

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Wednesday, March 29th, 1972

(The House met at 2:30 pm.)

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 45 The Department of Culture, Youth, and
Recreation Amendment Act, 1972

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 45 being The Department of Culture, Youth, and Recreation Amendment Act 1972. The act proposes to facilitate and expedite the actual work of the department in initiating, fostering, and encouraging the orderly development of all constructive forms of culture, youth, and recreational activities. It proposes to permit the department to use a seal and give authority to reproducing it mechanically as, for example, in the processing of our achievement awards. It proposes to permit the minister to rent facilities, purchase and sell goods, such as books at the Provincial Museum. The act further proposes to permit the minister to initiate policies to encourage and promote maximum interest in the participation in sport and physical fitness programs.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 45 was introduced and read the first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, today I am especially delighted to be able to introduce to you and through you to all members of the Assembly, 77 lively and alert youngsters from Grades IV, V, and VI in Glenora School accompanied by their Principal, Mr. J. W. Benson, and their teachers, Mr. D. Blackford, Mrs. C. Roth, and Mrs. Percy. This school visit is of special interest to the hon. Premier and myself insofar as both our daughters attend this school. They are in the members gallery, Mr. Speaker. I would ask now that they stand and be recognized by the Legislative Assembly.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, on your behalf I would like to introduce to you and through you 60 members from the St. Thomas More Grade IX class in the constituency of Meadowlark and their teachers, Mrs. Pirot and Sister Barbara. May they please rise and be recognized.

20-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure today in introducing, again, from the Peter Pond School in Fort McMurray, 34 Grade IX students. They are accompanied by three staff supervisors, Mr. Robert Crowe, Mr. Robert Jones, and Mrs. Margaret Shysh. The students left home at 5:30 this morning and travelled over the famous Fort McMurray highway, except that today, they were not too lucky. They did not have time to visit any place because they had trouble on the road, and did not get here until just before the opening of the session this afternoon. I would like them now to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you to the Assembly, ten students from the Diagnostic and Treatment Centre who are in the members gallery, accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Isabelle Tricker and a staff member, Mr. Sig Janssen. I'd like to congratulate them for taking an interest in the governmental activities and hope one day some of them may sit in this Assembly. I ask them to rise now and be recognized. Thank you.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, it is my very sincere pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and to the hon. members of this House a very distinguished gentleman, a parliamentarian who has served as a member of the House of Commons for the past 14 years, first as MP for Athabasca, and then after the redistribution, as MP for the constituency of Pembina. He has served not only the people of these constituencies, but the people of all Canada on various important committees, one of them being as vice-chairman of the NATO committee. I would now ask Mr. Jack Bigg to stand and be recognized.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table Returns No. 153 and No. 154 ordered yesterday.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table, as required by statute, the annual report of the Alberta Investment Fund for the year ended December 31, 1971, and the annual report of the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation for the year ended December 31, 1971.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table three reports, as required by statute. The first one is Sessional Paper No. 27, the report of the Department of Social Development as it then was for the period ending March 31, 1971. The second one is Sessional Paper No. 33, the reports of the accounts of the University of Alberta Hospital Board, and the third one is the report of Inspection of Laboratories of Animal Care and Facilities, carried out during 1971.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, I have the answers to two written questions which I would like to file at the present time. The first one is in Sessional Paper No. 119. This is a Return that was ordered by the House and answers a motion standing in the name of hon. member Mr. Ray Speaker in regard to family units receiving social assistance. The other one is Sessional Paper No. 128 in regard to a grant made to two citizens to assist them in developing a program to find work for senior citizens.

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-3

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Hunting Season

MR. DRAIN:

I'd like to ask the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests if, in view of the heavy snow that we have in our area and with the conceivably heavy loss of calf crop amongst our antlered animals, he would give consideration to revising the hunting season for this year?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, yes it was an extremely severe storm in southern Alberta -- southwestern Alberta in particular -- where it is reported to me that they had an additional 55 inches of snow at Waterton and 25 additional inches of snow at Lethbridge. This particular storm is not going to place either the game or ranchers in that area in a difficult position, because the temperature did rise with a chinook wind and that particular problem is being resolved. However, more specifically to the question of the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, I did receive a communication from him in this regard yesterday, and am pleased to check it out, and will do so through our official wildlife advisory council with whom I consult. They meet, I believe, on the 18th of April.

Conservation of Historical Sites

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Is it the intention of the hon. minister to introduce more stringent legislation re regulating activities on public lands to prevent destruction of historical and archeological resources?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, this matter is before the Environmental Conservation Authority, and they will be holding extensive public hearings and presenting to government a report in connection with the findings of their own scientific advisory committee. Then, as a result of the reports they generate on their own, as well as the public hearings, the government will consider this information and their recommendations, and then consider whether or not more extensive legislation in this area is necessary.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. minister planning to implement any other recommendations contained in the report on the conservation of historical and archeological resources in Alberta?

MR. YURKO:

Perhaps I might pass that question off to the hon. Minister of Youth, Recreation and Culture, who is also involved in this area. He may want to answer it.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. minister has just stated, there is a hearing going to be held in Calgary, Lethbridge and Edmonton, and probably a few other cities in Alberta regarding this matter. After we have studied it, we will propose properly the legislation to the House.

20-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation. Would you anticipate that would come in at the proposed fall session or next year?

MR. SCHMID:

It will be at the earliest possible date, Mr. Speaker.

Bow River Diversion Structure

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Is your department keeping a very close tab on the Bow River diversion structure?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are concerned with this particular structure. This particular structure, I believe, was patched up in 1968 or '69. It was never intended to be a permanent solution to the problem. A new structure is certainly going to be required in the not too distant future, if not, in fact, immediately. We are, of course, at this time, recognizing that if substantial waters flow through the Bow in early spring, and certain conditions are timed properly, that in fact the structure could fail. We are prepared with some pumping capacity in case this does happen. I would also like to suggest to the House that we recognize the immediacy of this particular problem, and have asked the PFRA to undertake the design of the new structure, possibly completing the design by the latter half of this year with the possible programming of new construction in the next year or two. This will depend to a high degree, on the success of our negotiations with the federal government on the entire irrigation package.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Your department is aware of the havoc that would be created if this weir went out insofar as the water users of WID are concerned, and insofar as the people of Chestermere Lake are concerned?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are very much aware of what the consequences may be. We have a contingency planned just in case this does happen.

MR. TAYLOR:

Does the contingency or the auxiliary pumping system planned sufficiently so that it could be put into effect within days should this structure go out this spring?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. We could in fact be in operation with pumps in the matter of days. It is portable pumps that we have under advisement at this time.

Rural Utility Authority

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. What is the government's

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-5

position with respect to the Uniform proposal contained in the brief of 1971 on central administration for rural electrification associations in the province?

MR. WERRY:

I would like to refer that question to the hon. Mr. Topolnisky. The Rural Development Committee has had that under consideration for the past month or two and I am sure he would like to comment on it.

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, in replying I wish to state that it is now being actively considered that there be a rural utility authority set up. At the moment it is being reviewed.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister Without Portfolio Responsible for Rural Development. Is the hon. minister in a position to give the House some indication as to when we can expect this study?

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have been discussing the matter with the power company. We have been talking to Calgary Power and there are two other power companies that we will be talking to. In due course we will have a reply.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister would specify what additional proposals are being considered, in addition to this one proposal from Uniform to provide power at cost to the farm people of Alberta, as promised before the last election.

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, we are reviewing in the Cabinet Rural Development Committee all the utilities and we are aware that this is a major problem all over the province as far as power rates and construction costs are concerned: when we have looked at all the areas of rural utilities, we hopefully will come up with an alternative.

Blackfoot Trail

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Highways. When will there be some improvement in the surface of the new Blackfoot Trail freeway in northeast Calgary?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are going to be doing some more finishing on that particular road this year, and I understand that the city is going to proceed with some more development at the end of this year.

MR. FARRAN:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are we locked in to the rather crude system of two sets of traffic lights on the Trans Canada Highway?

20-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

MR. COFITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, at this time I am not really familiar with whether there is more than one set of traffic lights on the Trans Canada Highway in regard to the Blackfoot Trail or not.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I wonder if the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport would consider making representations to the City of Calgary in regard to the sign. The present sign indicates 'Blackfoot Trail', and most people understand the Blackfoot Trail to go from the Trans Canada south. It would be far more meaningful if it read 'Edmonton Trail' going north from the Trans Canada Highway. I wonder if the hon. minister would consider discussing that matter with the City of Calgary.

MR. NOTLEY:

I would like to ask a supplementary --

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder if perhaps the hon. minister wishes to answer the questions, he should be given an opportunity to do so.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I will take that under consideration.

Rural Utility Authority (cont.)

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio Responsible for Rural Development. As you review the options, sir, with respect to providing power at cost to rural Albertans, are you considering as one of those options the official position of both Unifarm and the National Farmers Union, which is, of course, public power?

MR. TOPCLNISKY:

Yes, we are, Mr. Speaker.

Alberta Housing Corp. Loans to Single Persons

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has had an opportunity to review the question I asked yesterday, and if he has an answer today?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I was advised this morning that the present regulations do not preclude giving loans to single persons. There have been loans made to single head of household families for housing accommodation, and insofar as we have been able to determine no applications been received from a single person. If the hon. member knows of a single person who is looking for accommodation I would like to check her out.

DR. BOUVIER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, this is a male head of household -- I'm wondering if I understand the hon. minister correctly when he says 'single head of household', if he means somebody living common-

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-7

law and if this is the case how long would they have to live common-law to qualify?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, a single head of household would be where there is a family with only one parent, as we know it in the common sense - a man or woman as the head of the household. If it is a man perhaps I could get the hon. Miss Helen Hunley to check it.

DR. BOUVIER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in other words then, if a man has never been married and is not the head of the household would he still qualify?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. member would review the regulations, he would see the intent of that direct lending program, and probably the kind of person you are referring to would have difficulty qualifying under those objectives.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Minister without Portfolio, the hon. Miss Hunley. Would -- [Laughter] -- I think the hon. minister is psychic.

Would a 45 year old man living common-law with a 68 year old woman be entitled to free Medicare?

MISS HUNLEY:

I am not sure whether she would legally be considered his dependent or not, or maybe he is her dependent. I think if a man of 45 was living common-law with a woman of 68 I would suspect that he might be her dependent.

MR. TAYLOR:

If there were children from the union, would they be entitled to premium free Medicare?

MISS HUNLEY:

I guess we get into the legal terminology of what is a dependent. A dependent who is over the age of 65 entitles that resident - and a resident is a person who pays the premium - to free Medicare.

Legal Counselling by Law Students

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General and ask him, regarding the legal counselling service which I understand is a joint venture between the pre-law group of the University of Calgary, the Students Union and the Calgary Bar Executive, does the Attorney General's Department support this project morally?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would put that question on the Order Paper because it involves my checking into some aspects of the operation, and I would like to do that before answering the question.

20-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? Does the hon. Attorney General support the concept involved?

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am sure I can answer that part of the question by saying yes we support the concept.

Organized Crime

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Attorney General. In view of your expressed concern over the problems of organized crime in Canada and in particular as it may affect Alberta now and in the future, my question is what is being done to prevent the taking over of Alberta companies by organized crime or by people affiliated with organized crime, either through procedures of legitimate purchase or through exchange of shares, or by any other means?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question would be quite lengthy and would involve some detail, and again I think it is a matter that should be put on the Order Paper.

MR. HO LEM:

Perhaps you may be able to answer this simple question. Are there any screenings being done on the prospective buyers of Alberta companies at the present time?

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are some.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, does this affect the people's personal rights, and do you find it effective?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, again, Mr. Speaker, that is the kind of question that involves considerable detail and I think should be put on the Order Paper.

Family Allowances

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. At the present time the Family Income Supplement Program is under discussion in the federal parliament, and since this family allowance program affects the welfare payments to welfare recipients, particularly their children, could the hon. minister advise the House what the government intends to do in adjusting or maintaining these respective social allowance payments?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think that the full import of any proposed federal legislation has not been fully assessed yet. My first response to it would be that the overall intent of the federal legislation would appear to be to distribute money more to the areas where assistance is needed, rather than to the across-the-board type

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-9

of family allowance system there is now where even wealthy hon. members receive their regular government pension cheques for the small fry around the house every month. Therefore, it seems to me that, if the likely result is to increase the amount of income of people who are poor, an adjustment of our payments would not be required in the sense of an upward adjustment. And whether or not it is significant enough to apply some rule related to the basic budget of the family receiving social allowance that would cause a counter-balancing effect on his provincial allowance is something that I do not have full consideration of yet.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, does the government support the underlying principle of the family allowance program -- that is, one of selectivity?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that the only answer I could offer at the present time would be a personal opinion, because of the fact that the legislation has not been fully assessed. I am, therefore, not in a position to give a policy statement at this time.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Since the legislation is in the federal House and certainly the province of Alberta should be represented as to their position, have any arrangements been made either by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, or the hon. Premier, or yourself, to make representation to the federal government on this act while it is in the stages of formation?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, speaking for myself, my department has not. I do not know the answer in respect to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, to add somewhat to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development's answer, it is our intention, Mr. Speaker, to make an assessment of the legislation and complete the policy formulation that the hon. minister referred to, and have a reaction to the federal government.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. In his representations to Ottawa has any type of discussion at all occurred on this particular item?

MR. GETTY:

I would only say, Mr. Speaker, not of a formal nature. However, we have had so many discussions with Ottawa -- I am thinking particularly of Jasper when we were able to have considerable discussions on a variety of matters. The hon. Minister of Health and Social Development was at that conference, our Provincial Treasurer was there, and we touched on such a broad range of topics, both on the train and in other social evenings and informal discussions that I am quite sure it has been discussed -- but on a formal presentation, no.

20-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Would he consider making representation to the federal government prior to the royal assent of this particular act?

MR. GETTY:

It is our hope, Mr. Speaker, that we would do that and we will make every effort to have our assessment completed so that we can have an impact on the bill. However, I would not hold great hope for the House that we will change the federal government's mind regarding this.

Urban Freeways

MR. KING:

A question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Highways. Having regard for the controversy in Edmonton over the Jasper Freeway and the McKinnon Ravine, could the hon. minister advise whether or not, if Edmonton City Council decided that it wanted to reallocate its priorities for freeway construction in the city, the Department of Highways would be amenable to discussing this matter and the budgetary implications with City Council, if City Council wanted to change its priorities?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, in regard to that question, we would be open to discuss any problem that the City of Edmonton has that concerns our department, whenever they want to talk to us.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. Minister of Highways advise whether he has given any consideration to the possibility of ring roads?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have given very serious consideration to the possibility of ring roads, in both Edmonton and Calgary.

Finance Ministers' Conference

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Did he attend the finance ministers' conference in Jasper?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, how much of the hon. minister's staff accompanied him?

DR. HOFNER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. This is completely out of order. If he wants to get those kind of answers to those kind of questions, then that is what the Order Paper is for. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows it.

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-11

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, that point of order is entirely wrong. It is a proper question. If the hon. minister does not want to answer he can say so. I'll put it on the Order Paper, let the hon. minister speak for himself. It is not out of order. He's a big boy, he's a big man.

Annexation Proposals - Edmonton

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. The City of Edmonton has been quite concerned regarding the expansion of its boundaries as it affects their style of living for greater living space, and also the telephone dispute. And I was wondering if the government is giving serious consideration to an independent committee or commission to look into expansion of urban boundaries rather than the Local Authorities Board, as requested by the City of Edmonton.

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the City of Edmonton, in its submission, to a committee of cabinet, specifically asked that it not be referred to the Local Authorities Board because of the broader aspects beyond the mere question of annexation. We indicated to the City of Edmonton that because of the pressures of time while the House is in session, that probably their very complex submission could not be considered in any detail until after the spring session has adjourned.

MR. DIXON:

Supplementary question to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker. Is the government giving any serious consideration to Edmonton's request that they be allowed to expand other than for living space, such as the unitary government social aspects. I wonder if the hon. minister could enlarge on this.

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the title of their submission did in fact contain the term 'unitary government', and it was on that basis that their submission was made.

Private Employment Agencies

MR. NCTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Can the hon. minister tell the House whether the government is prepared to adopt any measures which would limit the activities of privately owned employment agencies to prevent them from charging excessively high rates?

DR. HOHOL:

High rates on?

MR. NCTLEY:

To the individuals that receive employment through their services.

DR. HOHOL:

The concern here would be that of the Board of Industrial Relations. To the best of my knowledge no concerns have been brought

20-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

to us. If they were we would certainly look into it. There are no specific intentions to deal with this in the way the hon. member has suggested.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the very clear cut concern expressed the day before yesterday by the Executive Secretary of the Alberta Federation of Labour, will the hon. minister give assurance to the House that he will consult with the Alberta Federation of Labour on this matter?

DR. HOHOL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, only to the extent that the Alberta Federation of Labour and other groups who are concerned with labour and who are in constant consultation with this department and other departments on other matters.

Potato Plant in Taber

MR. D. MILLER:

I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Hon. Minister, have you made a decision that you would care to announce today with respect to the Altafresh potato plant at Taber?

DR. HOFNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. We have agreed after discussions, both with myself and the hon. Minister of Industry, that we would provide the necessary guarantees so that they could go ahead and formulate contracts with the growers in the Taber area.

Universities Commission

MR. CLARK:

I have a question for the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. When does the government anticipate having a full-time chairman of the Universities Commission?

MR. FCSTER:

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am aware, we have a full-time chairman of the Universities Commission, and he is Mr. Haughton Thompson. His appointment is effective until, I believe it is June 30th. At that time we will have to reassess the situation. But I don't want the suggestion before the House, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Haughton Thompson is an acting chairman or in anyway less than a full-time chairman. He is not.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? Is the present chairman of the Universities Commission in fact spending his full time on affairs relating to the Universities Commission?

MR. FCSTER:

Mr. Speaker, at the present time the chairman is away, I think, on two weeks holiday. As far as I am aware, he is in fact spending his full time on this function.

MR. CLARK:

But other than during this period of time?

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-13

MR. FCSTER:

Yes.

Family Allowances (cont'd.)

MR. R. SPEAKER:

I have a question for the hon. Premier. In light of your remarks last Monday with regard to the universality of benefits to senior citizens, what is your position or the government's position with regard to the selectivity principle of the FISP Program, or the Family Income Supplementary Program of the federal government?

MR. LOUGHFEED:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to that question, I gave the matter some thought in framing my remarks to this House. It is true that the federal administration, with regard to certain proposed legislation, is considering different approaches. I did feel that it was important for us to express the views of the new administration on the issue and on how strongly we feel about it. I think it was as clear as I can possibly make it that that is our view with regard to provincial administration and provincial legislation.

Potato Plant in Taber (cont'd.)

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a supplementary question to the hon. Minister that ties in with my previous question. Would the hon. minister care to state how much assistance is provided for the Sunalta plant at Taber?

DR. HORNER:

We are going to provide a guarantee for \$75,000 that will guarantee the inventory of the organization so that they can make the contracts with the growers.

Family Allowances (cont'd.)

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Under the present legislation that is in the House, there are certain types of authority given to the provinces. On that basis do you feel it rather urgent to make representation and place your position before the federal government?

MR. LOUGHFEED:

Mr. Speaker, I believe we are forced by circumstances to draw a distinction between federal legislation and federal programs that involve an arrangement with the provincial government of the nature that the hon. member refers to, and legislation initiated by the new administration. It is specifically and entirely within the area of provincial jurisdiction and we do, in fact, draw that distinction. I could expand, of course, as I did on our feelings about the nature of these arrangements with the federal cost-sharing arrangements, but I think that I have done that at length. The point that I would like to make is pretty unequivocal; in our view, insofar as the proposed legislation regarding senior citizens is concerned, now before the House and in the budget, we consider there will not be a means test and we regret the view on the other side that they support it.

20-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

Hcg Processing and Marketing

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Are you in a position sir, today, to advise the House vis-a-vis the North American Integrated Food Processing Plant proposed for Taber whether; (a) your department has been able to ascertain the reliability of the contracts this company alleges to have in the Orient; (b) the financial capacity of the company, and (c) the position of the federal government with respect to the proposed operation?

DR. HOFNER:

Mr. Speaker, no to (a), (b), and (c).

Expenses of Applicants for Government Positions

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour with regard to the people who apply for employment through the personnel administration office. Are they required to come to Edmonton at their own expense when they are considered in competitions?

DR. HCHOL:

Mr. Speaker, there is no qualified yes or no. It depends on the circumstances of the particular case. If it is a position that we have difficulty filling here and have to seek assistance elsewhere, then the answer would be yes. In most cases, it is not so.

MR. BENOIT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What I meant to say is those who do have to come up -- do they have to come up at their own expense?

DR. HOHOL:

Again it depends on whether we sought the applicant. For example, an interview for an executive position at our request will be paid. If he initiates a move on his own and meets on an anticipatory sort of way, then he attends to his own expenses.

Energy Talks with U.S.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Premier. Earlier in the session the government asked to be in on talks between Ottawa and Washington regarding energy resources in Alberta, and as the hearings are being held today in Washington between the hon. Minister of Mines and Resources for the federal government, Mr. Macdonald, and US officials, I wonder if the hon. Premier or the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals have had any assurance from Mr. Macdonald that, owing to the fact that we are not in on the hearings as observers, have we had any guarantees from the federal government as to whether Alberta would be notified immediately after the talks of any decisions that were made?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, if I could answer the question of the hon. member. When Mr. Macdonald came to Alberta last week, he spent considerable

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-15

time with myself and the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals discussing all aspects of energy and the visit which he was making to the United States which he considered to be of a very exploratory nature, to establish a relationship between himself and the officials of that country regarding all energy matters. Nevertheless, he did discuss briefly with us some of the things he was going to talk about. He asked us if we would consider giving favourable consideration to a series of consultation meetings with him -- three or four a year, more if we thought necessary -- which would rotate between Washington, Calgary, Ottawa, and Edmonton. In that way we would always be brought up to date on any discussions which he was having regarding energy matters, not only in Canada and North America but throughout the world. We consider that a considerable improvement, and we are giving consideration to it. It appears to us that it may be a very valuable series of meetings, and I would say that, subject to Cabinet approval, we will go ahead with it and assess the amount of value that it would provide to us. It appears that it would have a great deal of value.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister, and I thank him very much for his explanation. My next supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, is, owing to the fact that transportation of our resource products is going to be at a high rate in a very short time, I was wondering if your government had made any representation to Ottawa about the urgency of having any major pipeline that may come from the Mackenzie delta or from the Arctic pass through Alberta so that it can tie in with the tar sands and some of our other larger oil fields?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer that in two ways. First, yes the matter has been raised. Secondly, it does fall heavily within the responsibility of the Minister of Mines and Minerals. So that I'm not dealing in too great a detail within his responsibilities, I'd like to ask him to respond to the hon. member.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to comment on that. One of the areas that we did discuss was our proposed pipeline conference which deals specifically with this aspect. At the same time, when the minister mentioned he was going to Washington to get acquainted, he did say that this was one of the areas that he was considering. We did invite their views on what the federal government's position was in respect to a pipeline from Alaska through Canada. He clearly indicated to us that the federal government is on record that they favour such a pipeline. He related to us some of the problems that they might anticipate with the United States in respect to this type of negotiation for a pipeline from Alaska through Canada.

AGT Toll Charges

MR. D. MILLER:

A question for the hon. Minister of Telephones. Is the hon. minister prepared to announce today that there will be no toll charges between Grassy Lake and the town of Taber as in other areas in the province?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would care to drop me a line or have a petition submitted from those people in the area, I would be pleased to have the Alberta Government Telephones review it. On the subject matter, the whole area is under review and there will be a

20-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

general policy statement made within the next two or three months. As I have enunciated in the House, I believe this is the third time now, we will not deal with one mutual in isolation. At this point, this would be about number 83 that we would have to deal with. We will deal with a total problem rather than one at a time. We certainly will reply to this and acknowledge it and follow-up when the policy does come down.

Fall Session

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Government House Leader? Is it the intention of the government at the end of this first session of the 17th Legislature to recess until the fall, or to adjourn the session and then call a special session in the fall?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, it is not possible now to give a definite answer, but the general approach being explored at this time is a recess at the end of this spring sitting to a date in the fall, which, if that were followed up, would have to be at some date known when the spring session recesses.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Would the hon. Government House Leader have any indication when the fall session will be held?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, if I could respond to that, I believe earlier in the session I was asked a question similar to that from the hon. Member for Highwood. I have received a suggestion from him. I would welcome suggestions from all corners of the House as to the most appropriate dates. I tried to explain, I believe, earlier in the legislative session some of the concerns we had as to a logical date to commence and to conclude. Perhaps if the Opposition House Leader could give us his views in the matter, we would certainly appreciate them, or those of any other hon. members, as to appropriate dates from their point of view.

MR. TAYLOR:

Further supplementary. Since the hon. members of the opposition do a lot of long-term planning, have you any indication as to how long the fall session might be?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, our view is that we would be talking about a period of three to four weeks, and that would be the target we would be looking at. We felt that anything less than three weeks was really too thin a period of time, having regard to the expense and the cost of bringing together the Legislature. We felt that much beyond four weeks would be getting close to threatening a circumstance I am sure hon. members on both sides would like to avoid, that happened in certain other provinces where it became one very, very long year-round session. At the moment our objective is to look to a three to four week session.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray and then I think we will have to conclude the question period.

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-17

MR. HC LEM:

Supplementary to the hon. Premier. Wouldn't you consider it more practical if you would suggest some dates that might be available so that we can take it back to our caucus to decide?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, a fair question. Generally speaking, we are looking at the month of November, but we would welcome views from the opposition with regard to that.

Fort Chipewyan Airport

DR. BCUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to either the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests or the hon. Minister of Northern Development. I am wondering, in view of the fact that there are now four main line air services through the town of Fort Chipewyan, is any consideration being given to paving the air strip or negotiating with the Department of Transport in Ottawa to having that strip paved?

DR. WARRACK:

I'm not sure which of us -- we don't know but I would be happy to find out.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Royalty Hearings

MR. LOUGHEED:

I would like at this time to rise on Orders of the Day to give the hon. members an interim report on the progress that the government is making with regard to the natural resource revenue hearing we propose. I made some preliminary observations in this matter earlier in the session and would like to be slightly more definitive with regard to our progress.

We are in the final stages of preparing a tentative government position on the matter which we hope will provide some alternatives and range of scope and stated objectives. We believe that it is necessary to do this in order to make any discussions on any proposed hearing effective in zeroing in on certain areas. As I mentioned, we are in the final stages. We hope to have this tentative position available to be presented to the House by the mid to latter part of April. It is our intention that, at the time of submitting the proposal and after discussions with the Minister of Mines and Minerals, we would make a motion to refer it to the Standing Committee on Public Affairs, Education and Agriculture. We would be suggesting in the referral motion that the House stand adjourned for a period of three to four days. We are looking at a similar type of hearing to that conducted by the previous administration with regard to The School Act in 1970, although for a longer period of time.

We would be asking in the Motion of Referral for the Standing Committee, when it meets, to consider the difficult question that troubles us, and that is to establish well in advance a deadline, perhaps, for organizations or groups who may like to appear and make a submission, and then for the committee to make an assessment of the extent and magnitude of these groups and organizations to determine, through the committee, how best to allocate the available time. If

20-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

the extent of the requests exceeds a three to four day period, the committee will consider what sort of alternative or contingency plan could be developed so that those submissions could be presented either to the Executive Council, or to a group of legislators, or in some other way.

It is the government's feeling on the matter that because of the other business of the House we should be looking at something in the range of three to four days. It has been suggested by advisors to the government that we should be prepared for the possibility that without any sort of limitations we could be involved in a two week period. We consider that that is excessive. We think that some better arrangement should be determined by the committee, and we will be making proposals. But essentially, the Standing Committee itself will have to resolve the matter in its organizational meeting after it has heard by a deadline date, as to the extent that groups or organizations wish to make submissions. That will be a difficult task for the committee.

It is the intention of the government to consider carefully the views of the committee, and the submissions made before the Legislature of the province with a view to reaching a decision on the matter of natural resource revenue, through the Executive Council, no later than the end of July of this year. And in stating that, I would like to make it absolutely clear that there will be no intention of the government, through any regulation of the Executive Council, to make the decision retroactive prior to the date the decision is made.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, if I may just make a point or two. First of all I want to say that I appreciate the hon. Premier making the statement in regard to the royalty hearings at this time, and I am particularly pleased that he has announced today that the final decision undoubtedly be reached by July, because in my view it is rather important that a decision be reached as soon as possible, having in mind the development that we can expect when a final decision is made.

I am a little concerned in regard to the suggestion made by the hon. Premier that we may not be able to hear all of the submissions that interested parties might want to make to us at the time of the hearing. It certainly occurs to me that it would be most difficult to decide which ones should be heard and which ones should not. I would, at this point in time, like to suggest that if a hearing is announced it would be most important that we, as legislators, make ourselves available to hear all of those who indicate that they want to be heard. Having said that it would seem to me that we can establish a deadline by which individuals, companies or otherwise would report to us as to whether or not they want to make representation. When the government has all that information at hand, they could then establish time limitations to the presentations. I would be, at this point in time, rather concerned if we were to make a decision that some might be heard and some might not. I would certainly want to urge the government that they give every indication at this time that those who suggest they want to be heard, will be heard. If there is any change in this procedure we would certainly want to have an opportunity of hearing the reasons why and then also the terms of reference in establishing who shall be heard and who would not.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that on announcements on Orders of the Day it is not appropriate to respond, except I do believe that having regard to the hon. Leader of the Opposition's remarks and the nature of it I would like to have leave to make a few observations for

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-19

clarification, because perhaps I was misunderstood, having regard to the leader's response.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I believe I suggested that that matter of putting on limitations, either on time or on the number of organizations, would be a matter for the determination of the Standing Committee and would be referred to them. Certainly it would be the government's desire that all people who wish to present their views could be heard; equally though, I would like to make it very clear, as I believe I have on previous occasions, that the government is under no legal obligation in this area to do so and we do, on the other hand, want to have as broadly heard and a representative a hearing as possible. I suggest though to all hon. members that they first of all consider the implications of the Legislature, through a Standing Committee, becoming involved in an interminable hearing with regard to the matter, and that is something the Standing Committee will have to resolve after it has determined the number that are to be heard.

In 1962, Mr. Speaker, no opportunity was given in any public sense for any sort of hearing of this nature. The government is equally concerned that other legislative matters that require the attention of the Legislative Assembly not be so delayed as to render a serious problem to our administration and to the public at large by way of delay.

I would like to make those three important clarification statements on this matter. I think that all members on both sides of the House should think very, very seriously about it.

MR. STRCM:

Mr. Speaker, I do not in any way want to enter into any debate at this point in time. I simply want to say that I appreciate the point that the hon. Premier is making in regard to the time factor. I restate again, however, that having made the decision to hear submissions, I for one, want to make our position very clear. We would not want to be party to saying to anyone that they could not be heard, and I take it from the hon. Premier's remarks that he agrees with that statement.

MR. LCUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a matter that the committee will have to resolve when they have held their first meeting and they have some idea of the magnitude that is involved. From the government point of view, we will have to look very carefully at an adjournment of the House beyond a period of the time that I mentioned.

Village Lake Louise

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, because of the amount of interest that has been shown in the House regarding the recent hearings that were held by the federal government on developments that might take place in Banff National Park, the government feels that certain correspondence regarding those hearings might be of interest to members of the House and, therefore, I would like to table two letters that touch on this matter. One, Mr. Speaker, is a letter written by the government to the hon. Jean Chretien about the matter and the other is a copy of a typical letter sent by the hon. Premier to citizens in Alberta who are writing to him about the matter.

20-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

BUDGET DEBATE

DR. HOHCL:

Mr. Speaker, I will be brief today because the contents and the substance and the attitude of the government have been fully presented by my colleagues, all of them, culminating in the outstanding address and statement on behalf of the government by the hon. Premier. I would like to comment, too, on the recent talk by the hon. Attorney General. He gave to this House and to the province of Alberta, a well reasoned and articulate statement on a serious matter, and I wish to commend him.

However, I do wish to comment on the budget and to report, in general terms, on some of the aspects of manpower and labour. When I say, Mr. Speaker, that I will speak briefly, I would not wish to mislead the House. Brevity is a relative term so I simply mean that I will not speak for as long as I would have earlier in the proceedings.

Before I do speak, please permit me to refer to the constituency of Edmonton Belmont, a new one following the distribution. In visiting over 8,000 homes I found the constituents youthful, ambitious and aggressive, very concerned with people but with an overwhelming concern for children. I found, too, that they recognised the need to be close to the government and a consequence of this is a shadow cabinet in the constituency of Edmonton Belmont. At the present time there is a cabinet of eight ministers and a shadow premier. They work as follows: each minister -- if you will permit me to use this expression, Mr. Speaker -- has a 'task force' of four to eight people whose job is to try to find out how the people of Edmonton Belmont feel on matters that affect them and the people of Alberta, and they work with the representative to have these views known by the government. I find, as the city member for Edmonton Belmont, that it is a very invigorating and in some ways a very tough role for an MLA to play, but a very proper one. I think this brings government right to the constituency and brings the constituents right into government.

Edmonton Belmont is in far northeast Edmonton and has the usual problems of a suburban area a long way from the downtown area of the city. Hospital service, recreation, schools, transit, and development of small businesses, all these are important. But as I work in Edmonton Belmont I find that this government's positive attitude about the future is shared by them, and they share our optimism and enthusiasm knowing that their constituency will prosper and thrive as does the province. I am very proud, Mr. Speaker, very happy, and somewhat humble to represent Edmonton Belmont in this Legislature.

The budget document is a clear and comprehensive statement of purpose for Alberta, for the first year of a four year program. Consistent with policy statements of the last few years, consistent with the election campaign, it provides both realism for today, and vision for the future.

I should like to touch briefly on the priorities of this government because this means so much to me personally, to the government and to the people of the province. The protection of human rights reflects a profound and deep respect for people. Making the Bill of Rights an act senior to all other legislation ensures that this attitude becomes a fact of law. The difficult circumstances of many of the senior citizens have filled volumes of professional papers and provided for many seminars and speeches over the years. But the evidence in programs for good intentions to this point have been scant. Provision in budget priorities recognizes both the senior status of people of advanced years, and for a large number, their difficult circumstances.

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-21

The effects of federal and provincial programs with respect to family farms over the last years has been a bleak record for both levels of government. It is important to say again and again that maintaining the family farm and dealing seriously with the matter of agricultural produce is a special commitment of the new government.

Another major area which will receive overdue concern and resources in the province will be facilities and support of handicapped children. It is in circumstances like these that the traditional concept of equality breaks down. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more unequal than providing the same amount of our natural resources for the education, health and welfare of unequal children. Clearly the unfortunate, in whatever circumstance, require more resources for the opportunity of equality.

Also moving from the field of professional papers, political speeches and general rhetoric and into specific action will be crucial reforms in mental health. While our ideals, attitudes and intentions are to recognize mental health in the same way that we do physical, a closer look at the record says it is not so. The over-emphasis of facilities over staff and services continues to reflect an unequal attitude which more accurately mirrors our real belief that mental illness is embarrassing to us as individuals and as governments.

I have some difficulty, Mr. Speaker, with some of the sound across the way. I had difficulty with the 'pay as you go theorem'. It seems to me that when you do not use the credit rating that you have to inure to the benefit of the people of the province, that that is not good stewardship. I had difficulty imagining a line-up of widows who without a means test have access to senior citizens benefits under the new government. I had a hard time visualizing them lining up at the banks to deposit their profits and accrue their interest. I had some difficulty with the proposition that needy people who obtain welfare will also receive damage to their character or to their personalities. At least with these three and some others, I had some difficulty.

In addition to the priorities, Mr. Speaker, the budget address reflects a commitment and a dedication of this government for individual and collective responsibility of all members to recognize the worth of the individual, whatever his circumstance, as we move into a new Alberta, with hopes and plans and aspirations, that are those of the 1970's and beyond. The budget is a compassionate statement of purpose to provide substantial new funds without increasing or introducing new taxes. As important, it is also a management manual for the various departments of government.

I should like to report to you, sir, and to this Assembly, on some areas of manpower and labour, particularly as the new Act will bring to provincial services a manpower function. It will affect future budgets considerably as it deals with employment and unemployment, training and retraining, the total human and industrial development of this province. The hon. Premier has often stated that the chief resource in Alberta is the talents and its people. You will also recall that he has said our natural resources are the second major asset. We believe now, and will continue to believe that a proper development of both will make Alberta the greatest province in Canada. The Alberta manpower policy is being developed on the basic attitude that employment is essential to the development of individuals and families, and that employment opportunities should be available to all. The general objective then, is to provide opportunities for jobs for all Albertans.

It is important to state that, in speaking of employment, there is no percentage of unemployment which is acceptable to this government, as there is not in the matter of poverty. While the objective cannot be readily achieved, it must nevertheless be that of

20-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

full employment. To view 3%, for example, as being an acceptable level of unemployment, we submit, is to assure that it will never be less and that likely it will always be more. I have some difficulty, Mr. Speaker, with those who say that all or any province or nation has to do is to make sure that the private sector is well geared and there will be employment for all. I do not decry this proposition in itself, because it is half of it (and it is a proper one), what we submit is that it is half of it. Thousands of years of adjusting the ups and downs, crests and troughs of the economy based on the market place has not provided employment for the people of this world, and not for this nation, nor for this province. So we take the position that you have to look at people, at breadwinners, at the wage earners. I should like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that as high as 30% of unemployed people are heads of households with as many as five dependents in the family. When you have this kind of information you cannot, and I will not, accept the proposition that there is such a thing as an acceptable level of unemployment. So our plans and our commitment and our activity will be in that direction.

I was going to, and I do want to, acknowledge the awareness of the government's proper involvement in plans and activities with respect to unemployment by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking. In trying to work towards this kind of objective there are four ways that help:

- (1) the adjustments in the number and types of jobs to fit the number and types of people seeking employment;
- (2) adjustments in the size and qualification of the labour force to fit the number and type of jobs available;
- (3) improving our capability to match people and jobs; and
- (4) introducing specific employment programs for those who find it difficult to find employment.

The priority employment program, Mr. Speaker, was one of those. The details of this will be provided in the second reading of The Manpower and Labour Act. Let me say only that as of March 14, 1972, \$78,500 were spent in the accelerated departmental projects by six departments which provided an estimated 9,400 jobs.

The second phase of the same program, which was the one supported by special warrants of \$9.6 million, an estimated 6,500 jobs were provided, and this, Mr. Speaker, is an effective kind of research when it comes to looking at employment programs.

The STEP program -- Summer Temporary Employment Program -- will look at the capacity, or more properly put, at the incapacity of opportunity for youth during the summer. This summer, Mr. Speaker, approximately 40,000 students will be trying to get employment at a time when the unemployment rate of those people under 25 is approximately 10%. So we will look at four ways to assist students in getting jobs this summer. We will ask private enterprise throughout the province to hire more students than they would normally do. Approximately 2,000 summer jobs will be provided within existing budgets of various departments of government. A number of projects located throughout the province will be implemented by various departments of government, and we will be providing assistance to municipalities in the form of direct wage payments for municipal projects which are judged to be worthwhile. Along with municipal programs, federal programs, the co-operation of private industry, we feel that we will improve in a marked way the capacity for young people to get jobs this summer.

Both the contents and the attitude of the Alberta Manpower policy will be based on providing information with respect to labour demand and labour supply. This will assist both sides of the equation to have as effective and as up to date information as they can to assist both the individual and the economic well-being of the province. Some of this information will include economic trends, employment information, labour forecasting, population trends, income

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-23

trends, and so on. These will be given to individuals as well as the public generally. We will provide counselling services, leaving, of course, final choices for individuals. We will also develop an inventory of enterprises for Alberta today, and as it will be in the future, particularly in the area of secondary industry. We will also put together an inventory of labour capability. We will study the difference between the two, and attempt to develop with the institutions of this province the kind of competence, the kind of capabilities that when we get the Syncrudes and the Imperial Oils and the Grande Cache, that we have a working force in Alberta for Alberta enterprises.

We will co-ordinate, Mr. Speaker, the manpower activities of this province with those of the nation, with those of other provinces, with municipalities and other agencies. We will review and develop new agreements in training, in manpower resources, and in policies. A proper case can be made that the Province of Alberta is in the best position to deal effectively with the problems of Alberta manpower. Mr. Speaker, I will provide additional manpower plans and information when we debate in the Assembly The Manpower and Labour Act.

In addition to manpower there are many labour aspects of this act that merit the consideration of this Assembly. Let me, sir, make only these comments for the present time. It is the plan of the government to hold public hearings with respect to The Labour Act. In the meantime, we invite submissions and representations throughout the year so that we can in this way develop an understanding of the attitudes, the ambitions, the aspirations and the concerns of all Albertans. It is our belief that a new act is necessary, rather than amendments to the present one.

Some new definitions, Mr. Speaker, some new structures, and certainly some new attitudes are necessary to more accurately build into legislation the labour concerns, problems and circumstances that affect the working man in this decade. In particular, the vehicle and the atmosphere in which collective bargaining occurs must be of serious consideration of this Act.

It may be that we may consider an Alberta Labour Code which will include both the Act and the regulations. The Act must contain a preamble which will provide for a full and equal partnership of labour with that of management. And in this respect, government must assert a strong leadership role in a co-ordinative kind of relationship.

Serious problems exist in collective bargaining generally, and in two major industries particularly -- those of education and construction. Many of the problems are rooted in the legislation of The School Act and The Labour Act of the previous administration. Problems of registration and accreditation of jurisdictional disputes, of zone bargaining; the collective bargaining process itself: the location of the mediation step, the role of conciliation, final position offers, arbitration and strikes must be re-examined in the light of conditions and circumstances of the 1970's.

In these concerns, Mr. Speaker, the role of government will not be that of a passive observer becoming involved only at the crises points as defined in The Labour Act. Rather, it will work actively with labour and management 12 months of the year, with prejudice to neither, but with determination that the general welfare of the people of Alberta, as well as the specific welfare of labour and management, is protected. In this attitude we invite labour and management, employers and unions to work closely with government on matters of mutual concern.

20-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

Mr. Speaker, you and the Assembly now know that another Act of considerable importance to the people of Alberta will also receive the thorough review of this government. I refer to The Workmen's Compensation Act. While we are bringing some significant amendments to the Act in this session, we believe that amendments on the long-term are not the answer. The view of the government is that the Act in many respects is dated, because of such factors as technological improvements in industry, and such social policies as are effected in provincial and federal legislation with respect to welfare and unemployment insurance.

We will name a legislative committee with access to consulting services as might be required, to hold public hearings, and to initiate such studies as may assist in drafting a new Workmen's Compensation Act that is contemporary -- that looks to Alberta's future in industrial development and its labour force with much understanding and accuracy. Access to appeal outside the Workmen's Compensation Board will be a major consideration of this committee. Benefits will be further upgraded.

As in the case of the Labour Act, Mr. Speaker, we will be looking for major building of social policy, rather than to housekeeping amendments as has been the case in the past. Not entirely unrelated is the matter of pensions, and consistent with our practice of reviewing all major policy and all major services. The three Pensions Acts which are the responsibility of government will be studied and changed if this is needed. Counselling will become an important feature of providing pension information.

With respect to The Amusements Act, I have had prior occasion to inform the Assembly that the whole matter of censorship of films in our province will receive the close examination that it requires. We are not happy with the legislation as it is, and thus the review. This will be done by a legislative committee under the chairmanship of the hon. Member for St. Albert.

I should like to mention, Mr. Speaker, the responsibilities of government with respect to The Civil Service Act, and in so doing, reflect the positive attitude taken in this matter by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Certainly, this government recognizes fully the vital function of the civil service, and our intention is to be a responsible employer.

This is an appropriate point on which to comment on the important functions which the Department of Personnel Administration provides to government and, therefore, to the people of Alberta. These responsibilities are notably in the area of the public service employee relations legislation to The Public Service Act and to The Crown Agencies Employee Relations Act. This immediate work, therefore, is a matter of collective bargaining on behalf of government.

Another responsibility is that of personnel, including the pay schedule and classification systems, and coordination of departmental procedures in the recruitment and employment of staff. It provides a high level of organizational competence to departments of government, as well as communications and training capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a very real honour for me to be able to rise in my place in this Assembly as the elected representative of Edmonton Belmont, and to review for you, Sir, and for the members, some of the functions, some of the problems, some of the hopes and aspirations of the Department of Manpower and Labour, within a total function of government services.

I look forward to doing my full measure of work on behalf of the people of Edmonton Belmont and of this province. And I look forward, too, to doing it in a atmosphere of good humour and dignity,

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-25

motivated by a commitment of all members to meet the responsibilities and obligations assigned to us by the people of Alberta.

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on the manner in which you conduct the business of this House. I want to tell you that you have gained my full confidence in your decisions. Your decisions, I feel, are very good, and I accept that they are impartial, and again I want to say that you have won my confidence. I also have high respect for all the members of this Legislative Assembly and especially for the leaders of our political parties. I think sometimes we hear remarks, and I don't think they are really fair, when one attacks the leader of a particular political party, because the leaders of any party have to express the views of not only themselves, but of their party. So I don't think it is fair, inside or outside the House, ever to make any remarks that are not favourable to a leader. I just look across the House and have the greatest respect for our hon. Premier. Even his smile would almost turn anyone on - it certainly does me. Also, the calibre of members that he has brought to this House is very commendable. As the leader one would have to recognize and certainly commend him for the stride that he has taken, and as far as he has brought the Conservative Party in the last few years. It is certainly very commendable.

One thing that is significant for myself, and what I appreciate more than anything else, is the beauty that he has brought to this House. And when I speak of the beauty, I am not referring to this vase of flowers that separate the Premier and myself and his beautiful smile, I am speaking of the two hon. ladies that are in this House. I heard it mentioned on this side of the House, that this side represents more of the voters than that side of the House. Keeping in mind that half of our voters are ladies in this province, I think the two hon. ladies can take credit for representing more voters in this House than any political party. Recognizing the leader that I work with very closely, the hon. Leader of the Loyal Opposition, I have got high respect for this gentleman myself, and I know many other members have too. You really have to work with this gentleman; you have to work with him in caucus, to appreciate his very capable legislative abilities and political abilities as well. I have done this and I certainly respect him. So many times in our caucus I hear the saying; is this a responsible position,, is this the position we should take? Another saying that I respect him for, is this in the best interests of the people of the province? Many times I hear these remarks within the walls of our caucus meetings.

With regard to the leader of the other party we have in this House, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I also respect him and the position that he fills in this Legislature. I don't know him as well as I do the leaders of the other parties but I certainly think that he has many contributions that he will make to this Legislature and I will be the first one to admit to my constituents that I am impressed with the hon. Leader of the New Democratic Party.

I did hear some remarks in this House that I don't know whether I should comment on or not, but I am going to and I am going to comment on them as a rural member of the Legislative Assembly. I hear the remarks that sometimes some of us sit on our hands, or read newspapers, or we pick up our cheques and we go home. I do not think there are any hon. members in this Chamber who would do anything like this because they have more respect for their position. I realize these comments are made and sometimes are not meant. I am just going to speak as a rural member in general on the duties that we have to perform. If I was to pick up my cheque with the contribution that I make in this Legislature possibly I would have a little bit of concern doing so.

20-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

Some of the rural members I could speak of - the hon. Member for Peace River, the hon. flying Member for Lac La Biche - they have large areas and it takes a lot of time to contribute and serve your constituents in these large areas. I will say that in some cases, some of these rural members have to drive from 20,000 to 30,000 miles a year to serve their constituents. In my area I have an office; I use the office for business as well as for taking care of my constituents. But anytime I feel that I have a responsibility to my constituents, when one comes into my office I drop my own business and take care of him. I know I have days when I have as many as 10 or 15 people in there who are concerned with problems, probably not relating to the provincial government, such as benefits from the unemployment insurance and so on, compensation and possibly other areas of federal and provincial responsibilities. Our indemnity now is based on our sessions. Possibly it would be more fair to base our indemnity on a monthly basis, because as members of the Legislative Assembly we are performing our duty year round, and I can say this for all members of the Legislative Assembly. So possibly this is an area we could look at and it might be more acceptable to our people to have our indemnity based on a monthly basis.

I would also like to thank my constituents for putting their confidence in me and re-electing me as their member. I try to represent my people on a non-political basis. I work with them on the same level whatever political party they support. On occasions I get criticized for not giving more recognition to party supporters. However, after checking on the results and the majority I got on the last election, August 30th, I can assure you that I am going to continue the same practice of representing my people on an impartial basis. They indicated to me in the election that they approved my approach by leaving politics to the election campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I think a number of us in this House are having a problem finding our position. Sometimes on this side of the House we have a hard time to realize that we are in the opposition. I hear the comments coming from that side and they sometimes have a hard time to realize the position - that they are the government in this province. I am going to accept my responsibility as an opposition member and play my part in this Legislature. I have certainly got to say that I am very concerned regarding the field of agriculture and I am impressed that on both sides of the House interest has been shown in agriculture, because this is one of our basic industries. I would be remiss if I did not congratulate our hon. Minister of Agriculture for the hold that he is taking on our agricultural problems in this province; I really appreciate this.

The program that was announced to assist the dairy farmers in the province is welcomed and certainly will assist this industry. However, again I suggest we do have to be cautious that this type of program does not create a greater supply than demand. As I have found in the past, when you have subsidized programs it always engenders interest which increases production. Therefore we have to accept reduced prices. I do realize there is a shortage of manufactured products right now in the dairy industry, but if we use attractive programs to get many more people in the industry and the "new" producers increase their production, down the road I can see a production problem for the entire industry. But if these loans can be regulated to make the dairy operators more efficient in their production and give our consumer a cheaper product I will buy this. And I do subscribe to loans rather than grants. I think the market sharing program that the hon. minister announced, and which was approved by the dairy producers in this province last night in this House, is a step in the right direction. It is more or less a two price system and I am certain it is going to protect and help this particular industry.

While I am on this topic of guaranteed loans I would like to express my concern with the cattle loan subsidy in the northern part

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-27

of the province or a portion of the province. I do think a program like this should be made available to all Albertans if it is going to be made available to some. The reason I say this, is because in the southern part of the province we have many cattlemen and they are doing very well. The problem I see when we come up with something like this, is that we are going to increase production in the northern part of the province which I think will have an effect on the cattle producers in the southern part of the province. So I would like the hon. minister, if he is going to continue with this program, to extend it to the entire province. It would be much appreciated.

Another prime example of an industry having problems is our potato industry. Here again I think our hon. minister is trying to come to grips with this situation to try and help the producers to get back on their feet and keep operating. This industry is unique from most other operations in that the producer has to finance the resource industry as well as the manufacturing of the product, which involves a very large amount of finance. There is a large investment in the growing of this product, in the packaging of the product and then in the manufacturing. This, Mr. Speaker, is why I say this is a unique operation. The reason they all have to be tied together is -- and the past has proven this -- that packaging and manufacturing has to be tied to the producer or, if investors are doing the manufacturing, they have to be guaranteed the raw product, and they are not guaranteed the product unless the product producer is tied to the manufacturer. For if the fresh market is good, the price is high and the demand good, the producer is going to bypass the manufacturer to take advantage of higher prices on the fresh market.

I would just like to briefly explain to this House, what manufacturing really means as far as the potato industry is concerned. And I want to say I was very pleased to hear the hon. minister reply during the question period that he is going to assist one of these potato manufacturing plants in this province. We have two major plants in this province. One is in Vauxhall and one is in Taber, and they are both having problems. These plants make granules and french fries. This is the product they are putting out.

Our potatoes are graded; we have our No. 1 and No. 2. And then we have our stripper potatoes and we have our utility potatoes, and this is where your manufacturing comes in. If our fresh market is not good, they can process our utility potatoes as well as our stripper potatoes. And this gives a market for these potatoes and takes them off of the fresh market, especially in our strippers.

The reason our potato growers are facing a very serious problem this year is because our quality of potatoes is very poor, and many of the potatoes have had to be put into these processing plants. And to establish markets has been a very serious problem.

Our potato industry is well organized, but the problem that our potato growers are facing is that they have invested so much money in the manufacturing and the growing of their product. Now that they have invested all this money the problem is they don't have money enough to operate. There are many potato growers who are having a serious problem trying to operate their farms and their operations this year. In the province we have between 2,500 and 30,000 acres, and down in my constituency we have almost 8,000 of those acres. So I do have a keen interest. The hon. minister has heard many delegations, and I very much appreciate the hearings that he has given these delegations. The potato growers are not asking for a grant, all they want is some assistance. They want a guaranteed loan so that they can continue to operate and get their operation more viable. I would plead with the hon. minister if he is going to go into a program like this, if he would do it as soon as possible because spring is approaching and our potato farmers are in a

20-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

position that they do need some assistance in the form of guaranteed loans.

Another area that our hon. minister could help with as far as the potato industry is concerned, and I am sure he is aware of it because the potato growers would have brought it to his attention. It is the unfair duty that we have on potatoes. On our potatoes that are going across the line to the United States, we have to pay 75 cents after we get over a certain quota. On potatoes coming in from the United States to Canada, the duty is 37 1/2 cents. We have been working on this for a long while, and I do hope that our hon. minister will put the pressure on the federal authorities and have this inequitable duty changed.

I do have some concern in The Agricultural Development Act and the \$5 million that has been put into this particular fund. The reason that I am concerned -- and again I go back to my constituency -- is that we have one municipal authority down there with 63 names on the list. And these 63 names, if they were to get \$20,000, this would take \$1 1/4 million. I am hoping that when this Act is set up it will not be like our farm purchase, that money can be put in without being put in by statute. This is an area that I do have a strong concern for. I think we can get money into this area and as I have heard our hon. Minister of Highways mention at a meeting, for every dollar you put into agriculture, there goes \$5 into the economy, and I certainly agree with this.

Another area that I have concern with is roads. This ties in very closely with our agricultural economy to have good market roads, and it also helps to control the exodus of our rural population. This is one item in the budget where I think we can justify borrowing. I agree it does have to be controlled so as not to get our future generations into debt over their heads which never can be paid back. However, if we build roads, and bridges and have them paid for when their use expires, I cannot disagree with this, providing interest rates are not too high. Give us roads and bridges to use and our people can pay for them as they use them.

I do have some suggestions for our hon. Minister of Highways (I don't know if he will consider them or not). Something I have been thinking about for a long while is the provincial government selling debentures in the name of the municipal district involved to put in our secondary road system. The program could work much like our school and hospital building programs where the provincial government sells debentures in the name of the local authority for approved capital construction. Then the province pays the local authority a grant to pay the due debentures each year. I would suggest the same program for roads, except shorten the debenture term for roads and lengthen the term for bridges. The advantage would be, if we are going to borrow the money to build roads anyway, if we do it in the manner I suggest, the local road authority can meet his own demand in his own area. It would be much easier putting these priorities on the grid road program in our province.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on roads, another area that I have much concern with, and I have heard it mentioned, is another north-south road in this province. We do have our east and west roads, but I think we should have another north-south. In my particular case, I am speaking of Highway 36. I think this is a road that we need, and we need it badly in this province. I think if it was hooked on to the United States border down there, and we directed the traffic, our through traffic, up the No. 36, it would certainly save a lot of congestion on our No. 2 Highway. I think that we could look into the possibility of getting the United States to help us build this road, because I am sure it would be an advantage to them as well.

I did hear in the question period the hon. Minister of Highways mention the fact that he thought oiling was a successful way to

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-29

preserve these roads. Well I have had experience on a municipal council, as far as oil is concerned, and I don't think it is working out satisfactorily. I think that the hon. minister, if he will check these roads after the spring break-up, will find they are not going to hold out. However, oiling does help to preserve our roads for short periods of time.

I think, when entering a debate in this House, that if you did not get involved in something contentious or a little bit political, maybe you might not be exactly in line. So I am going to speak a little on finances -- the finances of this province. We have heard much about the financial status of this province over the last few months. It is hard for me to realize what it is all about. I think we all have faith and confidence in our Provincial Auditor, which is only right for he is hired to do a job. What really is puzzling to me is the hiring of a consulting firm to look at the deficit side of the ledger, which I could have called a postmortem. If I was going to hire an efficiency consultant in my own business I would not want him to tell me how financially embarrassed I happened to be. I would want the firm to take a look at the credit side of my ledger and see how I could make my operation more efficient to meet the times and conditions I would be facing.

It is easy for one to realize the fluctuation which will exist in the current account of the Provincial Treasurer when handling over \$1 billion, so when I hear we have got \$20 million, \$60 million, or \$100 million in our account, it really does not mean that much to me. I get the audited statement out and get the true figures, keeping in mind the complications which you face with provincial finances. You can use these figures almost to suit your own situation. As I interpret them from the government year's end March 31, 1971, again keeping in mind the accounts receivable are not used in those figures, but payments to be made are included.

I have before me the Touche, Ross report and I am trying to assess it. I am sure that someone is going to explain it to me because I have to explain to my constituents what this really is. I turn to page 5 and it tells me the financial status of the province as of March 31, 1972. At March 31, 1971 the surpluses and reserves of the province, as shown in the audited financial statement, total \$456.5 million. The latest estimate prepared by the Provincial Auditor, based on actual expenditures to December 31, 1971, indicated that the deficit for the current fiscal year will be approximately \$150.6 million. Based on the past practices followed by the province, it is now anticipated that the surpluses and reserves will be reduced to \$305.9 million as of March 31, 1972. I can get that same figure out of this little book here put out by the Provincial Auditor. That tells me the same. I turn over the next page and it tells me that the province will guarantee a loan of \$95 million to the Alberta Resources Railway. This again is nothing new to me. I have heard this discussed in the House before and I was aware of this situation.

On the next page, it tries to indicate figures on some of these guaranteed loans where there is maybe some money that we are not going to be able to recover. Now I don't question this, but it says here that

"It has not been the practice of the province to reduce its loans and advances to estimated realizable values, nor to provide in its accounts for possible losses on implementation of guarantees. In our opinion, based on our review of the outstanding loans and guarantees, a provision of \$43.9 million is required for this purpose."

When I turn to the next page, it itemizes them all here, the guaranteed loan to Alberta's Universities Commission, to the provincially owned hospitals, the guaranteed debt of the Resources

20-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

Railway. Now, I turn over to page 10, and it tells me what the estimated losses are. Here is what it says: "The decrease in surplus and reserves of \$202.4 million results from the provisions which, in our opinion, are required to provide for estimated losses." These are estimated losses. If they are actual losses -- but these are estimated losses which anyone can estimate. Almost any of the information that I have been able to pick out of this book -- not being an accountant or being able to understand, there might be something that I am missing in this area.

Now with these figures I just quoted we have \$1,600 million in assets which are down in the book as \$1. Everything is not so good in good old Alberta, but it is not so badly off financially. And this is the reason why I make these brief remarks on the financial situation of our province. Many Albertans, in reading news items, could very easily come up with the impression that the previous government was trying to hide the financial state of the province. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I did not try to misrepresent the people of my constituency in any area, let alone in the area of finances. I tried to give them a true picture, and I am sure all other members in this Legislature did the same.

I just have a few brief, general remarks that I would like to make. I see my time is passing on and I did not realize that I was going to take this much time. Bill No. 25 was a bill that gave me much concern, and this was the distribution of our tax base and our tax revenue on pipelines, power lines and transmission lines. Now, in my own constituency, and I know in many other rural constituencies, this is going to be a big concern, and it could cripple the operation of the municipal district that is involved. I would agree in principle to the distribution of this tax revenue, providing it took all the industry in. In the cities and in the corporate limits we have our packing plants, we have all the other various industries, and if we take all our industry together, I would agree to distributing the revenue or the tax base in these areas, but I cannot agree to doing it only for this -- we call them transmission lines. I agree that we are all involved in this, but I do think and hope that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs will take a really close look at this before he brings this bill back to the House, because I think that it is going to have very serious effects on some of our rural areas.

In conclusion, I would like to make a few remarks regarding my own constituency. I do not want to get carried away when doing this, but we do have some good industries there. We have the largest feed lot in the Dominion of Canada for feeding cattle, and this feed lot is anticipating putting in a meat packing plant. This will be in operation by the fall. We also have one of the largest artificial lakes in almost the whole continent. I'm speaking of Lake Newell, which is a multi-purpose lake. It is for fishing, for tourists and for irrigation. We also have one of the largest irrigation districts in the Province of Alberta. We have in my constituency almost one-third of the irrigation that there is in this province.

This is another area that concerns me, and the hon. Member for Macleod mentioned it in his remarks the other day. I would like to see us get on with the federal government on our cost-sharing program, and get some assistance with the federal government to match the grants our provincial governments are putting in this particular area.

I see the hon. Minister Without Portfolio who is in charge of the Alberta Health Commission, is not in her place. I was not going to ask her for any favours; I was just going to assure her that I was going to pay my Medicare premiums. Providing this new bill that is before the House does not cut off my family allowance cheque, I will continue to pay my premiums to the Health Commission.

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-31

If the hon. minister had been in her place -- maybe someone can convey this to her -- we need an active treatment hospital in the town of Brooks very badly. We have been trying to get this hospital for a long while, and it is certainly needed. We have a plan down there -- if a hospital is built -- we are going to use the active treatment hospital we have now, and we are certain the commission will take a look at this, as an auxiliary hospital. Therefore, we will not be losing our old hospital because it can be used as an auxiliary.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close and say, thank you very much for the opportunity of speaking in this debate.

MR. GEUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, my presentation on the budget this afternoon will be short, not repetitious in things that have been said before, I hope. I think you can flog a dead horse so long and then it becomes rather fruitless. So I will zero right in on areas of concern that I have, first of all, for my constituents, and secondly, some that I see myself.

First of all, I would like to get into the area of education and related areas. There is the PEP program that is referred to in the budget. I made some references to this when I spoke in response to the Speech from the Throne, and I am sure the hon. Minister of Advanced Education will welcome my remarks and suggestions. I think he has been very receptive at this point, at least getting together and discussing things that are of concern in this area. I appreciate this very much.

When the PEP program was first introduced early last winter, I lauded this. I said publicly that I thought this was a good idea. I have not changed my position at this particular time at all. However, more and more, as time progresses, Mr. Speaker, it becomes more and more apparent that there are short-comings, that there are abuses; and I recognize that any type of government service finds it impossible to avoid all types of abuses. Nevertheless, I think we should plug the holes as quickly as we can and do what we can to avoid future abuse.

In the PEP program I refer in particular to two areas, Mr. Speaker. I refer to the area that will concern -- and this will affect the regulations. We have to be aware of the possibility, I would say the probability, that there are individuals who should be enrolling in the fall programs of vocational and technical schools, maybe even continuing education, but because they know there is a PEP program, where they can get free education, plus pay on the job, they are going to take advantage of that. I think we should really be aware of this, Mr. Speaker. I think this is an important thing, so I hope we will take note of that.

The other problem is that of individuals who will be enrolling in the PEP program, spending our money, being paid for this education, which really will not be too relevant to what they intend to do after. They will have small businesses, small enterprises, maybe even farms, but, after all, where is there a nicer place to spend the cold months of the winter than in a PEP program where you get paid to do it? They may then have no intentions of pursuing this line of employment or training after. I think this is a concern, and I think we should follow this one up. In other words, what I am saying, I am not adverse to spending money on this, but I am most concerned that we get value for our money and I do not think we can argue against that.

Further to the area of education, I note in the budget, there is a 1.8% increase to the universities. I think this is just fine and dandy. I believe it is in line with what we are seeing happening in

20-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

the universities as was brought out a day or so ago from my question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. There is a tremendous drop-out in the universities plus a tremendous decline in the university enrollment. I think the universities in this province and maybe all over the country, have over-sold themselves, and I don't reflect on the former Minister of Education or any Department of Education. I think that the universities have been successful in selling a lot of people to come to university, in having the students believe that after they were there for one, two, three, four or five years and come out with a degree, that this is a miracle performance. Here I am, here is my degree, will you please come and get me. Well, it doesn't work that way. They still have to work for a living I hope. And I think this has to be brought across, because this miracle hasn't been performed by the university for students, or they feel that it hasn't. So there is frustration and disenchantment. I concur that the university budget probably is a step in the right direction. And following along on that, I think that the 25% increase to colleges and vocational schools, are probably more in line with what the people of Alberta are thinking in relation to post-secondary education. Certainly I would have to admit that I have a little bias, having served on college boards and particularly the only good one in Alberta, in Lethbridge. This is a very important area and I think we need vocational, technical and job training. I think this has to be brought home because this is an important area.

Now, administratively, I think a suggestion that I would have is that we have the six colleges -- we have NAIT, we have SAIT, and we have the schools of agriculture and we have the Alberta vocational centres. It would seem to me that at the earliest possible time, Mr. Minister of Advanced Education, these should all be brought under the umbrella of the Colleges Commission so that we save NAIT and SAIT. For example, a lot of people feel that they have a blank cheque, and all they have to do is turn in the requisition and the cheque comes back from the government. They are being operated pretty much in that way. It would seem to me that it would be in the interest of the people of Alberta, certainly I would be very interested in knowing, if the per pupil cost, the course cost, and everything, is different at NAIT and SAIT than it is at other colleges offering very much the same type of courses and very much the same type of programs. It would seem to me to make a lot of sense all to have those come under the umbrella of the Colleges Commission under the same type of arrangements as community colleges do. I believe in that way we could see if one is getting favours that others are not. Then a more uniform type of service could be given to all post-secondary institutions other than the universities.

We move into the next area that I am concerned about -- the area of mental health. Now I would like to suggest here, Mr. Speaker, that I am being pressed hard by my constituents to see to it that the mental health budget is not passed over without us in Lethbridge getting our fair share of the budget. I don't for one moment suggest that just because money is being spent in an area in one part of the province that all parts should get it on a pro rata basis. But the need in Lethbridge and in Southern Alberta is great. We are not up to par. We do not have the right percentage of mental health facilities there to serve the area that we should have in relationship to our area and to what the hospital facilities are. I certainly am giving notice here, that when we get into the estimates -- and I am sorry the hon. minister is not in here now -- we are going to have to pursue this diligently and enthusiastically because we do appeal to the government to see to it that we get our fair share of this and bring it up to par.

I noticed too that the \$1.2 million for extra services are not now provided in the budget. This is a good idea, and I favour it because the money is going to be used, I understand, to co-ordinate

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-33

and help in the training of personnel to look after the mentally ill. I applaud this, and I think this is a move in the right direction.

Also in this same area, on page 23 in the budget, I notice that there is reference to the mentally handicapped. I will be pursuing this. I am just wondering if this program here, and they talk about \$1 million, is going to be for mental health but under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education. I would say that this is a good move and I think it is probably a continuing one. I hope, from what the former Minister of Education and the Department of Education said, that it refers to the schools for retarded children. Long gone is the time when we can leave the schools for retarded children, or the help for these children, in the hands of the medical people. It has been shown many years ago that they have not really been able to help them in the area that they should, because they need education and they need training. I think that we cannot overdo this area. These people need help and they need lots of it. I have been involved with this on a very personal basis in the last 20 or so years, when we first took steps to give some type of recognition to the fact that schools for the mentally retarded are the important way in which we help those children. All you have to do is go into some of these schools, or as I have done, have one in your own home and you can see what dependency means to a six month old retarded child. Here is an area where it is not their fault, the strikes are all against them from the time of birth and maybe from the time of conception, I don't know. The point is we need to help those people. Certainly education, in many ways, is the right way, Mr. Speaker. We must pursue this program and help these people, and do what we can to make their lives as pleasant as possible.

We get into the area then of Workmen's Compensation. This area also gave me a bit of concern as I listened on the TV to the hon. Premier's talk I got snowed in. I hope I am not snowed in when we deal with it in the estimates. I think he made reference to the fact that he felt this should be souped up a little bit, with \$1 million to raise the permanent disabled workman from \$175 to \$225. Possibly it should be increased and I think maybe this is right. But there is an area that I am not sure has been covered in the budget that gives me concern because I have constituents in my area who are very concerned, and this is the area of permanent partial disability. Now we have people who maybe received a partial disability award five or ten years ago. I have some who are receiving maybe \$40 or \$45 or \$50 a month. Ten years ago that must have had some relationship to the salary that they were earning at that time. If there was a relationship then it has very little relationship to the salary that they are earning now. I think in these areas that these should be automatically brought up so that relationship again means something to what they would and could be earning now. I think if we were to see some of these people - and I could bring them here - who at that time had a partial disability and whose conditions have deteriorated because of their disabilities. And it would not be hard to convince the members of this Legislature that they should be receiving more favourable treatment in this area.

We get into the area of tourism. I will not spend a lot of time on that because I know the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in Charge of Tourism will pursue this area with vigour and enthusiasm. But here again I just want to make sure that the money allotted in the area of tourism is distributed on an equitable basis, not a per capita basis. I think that all should benefit throughout the province. We do know that in the zone that I am in, down in southern Alberta that we are certainly getting the shorter end of the stick at this particular time, and we would like this brought up to par where we would be getting our fair share of the pie, I think also that all people benefit from dollars spent on tourism in the province. I think such things as signs promoting tourism in Alberta should be done on a provincial basis because we all benefit on an equal basis. I do not think they should be geared to just the big cities and the

20-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

large centres because after all we have a lot of people coming to this province to avoid the concrete jungle, not to get into it again. So I hope that this will be taken into consideration.

The hon. Attorney General gave a very excellent talk yesterday and I enjoyed it very much. I think his points were very well taken. He referred to crime, the police force, drinking drivers and this sort of thing, which I think were all very well put. However, I do have a concern in this area. I think that it is important that if we are going to achieve and maintain a very high standard of excellence in our police forces that we are going to need more manpower and we are going to need more training, and consequently we are going to need more money. I am pretty much of the opinion, and I have given this a lot of consideration, that grants maybe should go to all areas of the province and be particularly earmarked to go to the police departments whether the RCMP, the city police, the municipal police or whatever the case may be, to beef up the police protection in this province. It is much better to prevent than to apprehend. I think that if we are talking about the damage that is done to body and to property on the highways or whatever the case may be, or a youngster who is maladjusted who goes out and commits a crime that could have been avoided. It is much easier to prevent this and the money is much more wisely spent trying to prevent these types of situations than to cure them after, because this just is not the answer. So I don't think we should be stingy in these areas. I think we need to beef up this program of prevention by getting into the budget something to increase the manpower and the training in these areas.

Now I know all these things cost money and we have to find the money some place. One little area where I think we could do it without hurting anyone and which might help a lot, is if we withdraw all official funds that are going into these day care centres. I firmly believe there should be no provincial aid to day care centres whatsoever. This is strictly a private enterprise type of situation and I do not like the government meddling with that at all. I think it should be left to private enterprise. If individual young parents have to go out and work, and if they have to get their children babysat by these institutions, then that mother or that parent should seek help through the welfare, and the total institution should not be subsidized and encouraged to do this. People do not realise what these day care centres are taking on -- they have six-week, eight-week, ten and twelve-week old babies and they are snatching them right out of the mothers' arms. Pretty soon they will decide on what day care centre they will go into on the basis of where it is the cheapest. This is a deplorable situation and I am very much opposed to it.

There is one other area, and the last one that I am going to mention, Mr. Speaker, which I suppose will be a bit of a surprise to a few people because everyone feels it is not very political to mention. However, I am not much of a political animal anyway so it does not bother me that much. I don't see anything wrong with saying something as long as it is not dishonest or immoral. It is a thing that I have discussed with individuals on that side of the House, this side of the House, and with my constituents at coffee time, at lunch time and so on. It is something that I have not seen in the budget but it may be there and I just have not sought it out as yet. That is the business of expenses for members of the Legislative Assembly. I think that the \$15 a day expense account for MLA's living away from home is inadequate. It is insufficient, to say the least it is immoral and it is absolutely out of touch with the times. I am not a bit ashamed and when I go home to my constituents this week as I have done before, and I am not going to be making any apologies to them for a request that this be brought up to what reality is. It just isn't in tune with the times. Some people can say that it is dedication, well I have got another word for it, it just isn't that at all. There are not that many MLA's in this province and in this legislature, and I do not down-grade any of you

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-35

who are so richly endowed with apostolic zeal that you want to come in here and give your service, let the family suffer at home, pay five or ten dollars a day out of your pocket for keep. You know I think I would be a little naive if I thought that this was true. I am not so concerned about the salary end of it but I do think the expense is out of touch and out of tune with the times. The public do not even realise how bad it is; they think we are absolutely sapped. I know what is happening with school trustees, in county councils and city councils -- this is the cheapest outfit that I have ever been with!

So, Mr. Speaker, these are the few points that I have in mind and I hope the government will be courageous enough to bring them forward, deal with them. We will talk about them, we will vote for them, we will get the show on the road. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, it is going to be hard to follow my hon. colleague. This is sort of a red letter day for me because for the first time I am speaking to you as an intellectual. I didn't know it until I got the Reader's Digest and found that an intellectual is one that uses too many words to say more than he knows. I am going to start out as an intellectual by telling you a true story. I didn't submit it to any True Story magazines but they might accept it. The title is, "Our Baby Has Forgotten His Fathers". For the benefit of those who have deplored the sad situation foisted on the new government by the old one, I want to bring you up to date just a little bit about your fathers. About 1905 when we had a Liberal government, I remember the hon. member from our constituency, because he lived long after that, but these men had problems that you have no way of evaluating. That does not matter very much; they were only in office about nine years when we had the First World War and things were pretty badly tied up. They took all the good horses to the army for the cavalry, so even the farmers couldn't travel. But that didn't matter. When this war was over the problems really multiplied. Wheat had been \$3 a bushel, cattle as high priced almost as they are now, and things were pretty good. And then about 1921 we had the first of the recessions. In the southern part of the province the recession came on top of a winter which had killed as many as 70% of the cattle herds in that area. When the recession had gotten under way, cattle prices went down to three and four cents a pound -- people were in lots of trouble. Now there were some recoveries thereafter, but you can imagine the governments in those days, when the land taxes were not paid, were really struggling. I am very glad I was not provincial treasurer at that time. But by 1929 when it appeared that we were having a recovery, our fathers in this Legislature faced the depression which started with the failure of the stock market on October 29. Now it should not have affected a country where we had everything that people could need, but it did. It was a good example of how we get tied into international affairs.

When that depression had reached its bottom, wheat was selling for 20 cents a bushel, beef at 75 cents a hundred; 6.7% of the people of this province were on relief, and by the standards today, 67% would have been on relief; 4% of the family heads were out of work, and if you transpose that in terms of the unemployment statistics of today, it would mean that 34% of the people were unemployed; 50% of the provincial revenue was required to pay interest on the provincial debt at that time. Half the property in most municipalities was already in the hands of the municipal governments, for tax recovery. They didn't sell it because nobody would buy it. By 1936 the provincial debt had reached \$167 million, and even I, who don't believe in debt, am not going to criticize the governments who borrowed at that time to try to carry on the services that they provided for our people. The municipalities, small as they were, owed \$70 million, the farm mortgages were at \$162 million. Believe me, it was hard to keep the family farms going. The urban

20-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

debt was \$100 million, and the federal debt was \$3 billion -- it is now some \$37 billion. It took 32% of the total wheat crop of Alberta just to pay the debt charges for this province. Now, Mr. Speaker, we do owe something to the fathers of that time -- we owe it to them to remember that we have had it pretty good since then.

Now budgeting -- I have heard a lot of talk about the priorities, as if this were a new discovery. But budgeting has always been just a matter of priorities. It has been something else too. I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer will bear me out when I say that for him it is a struggle between the call of the future and the spectre of the past. Now the spectre of the past is somewhat connected with the true story that I told you. I am not going to criticize this budget, because had I been the provincial treasurer on September 1st, I do not know how much better I could have done. And I do not know whether my philosophies would have changed things particularly or not. But I do want to call the attention of the House to some of the problems of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and of the government when it faces these things. We talk about the spectre of the past. We can look at the Resources Railway, and we can criticize the government that went along with it without knowing the history of it, without knowing what forced one step after another, and how difficult it is sometimes to change your course in the middle of the stream, although you know you are drifting toward the rapids. Well, we are worrying about the money we said we left you and that you could not find. I am not going to argue about it, but just say that you have taken over at a time when the \$167 million was paid. If you take the worst figures -- at least you are even, and you haven't very much to worry about. Besides that, you are in an age of affluence. I can tell you that the statistics bear out that never in the history of this province have the taxes been so low in comparison with the incomes of the people. Our people have more discretionary income left over after they pay their bills, than they had ever had.

This does not mean that we do not have pockets of difficulty. I certainly go along with the government in its attitude that we must look for those. The priority on people is nothing new and I hope they can do better than other governments have been able to do. But when you start to budget you soon discover that there are certain services that must be continued. You cannot do very much about them. The only spectre of the past, of course, is what level of service is left on your shoulders that you cannot do much about. You have certain statutory expenses. Laws have been passed that say the government shall make these payments, and the Provincial Treasurer can do very little about it. But there does come the time of discretionary expenses and there does come the time to consider capital. Capital, of course, is one of the most difficult things to handle. We have had some very fine lectures and some textbooks quoted here to the effect that it is alright to borrow as long as you keep it related to the gross national product. If you take our neighbour to the south and the extensions made by their own economists you will realize that by 1980 the debts of the municipalities, the states and the federal government will be worth all the assets of the United States. No one will know just when the time comes to stop. I will say a little more about that later.

Then comes the necessity to make grants. The pressure on any government to make grants gets pretty great indeed. Everyone has an appeal. It is hard to say no. I have tried it. Then we have subsidies, and subsidies have a place too. As long as a subsidy serves a purpose in carrying people over a crisis, in creating a new environment; as long as it is not going to be a continuing thing which makes people dependent upon the subsidy and not on their own resources, I have no quarrel with that. But the Provincial Treasurer has to say what subsidies can we afford. If we start, what is the picture for the future?

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-37

Then there are the cost-sharing programs. They are difficult. We have heard in this House this day two or three differences of opinion. One fellow says we cannot afford to miss \$50 million that the federal government would have given us. Another, who thinks more like I do, says we will not let the loss of a little money take away the freedom, the right of our province to self-determination. Well, who is right? History may tell us.

At this point we need to say something about our constitutional rights. If we had, from the very beginning, insisted that the constitution be observed by this province and by the federal government, we would not have many of the troubles we have today. I am not so sure that we could rewrite the series of British North America Acts, which determine our relationships with the federal government, and do any better. I am not sure that we will make any amendments which, in 30 years, will have proved beneficial. Our great mistake has been to let the federal government interfere in matters that were ours. In our willingness to accept from them cost-sharing programs and apparent bonuses, it turned out that for \$2 worth of security, we have sold \$5 worth of self-determination. And I don't like it.

I am not going to say much more about what you have to budget money for. I am only going to say that there are only certain ways to get this money. Some are responsibilities too. I think when governments first started out - and I do not want to be the chief historian - but, if you go back to Britain and the development of democracy, you will find that when the King called the first parliament, all he wanted to do was get money from them. He got it from them by telling them if you don't give me the cash, I am going to lose the war and you are all going to get it. They gave him the cash and pretty soon they began to tell him what he could do with the cash. It is that battle between the gathering of money and what you do with it that makes politics, and also makes democracy work. But where do you get money? The first source is taxes, licences, and fees which you impose upon the people who get the service. You have a right to tax them. Nobody disputes it. But you have a responsibility to tax them, too. If I were going to criticize this budget, I would say perhaps the government failed in its responsibility, even as hard as it would have been, to impose some additional taxation to cut down on the necessity to borrow. I'm not going to say that that is not curable. I'll only be disappointed if the government continues borrowing, but I repeat that the government has a responsibility to see that we do pay for some of the services we want. If you ever want to do anything important in politics, it will be to impress on the people that this new program which we propose is going to cost this many dollars per head, or it is going to cost this many percent of sales tax or this much property tax. Then the people will be a little more reasonable in dealing with you.

Well, we can get some money from rentals and from royalties and from interest. We do have property. We have land to lease, we have royalties and we collect some interest and some payments. That is not very controllable by the Provincial Treasurer, but he has to consider it. But we do have concessions to sell, too. People tell me every once in a while, why don't we get the same royalties as they get in the middle east? And when I tell them that we get more out of the net value of our oil and gas by far than the governments of the middle east, and show them how we get it, they are usually a little bit quieter. We have auctioned our concessions, and they have brought to us millions and millions of dollars. One danger is that we confuse these as a perpetual revenue, that we don't realize that we are selling the capital assets of the province. I have already said that another slight criticism of this budget is that while we transferred a considerable amount of expenditure to capital, we took into current revenue what, in the end, will prove to have been the sale of assets -- capital revenue. Well, be that as it may.

20-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

And then we get to federal grants, and when we get to federal grants, we get into trouble. One of the great dangers of this day is grants, and something I could never understand and can't yet is why in the world do we think the federal government is responsible for the expenditures of the provincial government? I heard my hon. friend, the Minister of Labour say he was having difficulty understanding some things and I was about to send him a note and say that I have had difficulty all my life, but if you persist sometimes you finally understand, although I haven't reached that stage yet. Why do we say they ought to get out of this tax field and give it to us, when we know darn well that they will simply have to get the same amount of money from us in some other way in the end? Such provinces as Alberta will be worse off. You always get money from those most convenient and from those you can argue can pay best, and so we are going to get it in the neck if we proceed like this. I am always concerned that the municipal governments are telling us "you've given us the responsibility but you didn't give us the money." We didn't propose to give them the money. We said, "do you want to run your schools?" They did not have to form school districts. If they had said "no," we would have had to run them. But they said "yes," and so we let them run them. We give them the authority. We give them a guiding hand, because that is our responsibility. And right away they say to us, "will you give us the revenue?"

Now, Mr. Speaker, the money most ill-spent is that which comes from a gift or that which you borrow. It is true of a person and it is true of a Legislature or it is true of a government. Now I'm a little bit concerned that we get around to the point of saying we don't want federal money. We'll live by the constitution. We have a right to raise money by direct taxation, which means income tax, if you like. Let them account to the people for what they tax and let us account to the people for what we tax. But let us not say that the constitution has not provided us with the means of managing our own affairs.

And then there are the sales of assets. You can sell assets. I'm sure that this government, and I'm particularly sure that the Minister of Environment, the Minister of Lands and Forests, and the Minister of Mines and Minerals are going to try to make sure that we don't sell our assets without creating some renewable resources, and that is important. You can make business profits if you like. I don't think any socialist government ever found that it was a good way to raise revenue, but we could take over industries. I suppose that we could take over the power in the province and we could raise the rates to the point where we made a lot of money, and we could kid ourselves that we had helped the people by taking off taxes. And of course, you can borrow. There are many ways of looking at borrowing. I'm not against borrowing if the asset is going to pay its way. There are two or three reasons to borrow and that is one of them. If you can build a bridge by borrowing, and if you want to put a toll on it and let it pay for itself, you are justified. Those of you who know about the first freeway in America out of New York realize that you paid a toll when you got on. It paid for itself quickly, and has since become a freeway.

Those of you who know of the Golden Gate Bridge and others know that by tolls you can pay, and that is a good reason to borrow. If you need an asset which you simply cannot pay for out of current revenue, but it will, either directly or indirectly, pay back, then I am not against borrowing. All I am saying is that we have no right to borrow for things which we ought to pay for now.

When you come to expenditure priorities, there are a number of ways of looking at it. Every budget is balanced. It is just a balance sheet after all. If you do not get enough revenue, all you do is borrow, and the budget balances. I persuaded a certain woman I deal with quite a bit, to keep a budget, and particularly I wanted her to keep track of her expenses. She was faithful, and every month

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-39

it balanced up nicely. But, she was paying a lot of money out to a fellow named Dik. And I finally said, "Who the heck is this fellow, Dik?" She said, "That is not Dik, that is an abbreviation. It is 'Damned if I know'."

Well, that is one way of balancing the budget, if you have some item you can put in to take up the slack either way. Well, there are many temptations to spend money provincially. But the priorities ought always to be these: First, the protection of life, property and liberty. Any money required to do that is well spent. It perhaps takes precedence over many others.

Then comes education. There is ample proof that no nation can make progress without a good educational system. I submit that this government has inherited one of the best educational systems in the world -- expensive, with abuses, needing some overhaul, but it is there. What we have to decide is how much we are going to spend for it and what kind of education we are going to get.

Then comes health. Health is one of the priorities that has to come third. Again, how much service? It is always a bit remarkable how, as individuals, we fail to live the health laws we know are there. The drunk knows he will have a headache in the morning, but he seems to think maybe tomorrow will not come. The fellow who smokes two packages of cigarettes a day knows the dangers to his health. But he thinks he might possibly be killed in an automobile accident and then how terrible he would feel missing the comfort of a cigarette. And so it goes. How much health? How much are we going to get for our money?

Then comes social service. In social service there is a tendency for us to cultivate this same unhealthy situation, that we will convert homo sapiens from man to vegetable. Pretty soon we will make it unnecessary for him to make any effort, and just when we get him there, he will discover that we are out of sawdust.

The next responsibility of a government is to establish an economic climate. You can help sometimes, but you cannot do it by subsidies -- loans, maybe. When I was thinking of the terrible debts the last government left, these uncollectables, I was thinking, too, that in ten years from now, if I were here, I could pick up your budget and show you how many loans the new government has made that will be uncollectable. That does not really matter if they served a good purpose. But the economic climate -- I am very happy with the approach the new government is taking on it; to seek markets, to seek industry, the hon. Minister of Industry told us some statistics that startled me. He said for instance, only 8% of our people are employed in primary industry. Well, it is hard for me to accept that. He added, secondary, which means that 92% of those who are employed, are in what are actually service industries, hot dog stands, clubs and so on. If that is the case, truly, the new government is on the right track. I, for one, shall support every effort they can make to establish an economy where 40% is in secondary industry.

The sixth priority has to be in legislative responsibility; in creating those rules and only those rules necessary for our society to function well, and administration, for that same purpose. I am very much aware there is fat in government. If you could truly get an independent person to evaluate any particular branch of this government he could very shortly show you where you could cut out some fat, you could change procedures and you could get more for your money. Well, if this government can accomplish it, I will be ready to vote for them. And I think they will work on it. I think all governments should work on it. It is a difficult task to assess management. This is only a priority that any business has. It is the responsibility of government to get out of the assets of this

20-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

province every dollar they can get. That applies to royalties on timber, it applies to every other concession that we put out. And, of course, there they are faced with this delicate problem of how much can you load on the willing camel? What will be the result? And it isn't easy.

Finally, a government is responsible for the cultural climate of its people. And I mean by that that the finer things of life are important. Sometimes those who have been hungry have been sustained by good music. Sometimes those who have lived in hovels have been sustained and able to carry on because of fine art and fine sculpture which fill a need in their lives. Well, these are the priorities of government. And I hope the new government will be able to give them the priority attention that they need.

Now let us go to taxes just for a minute. The government has a responsibility to tax as well as a right to tax. The politics of taxation are the important things. Always he who has to tax is looking for that group to tax who will have the least effect politically. Now if you took all the incomes of all the people in Canada, above \$25,000 a year, if you took all their incomes it wouldn't quite pay the interest on the national debt. Who is next? Well, the people who make from \$5,000 to \$25,000. The main hope of a government is that this group will never get too big. Because if their votes ever become too strong, I don't know where we will turn. But we do have to expect that what we call the middle income people are going to have to contribute. How do you get them to do it? Well, of course the indirect taxation is very appealing. If you can get your hand in their pocket without them really knowing it, that is one way. I submit that the only sane way to tax people is directly. So they know they are taxed. If you are overspending they can criticize you, if you are not, they have to defend you. I am sure, if you can ever get to the point where you tax even those you benefit, I mean the old people, and everybody else, so that they are reminded almost every day that services cost money, that even though you have to give them additional benefits, you will have served a very big purpose.

I am not going to talk about specific taxes, I am only going to say that you have to be careful in your definition. The hon. member from Spirit River-Fairview said that sales tax is regressive. How do you define regressive? A progressive tax is one where the rate increases as the income goes up for instance. The regressive tax is one where the rate increases as the ability to pay goes down. In that sense sales tax is not regressive. It is only regressive in the sense that it may take more from the poor than other taxes do. But I submit to you that no statistics that anybody has ever produced can show that a sales tax takes more from the poor than the property tax. And when you begin to consider some exemptions for the poor you have to be careful. Why don't we sell them telephone service for \$2 less when they are poor? Why don't we take off some of the gasoline tax for those who are poor? Well, I know it cannot be done, and you know that it cannot be done, but I think that these are considerations that you have to talk about.

I am not going to deal very much further except to say there are two kinds of grants. One is the conditional grant and it is a dangerous one. It is the kind that makes us suffer at the hands of Ottawa, that you have to do this if we give you the money. It is like the old system of saying to the children of a little rural school - if you can raise half the money the board will buy you a new slide knowing darn well they can't buy a new slide because they can't put up half the money. A conditional grant always reacts badly on those least able to meet the conditions. I hope we'll get out of that. I am not going to say much more about borrowing, but I am going to say that if circumstances indicate that borrowing is in order, then we have to consider the future of that borrowing. Do circumstances also indicate that we will have a continuing revenue by

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-41

which to pay it off? Are we going to subscribe to that theory of borrowing that as long as you can borrow why worry? We have a lot about textbooks and Mr. Keynes. His theory was simply that it is the business of the government to put a little spur in the economy with borrowed money. Well Britain was responsible for this crazy politician and one of the first to take up his theory, and they are about the brokest of any democracy I know. I don't know whether that proves anything but at least we ought to think a little bit.

Now in budget management it is the business of this Legislature to see that we don't forget a few things, to see that we start early. I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer is already aware that the experts in government have plotted his demise and I think he can defend himself. It is natural that men who are put in positions to serve us think up new ideas, new things we can do, and if you are not careful they have already got the planning so far along you cannot stop them.

I was very happy to hear in the budget address of the necessity for some long range planning, for some projections. If you are going to build a new hospital you have to realize that sometimes three years operational costs will equal the cost of the hospital. That does not prove that you should not build the hospital, but it does prove that you have to be aware that in the future you are going to have to provide this money. You have to review old programs. I know how hard that is. In the next year I expect this government to review old programs. I once got in trouble in the House by saying it was high time we closed the agricultural colleges, that their usefulness was past. They didn't close them and I got a few blasts but I didn't change my mind. Finally, however, they did overhaul them and make them useful. I can give you lots of examples - I discovered in three constituencies where I made a study that 3% of the farmers were all that ever contacted the district agriculturist. In each case there was a good man there; there was good service, but if the people are not going to use it maybe you have to evaluate whether you have a district agriculturist or not. At the same time let us look at the home economists, for example. I know they are fine people, but if your schools have got to the point where there is no reason for people to need other sources of information about home management maybe we have to do something about it. Well, you certainly have to seek alternatives. What you do and what you can get away politically is pretty well managed by the maturity of the citizenry. You have to keep them aware that they have to prove their maturity.

Now for a very few minutes I am going to touch on some of the things that have been said in this budget debate and treat them perhaps in a little different way. I am going to start with the ladies by simply saying that they proved to me that charming women can true converts be. We love the precepts for the teacher's sake. They certainly did well. But I am going back to some of the others. The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands said we cannot mortgage the provincial assets, and I think he meant that you may not be able to go down to the court house and register a mortgage. But mortgage after all is a broad term that just finally was applied like that. He said, for instance that we are having so little comment from the opposition. That was something I was proud of because I thought it meant that we were happy with most of things that were being done. I still hope that is the reason because I don't think it is the business of the opposition just to make noises. I think when we have something to offer that is our business - even when sometimes we may not agree with it. Because our duty as I see it is to be sure that no alternative, no criticism is unevaluated.

Well I can pass along a little bit - the hon. Member for Stettler said how many of our old people are going to be unhappy with the new benefits. And my reaction was this; if you went to one of these old people and said, "Mr. so-and-so, we know you need some help

20-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

and we know that your daughter can get credit; she is not rich but she can get credit. Would you like her to borrow a few dollars for you?", the reaction would probably be "No". So if you want to label me a means test man, alright. My party would never go along with me. But I still think that if government is going to take over charity then they should only practise charity where it is needed. I think if I had ten cows and my neighbour had ten children and no cow, I would not get much criticism from anybody in this House if I had him arrested for taking my cow. But if the government came and took two cows and gave them to him, or took three and gave them to another neighbour who already had three but did not have as many as I, that seems to be a legitimate thing and I submit that that is not within the rights of government. I submit that in most of these matters the government cannot bury its mistakes; that is a monopoly of the medical profession. You are going to have to live with these things.

Well the hon. Member for Stony Plain only confirmed my suspicion that sometimes we get to thinking that nonsense and noise will oft prevail where reason and affection fail. He talked about funny money, and I just wonder if he ever tried to understand Social Credit monetary philosophy. The time might come when even you fellows will find it necessary to look at it, and maybe the truth will get through. The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill who is a pretty sagacious fellow -- I have followed his career and I think in general, I would trust the management of many things to him; he called this a simple budget. Without any offense meant, maybe it is just a budget for the simple. I was very pleased with the presentation because in my day we thought we had to tell the people of the province, because some of them would not read, where we got the money and how we were spending it. It was Mr. Bennett in B.C. who started this type of budget address, who made a very fine speech, and left us to read the budget. But I do like it. I think it is a legitimate and a good way to do it, but it is not necessarily simpler or more understandable. I wonder, if the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill had known that \$300 million was not in the treasury, if he would have run. He talked about the Touche, Ross report. I think the government had a legitimate motive in getting this report, but I think all you can get is an interpretation and nobody needs to accept it. We are not very much wiser if the money is there it is there, if it is not there it is not there. If some of these loans are uncollectable, that is what we have to accept and it was not worth very much to us. There are just two kinds of people when it comes to that kind of business, those who get their capital by borrowing and those who accumulate some capital to lend.

I am going to have to hurry along to make things meet here. The hon. Member for Camrose says this is an exciting budget. Well there are people who found excitement in it, how easily entertained they are. To me, Mr. Speaker, it was a pretty business-like budget. I enjoyed it. He talked about little places struggling for their existence and we all have those -- I have them and you have them, and I hope this government can do something about them. But when he said the government had to take the total responsibility I find I have to disagree. Conditions far beyond government are going to dictate whether or not we are going to maintain some of these little communities.

One gentleman made a speech that I did enjoy and that was the hon. member Dr. Paproski who isn't in the House at this time. But he gave us an example of what you should do when you want to speak to this Legislature. He had gathered some information; he had a point of view, right or wrong, which he gave to us in a pretty convincing way, and I think, perhaps, his suggestions were given to get some attention. I made very good notes on them because I want to refer to them later, not in the House, but for reference to see what I believe in. He talked about some of the important things that we can do for our people. I mentioned the hon. Minister of Industry and some of the things he said to us, but there were one or two places where I

March 29th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

20-43

was doing some thinking too. The loss of graduates from our universities may not be a loss in the end. It may be a contribution which we are making to other people in the world. It has always been the case that those nations and those countries leading in education have provided graduates for other countries. And perhaps we should be proud of it because I have seen this grow, and the time will never come when Alberta, if we maintain our educational standards, cannot provide the kind of jobs, the kind of challenges, that all of our graduates need.

He said the freight structure unjustly penalizes us, and I did not like the word 'penalty'. It is realistic, it is one of the things that always bothers me, that people go to the wilderness where they can buy land for a dollar an acre, and then they come back to the province and say, "we have got to have a school tomorrow! We have got to have a highway tomorrow! We are citizens, we are entitled to the same service." But when, due to the work of the province, that farm becomes worth double, they do not come back and say, we will split with you! Now I submit that we have to accept the fact that we are in an unfavourable position because of location, and rather than ask the federal government to subsidize the freight, we get busy on methods of production, on markets where the prices are right to overcome it.

He said the federal government withdraws vast sums. Well the federal government does withdraw vast sums, and we draw something back from them. But we wouldn't have much of an economy without the rest of Canada, and as I have said before, that is something we just have to accept.

The floating dollar was mentioned, and most of you know that it does affect our exports if our dollar floats upward. But in the end there is only one kind of trade and that is balanced trade, and the floating of the dollar will give us a better understanding of the realities of our industries and our production than anything else. And if we learn to live with it we will become a very strong nation indeed.

Well I can't treat everybody the same I suppose; I am just going to say one thing. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs did a very creditable job, but he mentioned one thing, and that is the number of tax sales which are evolving in the province. Now I think this is serious and I do think that we don't have to permit any of these sales to be made at less than real value. But I submit to you that they are a reflection of the fact that you cannot overcome inefficiencies by subsidies, that we cannot do a lot about it.

We talk about the labour force. The hon. member, I know is going to try to do a good job. But I just wanted you to be aware of the fact that if Alberta were able to achieve the total labour that he talked about, you would have to put a wall up around Alberta with an electric fence on top, because the rest of Canada would be on your doorstep. And while I quite agree that we ought to aim for total employment, I call again to your attention that it is a relative figure. Many people don't work because they don't want to work. They do not have to work, but because they register for employment, they get on the roll as unemployed. Maybe we just have to be realistic and say that if we can achieve 3%, and if at the same time we have a social service system which looks after those who cannot get employment, and if we are doing all we can to employ them, maybe we have to accept it. It's better than getting unemployment down so low that we have an invasion from a lot of other people.

Mr. Speaker, may I beg leave to adjourn the debate because I do want five more minutes to deal with one other topic.

20-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

March 29th 1972

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CCGKSCN:

Mr. Speaker, could I rise on a point of order at this point before we adjourn?

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the House has agreed the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CCCKSON:

As chairman of the Special Standing Committee, due to some misunderstanding in the proceedings of March 17th, the list of the hon. members opposite was not included in the total number of the Standing Committee on Public Affairs, Agriculture and Education. It was not intentional, but normally we assume that all members are a part of this committee with the exception of yourself, sir. And therefore, to correct this I would like to table the full list of the members of this committee and ask that you direct that the Votes and Proceedings of Friday, March 17th, be corrected.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House agrees that the Votes and Proceedings be amended as suggested by the hon. Member for Lacombe.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 5:30 pm]