

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, March 28th, 1972

[The House met at 3:00 pm.]

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 20: The Perpetuities Act

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being The Perpetuities Act. This bill deals with a highly technical area of the law and unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I will therefore need to take a moment or two to explain its purpose.

The rule against perpetuities is a judge-made rule of very long standing, which deals with the postponement of vesting in property, both real and personal property. I should say that vesting means the power to deal with the property as an owner. That rule makes void any disposition of property which would vest after a life in being plus 21 years. The rule operates in some circumstances very harshly and it has sub-rules which also operate very harshly in some circumstances. In addition, it acts as a trap for people who are not aware of the rule; this generally happens in the cases of persons who are drawing up wills. For example, a gift to Joe and Bill, 21 years after the testator's death is good. But under that rule, a gift to Joe and Bill 25 years after the testator's death is bad. The gift then would go to other people.

There are a number of other similar examples where the rule works very harshly. The Institute of Law Research and Reform have been studying this question for a long time, and a year or so ago submitted a report. This legislation arises out of that report. The legislation also deals with the accumulation of monies earned on property which is governed by a rule similar to the rule against perpetuities, and makes the rule against accumulations operate in the same way as the rule against perpetuities would operate under this bill.

Because, Mr. Speaker, it is a highly technical piece of legislation, and because persons who draw wills or draw documents making other dispositions of property, are the ones who would be most interested in this legislation, I propose to introduce it and bring it forward for second reading and then leave it until the proposed fall session, at which time we hope to have had comments on the wording of the bill. At that time, there would be clause by clause study.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 20 was introduced and read a first time.]

19-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

Bill No. 25: The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 1972

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I also beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Condominium Property Amendment Act, 1972. This bill deals with amendments to The Condominium Property Act. One of the first amendments defines and provides for the method of passing a resolution. Another amendment provides for the building of condominiums on leasehold property, whereas under the present legislation, they can only be built on property that is held in fee simple. Other amendments deal with the filing of caveats against the title of the condominium to secure payment for improvements and charges made against the condominium property. And lastly, there are amendments which provide for the method of insuring the condominium property.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 25 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 23: The Companies Amendment Act, 1972

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, No. 23, being The Companies Amendment Act, 1972. Primarily these amendments are of a housecleaning nature. The major amendment is the changing of the filing date for registration of the company from within 30 days of the end of the calendar year to within 30 days of the company's anniversary date. Primarily, what this proposed amendment will accomplish will alleviate the overload on the staff of the Companies Branch by spreading the returns over a 12 month period.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 23 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Dr. Hohol, that The Companies Amendment Act, 1972, be placed on the Order Paper under 'Government Bills and Orders'.

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent.]

Bill No. 37:

The Hospital Services Commission Amendment Act, 1972

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being Bill 37, The Hospital Services Commission Amendment Act, 1972. Mr. Speaker, as hon. members will be aware, The Alberta Hospital Services Commission, which has been in operation for approximately one year is headed by a commission board of eight members, four of whom are full time public servants, and four of whom are members of the public. The proposal in this amendment is to increase the number of members other than full time public servants, from four to six.

As well, the amendment would allow for the possibility of appointing one or more members of the Legislative Assembly to the commission, presumably under the classification of the six appointees at large, and has with it the necessary proposal that a member of the Legislature who is occupying a position on the commission would not void his right to sit as a result of that.

Finally, the act places certain responsibilities on the commission in requiring it to ensure the development throughout Alberta of a balanced and integrated system of hospitals, and to

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-3

conduct a continuing review of financial needs of hospitals and nursing homes; and a further amendment to Section 12 of the act would also place upon the commission the obligation to recommend, for the approval of the government, policies that have as their aim, the reduction of the escalation of costs within the system of hospitals and related health facilities.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 37 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 38: The Treatment Services Amendment Act, 1972

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce another bill, being An Act to Amend The Treatment Services Act, Bill No. 38. The situation relates to an amendment which is primarily for the convenience of the medical profession. In order to keep things orderly in regard to dealing with the medical professional associations, The College of Physicians and Surgeons is, at the present time, designated under The Treatment Services Act as the body which advises the government in respect to matters under the act. The doctors' preference is that, although The College of Physicians and Surgeons retains the responsibility under its act for disciplinary and other matters in respect to the profession, for the purposes of advising the government in this type of capacity, they would prefer that it be handled by the Association rather than by the College. So this is an act to achieve that.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 38 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 31:

The Department of the Environment Amendment Act, 1972

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 31, being The Department of the Environment Amendment Act. Mr. Speaker, the purposes of this amendment are several fold.

First, the minister is given the right to act on certain matters without the necessity for consultation with the coordinating council as established within the Act.

Secondly, there is given to the minister the statutory permission to undertake cost benefit analyses of proposed major alterations to the environment, and to study the need for the establishment of pollution control levies, insurance against major pollution catastrophies, resource use fees and methods of financing major resource development and pollution control projects.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the minister may examine and investigate methods of raising funds for major public installations or programs directly associated with the regulation and control of air and water pollution, watershed management, surface reclamation, and environmental protection and improvement.

Fourthly, it permits the minister to prepare a long-range plan for government consideration in matters pertaining to the environment.

Fifthly, the purpose of the amendment is to permit the minister to purchase land for various environmental uses and needs.

Sixthly, the purpose of the act is to define more closely the duties and reporting procedures of the Conservation and Utilization Committee.

19-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

And lastly, the powers of the Lieutenant Governor in Council are extended, permitting the establishment of a tariff and fee for the issuance of certificates of approvals, permits, licences, documents, blueprints or other records or services performed by the department.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 31 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 36:

An Act respecting the Minister of Telephones and Utilities

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would beg leave to introduce a bill being an Act respecting The Minister of Telephones and Utilities. This bill will officially change the name of the office of the Minister of Telephones to the Minister of Telephones and Utilities and amend the various statutory provisions of other acts where the Minister of Telephones is named. With this name change, Mr. Speaker, it will be the responsibility of one minister to supervise the operation of all essential services within the Province of Alberta. I might mention also, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the estimates that are before the House at this time, hon. members may be aware that included in the Department of Telephones and Utilities is the budget for the Public Utilities Board. This is for administration purposes only; the Public Utilities Board is still independent, quasi-judicial, and reports to the Executive Council.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 36 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 43: The Cultural Development Amendment Act, 1972

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 43, being The Cultural Development Amendment Act, 1972. This act proposes what the Minister may do to encourage or assist the orderly cultural development of any person or group of persons living in Alberta. The act proposes to establish more direct rapport among the public, the artists of our province, and the responsible personnel charged with promotion of cultural development throughout the province.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 43 was introduced and read a first time.]

#### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

DR. ECUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure this afternoon in introducing to you and through you to the members of this assembly 66 students from the Peter Pond School in Fort McMurray. Now these students left at 5:30 a.m. this morning, travelled over the famous Fort McMurray Highway, and were here in time to visit NAIT before coming to view the session this afternoon. They are accompanied by four staff supervisors, Mr. Robert Crow, Mr. Alan Ormerod, Mrs. Margaret Shysh, and Mrs. Jean Zeller, and a parent supervisor, Mrs. Lee Powers. They are sitting in the public gallery. I would like them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

MR. LIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I have the honour to introduce on your behalf to this Assembly some 26 students from that well known and great constituency of yours that you know so well, Edmonton Meadowlark. They are from the H. E. Beriault School, some Grade V and VI students accompanied by a teacher, Mrs. J.

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-5

L'hircndelle, and I now ask them to rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, it is my very sincere pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and to the hon. members of this Assembly 30 Grade IX students from the Boyle School in the Athabasca constituency. They are seated in the members gallery and they are accompanied by their teachers Mr. P. Avasthi and Mr. H. Wilson and by their bus driver Mr. Guay and I would ask them now to rise and be recognized by the members.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing to you and to the Assembly some 23 Grade IX students from McKernan School in the constituency of Edmonton Parkallen. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Miller and by a student teacher Mr. Bud Perkis. I would like to add just a word of congratulation to the students on the interest that they are showing in our democratic process by attending the Legislature this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, being in Grade IX, a number of them have been down to the Legislature before and I think it is a real tribute to them that they would come back again. I would ask them to stand in the members gallery and be recognized.

#### FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, with your leave I wish to lay on the table a report entitled The Conservation of Historical and Archaeological Resources in Alberta. This report was prepared by the Public Advisory Committee on the Conservation of Historical and Archaeological Resources for the Environment Conservation Authority. Mr. Speaker, in accord with the policy laid down by the government for the authority, a copy of this report is prepared for each member of the Assembly.

#### ORAL QUESTIONS

##### Research Facilities of the Department of Industry and Commerce

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Having given us your stated goal, sir, of resource processing within the province prior to export - in what specific areas would you envision using your department's research facilities?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, they are many and numerous - (a) in wood products and forest products (b) in hydrocarbons and petro-chemicals (c) in coal, etc.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is there any specific size which a business would have to be before it would be eligible for the use of your research facilities?

MR. PEACOCK:

No indeed not, Mr. Speaker.

19-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

Natural Gas Distribution Co-ops

MR. NCTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to either the hon. Minister of Agriculture or the hon. Minister of Rural Development. I am referring to a statement made in the House several weeks ago with respect to a study on rural gas co-ops. I am wondering if either one of the ministers could give the Legislature a report at this time on how the feasibility study is progressing relating to rural natural gas co-ops?

DR. HCFNEF:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer by saying this. First of all, we are now ready to go ahead with a study of the entire province to ascertain whether or not we can, in fact, provide gas to all of the residents of Alberta. This study will begin immediately, and we hope to have a preliminary report within a few weeks. Depending upon that report we can then move forward to the next step of defining engineering feasibility. At the same time we have been in contact with my colleague the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals, in relation to the availability of pipelines throughout the province. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we have also been in touch with Alberta Gas Trunk who have made a major change in policy in relation to the provision of natural gas to co-operatives and individuals throughout Alberta. We hope then, Mr. Speaker, that within a matter of weeks we can consolidate a program which will see all of the residents of Alberta having the availability of natural gas.

MR. NCTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister would tell the House whether or not the government intends to provide feasibility studies for natural gas co-ops already set up on a municipal basis or in an improvement district -- such as the feasibility study that the Natural Gas Co-op itself has commissioned about its own practicality.

DR. HCFNEF:

Mr. Speaker, I have advised all of the people that have been interested to try and set these up on a municipal or county basis, if possible, so that all of the people would be covered. One of the real problems over the years has been that the pockets of dense population have not had any trouble being covered by co-operatives under the previous rural gas policy. This has worked to segregate people in Alberta who might not be covered at all. In regard to the engineering feasibility, if these co-operatives would be patient until such time, within the next few weeks, that we have the complete provincial survey done, then we will take the next step of providing additional engineering services for them in relation to the provision of gas, and how they could best set up their own system.

MR. NCTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, either to the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Mines and Minerals. Is the government at this time giving any consideration to passing legislation making all pipelines common carriers?

DR. HOENER:

Mr. Speaker, that will depend entirely upon the results of the survey that is now going on. I am sure the House is aware, as I have said, the change in attitude of Alberta Gas Trunk has been pretty significant in this area, and we do not anticipate any difficulty with other gas pipelines in the province if we can show these people

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-7

that they are required to service the people of Alberta. And to take a hard line and say that we are going to force them to become a common carrier -- before we know whether or not we are going to need them as a common carrier -- I think would be premature. However, we are looking at this, and with the present system of pipelines we do not think there will be any difficulty in the provision of natural gas in these areas.

MR. NOTLEY:

A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, again to the Minister of Agriculture. This is just for the sake of clarification, sir, and is again with respect to the feasibility studies commissioned by natural gas co-ops in the different counties, municipal district, improvement districts and so on in the province. Can I take it from your remarks that, in fact, the government is giving serious consideration to picking up the cost of these local feasibility studies?

MR. HCFNER:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but that is not what I said. I said that we were doing a preliminary survey of the entire province. We hope to have the result of that survey within a matter of a few weeks. I would hope we are shooting for three weeks, but knowing some of the things that can happen, it may take a month. I would hope that all of the gas co-ops that are talking about feasibility studies on their own would mark time until this other survey is done, so that we will be in a position then to ascertain how much engineering assistance these co-ops are going to require to provide gas service to all Alberta. I did not say that we would pick up the cost of the ones that they have already commissioned.

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister would mind elaborating on just what this change in policy has been on the part of Alberta Gas Trunk.

DR. HCFNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty significant change in that they are now quite willing and anxious to service co-operatives and individuals by acting as a common carrier to provide natural gas to the citizens of Alberta.

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. minister saying that that was not the policy previous to the change in government?

DR. HCFNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am saying that this is a dramatic new change in policy on the part of the government in relation to provision of natural gas to all Albertans.

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of privilege, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the words of the hon. minister are not correct. That was not the policy of Alberta Gas Trunk because the Social Credit government would not have allowed them to follow that policy. It was exactly what the hon. minister has been telling us is now the case.

DR. HCFNER:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The hon. member is not aware of the facts, because if he would like to recall previous

19-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

sessions in this Legislature, when I asked, not only the previous Premier, but the one before him, to do something about resolving this problem of the provision of natural gas to the rural people of Alberta, we got exactly nowhere. And this is a dramatic change in policy on the part of the government.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the hon. Deputy Premier. After the provincial feasibility study is completed, will it be necessary for each municipal council to carry out a feasibility study in its own municipality?

DR. HCFNER:

Not necessarily, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary question. Is it not true that the submission by McCullough Gas to the board hearing in Calgary formulated some different policies as far as Alberta Gas Trunk was concerned?

DR. HCFNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is a former member of the Executive Council and a member from rural Alberta. He knows what the situation was before, and he also knows the change that has taken place.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, one more supplementary for information, in connection with the municipal councils wanting to pursue the matter of gas for their people: would you suggest at this stage that they hold everything in abeyance until after the feasibility study is completed?

DR. HCFNER:

Yes, very much so, Mr. Speaker. I am asking the municipalities -- some of them have organized gas co-operatives on a municipal basis, and this is what I have asked them to look at, so in fact once they do develop their system, everybody will be covered. I have asked them to hold in abeyance their own feasibility studies until such time as we can assist them by knowing the amount of gas that is available, the pipelines that are available, and whether or not, within a certain limit, everyone can be serviced in that area. And I really think that it will be to their advantage if they just mark time for a matter of a few weeks until such time as this feasibility study is done.

MR. NCTLEY:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do I take it from the hon. minister's remarks, that those people who have organized gas co-operatives, taken the initiative, and shown a great deal of enterprise, are going to be penalized, and that the government will not consider assuming their cost? Or would it be fair to say that the government would, after completing the initial province-wide feasibility study, then consider financing feasibility studies on a local basis including those that have been undertaken by enterprising co-ops?

DR. HCFNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member continues to try and put words into people's mouths. What I have said is pretty clear. We

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-9

are doing a survey as a province to ascertain whether or not we can provide gas to all Albertans. The second stage of that will be to help the municipalities or other organizations. In certain cases we won't be able to organize on a municipal basis, and in certain other cases to help them at all in relation to the feasibility of their own gas co-op. If they have had the initiative to start already, we compliment them on that, and we suggest that the information that we will be able to provide to them as well as to others, will be helpful in getting the final result of gas into their homes.

MR. HENLEESON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister could advise if it is the government's policy to subsidize the co-ops in this gas system they are contemplating?

DR. HCFNEE:

There has been no change, Mr. Speaker, to amounts in relation to the financing of gas co-operatives.

MR. FUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to this. In view of the fact that they are asking the areas to withhold any direct action at this time until the survey is completed -- is the hon. minister considering, shall we say, speaking first for some of the supplies which will be necessary when they go into this on a large scale?

DR. HCFNEE:

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the things that we hope to get some answer to from the survey; the amount of material that will be required, where the material is available, and where it can be had.

Alberta School Hospital, Red Deer

MR. CCKKSCN:

Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question to the hon. Minister of Health with regards the report in the Journal about the deplorable condition of patient residences in the Alberta School Hospital at Red Deer? Would you comment on the position the government might take?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on the first reading of the article in the Edmonton Journal today, it would be easy to interpret it as a crushing indictment of the policies of the recent government in regard to the care of young handicapped children over the past decades. In fairness, looking at it completely, really more than that is said. The medical director there indicated that one of the features of his long experience was that progress had been made. Another one was that public acceptance was slow. I think that the third one is that the present situation is considered to be critical in some respects. He mentioned the patient residences. This is an area that we found to be critical when we came to office, late last year. Hon. members, I think, would be interested in a short review, in view of the prominence given to this issue today, of certain steps that are being taken in regard to the Red Deer School Hospital. Steps are in process to arrange for a review of the 600 retarded children - 600 was the figure referred to in the articles as being awaiting admission to the Red Deer School Hospital - to determine if the extent of their need has changed and to explore other alternatives as to their placement.

19-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

In addition, since the number of physically and mentally handicapped persons in the province, where they are located, and what services are best suited to their individual needs, are not known, it is proposed to conduct a survey of the province to obtain the necessary information with which to plan the rational development of services for these persons. On the basis of present knowledge and with the results of the anticipated survey, it is expected that new programs and changes in existing programs will be required, roughly as follows.

First, an assessment unit in Red Deer to prepare residents of the Alberta School Hospital and Deerholm for discharge into community facilities, including a follow-up program.

Secondly, an improvement in the staff-resident ratio at the hospital and at Deerholm.

Thirdly, a foster care program for persons discharged from these two institutions, as well as for persons who may benefit from foster care placement as an alternative to placement in such an institution.

Fourthly, the expansion of the existing community residence program to provide for group living situations for handicapped persons as an alternative to institutional placement.

Finally, the possible establishment of day care centres for handicapped persons in Alberta communities as may be possible, and may be required to give adequate service.

MR. COOKSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When will this survey be completed?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the survey is at the planning stage. As to the completion date, I would think it would probably be up to a couple of months away. I am not absolutely certain how long it will take.

MR. LIXON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Last night, Mr. Minister, the hon. Member for Innisfail pointed out that the Bowden Institution was not being utilized to its full extent, with many buildings and equipment not being used. I was wondering if the hon. minister, or his department, is giving any consideration to using all or part of the institution at Bowden to alleviate the overcrowded condition in Red Deer. This institution is, as the hon. minister knows, fairly close to the Red Deer operation.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the short answer to the question is that no consideration has yet been given to that. Solutions to the Red Deer situation are being looked for in other program areas, as I have just outlined. As the House knows, the Bowden Institution itself probably requires quite a lot more examination before it would be utilized for a purpose other than the one that it was previously used for, and would normally fall within the jurisdiction now of the Attorney General in regard to that particular site and those buildings. The conclusion that was reached in regard to Bowden in the last year or so was that its use as a place of detention for young offenders was not the best use for it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didstury and then the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-11

McMurray.

MR. PAFOSKI:

I wonder if the hon. minister would be so kind as to tell us how long this type of situation has existed in Red Deer with respect to that particular institution.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the situation at Red Deer, speaking for myself, came to my attention very quickly after assuming office last year.

Availability of Motor Vehicle Registration Records

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways. Yesterday in the question period, the minister indicated that individuals would be able to get license number information from his department if they went through the proper channels. My question is, what are the proper channels?

MR. COFFITHORNE:

One of the proper channels, Mr. Speaker, would be through the RCMP.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is that the only channel?

MR. COFFITHORNE:

It is one of the few channels, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will it be possible for the War Amps to be involved in their program of key tags to people in Alberta this year?

MR. COFFITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, this has given me some concern, but I believe that there are other routes that they can acquire this information through.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, what are they?

MR. COFFITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to the House that I believe there are other routes, such as insurance companies, and probably there are others that I have not examined as yet.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, if this information is not going to be available to companies, how then are the War Amps going to get this information from insurance companies?

MR. COFFITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are now involved with compulsory insurance for one thing. And as I said, I have some concern in this regard,

19-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

and I have not examined it to see how really serious it is at this moment. But I think that there are routes through which they will be able to acquire that information to continue the service that they are supplying to the people of Alberta.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, one more supplementary question, then. Will the minister be taking some steps to guarantee that insurance companies do not, in fact, make the information on license plates available to everybody and anybody? It was to get away from this situation that you made the announcement on Friday.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a very difficult problem and I certainly will be looking at all aspects of the invasion of privacy. I have not come to that bridge as yet in the administration of this type of a policy, and when I do, we will cross it accordingly.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Do I understand that these lists are going to be made available to insurance companies free of charge?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I have never indicated that at any time that the lists of license plates would be available to insurance companies.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary. I'm just following the hon. minister's last answer. If the War Amputees' are going to get this information from insurance companies, the insurance companies must get it from somewhere. I would again ask, will this information that formerly was sold to Polk now be made available free or at a cost to insurance companies?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the insurance companies will have the names of all the people who are registered owners of cars.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. But do they have the license numbers? That is the question.

MR. COPITHORNE:

No, they do not have the license numbers, Mr. Speaker.

Alberta Housing Corp. Loans to Single People

DR. ECUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is it true that at this time single persons do not qualify for loans under the Alberta Housing Corporation?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know the answer, but I will find out and bring it back tomorrow.

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-13

Sessional Paper No. 128

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development? When may we expect a reply to Return No. 128, the one dealing with Ben Edwards and Aubrey Gitson?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I believe that one should be ready by Thursday.

Intestinal Bypass Operations

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Last week I brought up the tragic happenings of operations carried out in Ontario, which were pioneered in this province. The hon. minister promised that he would make a short statement to the House once he got the information. I wonder if he is able to do that today.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do have some information in regard to this subject now. Officially through my department there is not much information, but I am advised that the practice in Alberta is that every death occurring within 30 days of a surgical procedure must be reported to the department. A study of the information from the forms so provided to the department does not turn up any deaths in 1970 or 1971 attributable to this operation. There may be information of a speculative nature, which may or not be accurate, available in some other form equally to all members, and I refer specifically to the speculative articles that have appeared in the media. But as far as the department is concerned, no information beyond this type would be available. I think it is known as a result of news reports today that the doctors in Alberta are exercising caution, and the House will have noted reports that the University Hospital in particular decided to assess the results of these operations before proceeding any further. So I think the comment I made last week, that no doubt the publicity given to this type of operation would cause caution to be exercised by patients and doctors, appears to be the case.

Methadone Treatment

DR. EUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Attorney General. I would like to know, hon. minister, if you can tell the House how extensive the use of methadone is in heroin addict treatment in the Fort Saskatchewan jail, or do you have any information that you can give the House?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the hon. member put that question on the Order Paper.

19-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

Provincial Municipal Relationships

MR. NCTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. In your remarks yesterday, sir, you talked about the importance of levels of government closest to the people having more power to provide services. In view of that statement, are you planning any steps to transfer power from the province to the municipalities at this time?

MR. LOUGHFEEL:

Mr. Speaker, I hope I did not use the word 'power' and I will check the record, because I believe I was using constantly the phrase 'division of responsibilities'. With regard to that matter, it forms part of the overall assignment that has been given to the provincial municipal task force. It is, in our view, not sound policy to transfer jurisdiction or responsibilities to local government if they do not have the fiscal capacity to meet them. But it is part of our overall view that at any time, when we have an opportunity to assess whether or not the role can be better fulfilled at the local government level either municipally or otherwise, we will try to do so.

That is not to say there will not be times that it will be in the better interests of the province at large, being a province with a population of a million, six hundred thousand odd to have programs conducted by the provincial government. The main emphasis of my remarks had to do with the relationship between federal and provincial government.

MR. NOTLEY:

I have another question, Mr. Speaker, again to the hon. Premier. In view of the importance of working in partnership with the municipalities, has the government given consideration in reassessing the division of responsibilities between the province on one hand, and the municipalities on the other? Rather than taking a task force committee report, would it perhaps be a more prudent course to commission a full scale provincial-municipal conference to deal with this allocation of responsibilities?

MR. LOUGHFEEL:

I think I would like to refer that question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs because there has been a considerable amount of progress and discussion in that area.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I inject a question?

MR. FUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer the hon. Premier's response to the last question. There is, as the hon. member may be aware, continuing ongoing discussion between the municipal level of government and the provincial level of government. The methods used include the annual conventions, the submissions of resolutions, and the annual meeting of the provincial Cabinet with the executive members of the two associations in the province. So I might say that there is excellent ongoing dialogue. The specific purposes with which our government task force is commissioned are to ascertain the responsibilities that should be given to the municipalities on a strengthened local autonomy basis, and also some form of guaranteed source of revenue to carry out those responsibilities.

March 26th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-15

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary along that line to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. You possibly saw the statement that was made in Edmonton City Council on Monday, where some of the alderman felt that the responsibility of social development should be taken from the municipal level and taken to the provincial level, with the municipalities just retaining the preventative services aspect. Does your department have any intention of going ahead and formulating such a policy, hon. minister?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the policy in regard to that matter is under review at the present time. I would wait before reacting to anything that the city might do until the council itself has resolved its position in its own minds. I believe last night was the occasion when they may have dealt with that motion, and if they did, they no doubt will be writing me soon in regard to it.

MR. NCTLEY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. What is the position of the government with respect to municipal representation at the next federal-provincial conference?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, we have had, as a matter of fact, a representative of the municipalities accompany us to the last federal-provincial First Ministers' Conference. It was an offer made by the hon. Premier, and accepted by the municipalities. We have no objection to that happening as long as it is always clear in the federal government's mind that the municipalities are the responsibility of the province, and that we will not allow direct discussions or negotiations between the municipalities and the federal government to intrude into an area of our responsibility.

Admission to Alberta Universities

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education? Have the applications of any Oriental or Indian students to the University of Alberta or the universities in Alberta been refused as yet?

MR. FOSTER:

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would identify what period of time he is referring to.

MR. TAYLOR:

Since last September.

MR. FOSTER:

Do you mean applications for enrollment for full time students for the semester beginning in January, or for the fall?

MR. TAYLOR:

Since the beginning of September for the session beginning in January, or the session starting next September.

19-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

MR. FCSTER:

That, Mr. Speaker, is something that I would have to check. I am not personally aware that any non-Canadian students have been denied access to any post-secondary institution.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary to the hon. minister. Would it be possible for the universities to reject such an application without the knowledge of the government or without the knowledge of your department?

MR. FCSTER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be possible, but it is highly unlikely that I would not, or government would not, know about it at some point.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I might have some additional information on the question that is being raised. As you know, my prior occupation before this fall was at the University of Alberta and at that time I was on the Graduate Faculty Council. A large number of applications, both Caucasian and non-Caucasian, come in that must be screened on a basis of performance and ability to meet the program standards of the university. On that basis it is almost certain there would have been some rejections, but on that basis alone.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Intestinal Bypass Operations (cont)

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Health and Social Development regarding his statement as far as the operations were concerned. Do I understand, hon. minister, that your research went back only to the years 1970 and 1971? Because the deaths from these operations in Alberta stemmed from the late 50's and into the 60's and I was wondering, did your research go back that far or was it just in the last two years?

MR. CHANFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it was only for the last two years.

Energy Conservation Board

MR. NCTLEY:

I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Is he in a position to report today to the Legislature on the question I raised yesterday regarding legal council at the Energy Conservation Board hearings?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I am able to report as of first thing this morning. I did get on the telephone to obtain the information. I hope to have the information later today and be in a position to report tomorrow.

March 26th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-17

Program Planning Budget Evaluation System

MR. CIAFFK:

I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Education and ask him the present status of the ten pilot projects on the Program Planning Budget Evaluation Systems?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am expecting very shortly a report from my department assessing those pilot projects. When that comes in I will then be able to review it and the government will then decide as to the future of the pilot projects, and PPBES in Alberta.

MR. CIAFFK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the assessment being done by the department, or some agency other than the department?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Part of the assessment, Mr. Speaker, is being done by the department, and some of the report I have received now was done by the Human Resources Research Council, so we will be putting both of them together and making the assessment. I think, regarding timing, it appears at the moment that if such a system were implemented it would not be before January 1, 1974; this is at the request of and bearing in mind the representations from school trustees.

MR. CIAFFK:

My last question, Mr. Speaker. When might school boards, especially the ten school boards who have been involved in the pilot projects, expect some announcement of government policy and government intention in this area?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Possibly during this session, Mr. Speaker, although I am not in a position to guarantee a statement during that time.

Sale of Alberta-Owned Corporations

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Would your department services go so far as helping to find Alberta buyers for Alberta-owned industries that are for sale?

MR. FEACOCK:

Yes, we would do that Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, would the minister care to elaborate a little on that? Do I understand, sir, that you are in competition with the real estate industry then?

MR. FEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we have a publication that goes out to industry and to financial interests on a periodic basis, listing business opportunities in Alberta.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister

19-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

would advise us as to whether or not, as an aid to keeping Alberta companies Alberta-owned, he has considered changing existing legislation to allow private companies to trade in their own shares?

MR. FEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we haven't as a government given consideration to that point; we have discussed it.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, to add to that answer I might tell the hon. member that I have asked for comments on that proposal from various people.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Attorney General. Is the Ontario government considering such legislation or such a change in regulations?

MR. LEITCH:

I do not know.

Bow Valley School Drop-Outs

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Education? Does the hon. minister know the number of Grade XI and XII students who did not report back to school or became drop-outs after the strike in the Bow Valley area?

MR. HYLMAN:

No, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that. I think it would be difficult to establish the reasoning which the hon. gentleman suggests but if he would care to put that question on the Order Paper, to the extent that we either have, or have access to the information, I would be happy to provide the answers to him.

Revelstoke Building Materials Ltd.

MR. DRAIN:

I would like to ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce whether Ventures Limited, which is now in the process of attempting to acquire Revelstoke Building Materials and is a Toronto based company, is American controlled.

MR. FEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker I am not quite clear on what the hon. gentleman is asking me.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, there is an offer to purchase control of Revelstoke Sawmills, which is an Alberta controlled company, by Ventures Limited. I was wondering whether Ventures Limited is an American controlled company or a Canadian company.

MR. FEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer that question. The company is a private enterprise and I do not think it is the government's place to

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-19

be taking a position with regard to who are the shareholders of a private corporation.

Innovative Services Funds for Drug Abuse Program

MR. NCTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. It concerns the \$1 million for drug abuse under The Innovative Services Program, of which we received \$14,000 last year. Can the hon. minister explain why?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have the answer to that question at the present time. If the hon. member would like to put it on the Order Paper I would be glad to have it locked into and provide an answer.

Single Men's Hostel -- Edmonton

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, although the question period is just about over, I wonder if I could proceed to give an answer to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview in regard to a question he previously asked about meals served at the Single Men's Hostel in Edmonton. This is a matter that, apart from the hon. member's question, came to my attention as a result of some work done in that area of enquiry by one of the Edmonton radio stations. I might say that the matters raised by the radio station in question carried with them an implication which I do not dispute, that perhaps an independent enquiry into the quality of the food, and one or two other matters, might be justified. I make reference to that simply to say to the House that this was the context in which it first came to my attention. I have not as yet assessed the depth of the seriousness of the matter to an extent sufficient for me to say whether or not any enquiry will be made into the situation there, other than through the department. That is, whether or not an independent enquiry would be considered has not yet decided. I did want to say, as I mentioned yesterday, I believe, that menus had been made available to me and the hostel does not serve noon meals, it serves breakfast and the evening meals.

The breakfast may consist of fried bacon and sausage and scrambled eggs. In addition, cereal and at least two slices of buttered toast with coffee or milk for a beverage. The evening meal varies from day to day. The meat includes meat loaf, pork and beans, braised spareribs, breaded fillets, hamburger, shepherd's pie, cold meat, and potatoes and vegetables served together with bread and butter. For dessert, mixed fruit, prunes, steamed apricots, boiled pears, jello, egg custard, chocolate custard, and baked apple squares. Tea and milk are served as a beverage.

Mr. Speaker, the meat, butter and cheese are purchased in large quantities. First grade products are purchased from suppliers such as Swifts, Gainers, and Burns, and milk is purchased in plastic containers on a rotation basis from various suppliers.

Mr. Speaker, I give the House that information for the purpose of indicating that although an established procedure exists which would appear to be reliable, I think it is almost inevitable that occasionally there will be complaints. They have not been consistent or strong in recent months. They have been only sporadic. I think all I could say in respect to it, is that, where the indication is that the quality is below what it should be, reasonable safeguards would be taken to ensure quality and we would always want to have that locked into.

MR. NCTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. minister will agree that

19-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

reading off a menu does not necessarily mean that the food is as it reads.

Innovative Services Funds for Drug Abuse Program (cont.)

I want to ask a supplementary question however, relating to the question on drug abuse, and that is -- will the hon. minister assure us that if the federal grant under this Innovative Services Program is at the same level as last year, there will be no cutback in programs envisaged under alcohol and drug abuse in this province?

MR. SPEAKER:

This is a hypothetical question which really does not come within the purview of the rules regarding questions.

Motor Vehicle Registration Information (cont.)

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the questions directed by the hon. members of the opposition to the hon. Minister of Highways, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Highways could advise us whether the people from the War Amps have raised any concern to his office about the fact that they will not be able to gain access to these lists.

MR. CCFITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Edmonton Beverley, they have not asked for, or showed any concern about their access to the license plates list. However, if this is of a very great nature to their welfare and the industry that they have built up out of it, certainly we would be willing to have a look at it with regard to the restrictions.

Revelstoke Building Materials Ltd. (cont.)

MR. FEACOCK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. In answer to the hon. opposition members question regarding Revelstoke. To indicate what kind of a team we have got over here, I have just been passed information from the hon. member for Calgary Buffalo that the purchasing group is out of Winnipeg, and is Albertan. The President is from Redcliffe, Alberta, the secretary is from Winnipeg, the financing is received from the Bank of Commerce.

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-21

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

MR. STECM:

Mr. Speaker, the other day, the hon. Premier tabled the submission that he made to the federal government and indicated that if we wanted copies for each of the members, that he would make them available. I just wanted to report that the hon. members would like copies of it.

DR. HCFNER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of short announcements that I would like to make in regard to a couple of matters.

Milk Market Sharing Plan

First of all to announce to the House that the vote on the milk market sharing plan which concluded yesterday was overwhelmingly in favour of the plan. There were some 4,650 votes for the plan, as opposed to 1,450 against it. This means, Mr. Speaker, that the Alberta dairy industry will be more under the control of the producers in Alberta. We have already, by Order in Council, set up the regulations under which the market share plan will operate. For the time being, it will be controlled by the Milk Control Board, but amendments will be brought into the Milk Control Board to allow for representation on an Alberta Dairy Board by producers in all facets of the dairy industry including the cream shippers and the industrial milk shippers as well as the fluid milk shippers and the consumers in Alberta.

Alberta Sheep and Wool Commission

In addition I would like to announce the appointment of seven people to the Alberta Sheep and Wool Committee who will represent certain zones throughout the province. The prime aim of the commission is to initiate and stimulate or conduct programs for stimulating and increasing the economic well being of the sheep industry in Alberta.

As the House is aware, we extended, very shortly after September 10th, the Guaranteed Livestock Loan for female breeding stock in the sheep industry to all of Alberta. We are now setting up, on the advice of the producers in Alberta, the following commission. I would like to point out to the House that these are nominees by the producers themselves; Mr. L. R. Jensen from Magrath, Tom Simpson from Tilley, Mr. Phillip Rock from Drumheller, Mr. Vernon Gleddie from Edmonton, Mr. Ron Gordon from Athabasca, Mr. Ben Smashnuk from Wembley, Mr. Tom Reed from South Edmonton, member at large. In addition to this, Mr. Speaker, we intend to pursue with some vigour, the idea of an expanded sheep industry in Alberta. Now that we have the commission formed, we intend to pass to them the job of continuing that stimulation. We would hope to have changes in our regulations in the Guaranteed Loan Program in the very near future, so that the loan program could be used for other capital requirements in the sheep industry, besides that of the breeding stock.

Civil Service Association Collective Agreement

DR. HCHCL:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to announce that as Minister for Personnel, I signed today, on behalf of the Government of Alberta, a collective agreement with the Civil Service Association of Alberta. A major feature of this first collective agreement is the replacement of an informal grievance procedure with a complete formal step by

19-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

step system, culminating in an independent board hearing. The employees now have the recourse necessary to protect their rights under the agreement.

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-23

---

QUESTIONS

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the hon. member who asked Question NO. 144 that he agree to having it made a Motion for a Return.

MR. TAYLOR:

I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, then will we take it up when we get to Motions for a Return?

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that the Speaker order it to be a Motion for Return as per the rules.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do I take it that the hon. Member for Drumheller is moving that this be made an Order for a Return?

MR. TAYLOR:

I will if you like, but under the rules, the Speaker may order it to be made a return, which is satisfactory to me.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, must we wait until we get to the Motions for a Return? I am prepared to deal with it now.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree that the hon. minister proceed to deal with the question now as a Motion for a Return?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. GETTY:

I would ask the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, who is moving this motion, whether his intent was to establish the trips made by Cabinet Ministers outside the province, whether it was on private business or on business representing the Government of Alberta. From the way the question has been posed, I would assume that the Motion for a Return would then read, that you are asking for the number of trips made by Cabinet Ministers, and as a group that would mean any members of the Executive Council, outside of Alberta. I think you might consider adding "while representing the Government of Alberta".

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, we had in mind only the trips that concerned public

19-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

business which are being paid for by the public. We have no interest whatsoever in private trips paid for by the hon. ministers themselves.

MR. GETTY:

Then I would move, Mr. Speaker, that we add after February 29, 1972, 'while representing the Province of Alberta'.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House agrees to the amendment?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

144. By order of Mr. Speaker, an Order of the Assembly was therefore issued for a Return showing:

- (a) How many trips have been made by Cabinet Ministers outside of Alberta between September 10, 1971 and February 29, 1972, while representing the Province of Alberta?
- (b) What places were visited?
- (c) What was the main purpose of each trip?
- (d) What Ministers went on each trip?
- (e) Who accompanied each Minister?
- (f) What was the cost to the Public Treasury of each trip?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I feel that Question No. 145 should also be a Motion for a Return, and I move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Dickie, that this be a Motion for a Return on the question.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

145. An Order of the Assembly was therefore issued for a Return showing:

- (a) What is the total cost to renovate the former Misericordia Hospital?
- (b) What firm or firms did the work?
- (c) Has the work been completed?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, however, upon it being a Motion for a Return, I have the Return prepared and would be prepared to table it at this time.

DR. HCHCL:

Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the hon. Attorney General, that Question 146 be made a Return.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

146. An Order of the Assembly was therefore issued for a Return showing:

- (a) Is the Government of Alberta negotiating with the Government of British Columbia for the purpose of reaching an agreement effecting the portability of pensions insofar as employees of the two Governments are concerned?
- (b) If so, could copies of the correspondence be tabled?

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-25

DR. HCHCL:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the rather extensive nature of Question No. 147 and the detail required, this will take a lot of time. I would move, seconded by the hon. the Attorney General, that this be made a Return.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

147. An Order of the Assembly was therefore issued for a Return showing:

On the basis of Alberta Government departmental organization as described in the 1971-72 Budget estimates, provide answers to:

- (1) The number of permanent and temporary employees for each department of the Alberta Government that were on the public payroll as of
  - (a) April 1st, 1971;
  - (b) September 10th, 1971; and
  - (c) March 1st, 1972.
- (2) The number of approved permanent and temporary positions within the public service for each department of the Alberta Government as of
  - (a) April 1st, 1971;
  - (b) September 10th, 1971; and
  - (c) March 1st, 1972.
- (3) The number of additional permanent and temporary staff positions by department that were provided for in the Budget estimates which were approved by the Legislature for the 1971-72 fiscal year.

148. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question, which was answered by Mr. Copithorne as indicated:

What was the total income of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund and what was the total payment to claimants from the Fund in each of the four years 1968, 1969, 1970, and 1971?

Answer:

	<u>Income</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>
1967/68	\$1,282,081.14	\$1,174,775.98
1968/69	\$1,343,331.33	\$1,438,823.92
1969/70	\$1,332,016.97	\$1,874,658.81
1970/71	\$1,276,924.55	\$2,029,100.88

DR. EACKUS:

Regarding Question 150, Mr. Speaker, on principle, I would like to move that these questions which require a good deal of digging into a department to get information, should be made Motions for a Return, and therefore I would like to move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals, that this be a Motion for a Return. However, the efficiency of my department has produced the answer for it.

[The Motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

150. An Order of the Assembly was therefore issued for a Return, showing:

- (1) What were the number of employees in the Department of Public Works on Salary and Wages on September 10th, 1971 and at the end of each succeeding month up to and including February 29th, 1972 in the following sections:

19-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

- (a) Minister's Office
- (b) General Administration
- (c) Architectural Design Branch
- (d) Engineering Design Branch
- (e) Construction Supervision
- (f) Maintenance Administration
- (g) Caretaking and Maintenance
- (h) Government Garage Service
- (i) Maintenance Pool
- (j) Stock Advance
- (k) Construction Inspection
- (l) Physical Plant Division
- (m) Any other sections in the Department.

- (2) Have there been any transfers of caretaking and maintenance responsibility from the Department of Public Works to other Departments?
- (3) Have any caretaking and maintenance responsibilities been contracted out to private firms?

MR. EACKUS:

I would like, then, at this point to table the Motion for Return.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, what is the purpose and what is the reason for making a question a return if the answer is already prepared?

MR. HENDER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if I could speak to the point of order raised by the hon. member, surely it points out that all of these questions, or rather most of them, are improperly put, and most of them should have been put on the Order Paper as Notices of Motion for a Return. Ordinarily, written questions are those that require short and simple answers that can be sought and delivered easily. Anything that requires some work and is of a multiple nature should be, according to the rules, made a Notice of Motion for a Return, and a motion for the production of papers should of course always be made a Notice of Motion for a Return.

MR. TAYLOR:

Well, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I agree entirely, but the answers must have been prepared very simply, because they are now being filed.

MR. GETTY:

I would move that Question 151 be made a Motion for a Return, seconded by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development.

[The Motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

151. An Order of the Assembly was therefore issued for a Return showing:

- (1) How many copies of the book, "A Case For The West" were printed and what was the cost?
- (2) Where are the books now?
- (3) How will the cost of this book be recovered?

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-27

- (4) What remuneration was paid to its authors, Mr. Owen Anderson and Mr. Charles Eclan?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, Question 156, although directed to me, relates to matters which also come within the responsibility of the hon. Attorney General, and in order that he and I can give consideration to the manner in which it should be handled, I would ask that it stand over for a couple of days.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree to the suggestion of the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

#### MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

149. Mr. B. Speaker proposed the following motion to the Assembly:  
Seconded by Mr. Mandeville.

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

1. A list of classes of positions and the respective percentage increases made to the 1971 and 1972 Civil Service Pay Schedule since September 10, 1971.
2. A copy of any correspondence between the Civil Service Association and the government concerning any requests or replies for pay schedule adjustment.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent]

152. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to this Assembly:  
Seconded by Mr. Henderson.

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

1. The location of all leases pertaining to non-renewable resources in the Bow River Forest Reserve.
2. The amount of exploration work done at each location over the past five years.
3. The amount of revenue the Crown has received from each lease over each of the last five years.
4. The terms in each lease concerning renewal of the lease.

DR. WARECK:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on this matter for first a point of clarification. I am wondering if I might ask the hon. member if he is referring to mineral leases, which would be primarily through the Department of Mines and Minerals, or to surface leases which would be the Department of Lands and Forests, or possibly both. It is not clear to me from the question.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I am referring to both him and his colleague. It should be both mineral leases and surface leases.

19-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, we would be happy to provide that information. It might be helpful to mention that it will take some time, perhaps of the order of three weeks, to prepare it.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent]

153. Mr. Clark moved the following motion to this Assembly:  
Seconded by Mr. Sorensen.

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

At the following institutions:

1. University of Alberta
2. University of Calgary
3. University of Lethbridge
4. Medicine Hat College
5. Lethbridge Community College
6. Mount Royal College
7. Red Deer College
8. Grant MacEwan Community College
9. Grande Prairie Regional College
10. Fairview Agricultural and Vocational College
11. Vermilion Agricultural and Vocational College
12. Olds Agricultural and Vocational College
13. Northern Alberta Institute of Technology
14. Southern Alberta Institute of Technology

the following information:

- (a) The number of building projects commenced and completed during the last five years;
- (b) The cost of each project;
- (c) The name of the architectural firm who did the design work of each project;
- (d) The name of the construction firm who was responsible for construction of each project; and
- (e) The percentage of completion of each project as of September 10, 1971.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent]

154. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to this Assembly:  
Seconded by Mr. Sorenson.

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

At the following institutions:

1. University of Alberta
2. University of Calgary
3. University of Lethbridge
4. Medicine Hat College
5. Lethbridge Community College
6. Mount Royal College
7. Red Deer College
8. Grant MacEwan Community College
9. Grande Prairie Regional College
10. Fairview Agricultural and Vocational College
11. Vermilion Agricultural and Vocational College
12. Olds Agricultural and Vocational College
13. Northern Alberta Institute of Technology
14. Southern Alberta Institute of Technology

the following information:

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-29

- (a) The number of academic and non-academic staff during each of the last five years; and
- (b) The number of full-time student equivalents for each of the last five years.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move the following motion, seconded by the hon. Member for Macleod. "Be it resolved that this Assembly express grave concern for the possible loss of grain markets at the port of Vancouver for a number of reasons, including an insufficient number of boxcars and locomotives, and urges the Alberta government, in co-operation with the four western Legislatures, the railways, the grain companies, Unifarm and other farm organizations to commence an immediate investigation designed to pinpoint the causes, and effect results that will enable Canada to meet and expand its present overseas commitments."

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this has been on the Order Paper for some time, and there has not yet been a resolution go off the Order Paper during this session, I am going to try to keep my remarks short in the hope that it might be possible to pass this resolution today. However, that will depend upon how many people want to take part, and we do not want to curb debate at all. I would like to say, too, that while we say "to commence an immediate investigation", possibly in view of the fact that the government has done some work on this, we would have no objection were it to read "to continue an investigation", if it has indeed commenced such an investigation.

The first item I would endeavour to show to the hon. members is the matter of concern. The Alberta farmers are fully justified in becoming alarmed and concerned. And I want to quickly point out six reasons why this is so.

First of all, the hon. Otto Lang, who is in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board in the federal government, became very concerned, and he said he feared we could not meet all of our overseas commitments in connection with grain.

Secondly, the hon. Otto Lang again stated that the Vancouver port facilities could handle 800 cars per day, whereas officials at Vancouver port indicate that 600 boxcars on a day-to-day basis is the best they have been able to do. Another matter of concern.

The third matter of concern involves the cleaning facilities. Vancouver port provides cleaning for 700 car loads of grain per day, but 1,500 to 1,800 cars need to be handled daily to meet our commitments overseas.

The fourth matter of concern involves the exports of grain. Since January 1, 1972, exports of grain from Vancouver have dropped to less than half that originally expected. Shipments now are a month behind, and the Vancouver port is actually some 20 to 30 millions of bushels behind our commitments.

The fifth matter of concern is that unless things start to change, Alberta farmers could well lose from \$20 million to \$30 million or more through this loss of markets and through the loss of our commitments.

19-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

And the sixth matter of concern is that we were so far behind in our commitments, that when Japan recently called for tenders for grain, the Canadian Wheat Board didn't even bid on that tender. So there is a loss of markets.

On or about February 26th I took it upon myself, in view of the concern of this matter among my own constituents, to visit Vancouver harbour and the Vancouver port. I did this at my own expense incidentally, not at public expense. I found that the situation was even worse than I had expected. Consequently, that was the reason we wanted to have this matter discussed on the very first day of the session. However, the Legislature saw fit not to do that, and I am pleased that the government has been doing some work in this particular connection since that time, and possibly before that time; the government itself will have to outline what it did before.

And now, since I think we have established that there is reason for grave concern, I would like to deal with what can be done about it. The resolution is asking that we carry out an investigation to pinpoint the causes, to pinpoint the reasons, with the idea that, after pinpointing the reasons, we will then endeavour to find the solution for those problems. And the first thing that we could do to relieve this concern is to get more boxcars and more locomotives. I think that is, at least I would say so, one of the number one things that could be done. I checked with the CNR in connection with this, and was advised by top officials that the situation at the port in Vancouver was terrible, and I agreed with that, from what I had seen personally when I was there. However, the CNR did show an indication and a desire to try to improve the situation, and I appreciate that attitude very much indeed. Sixteen extra diesels were added as of March 2nd, which is a considerable increase over what they had prior to that. Three thousand cars per week, which is normal in the summer time, were increased to 4,500 cars, and some 4,500 cars are now being utilized. The CNR hoped to move 2,000 cars a week into Vancouver, but they pointed out that possibly they would only realize about 1,400 to 1,600 cars per week. That, of course, is even better than what was being done. The CNR had no compunction about admitting that they were some 3,400 cars behind, that they had loaded cars, at that time, at several places in Alberta that they were unable to move. Their plan of attack was to move the regular ones plus 200 to 300 extra cars of backlog, in the hope that they would eventually catch up. The cold weather and the difficult winter cut the efficiency of the railways to something like 50% during the worst part of that weather.

Now when I come to the CPR, I really can't report very much. The CPR have been behind and from appearances - I have been unable to contact the heads of the CPR; every time I try to contact them they are tied up in conference - but from reports coming from Vancouver, CPR is still falling badly behind in getting the grain to the Vancouver market. I certainly appreciate that the CNR is endeavouring to try to meet this very bad situation. The fact that they added 16 extra diesels and some 1,500 extra cars has been, I think, to their credit. So the first item I think that can be done is to get more boxcars and more locomotives, not only by the CNR but also by the CPR.

The second item is in connection with renting rolling stock. The railways, at least the CNR, stated that they were short of boxcars and short of diesels and I suggested that they should be renting these. For instance, Burlington North had a period during the winter months when the workers were on strike at the coast, when Burlington North undoubtedly had a great number of diesels and boxcars that could have been rented. Apparently there was little or no attempt made to rent these from Burlington North. Granted, renting rolling stock may be expensive, but nevertheless it is not as expensive as losing our markets.

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-31

The next thing that could be done would be to get alternate routes. And here there are some alternatives. The PGE is used occasionally by the CNR when there is a derailment and while the CNR admits that it is reluctant to use the PGE facilities, they have done so on occasion. It is reluctant primarily because the PGE insists that the railway that is renting their tracks supply the entire outfit - the diesel, caboose, the whole show - and of course this is costly. But again I say that the cost is not going to be as great as losing our overseas markets. The same with Burlington North; while CPR has no re-routing agreement with the Burlington North, certainly such an agreement could have been sought, and particularly during the months when Burlington North was tied up because of a strike at the west coast. I can see no reason why this could not have been used had there been a desire to do so.

While I was at the coast, also, I did check the railway lines and one gentleman pointed out to me a possibility of building another railway line about 50 miles from Lillooet east joining the CNR just west of Kamloops. I did not go over the route and I have no engineering feasibility studies, but he was of the opinion that this could be done and that it should be considered. I believe that some of our members of parliament in Ottawa have also dealt with the possibility of building such a line. That, of course, cannot be done overnight. But these other items, renting rolling stock and using alternate routes, could have been used right from last fall.

The other point in connection with alternate routes, of course, is to make greater use of the Prince Rupert port. The hon. Member of Agriculture mentioned in this House the other day, and the Minister of Transport in Ottawa also announced, that some large sums of money were going to be expended in order to bring Prince Rupert up and make it a more viable seaport. Certainly it is closer to some of the oriental countries than through the Vancouver port.

Then again I would like to suggest another route that possibly was not useful during this particular winter, but that is through the Churchill port - the Hudson Bay route. I would hope that over the next few years we can send more and more of our grain via the Hudson Bay Route. I think it has great potential and I think the federal government would be well advised to spend more money on the Churchill port. Well, there is another alternate route that certainly could be considered.

Another thing that could have been done is to improve and expand the west coast facilities, particularly in regard to more cleaning facilities and more trackage through Vancouver. The cost of expanding compared to lost sales would certainly be well worth while because it would leave more money eventually, I believe, in the pockets of the producers.

Those of you who have visited the Vancouver port will know that north and south of Burrard Inlet there is a draught of some 50 feet and the railway marshalling yards are about 15 or so miles away from the harbour.

Vancouver Wharves Ltd. are reported to have told the Palliser wheatgrowers (and I was not able to contact Vancouver Wharves when I was there) that they would be prepared to build storage facilities at no cost to the farmers on the prairies. So there is the possibility of expanding and using the facilities at the west coast.

There is another way, too, and that is something I think we could have done this winter, to a far greater degree than what we did, and that is to use the inland terminals to clean wheat and to ship clean wheat, graded grain to the coast. Now I am advised that the Canadian government elevators at Edmonton, Calgary, Lethbridge, Moose Jaw, and Saskatoon, have not been used to their capacity. The elevator at Edmonton can clean 40,000 bushels per day, and the cost

19-32

ALEERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

is about 1/2 a cent to 1 1/2 cent per bushel, depending on dockage. They can load out 60 cars per day, and trucks could be used to a much greater degree in connection with these inland government elevators.

We are not cleaning to capacity. One day I checked with the Canadian government elevator in Edmonton and I found that 300 cars of No. 1 wheat, which had been in storage for two or three years, had been moved that day. And that was during the month of February. Certainly we can use the facilities we have inland for cleaning to a much greater degree, and I would like to see the investigation explore that point to the limit so that we can make use of the facilities we have inland and then ship the clean graded grain to the coast.

Another possible method is making use of unit trains, although this may create some difficulty at the harbour because of the distance of some 15 miles from the railway yards to the harbour facilities. But, again, it is worth looking into. The bulk loading dock at Vancouver could probably be used. I did check with some people at the bulk loading dock and was told that it could be converted to handling grain with very little difficulty if there was some desire to do it. But one of the difficulties at that time was not having enough box cars of grain in Vancouver, which was a matter of very serious concern.

While I was there I visited three of the grain company harbours and saw some ships being loaded. As a matter of fact I talked to some Korean sailors, and when I asked one of them how he liked Canadian wheat, he said, wonderful, wonderful, it made the best bread of any wheat he knew, but he said he didn't think they would be coming back any more, and I asked why. "Well", he said, "We sat in the harbour for some seven days before even being brought in." They came into the dock on a Saturday morning and he said the crews were going to stop working on Saturday afternoon and they would have to sit over all day Sunday until Monday. Well, you know, when our farmers are working 16 to 18 hours a day to produce the wheat, surely to goodness we can expect that, when the wheat is there and when the boats are there to be loaded, our crews would be working right around the clock.

I do have some information from the companies out there which is a little encouraging. For instance, the United Grain Growers tell me, and this I quote from a letter from that company:

"Vessels can be loaded between the hours of 8 a.m. and midnight. Loading facilities would average 6,000 tons in an eight hour period, or approximately 10,000 tons during the hours referred to above. A 30,000 ton vessel would require three days of loading at our berth. Applying the same number of hours, two such vessels could be loaded at the same time but would require six days. When car supply at the coast is adequate most elevators unload for 16 hours per day, five days a week, and on an overtime basis on Saturdays. Our target for west coast ports is 4,000 cars per week. This target has been difficult to achieve due, in large part, to severe weather conditions which affect the railways adversely. The chief difficulty which we are experiencing is getting sufficient cars placed for unloading."

So we can certainly not condemn the workmen at the coast for not working overtime or around the clock when the difficulty lies in getting the grain to the west coast.

Now this matter is so grave that I think every hon. member should put his weight behind every positive action that our government is prepared to take. And we are asking that the government commence or continue, whatever is the appropriate word, an investigation into the whole matter, to pinpoint the causes, and then

March 26th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-33

to work out with the other western governments, with the Legislatures, with Unifarm, with the Palliser Wheat Growers Association and other farm organizations, and with the Canadian government, solutions to these problems. Mr. Speaker, we can't afford to be losing our markets, and when we don't meet our commitments, that is exactly what may happen. A few years ago, because of a strike at the west coast, we lost our barley market. The United States got the barley market and we have never regained it -- it is lost forever, apparently, to the prairie farmers. We can't afford to lose our markets. I think every step possible should be taken to make sure that we meet our overseas commitments, and then, of course, to expand those overseas commitments so that we can bring the wheat, that is grown with the sweat and tears of the farmers on the prairies in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and I am speaking particularly now of Alberta, to the harbour and then taken to the areas of the world where they want it, where they have made bargains to buy it, and where we want to sell it. I would urge every hon. member to support this resolution.

MR. FICKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to second this motion, I would say it is a motion which could generate a lot of excitement and a lot of heat, no matter which part of the province, or which part of Canada we live in.

Canada's exports are the highest in the world compared to our total production. The volume of supply is the major factor on the world market. The fact that we are able to ship the amount of grain that we do from all parts of Canada -- and most of my figures are for all of Canada, not particularly the west coast -- the fact that we have such a large quantity of high quality grain is one of the reasons that we are able to attract the prices and the demand on the world market. The hon. member mentioned wheat, but wheat is one of the most important of all our grains, we also have a large barley market, and we also have a large rapeseed market at the west coast.

Now for the half year of 1971-72 the farmers had marketed in this country, 451.9 million bushels of grain, an increase of 39% from the year before. Country elevators had shipped 503 million bushels, or 26.8% more than they had shipped the year before. 596 million bushels had been sold to domestic users and for export, for an increase of 31.6% over the year before. Now it is estimated that some 200 million bushels will be handled on the west coast this year; the Vancouver port itself will handle over 30% of the total grain sales of Canada. Now these grain sales will be going primarily to Japan and China, and our eastern markets. To move the amount of grain in Canada in a given year, we are using something in the neighbourhood of 30,000 grain cars, when you allow that 600 to 700 grain cars are required for 1 million bushels of grain. However, everything being equal, I would mention this again, everything being equal, 30,000 cars can move 800 million bushels of grain annually.

But Pacific shipments depend largely, Mr. Speaker, on winter movements. One of the reasons we are in the trouble we are in, in the last few years, in shipping grain from the Pacific coast, is the lack of stockpiling at the west coast. A lack of adequate storage means a constant movement from farm to port. This means that trains are continually in the short-term business of trying to supply the waiting ships. Inland terminals are not the total answer, and I doubt whether they are the answer at all, because the inland terminals add to the cost to the farmer, and this results in a net loss to him for the extra handling. Anything, whether stored inland or not, must be hauled to the coast before export.

Everything being equal - we mentioned the railways - this grain can be hauled without any trouble. But we have labour stoppages; we have grain handlers' strikes; we have longshoremen's strikes; we have

19-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

railway employees' strikes; and we have the weather. This winter particularly, if we are to be honest about it, the weather was the major factor in our loss of markets. We lost two weeks primarily because of the weather. This amounts to 10 to 15 million bushels of grain from western Canada for which markets were lost because there was no grain at the ports. Some sales will undoubtedly be lost. It is rather interesting to read that some potential sales will undoubtedly be lost. Vessels that are waiting for cargoes will continue to wait, but the Wheat Board has already shown reluctance to take on extra bookings. The loss of the equivalent of about two weeks business out of Pacific ports amounts to between 10 and 15 million bushels. This is unfortunate, at any time, and particularly so at the current time. However, compared with total movements from country elevators, which may still reach 900 million bushels this crop year, it cannot be considered to be one of disaster proportions. This is from our marketing economist from our own Department of Agriculture.

Some bookings have been switched from the west coast to the St. Lawrence for April. This means that, again, it will be a loss for the farmers because all this grain has to be hauled across to Montreal. We are also going to lose on the demurrage charges to be paid resulting in a net loss for the grain producer. We are not operating - we realize this - we are not operating at maximum efficiency at all our ports; primarily because of lack of grain. I think many of us don't recognize the magnitude of the job; it is far easier to blame the Wheat Board; it is far easier to blame the railways and blame our port facilities, when we recognize the amount of grain that has been moved in Canada in one year. I am sure that if government was to work as efficiently, in some respects in the way they have moved grain, we would be far better off in Canada than we are at the present time. This is a tremendous job and there is no country in the world that moves the amount of grain that Canada does under such adverse conditions. This is not to say that this is not a serious problem. Unit trains, as such, are only a small tool, as are inland ports. Unit trains - in fact one was tried in which the boat was not there. The unit train could not wait, and the grain had to be unloaded in the normal way and run through the port as if the unit train had not been there at all. So they are not the total answer. Unit trains add, according to the Country Guide, at least nine cents a bushel extra out of the farmer's pocket to the cost in building up and collecting grain for these unit trains.

Again, I have to stress that we have to have a greater storage capacity, and a greater upgrading of the present plan--more ports, inland or seaboard. Handling charges are all at the expense of the farmer; quite often those who are in agriculture may understand the problem. I'm not a grain producer myself, but many of the farmers understand what is going on. It's out of their pockets. There are a great number of other people who are concerned for the farmers and the plight that they are in. Everything that is done, all the handling, the hauling, all comes out of the farmers' pocket. He pays the bills and this means is that much less per bushel in his pocket.

We talked about cleaning at the coast. We have a market there for screenings. If the grain was cleaned on the prairies and sold here, we would lose the market that we already have for the screenings, and we would also lose the market for the feed grains in lieu of what we would be using for screenings here. So it's a saw-off one way or another. The screenings are sold and become a net asset in the payments of the Wheat Board.

Now, the hon. minister sent a letter to Mr. Jamieson on March 10, advocating what he felt was necessary in the upgrading of our ports and how serious they felt the situation was. I was quite interested, too, because in a report from Parliament Hill for the recommendations that he had already stated in his letter were advocated by his brother in Ottawa. So, at least it was a brotherly

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-35

act. They realize what is going on, they realize the seriousness of the situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to stress again the reason for this motion is that we seriously try to pinpoint where the breakdown is in the movement of grain. I'm not concerned particularly with the wheat farmer. He's part of the grain movement program, because the wheat, the barley, the rapeseed, are very, very important, particularly to Alberta. The barley and the rapeseed market in Alberta is one that could be one of the great salvations for our agriculture, other than the growing of wheat. We are deeply concerned, and we hope the House will support this motion. There is no ready answer to our problems, and I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture has already stated that there are wheels within wheels within wheels in the marketing of grain. We are not going to solve them here in this Assembly, but at least we can bring all the pressure that we can to bear on those who are in charge of the movement of grain so that everything that can be done will be done for the benefit of our farmers.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FRACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I am certainly pleased to enter this debate. I also share the concern of the hon. members from the other side in regard to this very complex problem. I think that it can be divided into three parts: first, the physical aspects of this problem; secondly, the political or legislative aspects of it and; thirdly, what we, the government, have done. Now if we start looking at the physical problems, we have had them for a considerable length of time. The hon. member suggested that he had been out to Vancouver and he had seen the port facilities and the storage resources there for prairie grains. Surely, he recognized that there are three or four elevators out there of considerable bushel size that were absolutely empty. He has seen the results of so-called surges from prairie shipment of grains in the past that have not materialized at the Pacific port. He has seen ships lying in the harbour with elevators almost empty, and I'm sure that he has also visited the port, seen the elevators full and no ships. And so, scheduling of ships to take care of the surge and the requirements of the elevators prevents a scheduling problem also.

I am sure he has recognized that with the elevators built around the Burrard Inlet, the access by rail to those elevators is by a small right-of-way of the CPR. When you get onto the north shore, you have a real problem. There is a real need for a causeway to switch over into the north shore facilities. The south shore is very cramped and the real-estate cost of moving those facilities or even broadening the trackage accessibility is almost prohibitive.

So the problem is not a simple one; it is a very complex one. I am sure he has recognized and understands that whether it be a government-owned institution called the CNR or a private corporation called the CPR, you cannot take care of capital stock requirements in 60 days or six months. In other words, to build up the fleets and move the technology for those diesels and generators that are moving now on both railroad systems requires a lead time. Therefore, to plan sufficient rolling stock and sufficient power equipment to move the surge of grain that we are expecting into the world marketplace out of the Pacific port requires much more than six months.

We are aware also that there are alternate routes. We have taken care to use what influence this government has had in bringing to the attention of the powers that be -- the hon. Mr. Jamieson, Mr. Pickerskill -- the needs for alternate route considerations, whether it be the Burlington or the PG&E

19-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

We have recognized that in order to allow a faster movement of grain out of the Pacific coast, it involves several marketing problems that the Canadian Wheat Board is involved in. While we hear great comments about the acceptance of Canadian wheat abroad, we recognize that our friends to the south are shipping wheat that is 1.5% as far as fine content is concerned, whereas the demands for the quality and dust-freeness of Canadian wheat is down to .02%.

These create problems of time and delays. We have also recognized that we are just embarking on a new grading system that has impaired to some degree our storage facilities in the terminal areas, because of the number of grades we have vis-a-vis some of our competitors, which allow greater access and serviceability to the stocks at hand.

Now we have recognized all these things. As early as October 13, 1971, and again on February 4 and 26, 1972, we had meetings with the provinces of Saskatchewan, British Columbia and Alberta, which I reported to this House, and discussed some of the problems we had in common with regard to transportation at that time. Through those preliminary meetings we have developed what we call the Pacific Transportation Council, its objects being to take an inventory of the physical features of transportation in western Canada, to find out what the commodity problems are, what our world markets and our projections might be in relation to those commodities in the world marketplace for the next five years; and to determine from those inventories the involvement of the suppliers, the producers and the terminal people, and what the transportation requirements might be in order to take care of these projected movements of product in the next five years.

We have also taken part in and supported the alternate route to Churchill that was recommended by the hon. member. We are very cognizant indeed, of all the problems that are confronting us in transportation in western Canada. There is no easy answer, and if a resolution on an Order Paper could in any way, in just one way, make it possible for the farmers and suppliers of commodity products in western Canada to move their products to the Port of Vancouver more easily or better, then I am sure it would serve some purpose. But I would like to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion, the problems that are facing us in regard to transportation are of such a complex nature, and are problems of such magnitude, that we must reveal to the House and all and sundry alike, a total inventory of the full resource picture of transportation in western Canada, and then and only then, can we make a decision as to what we might do.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly am one of the members of this House, and I am sure there isn't a member in this House who is not concerned with the problems of transportation in western Canada. Probably the hon. Member for Drumheller has stressed that more box cars are necessary, and I certainly go along with the problems that are related to the number of box cars needed, but we also have to remember that the heavy snow fall and the conditions in the mountains this past winter have been among the most extreme in the history of British Columbia. I think the one thing that we have to remember is that we could possibly drain off some of the wheat surplus in Saskatchewan by way of the Port of Churchill.

May I add Mr. Speaker, that I was a director on the Churchill Route Association for over 12 years. It was my fortune to pay a visit to this port. I stayed there for nine days. I arrived there on approximately the 25th of July. The first ship was already in harbour at that time. But storage facilities at that port at that time were about 5 million bushels of wheat, and the wheat grades in storage were approximately grades one, two, three and six. I report to the House that upon arriving in Churchill, Manitoba on the 25th of

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-37

July, there were also lying at anchor outside the port, five Greek freighters able to take on approximately 6 to 7 million bushels of no. 4 wheat. And I want to stress this point -- I was there nine days in the port of Churchill and I visited one of the ships. And if you have ever seen a penned up group of sailors on a boat for nine days outside of a port -- certainly the captains of those ships were not very happy. But the point was that the wheat board was charged demurrage on these ships sitting in port. And when you remember that we have a grade 3 wheat in that port and also a grade 6 wheat, and require a grade 4, it isn't too hard to put two and two together. We could have provided this. The storage facilities at that port were such that we could not load out of the Port of Churchill more than approximately 20 million bushels of wheat. I understand now, Mr. Speaker, that they have increased this to approximately 30 million bushels of wheat. I also understand that the Port of Churchill now is shipping out of there approximately 30 million bushels of wheat.

The thing that concerns me more than anything else is that the ocean rate is very attractive out of the port of Churchill, in fact it is far superior to any port of Canada. But the fact remains that the season must be extended by at least two weeks. Surely, when the one ship entered the port of Churchill on the 25th of July, with another two weeks we could have ships into the port of Churchill at least by the 12th of July. And if we could add two weeks on the other end of the season and increase the shipping season out of the port of Churchill by at least one month, we would have at least taken the bulk of the load out of Saskatchewan and Manitoba and the wheat from the eastern side of Alberta to eliminate some of the heavy drawings on the port of Vancouver.

Now there are two things that I think this government has to do and they should have been done by the former government. I know that the hon. Member for Drumseller sat with me for three days at the meeting in Winnipeg and I believe he is quite correct when he said that we must try to improve the port of Churchill. Some way or other we have to impress upon the Harbours Board that the season must be extended and it must be covered by insurance because you cannot get insurance to go into the port of Churchill before the end of July and I think it extends to approximately to the 31st of October. I think we have to impress upon the Harbours Board and the government at Ottawa that we must make more or better use of the port of Churchill and also of the port of Prince Rupert. But it is my impression, Mr. Speaker, after attending all the meetings of Saskatchewan, Manitoba and E.C. that one thing comes out very clear and that is that at no point do they like to disturb the balance of the work on the west coast; nor do they like to disturb the work and the unloading of the stevedores in all the busy ports, and that is Quebec and Montreal. I think this is a prime factor. I think we must make Ottawa recognize that there are ports other than Vancouver, Quebec and Montreal. I think Prince Rupert looks very attractive and I think the port of Churchill certainly should be made use of to a greater extent.

I think the only thing that we can do is to impress upon Ottawa that we expect them to provide greater storage facilities, larger berthing areas at the port and more unloading facilities. When I was there, there was only room for two ships to load and unload, and if you got one boat into unload you could not load the other one because the distance was too great. I understand now that they have made berthing possible for three ships and I believe that we should, at least in this short season in the port of Churchill, be able to load at least six to eight freighters at a time. I believe the Russians have shown that their preference was to take the majority of their wheat through the port of Churchill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

19-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

MR. STEINBERG:

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to you that our railroad and elevator system is as out-dated as the sulky plow. I will go back and take a look at the history of that era, the era of the hon. Member for Drumheller; these railroads were built in the '10's and the '20's, and our elevator system was built at the same time. It was in the old horse and buggy days. The elevator system was built according to distances that a good team of horses could haul 100 bushels of wheat in a given number of hours, approximately six miles apart.

Today our elevators have to meet, roughly, about 200,000 bushels a year in order to pay for their keep. We have many elevators today in Alberta that are not meeting that commitment. They are very expensive to the grain trade to subsidize and keep.

Yes, I would even go as far to say that the boxcar is out-dated. The problems of unloading a boxcar, the unloading facilities at Vancouver -- only six tracks into the Alberta Wheat Pool. The hopper car might be the answer, I certainly agree with that. As the hon. Member for Macleod mentioned, unit trains are not the answer.

Mr. Speaker, a Professor Moore from the University of Winnipeg has come up with a portable container that will hold from three to four hundred bushels of grain. The Wheat Pool of Manitoba has seen fit to commission Dominion Bridge of that province to build 25 of these containers and to test them. These containers are light, they can be put out into a farmer's field, filled, and stored. To me this seems like cheap storage.

We are losing markets throughout the better part of the world to countries that have no port facilities. Their docks and their ports are of such a nature that their unloading facilities are very expensive. These countries have approached the federal government to see if the government would build silos for the unloading of grain. The federal government have turned thumbs down on this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I too was out at the port of Vancouver last fall. I believe I had a more enjoyable time than the hon. minister from the 'windy' constituency had; I was on my honeymoon. But I suggest that we all get our thinking into the 20th century and that we take a real look at this idea of container shipment of grain. 90% of the boats now at Vancouver are handling container shipment. I think that it would be feasible to handle grain by this method. Thank you.

DR. HCFNER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to those of the people who spoke before me in relation to the problem. As the hon. Member for Drumheller said when he was introducing the motion, this has been a continuing problem. I am very pleased, as a matter of fact, that some of the hon. members on that side of the House have come around to that point of view, because I can recall very vividly some four years ago when I introduced a resolution into this House in regard to the question of terminals, those members of the Executive Council of that day got up and said there was not really anything they could do. I can still see in my own mind the former Minister of Industry storming back into the House raising Cain and telling me that was an entirely improper resolution and an entirely improper action for a provincial government even to be considering. And I am sure my hon. colleague from Edmonton-Whitemud remembers that very vividly as well because we had some unusual debate.

I bring that up, Mr. Speaker, to make the point that this is not something that just happened today, or yesterday, or last month, or last year, or in fact five years ago. It has been a continual problem that we have had in relation to the movement of our grain to our customers. One of the real problems that we have and perhaps the thing that becomes really serious, Mr. Speaker, is that the

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-39

-----

competition for the markets in grains is going to get tougher. While we hope to expand our markets and our ability to increase our total sales, there is no doubt at all that when you are competing against subsidized exports from the countries in the European economic community, when you are competing against subsidized transportation in the United States, when you are competing against subsidized programs of a variety of farms in the United States -- we have to clean the pipeline out and make sure that we get our goods to our customers, and there are a number of ways in which we can do that.

As my colleague, the Minister of Industry, has stated we have been moving in that area. We are also making this one of the responsibilities of the newly formed Alberta Grain Commission and they are already having some input into that area. It is not just a question of -- I would like to digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker, because there is also the other matter that concerns us very much in Alberta, and that is the fact that the payment our farmers get depends on whether or not a particular port is used. The situation, with regard to barley, may mean a difference of 14 cents a bushel whether you price at Thunder Bay or Vancouver, between what the Manitoba producer receives because of the pricing at Thunder Bay and what the Alberta producer receives because we are also priced at Thunder Bay rather than Vancouver. And I bring that to the attention of the members because of our pressure to move a lot of grain through Vancouver. I did not get what the hon. member said his figures were with regard to the percentage of grain moved through Vancouver, but I know what it is, it is 37 - 38% of total grain exports that are going through Vancouver. So this is one problem of immediate urgency that I have asked the Grain Commission to take up with the Wheat Board and we have already communicated with the hon. Otto Lang in regard to that, because 14 cents on barley is a fairly substantial sum of money, and we would want to look into that very carefully.

The other thing I want to clear up is one of the things that the hon. member for Calgary Millican mentioned the other day in relation to this in the question period, when he tried to show that in fact Otto Lang did not know anything about our Grain Commission and what we were doing, and of course, if he had bothered to read the Hansard accurately, and I now have a copy of that Hansard, he will find that that is not what Mr. Laing said at all. Mr. Laing said we have had discussions with the Wheat Board in regard to that -- and I have a copy of the Hansard and I'll table it for the hon. member because he seems to have some difficulty reading it.

In fairness to Mr. Lang, I must say that the provision by the federal government of \$6 million for the rerouting of grain that would ordinarily have gone through Vancouver, but was shipped out of the Thunder Bay terminals by train to the east coast ports, was a substantial contribution to this whole matter. Perhaps it may be necessary, because of the backlog in Vancouver, to approach the federal government to see if we can get them to make an additional contribution to that particular way of getting grain out, particularly to some of the customers for whom it would not make any difference in relation to the end cost of sea shipping.

The other point that I think needs to be made very clearly, Mr. Speaker, is the question of the ships lying in anchor at Vancouver, and who pays the demurrage, and whether or not, in fact, these are backup costs to the farmers in Alberta. We had a detailed discussion about this with the Grains Council and the Canadian Wheat Board, and in fact, some of these ships arrive early, because they go to the far east and are back again. If they happen to get good weather on both trips, then they are back earlier than they would ordinarily be, and as a result they come in ahead of time. One of the other problems of the Board is again bad weather. If they have a booking for a ship to come in and the ship does not show up because of bad weather this continues to plug up the system.

19-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

That same thing has happened, of course, on the railway end of the situation. We have tried to alleviate that partly by a pooling mechanism, in which all of the grain is pooled and it is sorted out by lockwork later, as to just whose grain it was initially. But we have not been able to get a pooling arrangement yet in the shipping context, which might be very helpful if we had better control of the weather and better control of the foreign shipping, so that the ships would arrive on time -- when they were scheduled to arrive. One of the things that happened last winter was that there was a delay in some of these ships getting back in, then a whole bunch of them arrived just when we had the most severe weather in British Columbia, which multiplied the factors slowing up our ability to get our grain into them. And of course, Mr. Speaker, the whole question of the grain system -- it doesn't matter which end you start with, as my hon. friend from Camrose has said, our elevator system on the prairies is pretty old and archaic, I want to say a word more about that in a few minutes. But certainly the change in sea shipping has made a pretty tremendous impact on the question of how we get our grain to our customers.

It wasn't very many years ago, Mr. Speaker, that 200,000 bushels was considered a boat load. And of course, there are very few boat loads of that size anymore in the grain trade; most of them are now taking well over half a million bushels, some of them up to a million and a half bushels. If you have a terminal such as the one in Prince Rupert only has storage for around a million bushels, (unfortunately, at the moment in Prince Rupert they can only load one boat at a time and it takes two or three days to load it), you have difficulty getting enough grain into that terminal to fill one boat load. They have restricted the numbers and the kinds of grains that go into Churchill because of that.

So we are pretty pleased about the announcement with regard to Prince Rupert. I would say again though that unfortunately there have been announcements before about Prince Rupert. As a matter of fact, it even got to the stage of letting tenders for a terminal about four years ago. Something happened and the tender was never let, which is again an unfortunate thing, because that additional terminal now would have been worth a great deal of money and would have cost less than to build than the one they are going to build now. That was unfortunate; it is unfortunate that the previous government did not put more pressure on at that time. The tenders were cut for the terminal in Prince Rupert, and then were turned down by the then Liberal government in 1966, otherwise we would have had that additional terminal in Prince Rupert today. These are some of the facts of the situation in regard to that area.

MR. HENDERSON:

Tell us what you did about it as an MP in 1966.

DR. HCFNER:

I will if the hon. member has enough time - if he has got all evening, I will recite it to him. The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc likes to lean back in his chair and chatter. He should really stand up on his feet and make a speech about it if he feels inclined to do so. It may just be, Mr. Speaker, that he does not have any knowledge about the matter which we are talking about so that he has to interject.

I wanted to say something with regard to the whole question of our elevator system in Alberta, because it becomes more and more important, not only to the resolution as stated on the order paper, but it becomes a very important matter for all of rural Alberta - the question of branch line abandonment, the question of elevator consolidation, the question of inland terminals.

March 26th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-41

I see my hon. friend for Macleod has taken a very firm position already, stating that inland terminals are no good and that they shouldn't be used. I rather suspect that he may be parroting some of the grain industry's ideas in that regard. I only tell him to be careful in relation to that and to keep his mind open as to the question of inland terminals. It may be that some of the people who own the terminal facilities at the coast do not want to see inland terminals because the cleaning business is a lucrative business in the grain industry. I think we have to keep that in mind. He says that in relation to the screenings, there is a market there for them. I want to suggest to him that there will be a market there for them, whether they are cleaned there or in Alberta. That is the stand taken by a recent investigation by the Palliser Wheat Growers and I agree with that stand, having had some opportunity to have a look at the situation in the port of Vancouver the screenings market is there as a supplementary feed basis. We are selling some of the screenings overseas. I want to suggest to the hon. member that what he really should be talking about is the question of using the screenings in a total feed base as a pelletized product and moving our coarse grains that way. The screenings then would become much more valuable.

But there is no doubt in my mind that we have to have a look at the question of inland terminals. The question of cleaning, of course, as the hon. Member for Drumheller says, is half a cent a bushel. What he did not talk about was the additional charges that are required if you truck all the grain there from the farm which is an additional cost to the farmer. If it goes through the regular system then we are into the problem of stopover charges.

We have to resolve that question of stopover charges if we are going to resolve and rationalize the transportation system for grain. This requires some pretty hardnosed bargaining with the railways, some talking to the federal government in relation to the use of their inland terminals. As the hon. member may know they have leased out some of the inland terminals in Saskatchewan. I think the Saskatchewan Pool or Pioneer Grain Company has the one in Saskatoon. They had a tender out for the one in Lethbridge. The last I heard, no one had placed a bid to rent the terminal in Lethbridge. Again, one of the reasons, I've been told, that these inland terminals have never been used to a greater degree than they have in the past was this very business of the grain companies' claim that they don't make any money handling grain, but they can make money cleaning it. And I would ask my hon. friend from Macleod to have some discussions with people in the grain industry because there is more there than meets the eye, particularly when you are buying grain in country points and then moving it to the terminals at the coast.

One of the real problems is that they are trying to make their profit in their cleaning and grading and dockage operations rather than in ordinary handling charges. And it may be that in a review of this that it ties into the question of the terminals. Because they want to keep using those terminals at the coast as a cleaning and sorting mechanism, because they claim that is where they make their profit.

These are the kinds of things that I think we need to have a much closer look at, because it is not enough just to buy what they are saying in relation to the inland terminals. I think that we have got to have a real hard look at that and look at the question of where the grain and elevator companies make their money, and what are the proper returns for them to make. I think now with the transfer of the Federal Grain Company to the three pools in western Canada, that I would expect the pools in western Canada to take the lead in this kind of an area. They have the knowledge right at their fingertips, if they would like to make it available to us. We are hoping that they will. We are hoping that they will act as advisors to us in the Grain Commission so that we can get down to some of these problems that are really behind some of the other problems that

19-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

we run into -- some of the wheels within wheels that we were talking about.

So it is not only a transportation problem, it's a problem of the entire structure of how you price grain handling in relation to the handlers. A few years ago we all felt, I'm sure, that the grain companies were not really very active in moving grain, because they were making a cent a bushel per month for storing it, and it was pretty good business just to store it in some of the country elevators and leave it there. This has changed somewhat now, but we still have to look at this other question, are there economic factors that are perpetuating the kind of thing that is happening on our coast, rather than looking at the whole matter and having to see whether or not we can rationalize the whole system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I did want to speak for a minute in relation to the question of the elevator system in Alberta. We believe that in spite of the very numerous reports of what the grains group under Ottic Lang has done -- and he has been kind enough to let us have a look at these, even though he has not made them public as yet -- we believe that an additional study is required, and that study is some sort of assessment of the impact on rural Alberta of elevator rationalization and rail line abandonment. If we, on one hand as a government and as a people, say that we believe in rural Alberta, we believe in being able to do some of these things in our rural communities, then I think that we have to be careful and knowledgeable about what happens to that rural community if the elevators are shut down or if we move them. What effect does it have on the budget of my hon. colleague, the Minister of Highways? If you do away with your present elevator system in Alberta and replace it with, as someone suggested, maybe 80 units throughout the province, it immediately means that you are going to have to have 72,000 lb. roads leading into those elevator centres. It immediately means a tremendous cost to the taxpayers in Alberta for the construction of highways. These are factors that haven't yet been taken into consideration by people who, with one paintbrush, would like to wipe out our elevator system as we now have it and replace it by fancy modern elevators.

It seems to me the logical answer, Mr. Speaker, has to be that we would sit down with the railways, we would sit down with the grain people; we would sit down with others knowledgeable in the whole area of what happens in moving a bushel of grain to a customer, and see if we cannot make the best use of the system we have now, with upgrading where necessary. We would see if we could bring up to date our (which my hon. friend talks about) archaic system; I agree with him there, but we also have an archaic system of freight charges on railways, and these have to be reviewed. We have to develop a better mechanism through which our province can make representations to The Canadian Transport Commission and through which our producers can have a greater input into the question of stopover charges, and the question of other railway charges.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, in my view, we should in that bargaining session make it clear that the Crowsnest Pass rates are not one of the cards that can be bargained for. I think we should make that very clear to everybody before we start. We need to have this kind of arrangement, Mr. Speaker, so we can develop a rational program that will enhance our producers' ability to market. It will enhance our peoples' ability to get that product to our consumer.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Moved by the hon. minister, adjournment of the debate. Agreed?

March 26th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-43

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, regarding business this evening, at 8:00 o'clock the government will submit Bill No. 3, The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, for third reading, and if that is granted, for Royal Assent immediately thereafter; followed by consideration of the government motion on page 10 concerning the five day adjournment at Easter, after which we will move to Supply.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House will stand adjourned now until 8:00 o'clock tonight.

[The House rose at 5:31 o'clock pm.]

\* \* \* \* \*

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

19-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

GOVERNMENT BILLS  
(Third Reading)

MR. MINIELLY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Hyndman, that Bill No. 3, The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act 1972 be now read a third time.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 3 was read a third time.]

SERGEANT AT ARMS:

His Honour the Lieutenant Governor.

[His Honour the Lieutenant Governor entered the chamber and took his seat upon the Throne.]

MR. SPEAKER:

May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly of the province has at its present sitting passed a bill to which, in the name and on behalf of the said Legislative Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

CLERK ASSISTANT:

The following is the title of the bill on which Your Honour's assent is prayed: Bill No. 3 The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act.

[The Lieutenant Governor signified his assent.]

CLERK ASSISTANT:

In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor does assent to this bill.

[His Honour the Lieutenant Governor withdrew.]

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move the government motion which appears on page 10, seconded by Dr. Hciner, that when the House adjourns on Thursday, March 30th, it shall stand adjourned until Wednesday, April 5, 1972. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is necessary to elaborate on the reasons offered to the House by the hon. Premier, about a week ago, regarding the usefulness of having Tuesday, April 4th available for members to canvass the feelings of those in their constituencies before coming back on Wednesday, April 5th. So the purpose of the motion, in addition to providing the usual four days during which the House stands adjourned at Easter, is to add one extra day, being Tuesday, April 4th.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, will the House stand adjourned on Thursday, at 5:30 pm?

March 28th 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

19-45

MR. HYNEMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. At the moment it certainly appears that that will be the time of adjournment on Thursday, therefore allowing the members to get away early on Thursday at 5:30 pm.

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent.]

#### BUDGET DEBATE

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this budget debate, I would like to join with the other hon. members in their congratulations to the hon. Provincial Treasurer on the presentation of his budget last Friday, March 17th.

In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the agri-business report with respect to the ratio of grazing land to arable land, was tabled in this Legislature on Friday, March 24th, and as this study will be paid out of the general revenues of the province, I feel I should make some remarks in this budget debate, with respect to the recommendations of this report. I should also point out, Mr. Speaker, that the report affects a number of departments of the government, including the Department of Municipal Affairs, the Department of Lands and Forests, and indirectly, the Department of Agriculture. This report is very important to a large segment of our province, and I refer of course, to the ranching industry. With respect to my constituency of Hanna-Oyen, I should say that our primary industry is the ranching industry. As an example I should point out that the special areas are made up of some 217 townships that exceed five million acres of land. Roughly 70% of this land is public land or Crown land, and so naturally you can quite understand the concern that I have with respect to anything that affects the grazing industry of this province. And so I say, Mr. Speaker, that decisions which will be made with respect to this report will affect everyone in the ranching industry, whether it is on a large ranch, a small ranch, or wherever it is -- in the southern part of the province, in the central part of the province or in the north. Maybe I should go further and say that perhaps no other decision which will be made by this government this year will be of more concern to the ranching industry than the decision with respect to the Sibbald report. This matter is extremely important. We realize it's very complicated and I think I will attempt to bring some of the points to the members of the Legislature tonight, so that you will fully understand some of the problems that I will be referring to.

Before dealing with the report, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be proper to review the history of the problem that was created when the government decided to bring the lease lands up to the taxation equivalent of deeded land. I am sure we will all agree that Crown lands should pay their fair share of the taxation dollar. As a matter of fact, the Western Stock Growers have always taken the position that they are prepared to pay their fair share of the taxation dollar. Naturally, they are not interested in paying more than their fair share, but they certainly are prepared to pay their fair share of the taxation dollar.

Going back to a period of time previous to 1969, the lease rental in the province of Alberta was established on a formula which was established in the Department of Lands and Forests, and this formula was quite simple. It is the price of beef times 250, times the forage value, divided by the carrying capacity, which results in X cents per acre for the lease. The price of beef is determined on the average of the Calgary market. The figure of 250 represents the weight gain, and the forage value is determined by the nutritional value of the grass.

It is quite easy to see, Mr. Speaker, that with this type of formula, as the price of beef increased or decreased in a particular

19-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

year, the resulting formula would increase or decrease in direct proportion. It should also be noted in this formula that the Department of Lands and Forests recognized that there is a difference in forage value in the different parts of the province. As a matter of fact, the forage value in the southern part of the province has been determined at 20%; 16.66% in the central part of the province, and 12.5% in the northern part of the province.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, that some two years ago when the study which I am going to be talking about tonight, was established, the forage value in the northern part of the province was reduced to 10%, and, as I understand it, it only implemented the outcome of the study.

Now with respect to the forage value of native grasses in different parts of the province, I should point out that grass in the northern part of the province - and I am speaking now of native grasses - drops drastically in nutritional value after a frost. This is one of the reasons the forage value in the northern part of the province is less.

We were very fortunate in this province to have the services of Mr. Campbell, who was the chief grazing appraiser for the Department of Lands and Forests for many years. He was recognized as an authority, not only in Alberta, but in many parts of the United States and other parts of Canada. Mr. Campbell is retired; I have not seen him for a few months, but I understand he is still living in Edmonton, and enjoying life after many years of very active service in the Department of Lands and Forests.

This, basically, establishes what we call "the formula". It was developed by Mr. Anderson some years ago and it was very well accepted. As the price of beef went up, the ranching industry contributed more to the provincial revenues. As the price of beef decreased, naturally what they paid decreased accordingly. This is what we call "the formula".

Now for many years, the formulas were levied and collected by the Department of Lands and Forests. Then in turn the department related 50% of the lease rental to the municipality in which the Crown land was situated. So we have a situation where the department levied the lease rental; the money is paid into Edmonton, and incidentally, along with this money they completed what is known as a cattle return, indicating the number of cattle and other useful information to the department. Then the department would rebate 50% of the lease rental to the municipality to assist in taxes.

Over a period of years the Rural Municipal Associations' annual convention consistently asked to have these lands placed on the tax role. And naturally, I think you can understand that in the township, many years ago, we had two sections cut of the township that were Crown lands, and you can see that from time to time some inequities could develop with respect to the amount of money that these particular areas would pay to the government in lease rentals.

So in 1968, the Department of Municipal Affairs prepared a pasture schedule which appeared in the Alberta Gazette of October 31, 1968. And it is interesting to note that the top grazing land in the province of Alberta is rated at \$12.50 an acre. I am referring now to the prairie, parkland and foothills which basically would be the area roughly from Edmonton south. They did place a value of \$12.00 an acre on the areas north of Edmonton in what is known as the grey wooded areas, although I believe there are some areas west of Edmonton, and possibly south. But basically, in the province, they had the two areas. For the purpose of my remarks tonight, I will contain them to the southern part of the province and use the figure of \$12.50 an acre. And incidentally, this is for a 16 acre carrying capacity. It is a very long schedule. It is not my intention to go

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-47

into it in very great detail except to say, as the carrying capacity decreased, then naturally the assessment value decreased. So we have a situation established by the Alberta Gazette and Order-in-Council setting up the value of \$12.50 for the top grazing land.

Now at this time, Mr. Speaker, I should point out that our arable land in the province has been established at a top assessment value of \$40. This has been established for many years. At one time it was \$30 and now it is \$40. No one has been able to tell me why this has been a \$40 figure, except that it has been established at that. But we start to talk about a comparison between grazing land and arable land assessments, it is quite easy to follow that on the one hand we have the top arable land at \$40, we have the top grazing land at \$12.50, and if you multiply or divide the one into the other, you will have a ratio of 1:3.2. And as you read the Sibbald report, they will refer on many occasions to the ratio of 1:3.2. It is very simple to understand how they arrive at this ratio of 1:3.2, and all that we are talking about tonight is this ratio.

I think we must also realize that when we talk about assessment in our tax structure, it is only through an assessment and a mill rate that we arrive at actual tax dollars. And consequently, if we have a ratio of assessment between grasslands which are not fair and equitable to arable lands, we will then have an end result which is not fair to the residents of that municipality. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is extremely important that the ratio of assessment between grass lands and arable lands must be fair and equitable.

Now looking at the assessment of arable lands I have already pointed out that the maximum assessed value is \$40 an acre. I should also point out that this value may be increased or decreased by the following factors:

(1) Advantage or disadvantage of location - in other words are you close to a market centre or are you farther away?

(2) Quality and productivity of the soil. This is very important to remember that the arable land is based on the productivity of the soil;

(3) Any profitable use that can be made of the land; and

(4) The benefit to the land of an irrigation or drainage project.

These factors are known as the plus and minus factors. So when the assessor makes his assessment he takes into consideration the proximity to urban centres, highway advantages, irrigation and many other factors, including stones and quite a number of things.

Irrespective, Mr. Speaker, whether this land is selling at \$150 or even \$200 an acre I again point out it is only assessed at \$40 an acre, which is based on the productivity of the soil.

Now coming down to pasture lands, assessment is determined by the carrying capacity. In other words, if you have a quarter section of land and it takes so many acres to pasture one cow for one year. So if you have a 16 acre carrying capacity it means it requires 16 acres to pasture one cow for one year, or looking at a quarter section, or 160 acres, this would pasture 10 cows for one year. The carrying capacity can also vary by the period of time that the grass is being used - for example, if the grass is only being used for a six month period it naturally will carry double the number of cattle. But that is a very simple explanation of the pasture land assessment. I should also point out that in the Department of Lands and Forests they have been very keenly interested in conservation. I think we have to recognize that grass is a renewable resource, and the carrying capacity that I have been talking about has been determined

19-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

by the amount of grass that is used to keep one cow for one year and at the end of the year there is a 47% carry over in grass. In other words, the amount that is required to feed one cow for one year will still provide for adequate conservation which will protect the renewable resources of this province. I want everyone to keep in mind that pasture lands are assessed on carrying capacity, and I also want you to remember that this is based on the productivity of the grass.

I think, Mr. Speaker, at this time it would be in order for me to refer to a court case, which I understand was an appeal from the province of Ontario with respect to assessment. I might say this morning I spent some time in the library looking through the Supreme Court of Canada. I was unable to locate this particular case, but I understand that the assessment in Ontario was appealed on the basis that it was not on the productivity of the soil. The Supreme Court of Ontario - I could be corrected but this is information that I have - ruled that the assessment must be based on the productivity of the soil of the grass.

So now we have a ratio of 1:3.2. Bringing it down to something that is quite a simple example, this means that if you have 100 acres of the very best arable land, and 320 acres of grazing land -- in both cases I am talking about good arable land and good grazing land -- you should be able to produce as much from the 320 acres of grazing land as you can from 100 acres of arable land. Bringing this down to very simple arithmetic, and using the figure of 40 acres carrying capacity, this means that on 320 acres of grazing land you should be able to produce eight head of cattle. So now if this formula is right, if this ratio of 1:3.2 is right, this means that you should be able to make as much off these eight head of cattle as you would on 100 acres of the very best arable land. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, you can talk to anyone in the cattle business, and if you tell them you can make as much off eight head of cattle as you can from 100 acres of good arable land, it will not take them very long to straighten out your thinking. And so I must say, in all sincerity, this ratio is not fair. It is not equitable.

In 1969 I raised this matter in public accounts, and we had a very interesting discussion. The motion that came from public accounts into the Legislature, read this way: "That the Legislature concur in the Public Accounts Committee recommendation that the Department of Lands and Forests new lease rental be postponed pending clarification of land assessment and taxation of Alberta." In the public accounts this motion was carried, and when it came into the House it was reported to the Legislature and then the motion did not carry. So that was the disposition of that motion in that first year.

Now following the assessment manual, the Western Stock Growers became quite concerned about this whole matter and they commissioned Hedlin Menzies to do a study, and Hedlin Menzies, using some information from the University of Alberta Agriculture, Economic Research Bulletin, January 1966, entitled "Income Variation and Beef Production", provided a 20-year average net income per cow figure for cow-calf enterprises, and other information. They reported that, in their opinion, this ratio should be 1:10. I should point out that they also made a recommendation that further studies be made. I should say, in all fairness to Hedlin Menzies, they only had a limited amount of time to prepare their report.

Following that, and coming back into the Legislature in 1970, I moved on February 10th that the government give consideration to initiating a study to determine if assessment rates now prescribed for application to arable lands, pasture lands, and lands used for haying purposes, are in fair and equitable relationship. Mr. Speaker, this motion was passed by the Legislature and the date was February 10, 1970.

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-49

It is interesting to note that about this same time the government had a committee which was known as the Special Committee on Assessment Taxation. This committee was commonly referred to as SCCA1. We have a number of members in the Legislature today who were members of the committee, and they possibly have more information with respect to its workings than I do. Except, I would point out, that one of the recommendations of the SCOA Committee was to have a comprehensive, unbiased study of grassland assessment. I should say, in all fairness to the committee, they didn't have really too much time to go into this in great detail, but the committee recommendation was to the effect that there should be further study, although they did report, that in their opinion, the ratio should be 1:4.2.

Now following the motion that was passed in the Legislature on February 10th, a special committee was set up with one member from the Department of Agriculture, one from the Department of Lands and Forests, and one from the Department of Municipal Affairs. This was a select committee, and I understand that this committee studied the matter for a period of time and were not able to come to a solution which was acceptable to the committee. They then reported to the government of the day, and following that we have the appointment of the Sibbald Committee.

It is interesting to note that on reading page three of the Sibbald Committee report it points out that the government appointed the steering committee and so on but I find it quite strange that no reference was made to the resolution which was passed in the Legislature, requesting this study. That is just something that I thought I would draw to the attention of the members.

Now, as far as the Sibbald report is concerned, the steering committee, in their brief study, did make a recommendation that the ratio should be 1:4.15. The Sibbald report was commissioned on February 16th, 1971, and was tabled in the Legislature on Friday, March 24th. I should just read you the terms of reference.

"The objective of this research would be to assemble representative sales information relating to trades of farm lands. This information would then be subjected to various statistical analysis in an attempt to drive ratios between arable and grazing land assessments, and to compare these with arable and grazing land assessments."

And so the steering committee made a recommendation that there would be 11 different areas on which they would like to see a study made, and just briefly I will read them to you:

Red Deer County No. 23  
Willow Creek Municipal District No. 26  
Wetaskiwin County No. 10  
Mountain View County No. 17  
Rocky View Municipal District No. 44  
Warner County No. 5  
Forty Mile County No. 8  
Minburn County No. 7  
I.D. No. 22 (That is north of the Peace River, I believe)  
Vermilion River County No. 24  
Stettler County No. 6

When you look at the areas that were selected, I believe Willow Creek has some area that goes out into the ranching country near the foothills, but basically the other 11 areas that I mentioned are pretty well between the Edmonton and Calgary corridor, with the exception of Minburn, etc. Then of course, we have the Forty Mile and Warner. I was a little disturbed that this particular committee would just recommend these 11 areas without the area that I represent, which is a large segment of the province, some 217

19-50

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

townships, with vast acreage of grassland. It seemed odd to me that this land would not be included in the study. Maybe I am more concerned with something at home than I am in other parts of the province. Nevertheless, this is part of the grass area of the province, and to me this would have been one of the areas that I felt possible should have been studied.

Reading from the Sibbald report on page 65, I should point out that in six of the 11 areas that I have mentioned, there were insufficient samples of grazing land to establish a ratio between the arable and grazing lands. When a committee is given the task of examining the Province of Alberta, selecting only 11 areas and six out of the 11 areas were not able to produce sufficient information for a report, I must question the reason why these 11 areas were selected. I should also point out, in all fairness, that the committee did make one recommendation that the ratio system of assessing arable land and grazing land does not appear to be valid. This is possible due to the fact that arable land and grazing land prices are moving up and down in response to a different set of factors than those reflected in the assessment manual. As well, different factors show up in southern Alberta than in central Alberta. They conclude their report by stating that further studies should be undertaken by the department concerned to isolate these factors.

So, Mr. Speaker, after having various groups look at our problem, which is affecting the grass industry in the whole Province of Alberta, we come down to this recommendation by the committee that we are now going to have some more studies. After four years of studies, we have a recommendation that we now should have some more.

I come back, Mr. Speaker, to the simple example that I used a few minutes ago. If you have 100 acres of arable land over here, if you have 320 acres of grazing land over there and if the assessment ratio is fair and equitable, you should be able to produce as much off one as you do the other, whether you start over here and go over there - no matter how you do it. In other words, there is no question in my mind that this ratio of assessment is wrong, and it is something that, in my opinion, should be corrected.

I have talked to many people this last four years with respect to this ratio of assessment, and I still have not found one rancher or farmer who will agree that this ratio is fair and equitable. As a matter of fact, the people that I talked to say that it should be 1:5, 1:6, 1:7. I have spent a great deal of time looking at various books that the farmers and ranchers keep, and I must say that from my observation, the ratio of 1:5 is possibly pretty close. I can't accept the figure of 1:10, I think it is too high. And after my simple illustration, I'm sure everyone in this Legislature will agree that the ratio of 1:3.2 is not correct.

I sometimes think that when we establish some of these commissions, instead of using some of these so-called experts -- and when you read some of these pages with their elaborate formulas, they certainly use mathematical terms and everything else, I don't want to be too critical of them -- we should use people with practical knowledge. The people that I talk to are the people who are raising cattle. These are the people that have the nitty-gritty of the cattle industry. When I talked to these people this last year, although cattle prices are higher today than they have been in previous years, they tell me they are making less money today than they were when cattle prices were lower. This is due to their increase in costs that they are not able to control. And so I say, Mr. Speaker, that when we have these studies, I would certainly recommend to the new government that you can place some people with some real practical experience on your committees. We have experts -- we can see what the experts have told us for four years. All they can tell us to do is to have some more studies. I think it is time

March 28th 1972

ALEERTA HANSARD

19-51

that we should start using some of the people that know something about the cattle industry.

I note with a great deal of interest that it is the policy of the government to extend loans to the cattle industry in the province. Are we now going to be in the position of extending loans to the cattle industry and then turn around and take an unfair share of their profits through the taxation dollar? This type of policy hardly seems reasonable to me.

And so we have a situation which shows study after study, and the only thing they can agree on is that there should be further studies. We have one study that indicates a ratio of 1:3.2. This is the result of the Assessment Manual of 1968. We have another study that says 1:4.15; another one that says 1:4.2; and then of course, the Hedlin report of 1:10. I want to make it quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that the sentiments that I am expressing here tonight are my own. I have not cleared them with our caucus on this side. This is the type of information that I have been saying publicly and in this Legislature now for some four years and I accept any responsibility for the figures and information that I am using here tonight. It's certainly not the policy. I have not even discussed it with anybody in the caucus. This book was tabled on Friday night, and the information that I am using here today is my little research over the week-end. I say if we are going into some of these new systems, why not just make it 1:5, which is a happy medium. If we are going into the decimal system, maybe 1:5 is a good ratio. And I say to the new government, when you were in opposition, you supported the view that the present assessment 1:3.2 is unfair. If we go back to the public accounts, a number of the members that were in opposition at that time certainly supported the motion that the ratio of 1:3.2 was unfair. And now that we have a new government, I say that one of the highest priorities of this government should be to correct this ratio assessment between arable and pasture lands. I would even go further and say that the Western Stock Growers and the people who have been using our pasture lands in this province have been very tolerant with us this last three or four years. The Western Stock Growers are a very fine organization. Their ranks are made up of some of the finest people that we have in this province. And I say again, Mr. Speaker, that they know this ratio is wrong. They know that they have been waiting for three or four years for somebody to correct it. I want to suggest something, that if we are not prepared to correct it, maybe someone may be tempted to resort to the courts to challenge the validity of this assessment. I am not saying they are going to do it; I am just suggesting they might. I think we recognize that a year or two ago we did have one group in the province who did appeal an assessment. I feel so sincerely in this matter, Mr. Speaker, I say that if we are so sure this ratio 1:3.2 is correct, then let us justify our position and let us take it to the courts and test the validity of this legislation.

I am not going to prejudge what will happen in the courts, but certainly, after my brief discussion tonight, I do not think there should be any doubt as to my position on this matter in this Legislature. I would certainly say, Mr. Speaker, and to the new government, let us make this ratio 1:5. Let us forget about all these studies. We recognize the ranching industry is not a small industry in this province - as a matter of fact we pride ourselves in having the finest beef any place in the world. I am not going into the figures of our production in beef as compared to other provinces in Canada. But we certainly have a very fine reputation.

We realize the ranching industry is a large part of our economy and I feel that this is a challenge to the new government. You now have this ratio of 1:3.2, and to me, this is one of the most important decisions the government will be making in the next year. And I ask the government to have a real look at it on behalf of the ranching industry of the province.

19-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

I see, Mr. Speaker, that my time is expired, so with these brief remarks, I want to thank you.

MR. FARFAN:

Will the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen permit a question?

Mr. Speaker, in all naivete, I am very impressed by the sincerity and clarity of the argument, but if it is such a bad deal, why is it the Crown leases change hands so often at a handsome profit?

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member repeat the question? He was not looking into the microphone.

MR. FARFAN:

This may be a very naive question, because I do not understand the subject too completely, but I just wonder, if it is such a bad deal, if the grazing leases are overtaxed, why is it they so often change hands at a handsome profit?

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, this question is very simple to answer. In the first place, I went into a little detail and explained that the assessment was changed in 1968. So we are looking at only a short period of time. It was not in effect until the following year. I should take the Farm Credit as a good example. For a person to go to Farm Credit, he must have what is known as an economic unit. And today, Farm Credit, as I understand it, recognizes a minimum of 100 head of cattle - in other words, you must have 100 head of cattle in order to have an economic unit.

The Department of Lands and Forests, I believe, have a regulation that says you cannot exceed more land than will support 500 or 600 head. It is one of those figures. One time it was 800 and I believe it is down to 500 or 600 now. To have an economic unit in the ranching industry today, you must have something more than 100 head of cattle. So, you come back to the economics of all farming. If you only have a small ranch here, and you must add to it, then if you take an assignment from someone else, there is a temptation for you maybe to pay more than what that land has actually been able to produce.

So this is one of the reasons why some of the prices that have been paid for some of these leases have appeared in court cases. Now incidentally, when you take an assignment of a lease, it also includes the fencing, the water holes, the dug outs and so forth that are on this lease. So when you take an assignment, you are actually paying the person that you take the lease from, for his fence, his buildings -- if there are any buildings -- the water holes, the dugouts, and all these other things.

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Member for Lethbridge East was on his feet first.

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. Provincial Treasurer for bringing to this Assembly his first budget. Unlike some of the other members, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel it necessary to stand up and make statements about the other members, which I will not do just to get my name in Hansard. I would like my attitude not

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-53

to change, but I have been warned, that if you sit in this House long enough, it will sure change.

The budget in my opinion is a most important document that is presented to the members of the Legislative Assembly. It lays down the guidelines for the ministers, and sets the basis of how our people will be taxed and governed in the coming year. It was said by the hon. Provincial Treasurer in his budget address, that Alberta has at the present time a low debt per capita, and as a result has a capacity to serve additional debt without strain. I would hope that our sound financial position stays in this healthy and enviable position. I can truthfully say that no government ever took over office and was in a better position to carry on affairs of the government and the people.

Mr. Speaker, we have in this province more hospital beds per capita than any province in Canada. We are envied by people who come to this province to see the way our senior citizens are cared for, and at the low cost to them. Our highways, bridges, universities, colleges and schools compare more than favourably with the rest of Canada, and I would like to add that we have the lowest per capita tax in Canada. This was all accomplished by the Social Credit government who were in power for 35 years.

When the Social Credit party took over some 35 years ago, they were not in the unique position of this government. As a matter of fact, there is a man living in Lethbridge who received a cheque from the UFA government for some road work and the bank refused to cash it. This is a far cry from the situation today, and I would hope that this province will never be in that state again. I find it hard to believe how the hon. members on the opposite side can run down the past administration for the way they have conducted the welfare of the province and its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I would like, as so many others have done, to talk about the removal of a 30 mill education tax from citizens over 65. I, like the rest, am in favour of this, but cannot see the logic of helping people who are living in luxury homes and do not need this help. Some of them are more able to pay this tax than the people who are working for a moderate wage and are just getting by. I would like to see some kind of a means test to determine who should be eligible to receive this tax deduction.

The \$50 grant to senior citizens is a step in the right direction, and maybe with a look at collecting taxes from those who are over 65 and able to pay, we would be able to help these people who really need it more. This would be a step in the right direction. We in southern Alberta welcome all the help that is given to agriculture and the marketing of our produce. Southern Alberta is a great agricultural centre, and our economy, to a great extent, is governed by agriculture and the marketing of our produce.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to say that we must preserve the small farms in the rural communities. We in southern Alberta are not affected by this as much as people in central and northern Alberta. I am in favour of helping to do this, but it is not going to be an easy task. In some cases this is not viable, and we must take a hard look to see that we do not force people into a situation which will not be desirable. It is easy to have a vision of what we would like to do, but to make this a reality is something different.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by touching on the borrowing of \$199 million for capital expenditures. This does not sound like much to start with, but this is the first budget brought down by this government. I would like us not to continue this kind of budgeting because we will not be in this enviable position very much longer. I am looking forward with great interest as to how the hon. members will explain to their constituents why they are not able

19-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

to give them all the roads, the senior citizens' homes and all the other things they promised them. I am sure we all realize that no government can give the people all they desire. We must do some things for ourselves and manage our affairs in a businesslike way. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, as this is my first opportunity to take part in the debate in this Assembly, I would like to begin by expressing my thanks to the voters of Calgary - Egmont and to say how very proud and very pleased I am to be able to represent them.

Calgary - Egmont is an unusual urban constituency. If we were to determine its boundaries by the diversity of its problems we would find that it is really a miniature of the whole province. In it are many people over 65; some live in their own homes, but many live in apartments. Nearly all of them live on modest means. This government's action in removing the Medicare premium for people over 65 and proposing the Senior Citizens Shelter Act will make life a little more comfortable for all of them, and I heartily endorse both of those actions.

Mr. Speaker, I have a city riding and it does have some unusual features. Perhaps one of these features can be matched by one or both of the hon. Members for Lethbridge, but not many other city ridings. It has in it, sir, a lake. It is a man-made lake, but lake it is. It also has in it a small town which is very much the same as any other small town within the province of Alberta. It has the same problems and the same difficulties. I may say, too, that it has on the outskirts some agricultural land, and while that is rapidly being depleted by encroaching residential property, I want here to serve notice on the Minister of Agriculture that his duties do not stop at the boundaries of the city.

Sir, in common with all Albertans, the people of Calgary Egmont are resourceful and energetic. An example of that is the community of Fairview, within the constituency. It recently opened a very lovely new recreation centre. The centre was planned, built and will be operated by the people of the community. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed by the fact that they raised from the people of the community half of the cost of the building, with the other half coming from grants. It is really an honour to be able to represent in this Assembly people with that kind of energy and resourcefulness.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to address myself to the budget. I suggest that a good test of the merit of the budget is the nature of the criticism it draws from the opposition. Now if that is a valid test, the budget proposed by the hon. Treasurer has passed it with flying colours.

I have carefully examined the several hours of comment the opposition voiced on the budget and have found very little that merits reply. They do say that by borrowing \$199 million the budget mortgages the future of Albertans. They say we are living in luxury and our children will have to pay for it. They stole the virtues of the pay-as-you-go philosophy. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. Premier and the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill answered that criticism much better than I can. They explained very well my philosophy and my thoughts on that criticism when they asked what programs would the critics have deleted from the budget. And that, of course, we have not had answered. They also asked if you would not delete certain of the capital works programs -- the operating programs. What would they have added by way of taxes? What taxes would they have increased? What new taxes would they have imposed? And that also, sir, has not been answered. I thought the Member for Calgary North Hill raised a very good point when he reminded us that the bulk of today's taxpayers have borne during their life time some

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-55

pretty heavy burdens. He reminded us that many of them had gone through a serious depression. He also pointed out that a great number of them had borne the cost of a war. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should also keep in mind that the bulk of our taxpayers today are educating their children better than children have ever been educated before. They are educating them longer and they are educating more of them. I think we should also bear in mind that today's generation of taxpayers are providing more for their parents than ever before in the history of this country. And I for one, Mr. Speaker, would be very hard pressed to say that we should add to the burdens of those taxpayers the additional burden of today paying cash for assets that will be used for many, many years by future Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, the tests we ought to use to determine how much money to borrow for capital projects are these. Firstly, is the capital work essential? Is it something we really need? Is it something that future generations of Albertans are going to use? And the second test is, can we afford, on the operating side of the budget, to pay the interest on the money we borrow and to make the annual repayments on the debt? We must remember that in the operating budget that has been presented to this Legislature, we have provisions for the payment of interest and payment of the annual instalments due on the debt. In my view, Mr. Speaker, this budget very easily passes both of those tests.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to talk about a subject that worries all attorneys general, as well as others, and that is crime. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the incidence or rate of crime, the means we use to control it, and what we do with the person who has committed the crime, are very accurate reflections of the nature of the society in which we live. For some time now I have been very concerned about the growing crime rate in Canada. Within the past eight years major crime across the whole of the country has increased by 100%. In the two major cities in Alberta major crime in about six years has increased by 100%. During those corresponding eight and six year periods, the population of Canada and the population of the two major cities grew by much, much less than that.

In short, in recent years the rate of growth of major crime has far outstripped the rate of growth of our population. In the future, Mr. Speaker, I will have a great deal to say about the crime rate, its controls, what we might do about it, and reforms that we might adopt in our correctional institutes.

Tonight I intend to confine myself to two aspects of crime. The first is what we call organized crime. One of the reasons I want to speak about that this evening, is that it is a matter of concern for a large number of Albertans. Since coming to this office on September 10th, I have had a number of people ask me about it. For that reason I thought it would be appropriate to say something on the subject tonight. First of all, I think I should define what I mean when I talk about organized crime, because that phrase has different meanings to different people, it has one meaning to the policeman, it has another meaning to the writer, and still another meaning to the person who hears the phrase used only occasionally. When I am speaking tonight about organized crime, I'm thinking of such things as gambling in all of its forms, prostitution, loan sharking, bootlegging, and perhaps, today, as serious as any, the narcotics trade. Now this kind of organized crime has a very special feature about it that distinguishes it from all other crime, and that special feature is this, all parties to the crime are willing, and in fact, eager participants to the crime. The person selling the drugs and the person buying them are anxious to do business together. The same can be said for the loan shark and his customer, and so on through all of the crimes I have just mentioned.

19-56

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

Now the members of this House will readily appreciate the difference between that kind of crime, and say, robberies, assaults, and crimes of that nature, because there the victim is not by choice a participant in the crime.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure everyone is aware that we have organized crime in Alberta, in the sense that we have the crimes that I have referred to. But the great threat is that such crime will grow into the size and type that haunts nearly every major city in North America. That is the kind of crime we think of when we hear the phrase -- La Cosa Nostra, the Mafia, or the Mob.

Organized crime on that scale brings with it a destructive capacity that is not found in other crimes. As it flourishes, it destroys the moral fibre of the community. I think that is sufficiently self-evident, that nothing more need be said about it. But more important, organized crime brings with it a life of fear, intimidation, and threat. Because it is a business, as I have said, because it has buyers and sellers and operates much the same way as any other business, it has the same need for regulation, the same need for rules, and the same need for enforcement of those rules, as has any other business. But organized crime operates outside the law, therefore it must provide its own rules, it must provide its own regulations, it must provide its own enforcement. It is the provision of the enforcement that brings with it one of the serious evils, because that enforcement operates also outside the law. For example, the pusher of drugs who doesn't pay his supplier's bill is first threatened, and if that doesn't work he has some physical violence worked on him, and if that doesn't work, something more serious follows.

The businessman who will not place the syndicate's gambling machine in his premises also becomes the target of threats and perhaps violence to either his person or his property. The apparently respectable citizen who becomes a user of drugs, becomes the victim of extortion. Again, Mr. Speaker, I do not need to remind the hon. members of this House that this kind of thing happens regularly in nearly all of the major population centres in North America. Mr. Speaker, when organized crime reaches that stage, I think it is fair to say that fear is its product, brutality is its trademark, and disabled minds and bodies its legacy.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we can now ask the question. If this kind of crime has come to nearly every major population centre in North America, can we keep it from Alberta? In my view we can keep it from Alberta, and we will. I say that because I am confident that we have, and will continue to have, in Alberta the two things that prevent that kind of growth of organized crime. Those two things are firstly, an honest police force, and secondly, an honest government.

Mr. Speaker, I need a few moments to explain why in my view an honest police force and an honest government are an impregnable barrier for organized crime. We must remember that organized crime, as I said earlier, is a business. It has to be a large business to bring with it the kind of evils that I have mentioned. It must, when it is of that size, have offices, it must have bosses, must have lines of communication, it must involve many, many people. In short, when it reaches that kind of a business, its presence within the community is so large that it cannot go for long undetected by the police. That being so, because its presence is always, at that size, going to be known to the police, it simply cannot exist or function unless it is able to buy protection. That it has been successful in buying protection in other major population centres, there is absolutely no doubt. Reports over the past few years, coming out of cities like Chicago, and the more recent investigation into the operation of the police force in New York, contain estimates that as much as one third of the policemen in those cities were on the payroll of the underworld. I think it is clear that organized crime

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-57

in all those areas could not have functioned without being able to buy that kind of protection from the police forces.

Mr. Speaker, as flourishing crime cannot go undetected by the police, dishonesty of any magnitude within the police force cannot go undetected by the government. Mr. Speaker, you will understand my confidence in this province's capacity to resist the growth of organized crime, when I say that in my view, we have a police force as free of dishonesty as any in the world.

I think we in Alberta are often too inclined to take for granted the merits of our police force while we dwell on their shortcomings. I am delighted that Albertans get upset when they hear of the slightest impropriety on the part of the police, because I think the greatest guarantee of our freedom is that we should be ever ready to make a fuss whenever we hear of anything which might be an improper use of position or authority.

But I am concerned that we do not appear to strike a balance between the merits of the policemen and his shortcomings. We don't read or hear very much about the difficulties of law enforcement, the many occasions which call for great courage on the part of a policeman, the fact that nearly always they carry out their duties in a humane and skillful way. We don't hear very much about that, whereas we hear a great deal whenever there is the slightest slip from what we have properly come to regard as required standards of the policemen.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, we need to occasionally remind ourselves of the things that the police do well. We need also to ponder the reasons why they have given us such good service and make sure that we do not do things that might destroy those reasons.

Mr. Speaker, I don't, by my remarks, want to leave the impression that there is not much to be done to improve our police force. There is. And there is also much to be done to ensure that Alberta is kept free of the kind of organized crime that has eaten away at North American cities. But Mr. Speaker, because of the honesty that has existed, and in my view now exists, in the police force and the political forces of this province, I am confident that our cities will not become duplicates of New York or Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to turn to the second aspect of crime that I said I would like to speak about. It is an entirely different area, and it is one that most of us do not call to mind when we think of crime. But measured in the cost of human life, pain and suffering, and financial loss, it is among our most serious problems. Mr. Speaker, I am referring to the drinking driver. And for a moment I need to refer to some statistics to demonstrate what a serious threat he -- and in deference to the Women's Liberation Movement, she -- might be.

In the year 1971, Mr. Speaker, 465 people were killed in motor vehicle accidents in Alberta. During the same year, another 12,000 were injured. Now, and I think this is important, Mr. Speaker, 40% of all of those people, that is the persons who were killed or the persons who were injured, had been drinking prior to the accident. That figure includes passengers, drivers, pedestrians and so on. But it indicates the very close relationship between people who have been drinking and accidents. Now another statistic which is connected with that, and equally important, is that 50% of the drivers involved in the fatal accidents had been drinking.

Mr. Speaker, in order to get a more accurate idea of the relationship between drinking and driving, we have to go a little further than those statistics. I think it is helpful though to consider what percentage of the total miles driven in Alberta are driven by people who have been drinking, because that gives us some

19-58

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

idea of relationship between the risk of being in an accident and the fact that you have been drinking. I think if you start with the total miles driven in Alberta, and from that figure you can immediately deduct, for practical purposes, all commercial vehicles -- when you think of taxis, delivery vehicles, buses, salesmen, you will appreciate that they constitute a very substantial percentage of the total miles driven. Essentially, I think that those miles are driven by people who have not been drinking. You can also deduct nearly all driving that occurs prior to 5:00 in the afternoon, again because people who are driving prior to that time, by and large, have not been drinking. You need too, to keep in mind that the drinking driver is normally someone who is on a short trip. The people who are taking long trips generally have not been drinking. So you will readily appreciate that the person who has been drinking really drives a very small percentage of the total miles driven in the province. And yet, those persons are involved in approximately 50% of the accidents involving fatalities.

Mr. Speaker, there are in the world programs which are now in use, which we do not have in Alberta, which have significantly reduced the accident rate. I am talking of programs that have reduced the number of drivers who have been drinking. In fact, the other day I was looking over some statistics which indicated that in some of the European countries, they had been able to reduce, by various programs to keep drinking drivers off the highway, the accident rate by 25% and 30%.

If we take those figures and apply them to what happened in Alberta last year, we would reduce the death toll by more than 125. We would reduce the number of injured people by more than 3,000. When I use the figure 3,000, some cities or towns in the province that have about 3,000 people in them immediately come to my mind, and I am thinking about places like St. Paul, Olds and Innisfail. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask these questions. Let us suppose in the town of Olds there was something like 150 people dying each year from some disaster. Let us suppose all of the other people living in those towns, that is roughly 3,000 of them, were injured in the one year, with some of them losing their sight, others losing arms or legs, and the remainder suffering injuries of greater or lesser seriousness. I say, just imagine that situation happening in Alberta.

If that occurred, what inconveniences would Albertans suffer to prevent such a disaster? How much money would Albertans spend to ensure that the disaster was not repeated year after year?

Mr. Speaker, when I imagine that situation, and imagine what Albertans would do to prevent it occurring year after year, and then look at what we are doing to prevent a similar disaster on our highways year after year, I cannot help but reach the conclusion that we treat that kind of disaster much, much, differently from the way we treat the drinking driver.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is a very important part of my department's job to try to develop programs which will be acceptable to Albertans, and which will reduce that annual disaster.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say there are many people in Alberta who know much more than I do about the causes of crime, about its control, and about what should be done with a person who breaks the law. In my view, my obligation is to try to provide leadership for the development of programs to control crime, and to deal with the person who is convicted of crime. As the first step, Mr. Speaker, towards developing those programs, immediately after this House recesses, I propose to begin having meetings with the senior law enforcement officers of the province, the police commissions within the province, the senior officers of our correctional institutes, the parole and probation personnel in the

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-59

province, and other persons having a special interest or a special knowledge of these matters.

Now, Mr. Speaker, out of such meetings I am hopeful will come the policies that will make Alberta a happier and healthier place for all of us to live.

DR. FAFROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to take part in the budget debate handed down by this government and by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, which I consider is an excellent budget. I think it was handled well; it was clear, concise and precise, and I think the Provincial Treasurer indeed, should be congratulated.

I would like to say from the outset that I am competent as a voice for Edmonton Kingsway and a voice from the province of Alberta, the citizens of this province will accept this budget without any hesitation. I consider this budget truly a people budget, truly a people-children budget, truly a people-senior citizens or older people, as they prefer to be called, priority oriented budget. A budget that recognizes priorities as they are, not on a theoretical or hypothetical plane. This budget of course, recognizes those things that are priorities, handicapped children, mental health, and so forth. This government, therefore has shown that it recognizes the individual and the family.

I do not intend to review the many other positive items contained in the budget. These already have been dialogued and duologued by members of this Assembly very well. However, I do intend, Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes to indicate what I see as some of the considerations that must be emphasized and possibly reconsidered.

Health costs. It has been stated very well by many members, both opposite and on this side of the House, and by the Minister of Health and Welfare federally that costs are going up very rapidly. They have increased by 13.2% in 1970 up to \$4.3 billion from \$3.8 billion in 1969. We spent per capita \$216 for health care. In Ontario they spent \$228 and in EC and Manitoba they spent \$203, in Quebec they spent \$193, and it goes down from that point on. So you can see in Alberta we are spending a large amount on health costs. The hospital care in Canada has also increased in 1970 by 13.1%, and physicians' services have also increased by 14.2%. But this is gross, and I want to remind you of that.

I have already stated that Canadians and Albertans are spending more on health care than many countries of equal or approximately equal socio-economic level, in Europe and elsewhere. And we are receiving, on the basis of information that is well calculated, probably less for the total health package. My observation here is that while the direction in the budget for health and social development is excellent, it is long overdue, and the specifics mentioned are first class. But what I am afraid of is that we are falling into the same trap that the previous administration has already opened. And each addition, although very, very important -- and I concur completely -- I am afraid may be a part of a segmented and not a part of a total co-ordinated program. The result, of course, is what? -- increased costs, increased inefficiency, fragmentation, and worse than that, the people have already paid for it, and the services may not come to them due to this fragmentation and mass bureaucracy. I merely mention this to caution everyone, including the government. But I do state here and now, a proper co-ordination is evolving and I congratulate the Minister of Health and Social Development for that.

Most of the health expenditure is in hospitals. It appears that the health care expenditure is about two times for hospital care and

19-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

one time for the balance of health and social development. And salaries and wages in hospital are the most important items of expense, the most important components of total cost for hospital care. Medical care is only one fragment of cost. There are a few main reasons for this rise in hospital costs, and I would like to mention these few main reasons. There is a desire to close the gap in wages and working conditions between hospital and other industries, and this is right, and it should be done. There is also the increased complexity in costliness of hospital care, caused by increased specialization, various equipment, highly trained personnel, and so forth. These medical advances rarely yield a decrease in so called unit cost, which is, of course, total expenditure per patient day. There is also increased volume use and increased length of stay.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer several remedial steps to this Assembly to modify this increased cost in hospital care, which makes up such a vast proportion of the total health costs. May I suggest that we improve hospital management. Let us improve efficiency by closing the gap between administration and the health professionals that are working in the hospitals. I understand the Minister of Health and Social Development is going in this direction and I am very pleased about that. But the administration, medical doctors, nurses and all the staff involved in hospitals should know about efficiency and should be intimately involved otherwise you will not have efficiency, but hampered efficiency.

We should improve budgeting, we should provide a basis for actual and anticipated expenses. We should provide statistical and financial and other data information that should be carefully verified and calculated and offered to the hospitals so that they can use this in the cost of service. There should be standards and measures of performance. These must be clear and understandable by all hospitals. I submit that this advice and guidance must be provided by the provincial government through its hospital service section of The Alberta Hospital Service Commission, to assist hospitals in improving their budgeting and therefore either decrease costs or at least get optimum service for dollar cost.

Let me mention another point, Mr. Speaker, there should be shared services. By shared services I mean things like computer time. We know computers can save time and save money. If this is true, and I submit here that it is true, then if computers are too expensive for one hospital I suggest that we share computer services. We should share laundry service, standardize charts. This one area especially is just amazing. A doctor or nurse will go from one hospital to another and the temperature page is a different colour, different standard, different quality paper and so forth. This is, I think, inexcusable in a modern society. We can share sterilization facilities. We should increase use of disposable supplies. All this is especially true in complexes where there are active hospitals, nursing homes and auxiliary hospitals side by side. I think we could afford very well to consider central stores for all supplies for hospitals across the province and certainly for complexes. We have to review what is an optimal size for a hospital. As I understand it there are some 115 hospitals in the province of Alberta, and I stand to be corrected, where there are under 100 beds. It is well established that any hospital with under 100 beds is not an optimal size, it is inefficient and very, very costly. The only excuse for such a hospital to exist in a community is if the travel time to go to a hospital is more than one and a half hours.

I think that consideration must be given here for the cost of education of health professionals in hospitals. I think this should be shared by all people in the province with appropriate share, of course, from the federal government.

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-61

Another point, I think we should increase the use of alternative services and facilities outside of active hospitals. Use the community resources, deinstitutionalize people. I will not dwell on community health and social development centres because this will be covered later, but emphasis should be placed on special homes of the deinstitutionalized type. I understand the minister is going again in this direction and I congratulate him. But again we can offer something else. Why not have motels near hospitals where people can wait while they are being investigated, if they are not very ill, or at least have a minimal care unit near such hospitals. We should expand Victorian Order of Nurses care, we should expand so called Meals on Wheels so that patients can stay at home, all within a home care program. I do not think this should be delayed, because delay costs millions of dollars every year.

I think we should place emphasis on a vigorous rehabilitation program. And this rehabilitation program is not only for active hospitals but also for nursing homes and auxiliary hospitals in order that these people in our auxiliary hospitals, in our nursing homes, who are senior citizens, will be brought up in the level of care, brought up in the level of their health, so they will not lose their dignity, and so their health cost will also go down.

Let me give you an example. Most of us I am sure, and I suspect many doctors feel -- what is the use of rehabilitating auxiliary hospital or nursing home patients when they are chronic patients and they should be just left there essentially to die. I disagree with this and I do not think this government has this negative philosophy. Most people can be rehabilitated to a certain degree and let me give you an example; if a patient can merely be taught to feed himself with one hand, this represents 10 minutes of feeding each meal. And his dignity will be restored. And if you are concerned about money, Mr. Speaker, if this Assembly is concerned about money and it should be, this represents, in fact, 912 hours per staff in five years. If you multiply this by \$2 per hour roughly, and multiply this 912 hours by 5,000 nursing home patients, not the auxiliary hospital patients, this represents roughly \$10 million over the five year period, which is \$2 million a year.

I recommend to this government that a rehabilitation team should be established as soon as possible, to go around this province and activate these patients as much as possible and teach the staff in nursing homes and auxiliary hospitals about rehabilitation. Not only to teach the nursing homes and the auxiliary hospitals, but also to make staff aware of facilities in and out of the institutions. And to this end also I suspect that many of the senior citizens in the nursing homes could possibly even be productive in some small way. And their productivity, although it may not produce much money, may produce a considerable amount of money. It gives them the increased dignity by participating in some work like occupational therapy; I think that they would be very, very satisfied.

Let me point out another area where improvements can be made to decrease hospital costs. Architectural changes in homes to keep patients at home where, in fact, they want to be. What does this mean? An extra banister, a ramp, for a few hundred dollars. And if we do not do this, the alternative is to place the patient in a nursing home or an auxiliary hospital which represents thousands of dollars over many, many years and loss of dignity.

I suggest we evaluate hospital use of beds and efficiency of general hospitals. It has been stated many times, and I know this to be a fact, that at least half the patients in every active hospital in this province, using a \$40 to \$50 bed per day could use a less expensive facility. But it is not available so they are using a more expensive facility. For the size of hospital I mentioned I think there should be better preparation of patients and investigation prior to admission to active hospitals, so that there would not be

19-62

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

any delay of care. And when the patient enters the hospital the rehabilitation team starts immediately, because rehabilitation should start the day of entry, or even before entry. Now when the members opposite criticized doctors' salaries and laboratory facilities, for example that they are too high, I submit to them that they should consider that these laboratory facilities which are carried out, outside the hospital have indeed decreased hospital stays.

Let us talk, if I may for a minute, Mr. Speaker, on federal cost-sharing. My thoughts are certainly in tune with that of the government and the Premier. However, when I reviewed the hospital cost-sharing during the period, and only one period, and as a cursory survey between 1962 to 1968, I found out that the previous administration did not take full advantage of cost sharing with the federal government. I think this is a serious matter. Why is it serious? Because we have paid the taxes already and it was our duty and the duty of the members opposite when they were in government to recapture these funds from the federal government for hospital cost within the federal-provincial cost-sharing formula. But what did this represent between the period of 1962 to 1968, which represents seven years, \$50 million in round figures. But worse than that, not only did we lose \$50 million that we paid taxes for already, but the municipal governments had to pay this \$50 million over again. This means \$100 million. Now I did not take the year prior to 1962 or after 1968, I was afraid to. I also want to mention that there were millions of dollars lost before we entered the Medicare scheme because of delay. I just want to remind the members opposite that we are aware that dollars equal sweat and toil and I do not think they have forgotten, and certainly we have not forgotten, how hard it is to earn a dollar. We cannot afford to have this type of blundering in federal provincial cost sharing when 30,000 children did not have a few million dollars for facilities or the mental health programs. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is the reason why that administration is now opposite to the majority of the people.

Regarding welfare, I will only make one comment. Welfare costs are rising, we know this. Where are the incentives? One of the members opposite said that one in ten is a deadbeat. I say to you this is false. They are not deadbeats. Almost 95% of those people actually would like to work, but I submit 50% of the people can work providing there were incentives, but there are no incentives

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct what the hon. member has said. I made no such statement that one in ten persons on welfare were deadbeats. I said that when I checked out the people that had complained to me of welfare abuses I found that one in ten at the most was what I could consider as a legitimate complaint. But I made no such statement that one in ten people in Alberta who are receiving welfare are deadbeats.

DR. FAFBESKI:

Fine, thank you very much.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that 50% of the people that are on welfare at this present time could be off welfare if there were proper incentives. Incentive programs were offered to the previous administration by welfare recipients themselves, but the previous administration did not hear them. And I suggest that we should offer to these welfare recipients a definite incentive program which would evolve over the next few months and years.

Let me turn to Medicare and the medical doctors. And this is the prime reason I really got up on this debate. I am amazed, and I am sick and tired that the hon. members opposite -- as a matter of fact many people besides the hon. members opposite -- have nothing

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-63

else to attack in the health system but the medical doctors who have been historically the central core of health care in Canada. As a matter of fact we should be proud of them. As the hon. Attorney General stated, he is proud of his police force; I am proud of our medical doctors, because I feel that in Alberta we have a group of medical doctors second to none anywhere in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, one of the hon. members opposite said that \$237 million was spent for hospital care and employed 23,000 employees; I hope that is true. Well, if there were no doctors there would be no hospitals and there would be no patients in hospitals, and as a result, no employees for those hospitals. Medicare spends \$120 million dollars for 2,200 MD's and employees. It should not have been said that way. I think it should have been said this way -- that \$120 million is spent for Medicare for 2,200 or 2,400 doctors and all of the associated employees directly and indirectly related to them. This represents at least 10,000 employees, plus the office rental, plus the additional service for janitor supplies, car service, tax dollars for our coffers, federal coffers and the supporting staff. Yes, the multiplying effect for services by medical doctors is an industry in itself.

Let us turn to the salaries that were mentioned. The medical doctor is receiving \$58,000 dollars in 1970-71 on the average. Firstly, this is a gross earning, and let us make this clear. The public must not be misled. Secondly they are not even true averages because they took those earning over \$10,000. I mention this is a gross figure and not a net figure. Thirdly let us consider how this net may look after the various deductions. And I submit here, Mr. Speaker, I do not think these doctors need a defence, but it is important that the public have a clear understanding where the expenses really go.

Assume a doctor grossed \$58,000 in 1970-71 (and this is not the true average, it is the average of doctors over \$10,000). Then 40%, or \$23,000, represents overhead. One quarter of the time is overtime, and I submit at least one-quarter or one-fifth of the time is overtime. Doctors work anytime, one, two or three o'clock in the morning, and this is not time and a half. This represents another \$11,000, and I submit any member can work overtime and earn money. He has to pay his own pension, insurance and retirement plan, which represents \$4,200 a year.

He has to pay back his educational costs which takes roughly ten years at \$4,200 a year. You now have a total expense of approximately \$37,000. If you remove that from approximately \$58,000 you have a net income and the doctor has to pay taxes on this of approximately \$21,000. If the overhead is too high for you, then let us make it 30%. If the overhead is only 30% then he still nets \$26,000 before taxes. After 8 to 10 years of training, with the associated life responsibility, stress kills medical doctors approximately ten years earlier than most other people. Is he overpaid? Ask yourself this question. I think the members should be ashamed of themselves when they go to call a doctor next time; maybe their necks will be red. They may be red for a different reason. I hope you don't have to beg for contentment.

In conclusion, let me say the people want service - we must provide it. They pay the taxes and the premiums for it. If we say the medical doctor is overworked and they have no choice, then I agree. Let's do something about it. Let's provide allied health professionals; let's provide community health centres so they will be less overworked.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of my thoughts and specific concerns and I hope they will be resolved in the months and years ahead. Thank you.

19-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

MR. SCRENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments and observations on the budget. The presentation of the budget was handled very capably by the Provincial Treasurer, the hon. Gordon Miniely. The hon. Treasurer's grandparents were one of the first settlers in my home area - 1905 and 1906. They were certainly a credit to the community. When they decided to move to another location, my parents purchased their farm and own it to this day. The basement of the house remains, as well as the stonework on the barn. It is situated on a hill overlooking a beautiful valley. Many antiques have been picked up there, among them ex shoes which our hon. member's grandfather manufactured at the forge.

Last fall, while walking across the farmstead, I noticed an object shining brightly in the sun. A mole had dug up a coin and it was untarnished by the elements. The hon. member's grandfather had owned this coin and somehow he had let it slip through his fingers or out of a hole in his pocket, I do not know which. We will excuse the grandfather; however, hon. Treasurer, don't you be guilty of letting hard earned taxpayers' dollars slip through your fingers!

This was the first opportunity for me to be present when an Alberta budget was brought down. I enjoyed it very much. Upon visiting the Legislature last year while it was in session, one thing especially caught my curiosity. It was the manner in which many MLA's were coming and going in the House. Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure you that the following few comments do not stem from any recent developments in this House. Last year I noticed that the Premier would speak and shortly after he would retire from the House. The Provincial Treasurer would make some important pronouncement and he would leave for a short time. The Leader of the Opposition would have something to say and he would be excused. This spring, before coming to the session, I assured my family that I would stay in my place through thick or thin. I have learned a number of things since that time, Mr. Speaker. People leave to meet with TV, radio personnel and the press; others are called out to meet with delegations or their constituents, and that has happened to me. Many MLA's have accepted speaking engagements which sometimes necessitate leaving a little early; and I had to cancel an appointment in my constituency tonight. Many MLA's, especially those who are very active physically, find it hard to remain seated for the long hours required here each day. This is true, especially at the beginning of the session I believe. Well I am present this evening and I have been every day because of, number one, a concern for the taxpayers of my constituency, and number two, a concern for the taxpayers of the entire Province of Alberta.

Many have found that their ambitions have been seriously nipped in the budget. It has made me sad, and speaking to many of my constituents, during the weekend even, it was clear that they, too, are downcast. Our hon. Minister of Highways, as well as the Minister of Lands and Forests surely must be distressed at the contents of this budget. On February 25, 1971, the present Minister of Highways introduced a resolution calling for an extra-ordinary capital financing plan which would improve serious deficiencies in the north-south road systems of our province. It seemed to be his contention that the grid road allocations of 1971 were but a drop in the bucket. Why then has so precious little attention been given to highways in this budget? I have heard no voice from government members concerning our north-south highways, specifically Highways 36 and 41. These highways constitute approximately 800 miles of major transportation. Highway 41 which serves the eastern portion of our province, is 350 miles from south to north. Highway 36 is the major highway running through the heart of this province, and it is approximately 450 miles in length. There is a portion of No. 41 in my constituency that is begging to be graded, begging to be constructed. This portion of unconstructed roadway is in the centre

March 28th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

19-65

of this arterial highway system. Thus, no thoroughfare exists in the eastern portion of our province. Highway 36 demands blacktop which will enable the transportation of heavier loads, such as oil, coal, livestock, heavy equipment, rape and other grains. Both of these highways have active highway associations. They have faithfully held annual meetings for the past 20 years. They have had cavalcades and other promotional ventures. Each year, briefs are presented by delegations visiting the minister. On numerous occasions, the minister or his deputy visits the area, and they are present at the annual meetings. Both associations were represented at the tourist meetings in Calgary, held in February, and both associations presented briefs to the hon. Minister of Tourism, Mr. Dowling. What greater means can there be of attracting tourism to Alberta than the provision of top quality north-south highways for vacationers to travel on. Gooseberry Lake Park is the only provincial park that we have in our constituency. It is located 12 miles north of Consort. There is a dirt road leading to it, and in the summer it is very dusty. If there was a better road in this area many more thousands of people would visit that park each year, I am sure. The grid road system got off to a good start in my constituency in 1971. Approximately 10 miles was realized north of Coronation, and eventually this will link Highways 12 and 13 and will be very welcome to the towns of Hardisty, Loughheed, Alliance East, and Coronation.

I am pleased to report that construction has started on the senior citizens' home at Sedgewick. This home is a replacement. Many years ago a high school dormitory was converted to a home for the aged, and this building deteriorated to the state where it was finally condemned. We are expecting twins in this respect. The eastern portion of the constituency is crying for a senior citizens' home, and we hope that we will receive this much needed facility immediately. Back in February, we opened a new nursing home in Coronation, a very beautiful building, and we are very happy with this service.

I have mentioned the need for a wildlife officer in my area. It seems that every Tom, Dick and Harry and Mary flock in our direction when the season opens for deer, goose, upland game, ducks. There are even wild turkeys in the area. We have a vacant RCMP barracks in Hardisty, a casualty to the hub system of policing, and this would be ideal for a wildlife officer. Hon. Mr. Warrack, please take note.

Many things are not needed in the constituency of Sedgewick-Coronation. Our problem at present is not the need for new schools. There may be some additions needed. There is a need to keep our present schools occupied. It is not a need for huge new hospitals, although we could use an auxiliary. There are five hospitals in our constituency, all strategically located and running smoothly, but under a financial burden. This constituency does not need any teacher strikes, and has been very fortunate in this respect.

The closing of a government service, for example, a licensing service, brings a quick reaction from our constituents. Each town or village, and there are many in my constituency, is very reluctant to let any service slip away. I view my position as MLA for Sedgewick-Coronation as that of "Horatius on the Bridge". We will not be overrun by needless centralization. We want to keep what we have. We welcome new industries, and new people and we feel there should be definite policies that will enable people to work and live where they wish to work and live.

We need an upsurge in agriculture that will enable our young people to go farming, and those who are now farming, to be able to remain on the farm.

Some of our needs at this time would have to be an animal slaughtering facility and a rape processing plant. My constituency is at the hub of rape production. The eyes of Alberta were focused

19-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 28th 1972

---

on Flagstaff last summer, when we were literally overrun by the Eertha Army Worm. From all reports, this has not discouraged our farmers, and they are planning on seeding a record number of acres again next year.

People of Alliance and surrounding areas have been working toward the erection of this project, and I am convinced this is top priority for that area.

Another need, of course, in the constituency, is to get some spending money into the farmers' pocketbooks. The two-price system for wheat is a giant step forward in this respect. It was Victor Quelch, I understand, the Social Credit MP, who first advocated this system while he was in Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, with the budget in mind, one cannot help but wonder, where have our good days gone -- the good days that we have been so accustomed to here in Alberta? Where, oh where, is the budget taking us? The people of Alberta can be thankful that we go to the polls every four years. In four years we will be looking at a huge deficit. The budget indicates this. Thank you.

DE. HCHCL:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour has asked leave to adjourn the debate. Does the House agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CLERK:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier has moved that the House stand adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 10:05]