

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Wednesday, April 5th, 1972

(The House met at 2:30 pm.)

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

MR. SPEAKER'S RULING

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. members may recall that on Thursday a matter of privilege was raised in the House by the hon. the Attorney General which was subsequently referred to in a motion drafted by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, the Deputy Premier, which motion was then left with me for consideration as to whether there might be a prima facie question of privilege. Since that time I have had an opportunity to read the motion and to review briefly some of the authorities, and with great respect I must say that it does not appear to me to constitute a point of privilege.

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise on a point of privilege. I wish to squelch the rumours concerning my broken arm. I would like to point out that it is not true that the injury resulted from my disagreements with the hon. members opposite, nor is it true my wife caught me. The fact is that I was in a father and son hockey game with my ten year old son and that is how it happened.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 40: The Weed Control Act

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being Bill No. 40 The Weed Control Act. This bill is a completely new bill which replaces the existing Noxious Weeds Act. The purpose of the bill is to provide a workable vehicle through which to control the spread of noxious weeds in Alberta, both in the rural and the urban areas. The bill was designed, in part, from existing legislation in other provinces and several states in the United States, but largely from our own experience here in Alberta in the control of noxious weeds. Certain sections of the bill were designed specifically with the urban areas in mind and the problems they have incurred in past years in weed control. A further purpose of the bill is to transfer some of the authority with respect to the making of regulations and the naming of noxious weeds to the municipal level of government in keeping with our promise to allow municipal levels of government more

22-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

control of their own affairs. The bill also allows for the naming of noxious weeds by regulation attached to the act, instead of by legislation within the act itself, so that weed control may keep pace with the changing conditions in chemical weed control, particularly in respect to new field crops in Alberta.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 40 was introduced and read a first time.]

DR. HCFNER:

I'd like to move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs that Bill No. 40, The Weed Control Act be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The Motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

Bill No. 30 The Agricultural Chemicals Amendment Act, 1972

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Agricultural Chemicals Amendment Act. This act does two things, basically. First of all it transfers responsibility for jurisdiction of the act to the Department of the Environment from the Department of Agriculture, and it also sets up the departmental mechanism for administration of the act. Secondly, it clarifies the conditions under which pesticides can be applied near a body of water.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 30 was introduced and read the first time.]

#### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. J. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 18 members of the Kitscoty 4-H Beef Club, their leader, Mr. Don King and accompanying parents, Mrs. Watt and Mrs. Stone, and their bus driver, Mrs. Stewart. They are seated in the public gallery and I would ask that they stand and be recognized.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 30 members of the Vermilion-Mannville 4-H Dairy Club and their leader, Mr. Leversedge and Mr. Haines. As minister responsible for 4-H, I should like especially to thank these leaders on behalf of all the other leaders that are working voluntarily for the 4-H Clubs in Alberta for the many outstanding efforts they are providing for our young people of Alberta. I would like them now to stand and be recognized.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly a number of persons who are in the members gallery, who are involved in Alberta's Girls' Parliament. They are the Girl Guides of Canada, some of their leaders, and other interested persons. Also with them are members of the Tuxis and Older Boy's Parliament who are giving the girls some suggestions as to what their activities should be in regard to the Girls' Parliament. Also with them is the founder, who is a former member of the Legislative Assembly, Mrs. Ethel Wilson, who is the founder of the Alberta Girl's Parliament. I would like to congratulate all these people on their interest in this democratic process, and I look to you people for increased interest on the distaff side in this

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-3

Legislative Assembly. I would like you all to stand and be recognized.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. members won't object to me just saying a word, inasmuch as Mrs. Wilson is part of the group that is in attendance today. First off, let me say that I really appreciate the contribution made by women to the past sessions of the Legislature and to our present session by those who are in here now. We have previously indicated that the introduction of page girls will add a new dimension to the operation of the Legislature. I am sure that all hon. members will agree that the introduction of Girls Parliament will introduce a new dimension to political thinking in our province, and that men may well look forward to having some real competition for MLA positions in the future. We're very happy to join with you in welcoming them here today.

DR. PAPROSKI:

I wonder if I could make a comment. Mrs. Ethel Wilson, I think I should comment, was my opponent in the last election; however, I would like to indicate here and now that I'd like to recognize her and her contribution over the many years that she has given to this province.

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 30 students from the Easter Fun Days classes sponsored by the Salisbury United Church in Sherwood Park. They are accompanied by several parents and leaders. They are in the public gallery and I'll now ask them to stand and be recognized.

MR. STROM:

I would like to introduce today a man who is sitting in your gallery, who spent a number of years in this Legislature on this side of the House. I cannot say that I always agreed with him, but I can say, Mr. Speaker, with sincerity, that I always respected him and his contribution that he made while serving the constituency of Lac la Biche. He is now serving as a member of the Federal Parole Board, and I am very happy to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Legislature Mr. Mike Maccagno.

MR. NCTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Legislative Assembly 16 Lutheran students from Grades VII, VIII, and IX from Hines Creek, Fairview and Dawson Creek, British Columbia and Sexsmith, Alberta. They are accompanied by Pastor Karl Sauer from Fairview, Pastor George Richter from Dawson Creek and Mr. John Mumm from Fairview. I would ask that they stand at this time and be recognized by this Assembly.

#### FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the annual report of the Glenbow Alberta Institute for the fiscal year ended February 28, 1971.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to submit herewith two copies of the annual report of The Eastern Rockies Forest Conservation Board.

22-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

---

This annual report is in compliance with both federal and provincial legislation. It is for the fiscal year to March 31, 1970, and therefore, for the fiscal year of 1970-1971.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a reply to a return requested from the Assembly I would like to table.

CLERK:

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon Premier. Is the hon. Premier aware that we had when we were in government issued an invitation to Premier Bourassa to visit the province of Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, no I am not aware of that. I have had discussions with the Prime Minister of Quebec, Mr. Bourassa about matters of that nature.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to hear that. I am wondering, supplementary question, what steps have the Alberta government taken to get a tripartite agreement between the province of Quebec and Ontario and our own province in relationship to dealings they intend to have with the federal government?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, it is not the intention of the present administration to be involved in any particular formal situation to the exclusion of other provinces in Canada. But we have been taking some initiatives in regard to establishing relationships with other provincial governments which we think are very important. This involved a number of discussions that we held at the first ministers' meeting. It involved the meeting of the Prairie Provinces Economic Council but it has been a continuing series of discussions we have held with other provincial administrations over the course of the past seven months.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, can I assume then that any suggestions made in this regard are false?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Pending the Leader of the Opposition, maybe he could clarify what he is driving at in relationship to a specific tri-party agreement.

MR. STROM:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would happy to do so. It was reported in the daily newspaper in our city that the Alberta government was, in fact, going to discuss with the two provinces mentioned. possible arrangements, whereby they would get together in an arrangement whereby they would be speaking with one voice (although those words weren't used) in matters relating to changes in the constitution.

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-5

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the newspaper report that the hon. Leader of the Opposition refers to. Certainly it appeared to be a speculative one. All I can say is that we consider, as far as our administration is concerned, that we are involved with nine other provincial governments in addition to the federal government. We have had, as I mentioned in the earlier answer, discussions with all of them and will continue to do so. We do think that it is an important part of the provincial administration to keep as close a contact as we possibly can with other provincial administrations, and I am very pleased with the progress that we have been able to make in the seven short months in establishing very effective working relationships with the other provincial governments.

Censorship Policy

MR. STRICH:

Mr. Speaker, this is a question on another matter. In the setting up of the censorship legislative committee, is it the government's intention to give direction to the members of their party on the committee as to the government's view in regard to changes that they would want made?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is, definitely not. Certainly Ministers of the Crown who have views with regard to these matters and are expressing them publicly are expressing them in accordance with responsibilities that they have. But they should not be taken to be matters of public policy at this time, and that is the purpose of having the legislative committee. It would not be, neither in regard to this committee or other committees, our view that prior to the determination and conclusions of the Legislative Committee, that members on this side of the House would feel that their situation was such that they were bound by any sort of terms of reference or direction. It is the Legislative Committee: that is why we have established them and mentioned them in the Speech from the Throne. That is why, as members recall, we have distinguished between the Legislative Committees and task forces of the government team, for that particular reason. So in answer to the hon. Leader's question, definitely not.

MR. STRICH:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would a minister speaking on the matter, making suggestions that changes are forthcoming, be speaking for himself or for the government?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I have a fair idea of the nature of the remarks that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is referring to, but rather than deal in a more general way, perhaps he could be specific about the matter that he is referring to, and I will attempt to respond.

MR. STRICH:

Mr. Speaker, in today's Journal I read this statement. "The Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation said Tuesday the guidelines which the Alberta Censorship Board uses will most likely be changed."

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think I will let the hon. minister respond to the remarks that he has made, but during the course of the past weekend I was involved in a television interview, and was asked a similar question; I said that among the things that I would hope the

22-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

---

Legislative Committee would look at would be alternatives in terms of whether or not we will be dealing strictly with classification or whether we would go beyond that. It seems clear to me, if we are going to have an effective Legislative Committee, that the Legislative Committee should examine not just both sides of that particular question, but also other aspects of it. Perhaps with those remarks I could ask the minister if he wants to respond.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, since I think it refers to the article in today's Journal, it was not an interview, it was a conversation across the table; the discussion was not whether this would be changed or not, the discussion was what the committee will look into. My reply at the time was that the committee will look into changes, if necessary, of The Censorship Act, or anything that refers to censorship in Alberta.

Two Standards of Justice

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General. Can the hon. minister assure us that all police forces in Alberta treat all citizens alike? Specifically, do citizens with influence ever receive courtesies or special privileges?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how I can answer for all police forces in Alberta on the spur of the moment. I can assure the hon. member that, as far as I am concerned, all of the police forces in Alberta will treat all of the citizens in Alberta in an identical fashion.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, can the hon. minister advise us if any municipalities requested him or his police commissions to investigate alleged interference with law enforcement by senior police officers?

MR. LEITCH:

I can't recall any such instance, Mr. Speaker, but if the hon. member has something in mind, perhaps he could mention it and that might assist me.

MR. WILSON:

Has the hon. minister, then, seen an editorial which appeared in last week's issue of the North Hill News in Calgary entitled "The Course of Justice"?

MR. LEITCH:

I have not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

I would like to table this editorial for the hon. minister and in the meantime could he assure us, then, that we do not have two standards of justice - one for the rich and one for the poor?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that so far as I am concerned we do not now have, and as long as I have this position, we

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-7

will not have two standards of justice - one for the rich and one for the poor -- or any different standards for anyone else.

Wilderness and Restricted Development Areas Near Grande Prairie

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Has the government made any decision yet with respect to the submission by Wild Kakawa, a Grande Prairie based conservation group proposing a wilderness area and also a restricted development area south of Grande Prairie?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the government has this matter under active consideration.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question,, Mr. Speaker. In your consideration is the government contemplating any changes in the present lease agreement between the government of Alberta and Procter and Gamble to permit a trade off of other public lands in exchange for the land requested by Wild Kakawa?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, there are many matters associated with the request that I have received, in connection with establishing a restricted development area, and in connection with establishing a wilderness area. These matters are all being considered at this time. This is not a simple question, it is not a simple matter. It touches on many aspects that involve many aspects of our society and these are all being considered at this time.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary, either to the hon. minister or perhaps to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. I would like to ask whether the government is contemplating any major changes in the Procter and Gamble lease at this time and, if they are, what are those changes going to be?

MR. YURKO:

I think I will pass this on to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forest.

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would assume that the supplementary question was related to the initial question and the hon. member might indicate if I am correct in that regard.

As I think the Legislature knows, we are contemplating amendments to The Wilderness Areas Act, Mr. Speaker, that will solidify and finalize the wilderness areas, as they have been suggested now as provisional areas with some possible changes, of course, and also to have a workable and usable act in the future if, in the interests of the public of Alberta, it should be necessary to add wilderness areas. One possible addition among several possible additions is the one addition suggested just now by the hon. member opposite. All these suggestions will be fully considered in the light of the decision of this Assembly respecting finalization and consolidation of that Wilderness Areas Act here in 1972.

22-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

---

MR. NOTLEY:

A final supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, Mr. Speaker. Does the government have any idea as yet as to a timetable in this respect and I want to come right back to the original proposal advanced by Wild Kakawa with respect to the proposed wilderness area and also the restricted development area under study- is there any idea yet as to, when we might have some definitive explanation of the governments position?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the government position with respect to The Wilderness Areas Act will be reflected in the amendments that will be brought forward for consideration in this Assembly. It is rather a separate matter regarding any suggested additions for changes in wilderness areas that we have in Alberta now or are suggested, and the one suggested by the hon. member has been suggested by a large number of people, as have several other wilderness areas. I think the point in response that I want to emphasise is this - it is essential that the finalization of The Wilderness Areas Act be accomplished in the 1972 session of the Legislative Assembly so that we then have an act that we can use and alter according to the number, sizes, and locations of wilderness areas in the future. More specifically with regard to any particular impact on a group of people such as an individual company, Mr. Speaker, this would be hypothetical until such time as the public of Alberta, through its elected representatives, decided that that wilderness area should or should not be included in The Wilderness Areas Act of Alberta and set aside.

Migratory Bird Damage to Farm Crops

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. A recent newspaper reported indicated that the federal government is, for the first time, accepting responsibilities for damage done to farm crops by migratory birds. My question is - would the minister elaborate further on this announcement?

DR. HORNER:

I have no further information other than the announcement from Ottawa in relation to this. We hope that this would be one of the areas that the Legislative Committee studying crop insurance would also look into in relation to a better approach to the question of the wildlife damage fund as well.

MR. RUSTE:

Supplementary question; do I understand then that no meeting has been held with the federal authorities on this matter?

DR. HOENER:

No meeting has been held on a ministerial level, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RUSTE:

One further supplementary question, in this article it refers to -- and I think I will quote it with your permission, Mr. Speaker;

"Mr. Davis made the announcement at a press conference after meeting Acting Environmental Management Minister, Mr. Leonard Evans of Alberta was not represented."



April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-9

I am just wondering if the hon. minister was aware of that meeting.

DR. HCFNER:

Yes, I am aware of that meeting, Mr. Speaker.

Assistance for Potato Growers

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The question is: is your government going to assist our potato growers in the area of guaranteeing loans for capital and for operating expenses?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, this is in addition to the announcement in response to a question from the hon. Member for Taber-Warner the other day. We are actively considering the matter and hope to have an announcement in the next few days regarding a program which will assist the potato growers all over Alberta in relation to some of their costs, both capital and operating.

Migratory Bird Damage to Farm Crops (con't.)

MR. BUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question; did the hon. minister not consider it important enough to be represented at that meeting or didn't he receive an invitation?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge I didn't receive an invitation to the meeting and as a matter of fact that particular meeting took place sort of ad hoc, as I understand it, in either Winnipeg or Regina when they were there for other purposes as well.

Grain Shipping

MR. PUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Sir, in reference to your letter of March 10th, written to Mr. Jamieson, the Minister of Transport, with copies to Otto Lang and H. A. Olsen, have you had any replies from these gentlemen on your proposals?

DR. HORNER:

I have had some acknowledgments from all of the ministers involved in the area, but we think that part of the reply was the announcement by the federal government of a start on the Prince Rupert terminals and, in addition to that, the hon. Otto Lang has already announced that he is going to be making an announcement very shortly in relation to the provision of box cars or special hopper cars for the movement of grain. I might also tell the hon. member that our Grain Commission has had its initial meeting, has decided on a course of action, and has divided into separate smaller committees to look into the various matters and to follow them up.

22-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

---

Offers of Employment in the U.S.A.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Would the hon. minister investigate the current advertisements offering thousands of jobs and a working holiday in the United States to Albertans by the Senitol Bureau of Liverpool, England, to guarantee that it is in fact a bona fide job offer?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly will. The question is an excellent one. It is a very intriguing and important situation when an American employment source finds advertising capabilities in England for Canadian students. I will certainly find this information and I want to mention that the hon. Member for Calgary Bow drew my attention to this before the afternoon session.

Provincial and AGT Borrowings

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer? Has the government as yet decided the length of time of the borrowings to be made this summer -- is it ten, fifteen or twenty years, or does it vary?

MR. MINIELLY:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question, we haven't made a definite decision. As you know, in the past it has been for a twenty year period. At the present time we have not decided with respect to future borrowings, but we tend to be leaning towards carrying on with twenty year terms, at least with the initial borrowings.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, will your department be handling the borrowings for Alberta Government Telephones this summer?

MR. MINIELLY:

Mr. Speaker, we will be making the arrangements, not handling the borrowings.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. What is the amount of money that AGT plans to borrow this coming year and does it expect to get it all on the Canadian market?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, there are two borrowings that are anticipated to fulfill the capital requirements of AGT and both are in the approximate neighbourhood of \$25 million each, and at this particular time it is anticipated that both placements will be made in the Canadian market but conditions may change weekly or almost daily.

MR. HENDERSON:

I would like to ask a supplemental question of the Provincial Treasurer. In view of the fact that the government is going to be borrowing very heavily directly -- there are Alberta Government

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-11

-----  
Telephones borrowings and there are also the other guaranteed indirect borrowings of other institutions in the province; could the Provincial Treasurer give us an estimate of the total direct and indirect borrowings that will be going to the marketing board this year?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I'll deal with that in my remarks, but I'm not sure though that I fully understood what the hon. member's question was.

MR. HENDERSON:

I was asking the hon. Provincial Treasurer if he could give the House some idea of the magnitude of the total direct provincial borrowings (which we have some idea of) and the indirect or guaranteed borrowings of other institutions in the province, for which the Provincial Government is responsible indirectly.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I'll be advising the House in due course on that. There are various facets -- as you know we also have to turn over the Alberta Resources Railway debt to some extent this year. They were initially on a short term basis so I can assess this; we have assessed the AGT and the direct borrowings, as you know, which I indicated in my budget speech, and I think I have also indicated to the House that we actually anticipate that we should not have to borrow more for general revenue account purposes than \$150 million approximately, but the rest will be clarified in due course. There are many facets as you know that have to be considered.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary to the hon. Minister of Telephones. Will a reasonably large portion of the \$50 million be made available or reserved for Alberta residents?

MR. WERRY:

Well that question, Mr. Speaker, has been raised a number of times in this House in the past two or three weeks and the Provincial Treasurer has dealt with it. Basically what happens on any bond placement is that the group that is handling the particular issue has individual dealers in Alberta, and as an Albertan you know there are a number of firms that will be within that grouping. There will probably be 15 or 20 different firms within any one grouping for an issue, so that any individual Albertans that wish to participate in that particular bond issue can contact their dealer or bank and I would think that they would be able to get all the bonds that they would like in order to invest in Alberta.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Isn't that exactly the way any borrowing has been conducted at previous times? Is there going to be no reserve made for the people of Alberta?

MR. WERRY:

Well, as I indicated, Mr. Speaker, this is the normal practice with the loaning institutions, and we have under consideration at this time different methods of debenture or bond issuing that may in fact depart from the previous procedure of the previous government. To date these alternatives have not been brought before Cabinet, and there has been no decision made on them, but I can say that different alternatives are being studied and probably will be recommended for consideration.

22-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

---

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Telephones.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. I believe the hon. Provincial Treasurer wishes to supplement that answer.

MR. MINIELY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to do so. Questions on the general government borrowings and the policy with respect to debenture issues and their provision for purchase by citizens of Alberta were asked by members opposite I believe by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crownest, some week or ten days ago. At that time I indicated to the House that we were considering being able to set a portion of these issues aside for Albertans, but this decision is not easily made because of the fact that we also have to balance it with the issue going quickly in order that the interest rate and the debenture issue in total is a successful issue. We'll report back to the House on that matter.

#### Sale of AGT

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, one supplementary to the hon. Minister of Telephones. Has the government given up the idea then of selling AGT in whole or in part to the people of Alberta as per the Premier's statement during the election campaign?

MR. WERRY:

Why, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that that statement requires an answer because it never was a position of this government. . .

SOME HCN. MEMBERS:

Ch, Ch!

MR. WERRY:

. . .but immediately upon taking office, I was asked this question by various members of the news media, and I think at that time laid to rest any rumour that was around to the effect that AGT would be sold to the public. There will not be, and there is at this time, no consideration being given whatsoever to the sale of AGT in any shape, manner, or form.

#### Television Interviews

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. Would the hon. Premier be in a position to advise the Legislature what other topics were covered in the television program mentioned earlier this afternoon, other than with respect to censorship? The television program in Calgary -- I believe you said you were on television over the weekend or something.

MR. LUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I have difficulty responding to that question. Is the hon. member asking me if I would outline my best recollection of the subjects that were raised in the television interview by -- I think it was shown on Sunday evening and was taped on Saturday in the CPN studio in Calgary -- is that what the hon. member wants me to

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-13

do? Well I don't know if that is a reasonable question to try to answer, Mr. Speaker. I think if the hon. member is interested, I will make an attempt to get a record of the tape of it. My recollection generally was that we dealt with a whole gambit of subjects that are raised and have been raised in this Legislature. They certainly involve the question of foreign investment and matters of the constitution. I don't think in the oral question period I can go much beyond that, unless there is any particular item the hon. member would like to ask me about.

MR. FRENCH:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the hon. Premier table the transcript?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Smoky River followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. FRENCH:

I just have one more supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did the hon. Premier make any statements with respect to Lake Louise?

MR. LOUGHIE:

Mr. Speaker, I think that certain hon. members might be inclined to view the remarks I made as not having been a statement. I did deal with the subject in roughly the same way it has been dealt with many times here in the House in the question period, and certainly as close as I could to the position as placed by the government through the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. As far as tabling the tape of that particular program, I would like to take that under advisement. That is certainly not, in any way, shape, or form, the property of the government and it may be better, perhaps, for the hon. member to direct his inquiry to the television studio as to whether or not that tape may be available.

Environment Conservation Authority

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment with regard to the announcement that Mr. Babey has been employed by the federal government. Will his position on the Environment Conservation Authority be terminated, and if so when?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Babey's functions with the Department of the Environment terminate on April 10th.

MR. MOORE:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will that position be filled or left vacant after that date?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, that position will be filled. If it is filled from within the Civil Service then there won't be any advertising. If it is filled from outside the Civil Service then the position will be advertised extensively.

22-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

---

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do I gather from the hon. minister that Mr. Babey is now employed with the Department of the Environment itself?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, for clarification Mr. Babey is employed with the Environment Conservation Authority which reports to the Minister of the Environment.

MR. FOSTE:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Would he give his assurance to this Assembly that the man who will be replacing Mr. Babey will have the same, or somewhat similar, agricultural background to fully represent agriculture on that board?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I will make no such assurance to the hon. member or the House.

Overtime Pay for Civil Service Professional Staff

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Apparently recently confusion has arisen, Mr. Minister, regarding overtime pay for the civil service, in particular those in the professional positions. I was wondering what the government policy is as far as overtime is concerned with the professional staff of the government?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the question is the kind that, in all honesty, I would have to look in the manual to find the answer. I know the policy is that the professional staff has no overtime as such except on assignments. But I would have to check on practice within the departments and give a full and complete answer. I hope this is satisfactory to the hon. member.

Land Bank Financing

MR. DIXON:

Quite satisfactory, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question now to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the government planning any changes in legislation regarding the land banks for transportation cores and the downtown cores of urban centres? Maybe while I am on my feet I could ask a supplementary as well. Are the government or municipalities taking advantage of Sections 40 and 43 of the National Housing Act regarding financing of land banks?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the hon. member has given me advance notice of the question. To the first question, the answer is no with respect to urban centres and transportation corridors. With respect to the second part, under Sections 42 and 40 of the National Housing Act, under Section 42 which covers assembly programs, a great variety of Alberta municipalities have borrowed about \$13.5 million over the past couple of years for land assembly projects. Under Section 40 there has been only one loan for land for

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-15

public housing and that was in the neighbourhood of about - well it was only in excess of \$3,000.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury followed by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

University Enrolments

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and ask him whether, in light of statements which emanated from the University of Alberta over the weekend, particularly from the Law faculty, he has given any further consideration to the serious matter of quotas on students?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not exactly sure what statements my hon. friend is referring to. I think he is referring to a statement made by the Dean of the Faculty of Law at the University of Alberta, that he would like to limit the enrolment of that faculty to 500 students and that there are something like 450 students anticipated in the following year.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to participate in the debate being conducted by the university in terms of their internal management. In fact, I will watch this with great interest. In terms of public statements, the House might like to consider a statement by Dr. Max Wyman, the president of the university, also in the same newspaper, wherein he stated words to the effect that it seems surprising that some sectors of a university would now be considering a quota system at a time when there seems to be a good deal of uncertainty with enrolments at universities.

So, Mr. Speaker, without trying to avoid the question, I am quite interested in the matter of enrolment at universities, in the Faculty of Law, from a professional point of view, and with the matter of quotas generally. I will follow with great interest both the debate and the discussion, both in the engineering faculties and elsewhere at the university. But to restate my position of several days ago, I do not intend to recommend any change in the open door policy of the university community in this province. I will be interested in the debate and discussion that may take place in the institutions.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question. In the opinion of the Minister, if this open door policy is jeopardized, do we have the minister's assurance that he would then step in?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think I would like to assess any situation before responding to that kind of question.

Red Deer College

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, one more supplementary and perhaps we can get more involved in that area during the estimates. My question to the Minister of Advanced Education would be, will the report of the commissioner reviewing circumstances at the Red Deer College be made public?

22-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

---

MR. FCSTER:

That is a matter, Mr. Speaker, that I have not, frankly, discussed with my colleagues in the Executive Council. My inexperience in government leads me to say that I am not really familiar with the procedure when a commission is appointed under The Public Inquiries Act and whether or not that report is thereby by definition a public document. I don't know the answer to that. But I would be quite happy to look into it and advise the hon. member.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps on that point I could interject by responding to it and saying that in a case such as that I think that if the recommendation comes from the hon. minister that it should be a public document. It certainly will be supported with favour by the Executive Council.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Minimum Wage Rate

MR. FARFAN:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Labour. When will the government rectify the gross injustice reflected in the deplorably low minimum wage approved and unchanged for so many years by the last government?

MR. SPEAKER:

Strictly speaking, a question should not contain innuendo. Would the hon. member like to expunge the innuendo and state the question otherwise?

MR. FARRAN:

I expunge the innuendo. When will the government rectify the situation of the very low minimum wage? That is not an innuendo, because that is a fact.

DR. HOHCL:

Mr. Speaker, looking past the innuendo and at the intent of the question, the government has no decision on the matter at the moment except that it will consider very closely representations from several groups that the minimum wage be increased: in particular, the Alberta Federation of Labour has made a strong and proper case and like any representation to the government through briefs or delegations or letters, we will give it close and serious consideration for next year or for possible changes at the next sitting.

Environment Conservation Authority (Con't.)

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of the Environment. Does the minister not feel that agriculture and food production has an important part to play in our environment and that at least one of the three man authority should be one with a background in agriculture?



April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-17

MR. YUBKO:

Mr. Speaker, some of the greatest conservationists in our country and in our provinces have been farmers. The saying, if I remember correctly, that my dad used to say was that if I could leave my land in better shape than it was when I found it, then in fact, I have accomplished something. And he did, if I might vouch for his conservationist tactics in this area. I want to suggest to the hon. member that we are very cognizant about the role that agriculture has to play in connection with preservation and the development and management of the environment in total. And in this light, I'm sure, prodded by the hon. member on my left, every consideration will be given to having representation from the agricultural community on the Environment Conservation Authority. It is not my intent at this time to give assurance to the hon. member across the way or this House, that in fact the man who will replace Mr. Babey will come from the agricultural field.

MR. HENDERSON:

Do I conclude from the hon. minister's statement that he is going to replace Mr. Babey?

SOME HCN. MEMBERS:

He already said that.

MR. HENDERSON:

No, he didn't say that, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HCN. MEMBERS:

Yes, he did.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. NOTLEY:

I have a question for the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

MR. HENDERSON:

Is it a supplementary? In that event, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Rapeseed Crushing Plant

MR. NOTLEY:

I would like to direct this question to either the hon. Minister of Agriculture or the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. It concerns the proposed rapeseed crushing plant in northern Alberta. Has the government made representation to DREE as yet, with respect to the proposal advanced both by the National Farmers Union and Unifarm in the north, that special exception be made for this crushing plant so that it could be located in a central location in northern Alberta?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, we have not, since the meeting with the two organizations which the hon. member has referred to; however, we have discussed the matter before with the officials of DREE, and they have advised us that they are not prepared to make a special exception.

22-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

---

MR. NCTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, again, to either one of the hon. ministers. My understanding and the understanding of the other representatives at the meeting was that one more try would be made with respect to securing an exception for this plant. Am I to understand now that the government is not prepared to make a second try on this?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the hon. member agrees with my understanding of our meeting with those two organizations. As a matter of fact, the 'one more try suggestion' was third or fourth on a series of alternatives that could be pursued. If he remembers, there were several others which both organizations would have preferred considerably, and we are following them up.

MR. NCTLEY:

One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I find myself somewhat at variance with our collective understanding of the meeting. However, again, on the specific question of the exception being made, do I take it then, that there will be no formal request on this matter?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is not understanding my reply. If he will recall, there were a series of things which the two organizations would like to have done, some of which they thought were much better than others. We are pursuing them to make sure that we try the best route first, and if we are unable and unsuccessful to make that route successful, we will have to try the others. But we would hope to first follow through with the most preferable alternative.

MR. NCTLEY:

One final supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER:

This is the post final supplementary, hon. member.

MR. NCTLEY:

The hon. minister and I can agree that the first choice was admittedly the dismantling of the area, is the hon. minister in a position to report to the House on his efforts in this respect, as far as the submission to Ottawa is concerned?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not.

Revenue Estimates

MR. HENDERSON:

I would like to address a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I wonder if the hon. Provincial Treasurer is going to make available to us, before we go into estimates, the revenue portion of the provincial budget. There is nothing in the estimates books on the subject.

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-19

---

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the revenue estimates are included in detail in the appendices to the budget address, as indicated in the budget address.

MR. HENDERSON:

Is that to be considered a part of the budget itself as far as approval procedures and study of the estimates is concerned? They represent the official record.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member was here the night I introduced the budget. At that time I indicated we were presenting the revenue as part of the budget address. The expenditures are in the estimate books, income and capital.

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Does this mean that we are going to be required to use part of his address and specifically go through it item by item for approval? This is a departure from past procedures.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, with due respect, this is used in quite a few other legislatures in Canada and in the House of Commons. There is certainly adequate detail. The budget address is not simply what I gave on March 17th. There are appendices which provide much additional detail beyond that which are included in your budget address. I would refer all hon. members to the detailed examination of the appendices in the revenue estimates.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary. On page 35 of the budget address I notice that we have a forecast of major revenue changes during 1971 and 1972. But nowhere do I see the actual estimate of revenues for 1972. Secondly, will we be voting on each of these items as contained in the budget address?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would clarify. Is he saying that there is no indication of the forecast actual revenue for the fiscal year ending 1972? Is that correct?

MR. TAYLOR:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I see the original 1971-72 estimates, the '71-'72 forecast and then 'Change'. But I don't see anything for 1972-73.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, all the revenue items and forecast are included by revenue item. Table C1 in the budget address presents the 1971-72 forecast.

MR. TAYLOR:

Will we be voting on that?

22-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

---

MR. MINIELY:

You are voting on the revenue estimates, you will be voting on the expenditure estimates, but you won't be voting on the forecast, I take it -- if you are asking about voting on forecasts.

MR. TAYLOR:

Will there be an opportunity to discuss the forecast?

MR. MINIELY:

Well, certainly there will be a debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

I am wondering if this is not something that is going to be dealt with in any event when the budget is being dealt with, rather than having it dealt with in the question period.

MR. HENDERSON:

On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, what we are concerned about is the chairman, when we get into estimates, will call each appropriation and we will go through them and discuss them and approve them. And the question we are asking is since the revenue estimates are not in the basic budget document (they are in the text of the speech of the Provincial Treasurer), is it the government's intention, when we get into committee, to call the revenue portion, even if it is in the appendix of the hon. Provincial Treasurer's speech -- is the intention of the government to call each one of the revenue projections for the forthcoming fiscal year, and have them discussed and approved by the members of this House? This is the question we are wanting to know, because debate is academic if the chairman isn't going to be calling the revenue estimates out for discussion and approval and this is the specific question we would like a specific answer on.

DR. HERNER:

Mr. Speaker, if I could respond to the hon. member in relation to his point of order. First of all, there has never been before a specific call by the chairman of committee in relation to the revenue estimates. . . [Interjections]. Well, if the hon. gentleman would just mind being quiet for a moment, I will make some suggestions to him in relation to how we can best handle this in an expeditious manner. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that all questions related to revenue estimates can be asked when we are discussing the estimates in various departments. But to suggest there is an individual specific vote -- this hasn't happened in the past, Mr. Speaker, and again the question in relation to how the committee handles its business, I want to suggest, is surely up to the committee.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I would like to bring to the recollection to the hon. members and in particular, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, that right in the front of the estimate book before, there was the statement of revenue from income and revenue from capital, and that was dealt with in debate. . . [Interjections]. It was dealt with in debate and debated. The hon. members have debated that on occasion. And that is the point that otherwise we are not going to have an opportunity to debate estimated revenues, which has a very definite bearing on the whole budget.

DR. HERNER:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. member can deal with any matter in regard to the debate on the budget. Nobody is suggesting that he

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-21

can't. We are suggesting that in fact, when the committee went into supply the usual way, each vote was taken on the estimates and that the debate on the question of the estimated revenue in each of the areas is surely in order. What I am suggesting is that that isn't part of each vote.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I am still not satisfied that just having the opportunity to debate revenue when we are discussing expenditures, is going to be in order, particularly when items of expenditure are financed out of general revenue, and there may not be any particular association between a particular source of revenue.....

MR. SPEAKER:

It seems to me that we are practically getting into a debate here at the tail-end of the question period -- which we have exceed slightly -- with regard to procedure which may be followed in committee. I would suggest that if the procedure is actually followed in the committee is not satisfactory, it may then be dealt with by the House subsequently.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

#### Sewage Treatment

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I would like to ask permission to make a short announcement in connection with sewage treatment project loans allocated by the federal government to the province. I would like to suggest that at this time last year the federal government allocated \$3 million for sewage treatment project loans to the Province of Alberta distributed through the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation by the federal government to the province. I would also like to suggest that it was possible to increase the \$3 million to \$6 million mid-year last year and subsequently towards the last part of the year the allocation was increased to \$9 million. As a result, last year a total of \$9 million of Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation funds was allocated in Alberta and an additional \$4.5 million was allocated through the Municipal Finance Corporation. This year, I am pleased to announce that the federal government, through Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, has allocated \$10 million to the Province of Alberta for sewage treatment project loans. These loans, of course, will be allocated with respect to priorities basically established by the province and will in all cases not be given unless the project is approved by the Department of the Environment.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might direct a question to the hon. government house leader. Can the ..

MR. SPEAKER:

The question period ended at 3:30.

MR. TAYLOR:

This is not a question, this is government business and government procedure which logically comes under Orders of the Day.

22-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

What we would like to know is if major legislation is going to be introduced at this spring session and if so when we might expect it? It is getting well on and we do want to have time to study any major legislation.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to that question, of course it is a matter of a different view of what is major and what is not. Certainly when I look at the Order Paper in terms of the bills that have been introduced there are a number of major items there and very, very important items. There are a number of other bills such as The Alberta Opportunity Fund Act which I believe the votes and proceedings indicate that have now been printed and will be introduced in a matter of days. There is other legislation proceeding and frankly I think we have been able to move quite extensively the degree of legislation. We recognize the need of the members on the other side to have adequate notice of it and certainly when we can get it through the printers and complete the necessary approval by Legislative Council, we assure all members of the House that we have no intention of delaying the introduction of the bills, so that the members can have adequate opportunity to consider the legislation.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, the type of legislation I had in mind was The Mental Health Act and comprehensive legislation does take a good deal of study.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to that by saying that certainly it is the intention of the government to assure that there is adequate time and I'm sure the hon. Opposition House Leader is aware that there will be certain items of legislation as there have been in the past years, of a major magnitude, which will be introduced later in the Session, because of the complexities of the particular legislation that is involved. With regard to that, we also recognize that a bill such as The Mental Health Act is introduced latterly during the spring sitting, we will give consideration to the need to assure that there is adequate time by the members to consider it.

#### Budget Debate

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, as proof of the old saying "if you give me an inch I'll take a mile," the government has been kind enough to pay my school taxes, 30 mills, and my medical benefits, now because I am retarded in thinking and speech they are going to give me a few minutes beyond my time.

I have only two or three things to say. One was to do with mines and minerals. I am not critical of what the hon. minister said, but I think there is another point of view that we have to look at. One has to do with whether the estimates used by the Energy Commission are right or not. This is a pretty speculative thing, even the experts cannot agree. I think we ought not to take it to literal that we have eight trillion cubic feet instead of 1.1. We should not feel too badly about it. The other is that Canada is a net importer of oil and they are importing now 800,000 barrels a day and Alberta's production is about one million barrels a day. As I understand it the government has decided not to issue any more development permits until the Syncrude deal is completed. Now, I think we have to consider two or three things. There will be a loss of revenue if we can't sell more gas quickly. There will be a loss of revenue to the oil companies and to the province, but I think

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-23

we have to balance that against the fact that there is not an indefinite supply of gas, that the east which is now taking only two-thirds of what it should be using will, eventually, have to take this gas. I think there is another point of view, too, and that is that in the interests of Canada and in the long-range interest of Alberta we have to know that while available oil is on the market from countries outside Canada, we may be very wise to use it and save a little bit of our own. If, on the other hand, we were to accept these ready markets we would spur some exploration perhaps.

The result would be that there would be locked in the ground a considerable amount of proven reserves and these resources would be there whether or not we did have this market. Now I think that we might conceivably take the point of view that eventually there is going to be a real seller's market. It is a seller's market now and I think it will be a real seller's market. I recognize the difficulty of financing, I recognize the need to get revenue from this source if we can, but in our anxiety to get it I hope that we will not lose track of the fact that we are the sellers and that we, undoubtedly, will be able to increase the price a very great deal over the years and any loss we suffer now will, in the end, react very much in favour of Alberta. As I say, I am not trying to be critical, I do hope that it turns out that we have the reserves estimated by the hon. minister and that the Energy Board is wrong but I submit that we are not going to be hurt in the long run by the decision of the National Energy Board except for the short-term look at money.

Now, I want to say two or three things about my constituency. One is to refer to the Blood Indians. There are 4,531 plus, since the day I got the figures. They have 346,000 acres of the best land in Alberta, some 77 acres for every man, woman and child. They are a progressive band. They have made very great progress. I think if you were to visit their homes you would be aware of this. Women have become good housekeepers, they are concerned about their children. Some 400 of the children are attending schools off the reservation. The women on the reserve are volunteering to assist in the kindergartens and I am very happy at the progress they are making. They have a few problems. I have here two copies of the Kainai News which I will leave in the Clerk's office and you can peruse them. The headline in one says "One Third of the Blood Tribe in Jail in 1971". Now they are concerned about it; it involved 600 Indians out of 4,500. Alcohol was a chief contributor and they are concerned about it and I hope the government will continue to work with those people on the reserve who are trying to do something about it. The other proves what a conservative group they are. The headline says "The First Native Winter Games to Operate in the Red". They will be wanting to borrow from the government. I don't know whether it's wise to lend them on this matter or not but I do want to point out that they are giving leadership when they sponsor the first Native Winter Games in Canada. I find them easy to work with. I am certainly going to hope that we can all work together to let these people develop their potential. Now that they are in our schools we are discovering that when the language barrier is overcome they are intelligent, as we always suspected they were; that they can be led to think directly; that many of them recognize that they never had it so good and if we properly co-operate, this particular tribe can certainly give leadership to all the native problems in the province.

Just one other thing, when I was home, my constituents asked me if I might propose to the House that because of the great preponderance of sagacity and ability on their side of the House, we might, on a lend-lease basis, send the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill to solve the problems in Ireland. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

22-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the budget debate and I am sure the hon. members at this late stage in the debate will forgive me for not congratulating everybody. I do extend the usual congratulations to all speakers. I am not going to be quite as eloquent as the hon. members on the other side in praising the hon. Premier, because I think we have to be very careful that our Premier doesn't get too lopsided in regard to this matter of praise. I don't know whether it is true or not, but I hear that after the first several speakers on the other side spoke our Premier looked in the mirror before he left for work one morning and he said; "Mirror, mirror on the wall, I am the greatest." And I can understand that, because of the speeches, but I am sure that in order to keep in the middle of the road, you have to have something on both sides and I would like to congratulate everyone who did take part in the budget debate, as it is an important debate.

The first thing I'd like to do is point out four unsound principles that permeate the budget, and the first one is one that goes throughout the figures in the budget and is representative of government policy as enunciated by the hon. Premier, namely that it is a 48 team government, not a 22 person government. This is something that I think sounds very good, but it really strikes at the very basis of parliamentary procedure and parliamentary government as we understand it, and it is a serious matter in that respect. Through the evolution of parliament as we understand it and as it has evolved through the centuries, it has been essential that the Cabinet remain responsible to the Legislature. That, I think, is a fundamental aspect, a fundamental asset, an axiom of our way of life. Now, if you have a 48 member government in a 75 member Legislature, what happens? The government then is no longer responsible to the Legislature, the Legislature becomes responsible to the government, which is completely contrary to the very basis of parliamentary government. This could destroy parliamentary government as we understand it today. If this principle ever takes root as it appears to be taking root with the present government in Alberta, if it takes root throughout the provinces of Canada, and indeed in our Dominion House, then the days of our parliamentary procedures and parliamentary government will be buried; will be killed; will become defunct. When we make the Legislature responsible to the government, then it is a pretty serious thing, because then the government rules the Legislature instead of the Legislature ruling the government. That is why throughout the evolution of parliamentary government it has always been essential that the Cabinet have fewer members than the total number of members in the rest of the House or in the rest of the Legislature. Once that principle is violated, the very basis of parliamentary procedure as it has evolved is destroyed, and I suggest to the hon. Premier and to the hon. members on the other side of the House that before pursuing this role very further, even now it should be reviewed, because it could be digging a grave for the hon. Premier and for the government. It is contrary to parliamentary procedures and practices as they have evolved throughout the years and I consider that it is an essential point.

Now the second point I would like to say that is unsound about the budget, is found in the way the government is handling the depletion of reserves. Now, reserves once they are gone, they are gone, they have gone forever. And we refer to our oil, and our gas, and our coal and so on, particularly to our oil and our gas. Now the previous government for many years followed the policy of using the money that came from the reserves, from the reserves that were being depleted to build other reserves that would take their place. So when we depleted reserves of petroleum and natural gas and coal, that money was used to build schools, and hospitals and public buildings and bridges, and highways, and other assets that would be an asset above the ground to replace the asset that was being destroyed or depleted under the ground. Now I think this is a pretty sound policy, and when we depart from that policy we are putting ourselves in a very dangerous position. And so I am concerned when I see the



April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-25

amount of Crown Leases and the Mines and Minerals Department being retained in the expenditure or the income part of the budget, not in the capital part of the budget. And if it was sound to move so many of the other items, and I am not arguing if it was or wasn't right now, if it was sound to move so many of the other items from the income section to the capital section, then surely, it is more sound to move the revenues from an asset that is being depleted, also into the capital. If that was done, of course, it would mean that there would be a reshuffling of the overall deficit, with neither the income or the capital actually being balanced. It is not the balancing part that I am stressing now, it is the principle. Because when we deplete an asset, an asset that belongs to us and to future generations, we should make sure that we leave something to replace that asset to the greatest possible degree. That policy is not being followed in this budget and I suggest that since it is not followed, that this is unsound.

The next point that I would like to stress as being unsound is, when you are borrowing money to build something for future generations, unless that particular something you are building is going to be there to be enjoyed by the future generations who must pay for it, then it becomes very questionable and a very unsound policy. I think of the borrowings that were carried out by the UFA government in the early history of this province with which they built roads. The people of Alberta went on paying and paying and paying for those roads 10, 15 and 20 years after the roads had disappeared entirely. This was unsound. It wasn't right and this maybe was the policy that is now being followed.

In that connection I would just like to run through, not all, but a few of the points in the capital budget to indicate the points that I want to make. Because if the borrowing is for 20 years - and the hon. Premier did not say it would be, he said he expected it would be - I suppose it could be for 10 or 15 years. My comment is being based on the possibility of the borrowing being for 20 years. Consequently the money for which this borrowed money is going to be used, the projects or the items, should be here 20 years from now, or 25 years from now, so that the people then who will be paying for part of them will be able to enjoy them. Otherwise, I am sure, no hon. member of this House would argue that that type of thing is sound. When I look at the various points - I am not going to say the ones I have no objections to or that I think are sound - but I am going to deal with a few that I think in principle should be looked at pretty carefully.

I look at vote 1193, land manager \$203,000, provides for administration of The Irrigation Land Manager Act for the administration dealing with collection of water rights sold under former Crown corporations and in new and old land agreements in accordance with the act. Does this mean that borrowed money is going to be used for administration purposes? Because if it is, it is not sound. That money is going to be used and will not be available, will not be in service for those who will have to pay part of the bill - five, ten, 15, or 20 or 30 years down the road.

I look again on page four and I notice secondary road construction, \$11.5 million. A road is an asset and I suppose it depends on the specifications you use as to whether a road is going to be there ten or 20 years afterwards. But the life of a well constructed highway today is 20 years. Generally speaking you must then start either recapping or strengthening that highway, if it is going to continue to give good service. If you are going to build the secondary roads to that type of specification, then \$11 million is not going to go very far in building roads if they are all going to be built to the 72,000 pound maximum loading -- \$11 million will not go that far. I am not suggesting that every secondary road should be built to the 72,000 pound maximum loading, some should be built that way and some should be built to higher specifications.

22-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

but the ones that are not built to the specifications that will ensure the life of that highway for a 20 year period so that those who will be driving cars 20 years from now will have the use of that highway, then I suggest that this is unsound.

Bridge construction I have no quarrel with at all, because most of our bridges today are built for 40 or 50 years. Certainly, there is no reason why the future generation should not pay part of that particular item. The same with the primary highway construction. If they are there 20 years, and the highways being built today it should be there 20 years from now. But when I come to the next point, No. 1585, which says part of the money will be used to carry on an active traffic safety program. I can't see how an active traffic safety program, good as it is, and valuable as it is, and necessary as it is, is going to be of value to people 20 years from now. It is of value to we who are living, we who are driving the highways, we who are pedestrians. That is whom it is benefiting. It is not benefiting somebody 20 years from now. Consequently, I suggest that using borrowed money for that type of thing is not sound and it's not sound to say to future generations, you pay part of the bill so we could have things better back in our day. That is not being fair to our children and our children's children, or maybe I should say to your children and to your children's children.

Now, another point, improvement districts. Generally, roads in improvement districts are built to reasonably good specifications but not to highway standard. There are many roads that are built in improvement districts that do not have a longer life without considerable work on them beyond ten years. Are we going to charge the generation 20 years from now for roads that will not be available to them 20 years from now? If we do, it is unsound. The same with the grants to municipal districts and counties and district roads. Some of the counties and municipal districts are building to high specifications as the hon. Member for Innisfail knows, but some of them are not being built to high specifications. As a matter of fact, I'm sure the hon. Minister of Highways is as concerned as I was about some of the types of construction that you see in some of the municipalities. They will not last under reasonably heavy traffic conditions for five years, let alone 20 years. And to raise the specifications means fewer miles of highway are built, fewer miles of roads are built and many municipalities are still trying to get people out of the mud and give them a grade upon which to drive. But the point I'm making is that these roads are not there 10 - 20 years from now. It is not fair and it is not right to be charging the future generations for them.

I come to Public Works, No. 2683, and there I see \$4.5 million for furnishings and equipment to all departments of government. Now I suppose some of the furniture that is being purchased today will last 20 or 30 years, but much of it will not last five years. And again I suggest that that portion that is going to be used by this generation, it is not fair and it is not just to charge the future generation for it. And so we could go on.

I look at one more, vote No. 2984, \$3 million, \$2.5 million for salaries and wages and related travelling expenditures. This is under technical services under Water Resources. This is going to be used up in the one year, not of value to people in future generations. And so I suggest that the basis upon which we have been given to understand that this money will be borrowed is that the future generation should pay for the projects which they will enjoy. Surely, that is unsound to charge them for something that they will not enjoy and for which they will not have any use.

Now I come to one other major point which I think needs clarification. I'm sorry the hon. Minister for Lands and Forests is not in his seat, because it is to his department to which I refer this incident. I hope it is not common to other departments. I hope

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-27

our employment program which is good, trying to get people an opportunity to work and to contribute, is excellent, but if we are simply going to show this on paper without any real tangible results, then it is not good at all. I came across a case where one man was fired from the shop of the Minister of the Department of Lands and Forests, to hire a student. Now, this may look well on paper. I understand the workman was a good workman. He didn't tell me, but others did. He was a good workman, but he was let go and they hired a student in his place. Now is this an employment program? Or is it something to show at the end of a period that we've hired so many people. Mr. Speaker, that sort of thing will never be tolerated by the people of Alberta, and I hope it is not a part of a parcel of government policy and I would hope the hon. Provincial Treasurer will assure us that there is no such designed policy in the government to let some people go and replace them with others and then call that an employment program. That is not an employment program, and such a program is to be deplored.

Now I want to deal with some other items in the budget -- some items about the budget. Those were the four unsound principles I think upon which the budget was built. That it is contrary to the parliamentary procedure as we have evolved it; that if the asset is not there to be enjoyed by future generations, future generations should not have to pay for it, and finally, the employment program should be the maximum employment of new men, not discharging some in order to hire others.

Now, I would like to say a few other things about the budget. I think I could say that the budget is a budget of joy, a budget of happiness, if you want to put it that way. Certainly, it is a budget of joy on Bay Street and on James Street. I understand there has been almost heavenly ecstasy on Bay Street and James Street over the fact there is going to be \$199 million borrowed this year. What a windfall for the people of Bay Street and James Street. A real budget of joy. I can readily understand why they would be happy. They should be even happier than they have been so far with the information given to us this afternoon by the hon. Minister of Telephones because there is another \$50 million to be added to that. This \$246 million borrowings in one year certainly should be a matter of joy to the financiers of this country. But, by the same token, it is a budget of sorrow, too. It is a budget of sorrow to the people who are going to have to pay for this borrowing. Because, Mr. Speaker, if you are borrowing money at 7%, and we will be fortunate if we can get the money at 7%, then the amount borrowed doubles itself every ten-1/2 years. In 20 years, what happens by this borrowing? The present generation pays for it, the generation of the next decade pays for it, and the generation of the next decade pays for it. In other words, you pay the bill three times by doing it with borrowed money at a rate of interest of 7%. That means, that really, you are getting 33 and one-third cents out of every dollar you spend, if you get full value out of every dollar spent. That is not sound financing, Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of sorrow to the people of this province.

It was a budget of tears, too, but a different type of tears. I can understand about 104,000 senior citizens being very happy when they found they were securing premium-free medicare and tax free education. This is something to make tears of joy. We can all appreciate that, particularly the family who is worried about where the money is coming from to pay the 30 mills on their assessment. The families that are poor, the families that are hard-up certainly benefit and those who framed the budget are to be commended in that respect. But, by the same token, Mr. Speaker, it is a budget of agony to some of those people, too. Some of them have estates of over \$100,000, and they happen to be over 65 years of age. The country has been good to them. Yes, they have been good to the country, but the country has been good to them, too. Now to say to them, you don't have to pay educational tax anymore or you don't have

22-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

to pay for your premium for Medicare because you are 65 years of age, even though you have an estate of over \$100,000, this is not sound. This isn't sound at all.

I stood in a meeting and heard a man stand up and say, "I got a cheque back for my Medicare. I feel like tearing it up. I am better off than anybody in this meeting. I'm rich. Why do I have to have these people pay my premium?" Mr. Speaker, this is unsound. If it is 25%, it has been said the administrative costs will be high -- well, it is the principle. Do we work out policy based on the administration of it or do we base our policy on fairness and justice? Surely it should be on fairness and justice, not because we are going to put more work on the shoulders of those who happen to be administering the program. I suggest that this is unsound, just as unsound as the illustration used the other day in this House of people having their Medicare paid for them while they are working. And who is paying for it? It is not free. If it was free I would have no complaint, but it is being paid for by other people who can ill-afford to pay their own, let alone pay for their neighbours who have an estate of over \$50,000 or over a \$100,000.

The "Statistics Canada" in their latest report in 1967 (so we could raise that considerably) indicated that 25% of the families of this country were in the poor category, in the low class, with incomes under \$4,800 -- they are paying tax of \$267 -- and the mid-income group are 50% of the population, with an income of under \$10,000 or about \$9,800. There we have 75% of our people who are going to be required to pay more, and I am sure that not one of them will complain if it is for a needy senior citizen or a needy handicapped child, or someone who is mentally deficient and needs help. No one would complain. But when it is for somebody who has an estate of \$100,000 it is not sound, and I defy anybody to say that is sound. Who is paying for it? The working people of this province are being asked to pay the bill. Yes, it is a budget of sorrow for the working man -- a budget of sorrow for the working man. He will not only pay it now, he will pay it as long as he lives and his children will go on paying for it because I have outlined already, this will not end with his debt. The debt will go on for another ten, another 20 years, each year taking its toll of interest and capital retirement.

The night the hon. Provincial Treasurer introduced his budget, there was a child born in one of our hospitals. And if the nurse there had known what was happening in the budget, she could have taken a little ticket and put it on his neck, you owe \$124 as from tonight. A debt, just born, with a debt of \$124 around his neck, and prior to the introduction of that budget he had a debt of \$9.26 around his neck. Suddenly it became \$124 and with what the hon. Minister of Telephones tells us today it has jumped another \$31. So a baby born today, owes \$155 before it has even had its first drink of.....whatever he drinks.

\$155 is around the neck of every Albertan, 1.6 million of them because of this policy. And, Mr. Speaker, this is not a sound policy. When we say that 25% of our people who are the working class, who are struggling to make both ends meet, who are struggling to keep the wolf from the door, have a minimum of clothes, and a minimum of entertainment, and a minimum of food; and say to them, you are going to have to help pay the bill for so and so, who happens to be 67 and who happens to have an \$100,000 estate. I say that is shameful -- that is not helping the working men of this province. It is no wonder a worker said to me, frustrated and discouraged the other day; "I feel like throwing it all up -- throwing it all up. Why should I continue to work? My taxes are going to increase. I think I will go on welfare like everybody else." And this type of policy is what is going to drive people to welfare. And, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members on the other side can smile, but if they had to pay the bill when they don't know where they are even going to

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-29

get enough to pay their own grocery bill, and have a fear of their house going up for taxes, then it is a horse of a different colour.

I don't know how many hon. members of this House have been hungry. I know some have and I have too. I have seen the time when there was little food on our table and I know the struggle that we had, to try to make both ends meet to pay the bills when the mines were not working and to have enough food in the house. I have seen my own mother go without food. Ladies and gentlemen policies that are today making it harder for the working man to stay working, are unsound, completely unsound. I don't care how much joy you get out of saying every old age pensioner is going to get free Medicare and tax free education and no taxes on the foundation program. The working man is not going to complain and he will bear his hunger if he knows he is helping those who need it, but it only builds up bitterness and frustration when he knows that he is paying the bill for somebody who is much better off than he, because a man happened to be born in a year that now makes him 65, 66 or 67. That is not a basis upon which to place a program. Many of these senior citizens, I say they all have made a contribution, why should we be saying to those who are well able to pay; "You don't have to pay, we'll let the other people pay your bill," because that is what you're doing, that is what you are saying; "We'll let the other people pay your bill."

Again I emphasize so that it will not be misquoted - I am raising no objection to premium free Medicare for the senior citizens nor I am raising any objection to the rebates from the foundation program, for our senior citizens who are in those categories that deserve it and need, but I have every objection to paying for those who have estates of \$50,000 and \$100,000. According to the "Canada Statistics" that could well be 25%. Whatever the percentage is, it is wrong, the principle is wrong. Taxation should be based on ability to pay. If we want to help those who are poor why don't we make representations to Ottawa? Why don't we talk until we are blue in the face there, to raise the exemption so that the men, women and children who need it the most will get the benefit. Why are we always striving to get policies that are going to make the rich richer and poor poorer? That type of policy should be denounced across this country because of what it is driving us too - a state where people will eventually say; "I'm giving up, I'll go on welfare too."

There are countries in the world today where people have sold their birthright for a piece of bread. Hunger drives you to that point, hunger drives you to where you will do almost anything, give up your freedom, your independence - if you get hungry enough. I spoke to a sailor from Korea one time, on a plane. I asked him how he liked it in Korea. He was a lad from Nova Scotia. He said, "I hated it". I asked him why and he said, "How would you like to see women with babies on their back digging in the garbage can behind the mess tents for something to eat? How would you like to see aged men crawling like dogs in the alley picking up scraps that had been thrown there by soldiers and airmen?" They gave up their freedom, they gave up everything because they were hungry and to the same degree do we when we bring more and more under the girdle of government by pretending it is free when somebody else has to pay for it. We not only take much of the independence away from that person that we think we are doing so much good for, but we are also directly hurting the man who then must foot the bill to pay the difference. And when things go far enough, and when you have everybody in that category, then of course you have a state of communism, the very type of thing we don't want, where a government has control over every human being. Now I suggest we are a long way from that, but we are getting closer every year. Governments are taking from some to give to others. They are taking from those who earn wages to give to those who don't earn wages, and where there is need most people go along with it, but now we come to the point in this particular budget where we are taking from those who have not, to give to those who have -- taking from those who have not, making it tougher for the

22-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

working man. And many of those who are in that category today can't believe that they don't have to pay their taxes when they say, "I am well able to pay my taxes", and they should be paying their taxes. The country has been good to them just as they have done much to contribute to the welfare of the country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the budget leaves much to be desired and the points that I have endeavoured to outline today, I think, are points that need to be carefully analyzed and carefully looked at.

Now, if I have any time left, have I?

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. member has a further five minutes.

MR. TAYLOR:

I would like to deal with one or two points in my own constituency and the hon. Premier mentioned that he would welcome MIA's saying the things that their constituencies needed, and I appreciate that attitude. I think that is an excellent attitude and I am going to put down as one of the major requests for my constituency is for another hospital. The people in the Strathmore-Gleichen area today either have to go 50 miles to Bassano or more, or 50 miles, more or less, to Calgary. The decentralization program of the government is good, and I suggest that the Strathmore-Gleichen area is an area that deserves a hospital. About 75% of the sick from the Rockyford area now go into Calgary, the other 25% go to Drumheller. About 50% of those in the Gleichen area go to Bassano and the other 50% go to Calgary. Strathmore is ideally located for a hospital and I want to commend the Hospital Commission for carrying out the study, and the minister who is responsible for it, and I am hoping that the study will indicate that a hospital can properly be built in order to better serve that vast area today, that is dependent on hospitals too far away. And it would also have a very important effect in decentralizing services in that particular area.

I want to mention, once again, since the hon. Minister of the Environment is here, and commend him for the information he gave me following the questions the other day, that he has issued instructions that the structure for the Bow River diversion be designed. I think this is foresight and I think this is excellent. If that dam should go out this spring, there is going to be havoc, extreme havoc and suffering. The people who live on Chestermere Lake depend upon that dam for their fresh water supply. The hundreds of farmers in the western irrigation district depend upon that structure for water to nourish their crops and, in my view, this is one of the highly important items of my constituency, the rebuilding of that dam.

The industry program of the government, in which the government has raised the hopes of people in our smaller towns and cities is important. What is going to keep them alive in the final analysis? I think that all of the studying and so on is fine, if we can find ways and means of working out inventories of bringing industries to our towns, but the big point is, unless we get industries into our smaller centres, they are not going to be very viable centres. We need work. There was hardly a soul in the Grande Cache area until an industry was started. And look at the thriving metropolis now, the beautiful streets, the beautiful buildings, all done because of an industry work was provided, jobs were provided, and people had an opportunity to earn. You can look at the same thing many other places in the province. If we can somehow or other, I don't know if it is going to take a miracle or not, the government surely has some programs, because this is part of their program that they placed before the people, and was welcomed by the people, to get industry into our smaller centres. That is an important item.

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-31

The de-centralization program is an excellent program. I forwarded to the hon. Minister of Social Development the other day, a very excellent brief prepared by the people of Carbon, in which they set out very excellently the reasons why they should have a senior citizens' lodge in the town of Carbon, and I think this is something worthwhile considering. They need not all be in Drumheller, they should be de-centralized to the other places and the thing that pleased me most in the brief, and I am sure it appealed to the hon. minister as well, was the statement of the number of people who would move into the lodge tomorrow if it was ready. It could become self-sufficient.

Now there is just one other point I want to mention, and that is the matter of water and sewer in the hamlets of the Drumheller Valley. The Drumheller Valley has for the last 50 or 60 years been a coal mining area with outdoor privies, and outdoor wells. There is hardly a spot in anybody's backyard in Macmine or East Coulee or Rosedale, and up until just recently, Newcastle and Wayne where there hasn't been a privy at least once and sometimes two and three times over the last 50 years. And that combined with the fact that they have sandpoint wells makes it a pretty dangerous health situation, as a matter of fact, doctors have said to me, "I'm amazed that there hasn't been an epidemic in the valley long before now". I commend the previous government for eventually starting a water sewer program and we were able to get water through the work of the Mayor of Drumheller and the Council and the federal government who then backed out of their program, we were able to get water and sewer in Newcastle, and perhaps some of the hon. members saw the CBC program, 'The Burning of the Privies'. They had a great celebration the day the water was turned on, but the load that left my shoulders and I am sure the shoulders of many other responsible people in the area was the elimination of the fear of an epidemic because of that water and privy situation. The same situation today exists in Macmine, it's being corrected in Midlandvale, it exists in Rosedale where there is no sewer -- they do have water, which has helped. It exists in East Coulee and it exists in Wayne. And I would urge the government to continue the program in our LID's of providing water and sewer and spreading the cost over a period in which those people can pay, so they can have the benefit now and we can avoid an epidemic. I think it's a sound policy. We are past the stage when men and women should be using outdoor privies in 50 below zero weather. We are past the stage when we should be jeopardizing the health of boys and girls because we have our outhouses too close to sandpoint wells.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, and from my first part in the debate during this session, I'd like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your position as Speaker of this Assembly. In listening and observing your conduct during the session, I can't help but compare yourself to a father in a family who has many difficult decisions to make, and who at times makes decisions which those under him may not always appreciate. But it is my wish sir, that you may fulfil your position with dignity and fairness as has become customary in the British parliamentary system.

I followed with interest the happenings and the releases since that day, August 30th, last year. I have compared the statements made since that time to statements made prior to that time. Certainly I have never seen such a rash of committees, of studies, that we've had since that time. Many of us were expecting more that has failed to materialize. I might mention also, that I had expected that the hon. Minister of Agriculture would have reported to the Assembly and have given us an outline of some of the major legislation that he proposes to bring in.

One of the interesting things that I had the opportunity of attending last fall was the Uniform Convention. At that convention,

22-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

the hon. Minister of Agriculture spoke briefly, the "now" Premier spoke as well. It was rather interesting that when the "now" Premier spoke he indicated that agriculture was so important that he had the Deputy Premier as Minister of Agriculture. I could not help but think that in the previous administration, the Premier at that time made his living farming. The hon. Minister of Agriculture in the previous administration made his living farming. So I think that they were quite close to land. But possibly the new trend is that you make your living off the farmers.

Now I think that we get into the budget debate and I would like to commend the hon. Provincial Treasurer for his -- I notice he is not in his seat at this time -- for his deliverance of the document as we have it before us. Certainly I think during the discussions of the estimates and the items that we will have many questions to ask. Certainly it was rather interesting in reading through the reports of the session and so on that I get a legislative roundup in one of our weekly papers which deals with the different provinces, and it gets to a record for Alberta. There is unanimous agreement on two issues in the Edmonton Legislature last week. Premier Horner proposed inviting Queen Elizabeth to participate in our RCMP Centennial Celebrations in 1973. I just suggest in listening to some of the applause that we have had during this session, that I just wonder who really is getting the applause.

Mr. Speaker, in getting back to this session I have been rather interested in the, shall we say, mutual admiration society that is taking place on the other side. I think there have been flowers and bouquets and everything else, and I think there have been some statements made with reference to the previous administration -- certainly the matter of open government, budget documents, and so on. And I am waiting to get into the estimates to see what further information we have. Because as I recall the previous budgets, we have had the budget speech available to us, we have had supporting documents, and other information has filled out this. So maybe as we go on, we will see.

I am a bit disappointed that with all the flurry we had on the open government, the televising and the Hansard that to date we have not received too many copies of Hansard -- maybe there are some things here that are rather difficult to keep up with -- however be that as it may, we haven't received very many copies as yet.

Certainly at the opening of the Legislature when they had the hon. Premier introduce Bill No. 1, I was rather interested in comparing its length to that of Bill No. 145 of the last session. Certainly we've had some changes made there and we will see what the explanation is for that. Since the date of August 30th there have been a lot of Orders in Council, there have been a lot of decisions made, and I for one was waiting for an earlier session so that we could get into the business of this province. Certainly when the budget was brought down by the hon. Provincial Treasurer I am sure that Albertans looked forward to great things from the "now" government. Not one that one of the speakers opposite got up and referred to \$199 million as peanuts. Certainly when I listened to the speech I was reminded of the time as a farmer when I was out near harvest time observing the growth and the progress of the crop -- I might mention this was in slightly rolling land. It was a lovely evening and the crop stood there with all expectations. During that night we had a frost, and later that fall we had the disappointment of a frost ruining the best of the crop that was in the lower spots, and yet missing those areas on higher ground. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this budget is just that -- there were some good points but there were also some bad ones. I submit that as I had the expense of that crop to pay for in succeeding years, so the generations yet unborn are going to have to pay for the expenses of this budget in years to come. I suppose that a person could say that in using lofty phrases, and in many cases I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the new



April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-33

phrases, the new directions are just changes in name only, and not really in principle.

I think it was rather interesting today, when Bill No. 40 was brought in. I'm going to follow this fairly closely to show just what changes there are involved, with the exception of name and a few things like that. I'll be interested also in the announcement that was heralded province-wide of the \$50 million Agricultural Development Fund. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that \$21 million of this is made up of The Farm Purchase Credit Act which has been in operation over a period of years.

It's also interesting to me that the 'now' Minister of Agriculture, when he was in opposition, had all the answers to agriculture, and now in the matter of crop insurance -- and I have one of these policies myself -- I was expecting some changes this year in the crop insurance but now I understand that it has gone into a Legislative Committee for further discussion.

There is one thing I would like to commend the Provincial Treasurer for in the delivering of his budget speech, and that is on page 17 where he referred to the finances of the province. I would like to quote as follows:

"In this respect, Alberta, relative to other provinces, has at the present time a low direct debt per capita and as a result the existing debt service charges are relatively small as a percentage of budgetary revenues."

That was food up to that point. Then he goes on to make the case for the borrowing and the further entering into parts in debt.

I would like also to refer to another bit of statistics at this time, Mr. Speaker, that refers to the growth in the agricultural income, and certainly those of us who are farmers on this side of the Assembly and the other side have been through an area in the 1970's, starting in 1971, when the agricultural income was at a rock-bottom low, shall we say. I think it is rather interesting to see that the farm cash receipts in the January-October period of 1970 at \$587 million had risen in 1971 in the same period to some \$647 million. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is an increase that has come about from many various reasons.

I'd like to refer back at this time, Mr. Speaker, to some of the things that have taken place over the last few years. I'd like to touch on the task force, on agriculture and all of its ramifications, the federal report -- certainly this was discussed and maybe even cussed, as far as that goes across this nation -- the formation of the Canada Grains Council and the part that this province had in setting aside funds, along with Saskatchewan and Manitoba and the federal government for exploring new markets, the Grains Group, the LIFT program, and certainly submissions which were made by the previous administration and I trust followed up by this one in all these fields. The stabilization program -- there were a lot of things said in a detrimental way towards this program, but certainly the product promotion, the \$10 million that was set aside towards expanding new markets was one that was really useful. And also the White Paper on Taxation and its ramifications, which has a serious effect on the agricultural scene. Also the Canadian Grain Marketing Review Committee and our own extension report, "Tradition and Transition." I'd like to point out here that while the 'now' Minister of Agriculture was on this side of the House I can remember him holding this report up and saying it was government policy. Now he has accepted the fact that he is continuing to receive, or he has received, the submissions made by interested people on this report, and certainly I, for one, will be looking forward to the policy changes that may be made as a result of that.

We also have the Rapeseed Study Committee, another one that is pretty important in the whole field of agricultural marketing

22-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

development and in the process that is taking place over a period of years, that is coming now with the two-price system for wheat, that is coming with the recognition by the federal government and all other governments of the needs of agriculture in transportation, in marketing and many other fields.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal briefly with some of the submissions that were made by the previous administration, and I'm not going to go into any detail particularly but just to refer briefly to the submission made to the agricultural committee of the House of Commons when they were in Edmonton some three years ago and, as well, to the Canadian Agricultural Congress. The one dealing with the dairy policy -- and I'm certainly happy to see that with the representations made not only by this administration but the previous one, that changes are being made in this. And I think we have the clear indications of the producers of this province on the market-sharing vote that has taken place a short time ago.

We were able to obtain a representative of The Canadian Dairy Commission to stay in Alberta to hear the concerns of the people who are involved in the dairy industry. I might just mention here the two price wheat submissions we made. I will read this one paragraph. This is made to The Canadian Agricultural Congress as well as to the agricultural committee that was in the province. It is as follows:

"Western Canada farm income should be increased by implementing a two-price system for wheat. Raising the price of wheat used for domestic consumption by \$1.00 a bushel would give 77% of western farmers an extra \$400 income without tapping the public purse."

There is more detail on this, but this is an Alberta government submission based on the two-price system for wheat.

Now we get into the matter of last summer when the ministers of agriculture from across Canada were hosted by the province of Alberta. At their meeting in July there were some pretty definite policy decisions made. I want to mention here that the ten provincial ministers of agriculture rejected unanimously the proposed federal farm adjustment plan as it was presented to us at that time. Certainly, we established a committee of deputy ministers who were to go to work immediately to develop policies, to tackle the low income problems that farmers have because of uncertain prices. High cost inputs, excessive price spreads between the producer and consumer, and the dumping of cheap foods from other countries.

I think this served as a basis for the report that the "now" Minister of Agriculture presented to the federal government in their meeting. It was a 29 page document which covers the field of agriculture quite thoroughly. I am not going to quote the whole thing, but I want to quote a little bit that deals with the free market economy. Page 5, section 6:

"The free market economy has not been very favourable in terms of income for the majority of farmers. Recognition must be given to attitudes and measures that will help alleviate the major problems created by the free market economy."

It goes on to discuss the controlling and sharing of markets for certain farm products is necessary to ensure adequate returns for producers of those products. It goes on in more detail there, which I won't go into at this time.

Certainly, in the budget as presented, I would like to commend the hon. Minister of Agriculture for the continuation of the emphasis on marketing. Alberta was first with the appointment of a marketing commissioner. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba have been following what Alberta has been doing in this, and certainly, I hope the hon. minister has the go-ahead to go even further. If we look carefully at the budget of a year ago it showed a 36% increase in the marketing appropriation.

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-35

So, if anybody suggests that it stood still, he isn't recording the facts as such.

As I have mentioned, many of the events have had a significant effect on agriculture, and have had some important effects on the newer policy. I submit that many of the things I mentioned have taken place over the last two or two and one-half years and have important parts in the policy that is determined today. They will have an important part on policies yet to be determined as the needs for agriculture are constantly changing.

I would like to touch briefly on one other point where I would like to express concern, and that is, of the transfer of The Agricultural Chemicals Act from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Environment. In my questioning today I was hoping that the hon. Minister of the Environment would have indicated that it was important enough to have some knowledgeable person in agriculture there, but certainly, I would like to express my concern that in the whole conservation field we recognize the importance of food production and the important part that the property of chemicals has in that whole field.

References were also made in the budget to other good points and that is dealing with senior citizens. I think, Mr. Speaker, that I can speak as one who is as about a close a contact to the original pioneers as anyone in this Assembly. And I would like to submit, Mr. Speaker, that he left much better conditions for me than he found when he came here at the turn of the century. And I would like to reiterate also, that unless people pay for something, somebody else is going to pay for it, and I think that is the important part. I think my colleague from Drumheller pointed out the fallacy of some of these things, where those are who are able to and willing to pay are going to miss out. Certainly no argument can be had with the mentally and physically handicapped and yet, just this morning I heard on the radio where the local school board took exception to some of the news releases that have been issued as to the 'now' government's concern in this field, and yet when they get down to their basic budgetary matters, they were coming short of money in this field. I submit that this should be looked at.

Certainly in the matter of Workmen's Compensation it is an adjustment that is welcome and timely. But then having said all these things it hardly compares to the doubling of the Minister's without Portfolio doubling of salaries in such a short time, and certainly other benefits to those on the opposite side of this Assembly as we go on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't want to close without saying a few words with regard to the Department of Lands and Forests. I was rather disappointed that the capital budget was down 65% in this field because of the increasing awareness of the public or the environment or getting out into the open, and certainly with the efforts being made by the Minister of Tourism, these two just don't add up to me, Mr. Speaker. He is inviting people in and yet, on the other hand, he is cutting back on the facilities to take care of these people. And certainly when you look closely at the operational budget of the Department of Lands and Forests I think there is an actual cut. The dollar figures may be the same, but when you look at the increase in salaries, the increments that go up, I think you will find that there is actually about a 12% reduction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take too much time this afternoon, but I would like to, as the MLA for the Wainwright constituency since 1955, say to you that as a member of that area, I have endeavoured to represent all political faiths of all people in that area. It is my intention to continue to do so. I was elected to that area on that basis, and I intend to continue that way. There is one thing I would like to say relative to my constituency, and

22-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

---

that is that the school division in the Wainwright area was in the news not too long ago, and certainly my concern and that of the people in my area, is that the gap doesn't widen still further between what is provided in the rural and the urban areas. We had a good meeting with the Minister of Education, we were disappointed though that we didn't get more funds, because I feel, and feel strongly as do the people in my area, that we have got to make available to the people in the outlying areas, facilities and education that compares favourably to that which is available in the areas of this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would just like to say that as we get into the details of the estimates, I will be following the various votes on several departments, and I think that our main concern in this budget is, that the money used should be to the benefit of the citizens of Alberta and not to build ivory towers. And here is one in the Department of Agriculture, that there is a substantial increase in the vote, and I would hope a lot of it doesn't go into administration and get lost in the use that it could be made for the farmers of this province of Alberta. I am hopeful that the Minister of Agriculture of the present government can do as good for agriculture as he has done for the medical profession that he represents.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, entering into the budget debate I would first like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on the excellent job you have done in managing the affairs of this Assembly. I feel that the decorum of this House has been excellent, and certainly the knowledge and awareness that you have shown is to be commended very, very much.

I would certainly like to congratulate the Provincial Treasurer in his presentation to the House. I certainly felt that his first presentation was well organized, certainly well thought out, and I am sure that he has spent a number of hours preparing and analyzing what was going in to it.

In my remarks today I am not going to go into an analysis of the budget itself because one of the criteria in program budgeting is the fact that in the initial stages of that type of budgeting certain objectives are determined, certain objectives are set. At that point in the budgeting process the component of evaluation initiates itself or begins to occur. I feel that an assessment of this particular budget would be more fair in the fall session or a year from now when we examine the next fiscal budget. So my criteria certainly is going to be (a) an evaluation as this present fiscal year moves ahead, (b) at the discussions of the next fiscal budget to determine whether the objectives so set down in the budget have been reached or have not been reached. At that time I feel that a fair, honest and most sincere type of criticism, constructive or negative can be made. However, certainly during the estimates I will have some questions with regard to expenditure.

The other items I would like to cover very briefly today are some of the Little Bow constituency. I feel that as a member of the Legislative Assembly and a member that is representing some 13,000 to 14,000 people in southern Alberta that certainly their concerns and their views should be heard by the new ministers. I would be the last one not to take the opportunity to present them before the House. I would like to do it in an enumerated fashion, Mr. Speaker, if that is acceptable.

The first item that is of concern to my constituents is the matter of provincial parks. In the western end of the constituency is located the Little Bow Park. It is an excellent park and is used

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-37

by many, many, citizens in the area and particularly citizens from Calgary and district. I would like to place some items before the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. We will require an expansion of that particular park because of its utilization.

Secondly is that certain capital works projects, such as sewer services for the park, are a necessity; also a new concession stand is a necessity to serve the people that take part in the activities of the park. Those are just two. The second item under provincial parks is the McGregor Lake area. Up until the present time this has been a park administered by the local people and supported through the Department of Lands and Forests who have presented a grant to the county of Vulcan. I urge at this time that the hon. minister consider making the McGregor Lake area into a provincial park, and if that is not possible to assist with a grant so that we can maintain the state to which the local citizens have brought this park at the present time. I must mention that this area certainly takes a lot of the weight off the Little Bow park in serving the citizens of Calgary and district.

Along with that I would like to make a suggestion to the minister, and I have felt strongly about it in the past two or three years, I felt that it would quite expedient to establish a provincial park somewhere along the Bow River so that Calgary residents would have access to that type of facility. At the present time, just from my observation of the utilization of the Little Bow Park and the McGregor Lake Park, there is certainly a tremendous need to fulfill for the citizens of Calgary. I speak partly on behalf of the citizens of Calgary in saying that and secondly on behalf of my constituents who find that when they want to use their local park or the provincial park -- which certainly belongs to all the citizens of the province -- it is so full on weekends that it is just about impossible for them to have that type of leisure activity.

The second major item that I would like to mention is the item of irrigation rehabilitation, and I would just like to make the point to the hon. Minister of Agriculture that he should deal with this matter with all haste and expediency. Also I would encourage the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs to have a look at the matter and consider it, we would like this item dealt with as quickly as possible. The expectations of our people in Little Bow are that you will. Certainly I sit in anticipation for you to complete that task.

The next item is potato marketing. The next item is potato marketing and I was very pleased that the hon. Minister of Agriculture mentioned capital and operational assistance to the potato growers in the southern part of the province. There is certainly a need there; they are in a critical position at the present time, and any type of help will certainly be welcomed. I am sure, that, as a government if you wish to win some merit points, this is one of the very significant ways of doing just that.

The next item that I would like to mention is the matter of industry to small towns. The towns of Vauxhall and Vulcan, particularly, in my constituency sit with great anticipation waiting to see what type of industry can move into the centres to supplement the employment needs in those towns and also to build and stabilize their economy. So I urge the government to continue and work towards the decentralization program that they have promised to the people of Alberta.

In my last few remarks I would like to make a comment or two with regards to the hon. Premier's speech and attempt to do it in a very positive manner. I would like to say, first of all, that, as always, the speech was very well delivered. It certainly was a very descriptive speech of happenings that his government has initiated.

22-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

---

One of the things I waited for in the speech was a vision of what was actually going to happen in the future. I felt that the emphasis for a maiden speech was more in the past than in the future, and I say this not in just my own opinion, but in the opinion of others who viewed it through the opportunity of television. I think we would like, as citizens of Alberta, to have our hon. Premier analyse in a very analytical manner and, with a futuristic type of viewpoint, outline what he expects to happen in the next few years. We would appreciate this approach rather than looking at what we already know has happened and what his government has initiated in a commendable or, in some instances, maybe we feel not a commendable manner. This is one of the expectations I had, and I am certain that follow-up speeches from our Premier may be in that manner.

I feel also one of the anticipations and expectations we have as Albertans is that within the year, or year and a half, words we have heard from the Cabinet, such as "consider", "study", "review", "concern" and "looking at", will change. I know as a minister that this is one of the pitfalls that you can have. It was one of the ways of saying, "Well I just didn't get at it today, or -- I am just going to put it off a little longer." I would suggest to the government that these are words that have been in the vocabulary of politicians for a long time, but are not action words that will take Albertans and this province in new directions and into new developments. I can say that I hope and anticipate, in the next year -- particularly in the fall session and in the next spring session that words from the front row will come out such as: "we have decided"; "this is our decision"; "after consulting with the people of Alberta here is our commitment"; and "now we have new directions on paper". I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that my constituents and I wait in anticipation for that. We have great expectations. We certainly do not want to have any type of conflict or frustration and we hope for great progress for the goodness of Alberta. It is our responsibility as MLA's to promote that objective, not our own objectives that we may feel expedient for our own ends.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. MINIELY:

I don't quite believe it, Mr. Speaker I wasn't sure whether the hon. members on the other side really wanted to get up and talk today or if they just wanted to limit my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about my constituency which I am honoured to represent, the constituency of Edmonton Centre. I sometimes joke, with a great deal of truth, that I am truly the only MLA who really works in his constituency, because this fine Legislature is in my constituency and, of course, we spend many hours here.

Mr. Speaker, this centre is truly representative of all the different facets of the problems and lives in the province of Alberta. I will always recall my nomination meeting in Edmonton Centre which was, interestingly enough, a year to the day of the opening of the Legislature, in which we had 1,500 people from Edmonton Centre and our hon. Premier attended that particular nomination. It will always remain a highlight in my time in public life. When I look back at it as a Minister of the Crown today and as Provincial Treasurer for Alberta, it reminds me of the people who were there and the people who were in attendance, and I'm pleased when I relate that, not just as the Provincial Treasurer, but as a

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-39

member of this government team of 48 members to see the progress we have made in our first budget.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. premier honoured me and my constituents by appointing me as Provincial Treasurer of the Province of Alberta, one of the first things I did was to enter my office, and I have been told by many people who have been in public life that as a minister I should never forget my responsibility to my constituency, and so the first thing I did was to write a little note to myself and basically the note started off: "Don't allow yourself to get so busy that you forget the responsibility you have to your constituents", and I taped it beside my phone and I see it everytime I answer the phone, and interestingly enough I am proud that the first item I had listed on there was removal of education tax from senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this being the first budget of our new government, and my first budget presentation as Provincial Treasurer of the Province of Alberta, it has been very interesting for me to listen to the comments from both sides of the House. When I considered what I should say and the comments of all members on both sides of the House, I thought that I really had two alternatives. One was that my colleagues, I felt, had done such an excellent job of responding to many of the criticisms regarding the budget that I could simply just wrap it up. However, Mr. Speaker, when I thought about it, I thought that there will never be another first budget that I will present as Provincial Treasurer; there will never be another first budget of our new government, and there were some fundamental things that should be said, because I believe them very strongly.

Mr. Speaker, prior to the time I was in public life, when I practised as a chartered accountant, I will always recall the first day I opened up my office and I thought what my goals should be. Obviously as a new person in practice one of those goals was to service my clients, to do a good job, to render sound advice. But it struck me that even though I might accomplish this, if I could not communicate it in everyday language, in layman's language that they could understand, they would not realize what I was attempting to do. Now, Mr. Speaker, I mention this because when the hon. premier, as I mentioned earlier, had honoured me by appointing me Provincial Treasurer of Alberta, I thought about those goals as Provincial Treasurer of the Province of Alberta. Obviously, the first goal that would come to your mind is that it would be my responsibility to develop sound, responsible financial policy for the Government of the Province of Alberta and for the benefit of all the citizens in the Province of Alberta. Obviously as Provincial Treasurer it would be my responsibility to develop tax policies which are related to our citizens' ability to pay and that would be an obvious policy as Provincial Treasurer of this province. Obviously the day-to-day financial management of financial affairs of the province would be a responsibility of the Provincial Treasurer and one I would take very seriously. But Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that governments have a further responsibility -- it applies to every minister in a government -- and that is one of realizing that we're not making policies in isolation; we're making policies on which the onus is partly on the government and a good deal on the government to ensure there is adequate public communication of what we are doing. And, Mr. Speaker, I thought that very early when I was considering my goals as Provincial Treasurer.

I feel that, although I can be proud of the other things, if I can develop sound financial policy, I feel that one of my greatest areas of pride in the years that I might serve as Provincial Treasurer of Alberta would be if I could, even in the slightest way, improve public understanding and awareness of a technical subject that doesn't have to be clouded quite as much as it is. It is a difficult task and I am not under-rating it. But even the slightest bit would be something I would take some pride in.

22-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

---

Mr. Speaker, before I comment on responses to the budget, particularly from members of the other side, I would like to develop a framework of how the budget basically evolves, because I think it is the first budget of our government. In spite of what might be said, in spite of what comments might have been said by any members on the other side of the House, every step that was taken by our government from the time we formed office was a step that would be no different if I was the chief comptroller of a major financial concern. I believe strongly, Mr. Speaker, that the development of financial policy is an orderly process, and this is the way it should be done.

So Mr. Speaker, in developing the framework for my conclusion of the budget, I would like to briefly elaborate on how the budget developed. It wasn't just something that all of a sudden was piled on the table, there was an orderly development of that budget. We spoke, during my budget address, a good deal about new directions. Well, Mr. Speaker, very soon after I took office there was an obvious need for me to assess firstly where we stood. What is the position that the Province of Alberta is in? That is an obvious starting point, and it is an obvious startingpoint in the development of sound financial policy without regard for any need to criticize the former government. We have no need to do that. It is part of the proper development of financial policy.

Mr. Speaker, what did I find? I think this has been twisted to some extent. I would say that I know certain hon. members on the other side who said that we would need someone to interpret the public accounts to our new government. Mr. Speaker, I submit that these public accounts are of such a complexity that anyone who would take them and pull out two figures and say that that is the way the situation is, doesn't realize the complexity of the issue. The public accounts, Mr. Speaker, must be analyzed, and fully analyzed. It is not as simple as some hon. members might lead us to believe.

What did I find? Firstly, if a person looks at the public accounts with respect to the opening position, we find that -- and this is clearly indicated by the Provincial Auditor of this province; we are not in disagreement on it -- subject to the qualifications contained in my report on page 24 of the public accounts. Now that is a key statement which a person -- you might have to be trained in the field to realize what he is saying -- but basically I think it is very easily understood, subject to the qualifications contained in my report. Mr. Speaker, when you go further and look at the qualifications you will find that one of them is that uncollectable loans and advances are not provided for under public accounts. That is one of the qualifications. I am not criticizing this, I am saying that if you are going to communicate, don't just pull out a couple of easy figures and say that is the way it is. It is much more complex than that. Mr. Speaker, there were causes for concern, not simply with the idea of criticizing the former government, but back to the public communication in my view, the citizens of the Province of Alberta had a right to know the proper opening position that our government inherited. They had a definite right to know without any cloud.

Mr. Speaker, I object to the use of the word reserves, because that is a poor word. Reserves implies something that we have there for a rainy day and it is not. The reserves simply were not there for a rainy day. Why would we have to borrow? The opposition has been criticizing us for the last two weeks on the borrowing program. Why would we have to borrow if it was there?

Mr. Speaker, certainly I feel it was incumbent upon me to analyze the opening position we inherited. Certainly we were concerned about the direction and level of expenditures. I know my hon. colleague, the hon. Fred Peacock, was interested in his Alberta Opportunity Fund. When I looked at the items in the public accounts



April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-41

and I looked at where the so-call reserves, and I use the word advisedly because I mentioned that I don't like the word if I can find a better one -- if I could create better public communication, I would do so. He was shocked when I told him that there wasn't a lot of money in reserves that could simply be picked up and put into the Alberta Opportunity Fund. Mr. Speaker, once the opening position had been realistically assessed in terms of the the fact that one alternative would have been that there were cash reserves that our government could utilize. Clearly in the initial assessment, that was not the case.

The next question was what direction are things heading in? Without one new policy by our government, where were things heading? In other words, I called on my department for an indication of, if we simply did not implement one new policy, what kind of expenditures were we facing? Now, Mr. Speaker, if we had not implemented one new policy, the outlook was, early in my term as Provincial Treasurer, we would have been faced with just the former government programs and carrying them on as the estimates came into my department with borrowings of \$250 million, with a \$50 million deficit on operating account. Now I say that because, when we saw it I think you can see that all the compliments that it might have brought me as Provincial Treasurer are really the teamwork that went into it. The cabinet ministers and the government members and all 48 of us -- when we saw this we knew that there were many pet projects that could not be proceeded with. We would have to move very carefully on a priority basis and the direction of expenditures was something that we should be concerned about.

Mr. Speaker, we are also interested in determining what had happened in the past. The third thing was the borrowings program of the former government. Obviously, we've now determined that; (1) there are no cash reserves we can utilize; (2) we need to be concerned about the level of growth of expenditures and, (3) what is the debt situation of the province? I have heard lots of noise during the process of the budget debate, but frankly, Mr. Speaker, it started a long time ago. In 1969 the borrowing started with \$30 million. In 1970, \$70 million. Last year, \$100 million, and we are only projecting this year that our needs will be possibly \$150 million.

Now, with all this assessment, Mr. Speaker, I think that every hon. member will understand if it is very difficult for me to accept some of the statements that have been made. These old directions were occurring with no proper planning, priority setting or financial management, no provisions for relieving the inflationary burden on our senior citizens, no provision for improving net farm income by agricultural marketing thrusts, no provision for improving facilities for handicapped children, and no provision for implementing mental health reform.

It is very difficult for me to know what the members of the opposition are saying when they say -- as the hon. Leader of the Opposition started out -- by saying that we are mortgaging future generations. Well, Mr. Speaker, in fairness, it is not something new. It's credible and it's responsible. We have determined that. He doesn't provide any alternatives for reducing expenditures; he didn't mention one during the course of the budget debate that he would reduce. I can only assume that a Social Credit government would have raised taxes to Alberta's citizens. The hon. Leader of the Opposition criticized staff additions and I know that one thing he tried to say was that their estimates were as open government as our estimates. Well, I'll invite anyone to examine both. There is a lot more improvement I would like to make. But, Mr. Speaker, I think there is obviously some improvement in terms of the information that is available to the public.

22-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

---

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister criticized staff positions and interestingly enough, he didn't look at the right column in the new format. It might have created some confusion for him, because the actual staff increases in our first budget over the actual staff included in the forecast actual expenditures are 449 staff positions. What happened, I think, to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, is he compared our government's first budget with the estimates of staff positions that were presented in the Legislature last spring. Now, obviously, with the extent of over-expenditure that occurred, a lot of the over-expenditure was related to new staff, many of whom were, in fact, on staff before we assumed the responsibility for government.

Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to understand why that is being said. Then, the hon. Member for Highwood -- and this is one I really didn't think I'd hear in this Legislature, or that anyone would really say it. We shouldn't long-range plan because we can't do it accurately. Now, that's the kind of statement that is going to get any government in trouble in the whole country: we shouldn't long-range plan. I really couldn't believe it!

Several hon. members I think referred to financial aid to cities. I would like to say, firstly, and go on record -- I know our government has said it frequently -- certainly we would have liked to have done more, but there are three basic things I would like to say about our first budget with respect to cities. One is, that we consulted with them long before they prepared their own budgets. We didn't unilaterally make the decision and present a bill in the Legislature after it was too late for them to adjust their budgets. We consulted with them early in the game. Secondly, the increase to the cities is greater than the general budgetary increase to the province. But I think the first point is key. We also indicated to them that we realize their problems and would like to do more, and with limited financial resources, as I indicated earlier, we obviously have to decide priorities. We know this is a priority we will have to be looking at, moving on in the future.

One thing I don't understand is the general criticism regarding the provisions for the working man in Alberta. I would like to know what the Alberta Opportunity Fund is for. If it is not for the working man, if it is not going to stimulate employment in this province, then why all the criticism the provisions for the working man? One of our biggest challenges is to provide 20,000 to 25,000 jobs a year for the people who are coming into the labour force every year. But surely this is something for people who are presently working in order to maintain the level of jobs, as well as for people who are new coming into the labour force. (You had your time you wanted, to say what you wanted, hon. member).

The other thing is, with the manpower planning capability. Surely, this is something for the working man. How can you say that our government has not tried to move within the limited financial resources we have in this first year to do anything for the working man? I don't understand that, either.

Mr. Speaker, I see that the hon. members from the other side cut into my time. I shouldn't speak too long, anyway. There was another amusing one, I thought, because this shows the conflict. The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliffe, in his first breath he criticized the borrowing program of the government. And in his second breath he urged our government to spend more money in the first year for the Agricultural Development Fund. I thought that was rather amusing.

Now, this is something that I consider, Mr. Speaker, fundamental, and there is a point which I do not believe has been brought out in the entire debate, in the area of the removal of education tax for citizens over the age of 65. Firstly, our government, during the course of the campaign and since we have been

April 5th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

22-43

the government, have recognized the unfairness of taxing property for the purposes of education. Secondly, by the time a citizen in Alberta has reached the age of 65 -- and when you couple this with my first point, surely they have paid more than their full share towards education. Thirdly, our government is unalterably opposed to any form of a means test. Now, Mr. Speaker, if you tie all three together I don't understand the criticism, because to me it is an absolutely logical first step in the removal of education tax from property and will provide us with an excellent test.

There is one member from the other side I would like to congratulate. I am speaking of the hon. member from Lac La Biche - McMurray. In all honesty, I think a person does have to be fair. If a person makes good comments, I think that he should be complimented in this House for making good comments. The hon. member from Lac La Biche - McMurray, in my view, did much more homework on the budget than many members on the other side did, and made credible comments with respect to the budget, not strictly political comments. I was very interested, and I know that several of our ministers talked about it afterwards, we were very interested in your statements regarding leaving education tax on industrial property because in your views, industry was presently loaded in favour of the urban centres. I think that it requires further consideration, but I thought it was a good point and it is a point that our government will consider through our task force on provincial-municipal finance, which is working in this area. I was somewhat surprised at your criticism of the provision of northern development for native people, and I wonder if you missed the provisions that are included in the Department of Advanced Education which are related to the northern area and the native people.

I couldn't leave my hon. friend from Wetaskiwin-Leduc alone. I would have to say one thing. You said, you said very clearly, that.....

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. Minister address the Chair please?

MR. MINIELY:

If we are going to borrow \$200 million why not \$400 million? Now you know better than that. Are you saying... [interjections]... Well the point that I will make, in which the hon. member knows very well, is that there is a big distinction between responsible borrowing and irresponsible borrowing. Our government intends to pursue responsible borrowing.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I feel that our government has made a real start on new directions within the limited financial resources that were available to us in the first year. We did shift gears and change priorities. But I don't believe that hon. members on the other side studied their estimate books very well before they got up to speak. I might give them a hint for future years. For the first time we have included percentages in the budget estimates, and the revenue growth averages 8.5%. It is very easy for someone to look at a minus figure and a plus figure and say that priorities have changed. But really priorities are related to the degree of revenue growth that is assigned to each new appropriation. In the case of our first budget, our revenue growth is 8.5%. I counted 174 appropriations which we allocated increases below the 8.5% level which would be relatively a lower assignment of priorities than those over.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in developing these new directions and I have clarified how we developed what we consider to be a

22-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 5th 1972

---

responsible financial framework for Alberta, the alternatives were clear.

We must have and operate on a balanced operating budget, and we have achieved that. We must pursue a responsible borrowing policy for capital expenditures and a borrowing policy that is well within the ability of the province to service the borrowing, and we did that. Another alternative was tax increases and in our view the responsible alternative, Mr. Speaker, was obviously responsible borrowing for capital purposes well within Alberta's ability to service the debt.

MR. SPEAKER:

Moved by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, seconded by the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals that the Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the Assembly do immediately resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

[The motion was carried on a voice vote.]

It now being half past five on Wednesday afternoon, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at half past two.

[The House rose at 5:30]