that will work hard for the overall good of all Albertans, a party that will not stoop to idle or petty criticisms, but a party that will work for and fight, if necessary, for those things which are constructive, honest, essential and dear to the citizens of Alberta, and of course, by extension, to all the people of Canada.

To me, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the important issues to which I, as an opposition MLA, will continually urge the present government to give careful consideration and high priority.

Mr. Speaker, in specific reference to the budget. As in the Throne Speech, I feel that there was a marked absence of any substantial financial aid to our cities. Surely something must be done to give them a wider and more permanent means of providing for their financial needs. I feel that a strong policy of financial help should be an item of high priority. We must give them a more permanent arrangement of understanding, insofar as provincial-municipal-fiscal arrangements are concerned. And still on this issue, because of the heavy concentration of population in the urban centres, the province should, I believe, be the first to recognize the need and advantages of sharing certain autonomies, benefits and responsibilities with the municipalities, inasmuch as a substantial share of the revenue of the province is collected from, by and through these municipalities. It would seem to me logical, as well as astute for the government of Alberta, to revise the program in the field of provincial-municipal-fiscal relations, especially if such a revision will give more autonomy and a stronger voice to the cities and the municipalities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to the second paragraph on page 4 of the Budget Address. And I quote, "My department will review existing budget procedures in the provincial government during the coming year with a view to developing new approaches to the formation of budget policy which will maximize the effectiveness and efficiency of public expenditures." I would like to offer my sincere congratulations to the minister for having so quickly reached that pinnacle of political maturity in the fine art of saying nothing in a very important scunding way, and I'm certain that, with a bit of practice, he will shortly be in an undisputed class by himself.

I am also concerned about a statement on page 9 of the Budget Address wherein it stated that a large share of our direct provincial budget is tied in with federal cost sharing agreements. With this in mind, it is even more disturbing to see this government spending our money helter skelter and putting us \$200 million in debt, while at the same time relying on receiving 40 per cent of the budget for some

16-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

major projects from the federal government that has, in the past, proven to be rather erratic in its relations with the provinces.

I would like to say that if there ever was a time when it would be appropriate to exercise caution in our reliance on the federal government, that time, Mr. Speaker, would seem to be now. It is quite possible, of course, that our provincial government is throwing caution to the wind and is banking on a change in the governing party in Ottawa. It very well may be that we will have a new party in power in Ottawa after the next federal election, particularly after our Premier's statement that he will deliver all of Alberta's seats to Mr. Stanfield. He is probably expecting a change. I do not believe, however, that it is in the best interests of Alberta at this particular time to assume that there will be a change until after the next federal election results are in and counted. This could be in June perhaps, or October. In the meantime, I would caution our government to use the utmost care and diligence while having to rely so heavily on the federal government for so much of our budgetary income.

Mr. Speaker, on another subject. I am becoming extremely concerned over the present trend of all governments, including this one, towards socialism. It seems each year more and more of our tax dollars go towards that kind of dead-end projects that will never ever have a hope of reaching an end. I am fully conscious of our obligation to society. Surely, we are responsible to see that no one in this province suffers from the lack of necessities and essentials. The elderly have contributed their share to our prosperity. They are surely entitled, and have the right, to draw upon this generation for their comfort and dignity. Because of the great sacrifices, the accomplishments and the legacies that they have left us, we have what we have today.

There are many areas of social responsibility that it is our duty to meet. But if the migration of people from other parts of Canada into our province can be taken as a reasonable guide, I would say that we must be meeting these obligations quite adequately. Each year, however, we seem to be spending more and more of our tax dollars on direct grants for welfare and unemployment and related services, for people who have the capacity and the ability but not the initiative and incentive, nor the willingness to contribute to the growth of our province. These programs take so much money that there is less and less money available to use on things that would help combat these very trends.

Today we have come to the situation where we have more and more people demanding an ever-increasing share of our tax dollars, who are not willing themselves to contribute to the society upon which they are calling. The very incentives that at one time gave people the encouragement and a direct willingness to contribute to the prosperity of our province have largely been nullified by government handouts.

This situation is, of course, very disturbing and we must work towards providing a climate where individual initiative and honest hard work will again become the yardstick whereby success is measured among our people. Very frankly speaking, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that the main emphasis of this budget is directed toward that end, because very little consideration is given to the working man who pays the bills.

We, for example, are spending more money on direct government welfare payments than we are on the combined budgets for the Departments of Agriculture, Human Resources, Industry and Commerce, Manpower and Labour, Lands and Forests, Mines and Minerals, etc. While I appreciate that these welfare payments must be made to the needy, it would seem to me that the government should re-examine its

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-67

priorities to ensure that the future generation will also enjoy the same prosperity we are now enjoying.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to leave politics aside for a minute and speak as an individual citizen of Alberta. We all know of instances where government paid welfare is being abused; we hear it every day. We know of people who have found it more profitable to live off society than to contribute to it. The question is now asked in many quarters, do we have a right to impose penalties on those people in our province who choose to become self-reliant, industrious and responsible citizens in order to support those who are not willing to carry their fair share of responsibilities in this province? There must be some shortcomings, serious shortcomings, in a society where it is more profitable to live off the taxpayer than it is to be a taxpayer.

I readily admit, Mr. Speaker, that the answer to this serious problem is not an easy one. However, an answer must be found if we intend to remain a strong and prosperous province. I am fully aware that many people would feel it politically foolish to suggest we tighten up on our government handouts. I can sympathize with them and appreciate the stand that government is forced to take in order to appear concerned about the people on government welfare. It is a responsibility that they have undertaken, and I respect the position, just as I respect the position taken by the previous government of this province. This does not, however, alter the fact that we do have a very real and devastating problem on our hands that this government must very soon solve. I am, therefore, making a strong appeal to all members of this Legislature to actively help seek a solution to these problems. I ask you how long can government be expected to support individuals who are unwilling to carry their fair share of responsibility that all of us have towards our society and our province?

Mr. Speaker, on still another subject, for the past many years there has been a marked trend among governments throughout the world to borrow increasing amounts of money in order to meet their budgets. This trend has resulted in the ridiculous situation where governments today are even forced to admit that their national or provincial debts can never be repaid. The people who are going to pay this debt and supply the money that we are asked to spend today, have, in many cases, not yet been born. In fact, this debt will still be outstanding long after we are dead and gone.

Fortunately, we in this province, are in relatively good financial standing. Our provincial debt is small but I am deeply concerned about the trend that we are setting. This year the increase in our total debt is to be an unprecedented \$200 million. It has been termed in some government quarters as only a modest amount. Perhaps it is. But you will have to convince me and I may be hard to convince. I haven't seen the schedule of repayment, and until that is given to me, I cannot be convinced. It is easy to go out and borrow money, but you have to tell your bank, "Well I need so many dollars, and I'll give it back to you according to this schedule." The government so far has not presented us with such a document.

However, even with this seemingly modest amount, do you realize that one MLA sitting in this Assembly would have to sit at his desk for six years in order to earn enough money to pay for one day's interest on this amount? So I am hoping that this just might bring out the point of what we are getting into.

It has been stated that because of our low per capita debt we will have no problem in borrowing this \$200 million. I guess this question was asked the other day and we were assured that we will be getting \$200 million at the accepted interest rates. This, I admit, is truly an enviable position to be in, but it did not come about by

16-68

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

overspending our income by this amount every year. We are in this position because we had adopted a pay-as-you-go program in past years. Has this pay-as-you-go policy held us back in the past? Look around you: Alberta is a province with the healthiest financial position of all provinces in Canada when this comparison is based on a per capita basis.

We have the best education standards, good schools and universities. We have the best of health programs, hospitals, and institutions designed to care for our people. We are now classified as one of the "haven" provinces and our people have come to enjoy and expect a high standard of living. We are the envy of every government in Canada. Are we going to abandon what has proven to be a winning formula? Are we going to argue with success? Are we going to saddle our future generations with the responsibilities of providing this present generation with unearned amenities, simply for the sake of political expediency? Is this what our government had in mind when they preached the 'new' philosophy during the election?

Let me emphasise this point, Mr. Speaker. To the government and the people of this province the budget should be a reflection of their needs and aspirations, we have no mandate, we have no authority, we have no license to assign the future generations of this province the responsibility of inevitable bondage; that is surely the result of these actions now.

Mr. Speaker, let us consider the sobering fact that in our province we are heavily dependent on non-renewable resources for our earnings. Our oil and gas will some day run out, and the day will come when we can no longer look forward to these things to pay our way. It is, therefore, foolish to suggest, or even to think, that future generations of Albertans will be in a better position to pay for our provincial debt.

Yes, we are relatively prosperous at the present time. Let us then make sure that we do not demand more of this prosperity than we can generate on a renewable basis. Let us be careful that we do not demand more prosperity now, at the expense of the future. Because this proposition is like feeding an elephant. The more you feed him, the bigger he gets and the bigger his appetite.

Let me say again, Mr. Speaker, we do not have the moral right to pass on our debts to the future generations of Albertans; if for no other reason, simply because they do not have a voice in this Assembly. We in this province have a desirable and enviable reputation to uphold. This is true, but let us not sell it merely for the sake of short-term political gain.

I appeal to the government, not as a member of the opposition, not even as a member of any political party, but as a member of the fortunate people who have the privilege of calling themselves Albertans. Let us not mortgage our future.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I hope that I have the concurrence of all the hon. members that up to the present time I have not tried to dominate the debate in this House.

Mr. Speaker, as a novice in this House I have sat and listened during many past days. And I confess to mixed emotions. At this point in time I feel a deep sense of pride and satisfaction -- a pride and satisfaction with this budget. And at this time and place I am proud and pleased to have had a hand in the structure of it, in whatever small way it may have been.

This budget is so businesslike, but so weighted with the humanities. It does what we said we would do in the area of

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-69

agriculture. I feel sure we will see great improvement in our rural economy as a result of it. It offers an opportunity to rural areas to seek out industrial development, and it offers encouragement for us to help ourselves.

I speak now for my rural constituency, and, indeed, for all rural constituencies, for I think we do want to help ourselves. How glad I am that we are not as pessimistic as the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, who views industrial expansion as a threat, instead of a challenge. How unimaginative to think that there is no room for industrial growth, except at the expense of established industries. I am really glad that he isn't on the Chamber of Commerce of the town I come from.

Mr. Speaker, we from the rural areas look forward to the future with zest and enthusiasm. We want to help ourselves. We want to do our own thing. Just give us a little leadership, a little inspiration -- and, of course, throw in a few bucks to make it all possible.

In this budget I applaud the assistance to senior citizens, and I rejoice in the priority given to aid the handicapped and the mentally ill.

Borrowing to pay for capital projects does not worry me that much, Mr. Speaker, though I do share some of the concerns of the hon. Member for Calgary McCall. My years in municipal government, as well as operating my own small business, have taught me there is no harm in borrowing, that it is often good business to do so, as long as you have the ability to repay. And we have that, Mr. Speaker. Maybe we haven't got quite all we were led to believe a short eight months ago, but we can still go ahead with capital projects and let the users pay.

If we don't borrow -- what will we do without? If you wish to select the capital projects that you would like to eliminate, maybe we can eliminate them. But I don't believe that that would be in the best interests of the people of Alberta, and I don't think that is what they would like us to do.

Some of the hon. members on the other side are disappointed. How sad. I was disappointed, too, that some of my pet projects went down the drain -- if you'll pardon the expression -- but I realize that there is a bottom to the barrel and we must realize that.

Those impassioned speeches from the other side about the Human Resources Research Council have touched my heart. Somehow I fail to see why that white sepulchre of the previous administration should be so untouchable. In reviewing the work of the Human Resources Research Council, I wish to go on record as stating that some of their work is excellent, and I'm not going to use Social Futures as an example. But some of it, by their own admission, is not worth publishing. And some of it has been printed but is not endorsed by the council itself.

Since this is the budget debate, maybe we should talk about costs as opposed to values. When the Human Resources Research Council was first formed it had a modest budget, comparatively speaking, of \$500,000. In subsequent years this rose as follows: 1969-70, \$750,000.; 1970-71, \$900,000. Last year, Mr. Speaker, it started out with a request for over \$1 million according to the minutes of January, 1971. This was reduced to \$900,000, and then in the estimates was cut again to \$700,000. However, the Department of Education wanted some extra work done so they threw another \$50,000 in the pot. Then, by May of 1971, the hon. Minister of Education, now the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, had agreed to slip them another \$200,000 out of the education budget. So now we are talking of a 1971-72 budget of \$550,000. I understand that this last

16-70

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

\$200,000 was to pay for a project called Social Audit. No wonder the hon. member liked social audit so much. One of those products of social audit he proudly displayed to us on Tuesday night. However, he neglected to tell us what this little goody cost the people of Alberta. But I'll tell you what it cost you -- it cost you over \$32,000 to produce and distribute 10,000 copies. Maybe that is why that child in the back has got that tear on his cheek.

I am glad, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury likes that publication so well, because I'm telling everyone who complains to me about it that I'm not responsible for it and he can have all the credit, or the blame. I know it was published only recently, since August, Mr. Speaker, but it was budgeted for in 1971-72 and planned in September. All I'm trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is that kind of an extravaganza was obviously encouraged by the previous administration, and now they are upset because we feel that money can be put to better use, and we intend to do so.

One of my non-fans has today sent me some publications comparing them to our little goody. There is one from the National Research Council of Canada. And in the letter which accompanied the complaint, they referred to this as 'being a better example of how to compile our information and distribute it to the public.' There was another one. 'The information is probably valuable but I question the design and the production of the product.' According to reports from the Human Resources Research Council, these councils don't come cheap, Mr. Speaker. A report dated 1969 stated that the Ontario Institute for Studies and Education had a budget of \$12 million. The same report suggested that for Alberta, the budget should be considered as follows: 1971-72, \$1,800,000; 1972-73, \$2 million; 1973-74, \$2.1 million. In all fairness, Mr. Speaker, there was no indication that the previous administration intended to accept these recommendations, but the signs were pretty evident that early in the game this autonomous creature down the road was going to be an expensive thing to maintain. And I think when it was created they had champagne tastes on a beer income.

It takes courage to say enough is enough. But that is what we did. We wanted the money for other programs which we felt to be more important, such as senior citizens, the handicapped, the mentally ill. So we are phasing out the Research Council, and somehow I just can't get all checked up about it. There are other ways of obtaining research, either within or outside the departments. It is not our intention to abandon research. We expect to use it extensively. We only intend to get it in a different way, a way in which we can see value for the people's money.

But now, Mr. Speaker, I prefer to speak in a more positive vein because I am not that happy in adopting a negative role. I wish to speak of other matters. I was very proud when the people of my constituency chose me to speak for them in this Assembly. I feel honoured too, Mr. Speaker, to be a member of the Executive Council. It is my intention to serve all the people of Alberta to the best of my ability. I know that this attitude is not unique. I believe there are 75 more people in this House who feel the same way, and I include you, Sir, because I feel you feel the same as all of us.

As a Minister without Portfolio I enjoy the challenges of the variety of assignments I have been given, and there seems to be an endless variety. One of my more pleasant interests has been in the Department of Advanced Education, where I have worked with my colleagues, the hon. Jim Foster, Minister of Advanced Education, and also with the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, Mrs. Chichak. This idea is not mine, much as I would like to claim it. On the other hand, some considerable work had been done on it by Mrs. Wilson, Minister without Portfolio in the previous administration. This hasn't turned out just as she envisioned it, Mr. Speaker, but to me

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-71

it's a very effective way of offering training to fill a need in society today.

I refer now to the Domestic Aid Training Program presently being carried out in the Alberta Vocational Centre. It was my pleasure to visit the class a few days ago and I am most impressed with the students and staff. Here I would like to give a commercial to all the hon. members because perhaps this course is not too widely known, and I would very much like the people of Alberta to hear more about it. Perhaps the hon. members will speak with those in their constituencies whom they feel might benefit from such a training. This is a practical course and it is intended to fit people to better accommodate themselves in the domestic service. They do not necessarily need to be looking for employment, but this is our aim to provide more jobs for unskilled people and to fill a need that we feel is existent throughout society today. It has other uses. I would like to see the women who are on welfare have an opportunity to take this course because of its system of budgeting and managing and sewing and keeping a house. I feel it has some merit and it would perhaps help them either to get off the welfare role or it certainly would make their lives more pleasant and make them more able to manage on the money they're given. Lest I be accused of discriminating I'd like to say that men would perhaps, in many instances, find this to be a useful course. Widowers with or without small children could find this a great help.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the budget in the Advanced Education Department will extend far enough to continue this because it's only a pilot project at this time. I believe it fills a real need and I do hope that with support from this Assembly we can see it continue. I feel that it does fill a role in providing occupation for many people who are otherwise unemployable, as well as filling a need.

I have also received a great deal of satisfaction from the numerous meetings, interviews, etc. with concerned women's groups. I'm not exactly a Women's Lib type myself. I haven't burned anything but the garbage for years, but I am concerned about the role of women in today's society, and it is my firm intention to keep foremost in everyone's mind that we have a role to play in society and somehow we will find a way. Most of us do not expect special consideration. We only wish to get full marks for talents, ideas and capabilities that we have. And we insist we have a right to contribute according to those capabilities. It is my firm intention to aid, abet and encourage other women to take their rightful place in society.

I cannot complain over my acceptance from all hon. members in this Assembly, and certainly not in the Executive Council. I find my ideas if they have merit, and some of them do, accepted and considered. And if they don't have merit I expect that I will get my lumps along with everyone else. And that's all we ask, really, is to be considered as persons. Is that too much to expect? I was delighted when the hon. Minister of Highways told me he had recently hired a woman engineer. The hon. Dave Russell advises that the Housing Corporation has appointed a woman for the first time to its board, and to the various boards and commissions. I do not seek token admissions just to keep us quiet. I insist that we are approximately 50 per cent of the population and we are not without intelligence and capability. I believe women should be considered for appointments which are worth some money for a change, and not be just considered as hewers of wood and drawers of water. It would please me to see more women seeking political office, and I'm sure we will, at municipal provincial and federal levels. At the moment, we have twice as many members as we had last session, but a few years ago there were four women in the Legislature, so I do not consider the present record all that good. So, Mr. Speaker, through you I say to the women of Alberta, "Come on in, gals, the water's fine -- hot sometimes, but still fine."

16-72

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

The presence of girl pages in this House is not a really vital matter, but I think all hon. members will agree that they add to the appearance of the House. And I have noted that they do their work cheerfully and well. I was pleased to lend my support to the suggestion that we have them. I have noted that their work is carefully done and I'm sure they do it just as well as the boys do.

In my work with the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission I find an intriguing challenge. The challenge, Mr. Speaker, is to work toward the finest plan to do the most good for the most people in the most efficient manner possible. And it is to this objective I am presently directing my energy. My colleague, the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, has before him a mammoth job, and I was happy to be assigned to his department to work in whatever capacity will be the most useful. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the future with enthusiasm.

And now, because I have not yet had an opportunity to talk about my constituency, perhaps I should end with a few remarks about that great place, the Rocky Mountain House constituency. Mr. Speaker, our constituency is backed up against the mountains with some of the finest recreation areas in the world. We aren't as large as some of those in the north, but it seems pretty big when I try to get around it. About 140 townships is a fair distance. I'm counting on the co-operation of the hon. Minister of Highways to complete the David Thompson Highway so that I can traverse my constituency more readily. Many of the people of my constituency are engaged in agriculture from grain farming in the eastern part to ranching in the foothills. Mr. Speaker, my people are very interested in the activities of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I am happy to report to them the priority given to his department in our budget.

The petroleum industry has contributed a great deal to our economy, but while contributing to our economy, it also adds to our concern because of pollution. Some of our gas plants have spewed out more sulfur dioxide than we consider acceptable. And I am pleased that our government has adopted improved standards and will be requiring the industry to meet these standards. I am also pleased that the budget for the Department of the Environment shows that we mean what we say.

Our resort town of Sylvan Lake suffers from over-population in the summer, caused by the influx of visitors, and I think all resort areas have this problem. It is my intention to discuss with the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation, and the hon. Minister of Tourism, the problems which develop in all small towns of this type. I believe some policy of additional financial assistance should be developed. We are also anxious to let the hon. Minister of Education know that the Rocky Mountain School Division has been operating on less money per student than most other places in central Alberta.

In 1971 our cost per student was \$769.08 compared to a high in County of Forty Mile No. 8 of \$1,069.50, approximately \$300 per pupil difference. The twelve other districts and counties we studied varied between these amounts. Our pupil-teacher ratio is one of the highest in the province. We like to think that we are good managers, but we do feel that all students of this province should have an equal opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, so varied is our constituency that there is no department in this government which does not interest us. With all that space, there are only three towns, one village and several hamlets. Most of our west country is forest reserve, and it is there we go for our recreation. It is not only a spot for recreation though, it is also a great source of income and employment through the lumbering industry which is still very important to us.

March 23rd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

16-73

Then, of course, we have the Big Horn Dam. But that is something else again. Not to be overlooked either, in our west country, is that it is the home of the famous weather forecaster, the Son of Walking Eagle, and the legendary Sasquatch. With all my campaigning, Mr. Speaker, I never did find the Sasquatch, because I was going to solicit his vote too!

If some of the hon. members on the other side find it offensive that we are an enthusiastic and a loyal team over here, that is just too bad. I personally feel very happy with the way we work together, with our co-operation, with our admiration and respect for one another. To our Provincial Treasurer, I offer congratulations for a job well done. And to our leader of leaders, Premier Lougheed, I say, Mr. Premier, you are the one who inspires us all, and I am proud to be part of the team. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I think this was one of those ties, and I wonder if perhaps, in view of the balance in the House, we shouldn't have another member from this side, and then another member from that side.

DR. BACKUS:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe there may have been some confusion. I wonder if perhaps the hon. minister would wish to withdraw his motion to adjourn if the hon. Member for Viking would wish to speak with us.

MR. SPEAKER:

My understanding is that it may not be withdrawn without unanimous consent. Is it the wish of the House that this motion be withdrawn?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would all those in favour of withdrawing the motion, please say, "aye". Those opposed, please say, "no". I am afraid the motion may not be withdrawn.

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

16-74

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 23rd 1972

MR. LOUGHEED:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, Please. The hon. Premier has moved that the House stand adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 10:05 pm.]