

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, April 6th, 1972

(The House met at 2:30 pm.)

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

NOTICES OF MOTION

Select Committee on Censorship

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave of the House to give oral notice of a motion which I propose to move tomorrow in the House. It is a motion which I would like to read setting up the Select Committee of this Assembly regarding the censorship issue. It is a motion moved by myself and seconded by the hon. Mr. Schmid:

Be it resolved that a Select Committee of this Assembly be established consisting of the following members:

Chairman: Mr. Jamison

Members: Hon. C.M. Leitch, Attorney General

Frank Appleby

John Ashton

Arthur Dixon

Nick Fluker

Doug Miller

Bill Purdy

Ralph Sorenson

with the following instructions:

(a) to review in all its forms the existing Alberta legislation and practices related to censorship;

(b) to examine generally the policies and principles underlying such legislation and practices;

(c) to make such recommendations regarding the future of censorship in Alberta as the committee deems necessary;

(d) to receive representations and submissions at such times and places and in such form as it deems advisable, and that the said committee shall meet at the call of the chairman and submit their report and recommendations prior to November 15, 1972.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is there any reason why this type of resolution that contains considerable subject cannot be placed on the Order Paper, or in Votes and Proceedings with the proper 24 hour notice?

23-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I believe according to the rules there are two ways in which notice of a motion can be given in the Assembly. One is on the Order Paper which would put notice on the Votes and Proceedings two days prior to the vote, and the other is by oral notice, as has been done today. Insofar as this matter was referred to in the Speech from the Throne, it was felt that it was not such a contentious matter and certainly was within the rules to give notice tomorrow of the fact of the appointment of the committee.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order I know that there are two proper methods of notifying the Legislature. Generally, an oral notice is given when there is very little material contained in it and where it would be expected to receive unanimous consent and where there is some reason why it could not have been placed on the Order Paper. I submit that in this type of notice where the terms of reference are highly important, that we have some opportunity to read these and study them before the motion actually comes before the Legislature. On that point, since the terms of reference are very important, I would think even at the risk of delaying this for a day or so that either it be placed on the Order Paper or that all members receive a copy of it today so that we can give it proper notice and study.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, upon being made aware of the concern of members opposite, we'd be prepared to, in effect, provide more notice and send a copy of the proposed resolutions to the hon. members on Monday or Tuesday next week to vote on at that time.

#### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly a group of nine young people, together with their leader, from the Debolt Youth Group in my constituency who are seated in the members' gallery. I would like to express my appreciation to them for taking time out during the Easter holidays to view the proceedings of this Assembly. Would they please rise and receive the recognition of the members of this House.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of introducing to you three groups who are carrying out valuable activities in my constituency and outside the constituency: (1) the Edmonton Council of Knights of Columbus, Lady of Fatima, under the council chief, Mr. Jim Ellers and the civic cultural counsellor, Mr. Clarence Verhulst. We all know the various activities carried out by the Knights of Columbus. One of the specific activities is sponsoring a Circle of Squire and Squirette groups, who are a youth group carrying out various spiritual, cultural, social, and other activities. They are also located in the Assembly, and this Circle of Squires group here today is called the G.P. Vanier Circle, 1664, and the Circle of Squirettes is called Circle of Squirettes of Mary, No. 1. I'd like to commend all these groups for carrying out their activities and taking an interest in the legislative process. I'd ask them to rise and be recognized by the House.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, through you, may I introduce to the Assembly a group of 4-H Clubs from Strome, Alberta. We have with us this afternoon the Strome Beef-Dairy Club and the Wavy Lake Beef Club and the dedicated people who have given so much of their time to these

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-3

young people, their 4-H leaders. Now, last summer, the Squire Clubs of Edmonton were in the Strome area as guests of these two 4-H Clubs. And now, during the Easter recess, the Strome 4-H Clubs will be the guests of the Edmonton Squire clubs. Now will my group please stand and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to the members of this Legislative Assembly the principal of the non-subsidized language school of the German-Canadian Club of Calgary, Mr. Hans Heller. Mr. Heller is accompanied by his wife and family, Rosemarie and Peter, today, and they are in your gallery, Mr. Speaker. I would like them now to rise and be recognized.

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 29 members of the Peace River Air Cadet Squadron No. 124, along with their captain and his wife, Captain and Mrs. Black. The members of the Peace River Air Cadet Squadron are in the public gallery and have taken the time during this Easter holiday to be with us and to communicate again in the community affairs of our great community in the Peace country. I ask them now to stand and be recognized.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and to the members of this Legislature a man sitting in your gallery and a man who has spent a considerable number of years in this House. He is well known to many of us. I refer, of course, to Mr. Mike Senych, the former MLA for Redwater.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### University Grants

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and ask him if the government followed the practice of establishing university grants at the amount of \$91.1 million, contingent upon no increase in tuition fees to university students.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I think this is something that should be dealt with in more detail under the estimates. But I could reply to my hon. friend in this way. That in writing to the Universities Commission at the time I advised them, I think February 24th, of the amount of a grant which I would be prepared to recommend to the House, and in those terms, I expressed the hope that it would not be necessary to raise tuition fees in the coming year.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary question. Was the same type of correspondence carried out between your office and the Colleges Commission with regard to the amount that you have recommended to the House in that area, \$11 million?

MR. FOSTER:

I don't specifically recall, Mr. Speaker, whether or not I expressed the same hope with the Colleges Commission. It may be that

23-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

if I did not, I was aware of the tuition fee structure of the colleges, and was aware that they were not, in fact, contemplating any change in the following year. So, if I did not say that, it was for that reason. If you like, I would be happy to check that and report it.

NAIT and SAIT Student Fees

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question. Do the revenue estimates from the Department of Advanced Education anticipate any increase in student tuition fees at NAIT or SAIT?

MR. FOSTER:

I think, Mr. Speaker, I now see a good reason why this matter should have waited for the estimates. I would like to check that and report. I believe the answer to that is no, but I don't want that to be taken as a categorical answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Unsatisfied Judgment Fund

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways. Now that we have compulsory insurance in the province, when can we expect the \$1 contribution to the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund to be removed?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, this actually comes under the Department of the Attorney General, but with his permission, I think I could answer that question. Actually, there will be no change in the \$1 Unsatisfied Judgment for at least four to five years. At that time we would be able to reassess it to see if it could be relaxed to a lesser amount or not. As the hon. member is aware, the fund is running at a fair deficit according to the papers I tabled here the other day to a written question that was asked. If the fund were to be self-sufficient, it would, at this time, need to be doubled.

There will always be people coming into the province who are not carrying insurance, and our people within the province will need the fund to wind down the cases that are now before the courts, as well as the case of the No Fault clause in the accidents that would be created by people coming into the province who are not carrying insurance.

Energy Resources Conservation Board

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Is the hon. minister prepared today to report on my question of last week regarding the law firm of McLaws and Company representing both the Government of Alberta as well as Chevron Standard at the recent Energy Resources Conservation Board hearings?

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-5

---

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed the situation and am pleased to answer any of the questions specifically that the hon. member would like to direct to me.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Is it not true that because one firm would have to bill both parties that it is not customary, indeed that it is a rare occurrence for one firm to take divergent sides on a case?

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. member is asking a question with regard to legal propriety or legal customs, I would suggest that he obtain advice outside the House.

MR. NOTLEY:

I will leave that then, Mr. Speaker, and direct this supplementary question again to the hon. minister. It is a question that I raised several weeks ago when I first raised the issue. Is the position then of the Government of Alberta and that of Chevron Standard identical on the question of the increase in the price of natural gas?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that in respect to the position of Chevron Standard Limited, I did obtain a copy of their submission to the Energy Resources Conservation Board and am pleased to make that available to the hon. member. In respect to the position of the government, I think we have made that position clear before, that the Alberta government did request the Energy Resources Conservation Board to inquire and investigate the field pricing of natural gas. The Energy Resources Conservation Board called a public hearing and invited submissions. We will receive a copy of those submissions and we will analyze those submissions together with the recommendations from the Energy Resources Conservation Board. After that time we will make our position known.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Did the legal counsel representing the Government of Alberta engage in cross-examination during the hearings?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. In view of that, in view of the minister's inability to advise the House whether or not the position of Chevron Standard and the Government of Alberta is identical in relation to the increase of the field price of natural gas, is it not then, unusual that the government would have as their legal counsel a representative from a firm which is also acting on behalf of one of the producers?

MR. DICKIE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that question is phrased rather badly, but I would like to answer the question in this respect, to say that after the Energy Resources Conservation Board did call the public hearing, the government did consider its position. The government decided by virtue of the fact that it had requested the

23-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

Energy Resources Conservation Board to conduct this investigation, that it would not present evidence or make a submission, but however decided that it should be represented at the hearing by legal counsel in an observer capacity. It was that position, to have a watching brief or listening in respect to the hearing, and that is the position the government followed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall, and the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Automobile Licence Fees

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Highways. Does your department contemplate reviewing the method presently used to determine the fee for licence plates on private automobiles in the Province of Alberta?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, at this time we are reviewing many of the aspects of the whole department and this would come under that review as well. Whether there will be any change is something that will be decided at the time of the review.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Supplementary then, hon. minister. Are you aware then that there are now certain inequities in the fee structure because of new engineering and designing techniques of the automobile manufacturers?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. In the licencing of all vehicles -- in my own personal opinion -- there are many inequities that I hope to be able to make more even and more administrable.

Camrose College Student Funds

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. Sir, in view that you have been recently informed of the proposed increase at the Camrose College for foreign students from \$400 to \$1,400 a year, what does the hon. minister intend to do about this?

MR. POSTER:

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Member for Calgary McCall says that I was made aware of this, this is quite true. The hon. member and I attended a luncheon meeting with some non-Canadian students at the University of Alberta at which time the matter of the foreign student fee structure in the private colleges of Alberta was raised and discussed. And I think as we all appreciate, the government of this province does in fact provide some funds to certain public colleges. One of those public colleges was specifically referred to. I indicated to the hon. member at that time, and I am quite happy to refer to it again now, that I will be contacting the college to find out the rationale behind this move on their part in the sense that the proposed increase is quite large. More than that, Mr. Speaker, I am also contacting them with a view to discovering their complete financial operation and they have been quite agreeable to this. They have agreed to provide me with the information. Should the hon. member or the House be interested in going into this in detail I

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-7

would be very happy to do so, to the extent that it does not breach confidences and I can make the information available.

Use of the Prefix Ms.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier. In regard to your typical reply letter tabled on Village Lake Louise last week, was the Ms prefix on the greeting a typographical error or does the government now formally recognize the leading symbol for Women's Liberation? -- [Laughter] -- Mr. Speaker, I am serious. The Premier's letter very clearly states the prefix before the lady's name Ms. and this is an issue of grave concern around the country these days. Was it a typographical error or were you formally recognizing the symbol?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, please.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. Premier aware that the government of California state unanimously passed a bill recently, allowing women to register on the voters list using the prefix Ms rather than Mrs. or Miss and the bill is now going to the state senate to allow women to register using any one of the three prefixes?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, in regard to the gravity of the question I think it is a matter I will take under serious advisement, but I would be very cautious to respond in a definitive way without some consultation with the hon. Miss Hunley and the hon. Mrs. Chichak. I will do that later today.

Japanese Coal Contracts

MR. DRAIN:

I have a question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. This report that I read that the government is going to intervene directly in the matter of negotiations for coal contracts in Japan - is this correct?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure which government he is referring to and perhaps he could elaborate just a little bit on his question.

MR. DRAIN:

In the last Canada Manpower Review there was a notation that said the Alberta government was going to enter directly into negotiations with the Japanese in the matter of coal contracts and I want to know if this is so, and if this is a government position to do this.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we would like to see the document that he is referring to because I do not know in what context that was stated, so if the hon. member would provide me with a copy I would be happy to give him a reply as quickly as possible.

23-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright, followed by the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has he had any meeting with any federal minister relative to the crop damage by migratory water fowl and the federal participation in that?

MR. GETTY:

No I have not, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to refer the question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture who may be able to shed some light on it.

Crop Damage

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member asked that question yesterday with regard to the meeting on migratory bird damage and this comes under the concept of the Minister of Lands and Forests, primarily, although we administer the Wildlife Damage Fund for the Department of Lands and Forests. The Minister of Lands and Forests was notified of the meeting and had some personnel attending it.

Prairie Provinces Meetings

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, then a further question. In Hansard it is reported that Mr. Davis had said, "I have had discussions with the ministers from the prairie provinces", and in the reply by the Minister of Agriculture yesterday he indicated that there was no meeting held on a ministerial level, as was confirmed by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, and I am just at a quandary now because the federal minister said he had met with provincial ministers. Now do we consider ourselves as Albertans and not as a prairie province?

DR. HORNER:

Well, I am sure that the hon. member has finally arrived at the fact that he is an Albertan and that, perhaps, he should have been working harder for Alberta in the past. As a matter of fact, the entire question of this meeting -- and if we want it laid out from A to Z for him -- was that with 48 hours' notice they notified the Department of Lands and Forests that the minister was coming to Winnipeg, and that they were going to have a meeting on it. Neither the Minister of Lands and Forests or myself were available for that meeting but as I said earlier to the hon. member, personnel were at the meeting representing Alberta.

MR. RUSTE:

Well, a further supplementary question. Do I take it then that Mr. Davis in his answer in the House of Commons was wrong in that he answered that he had had discussions with the ministers from the prairie provinces?

DR. HORNER:

Well, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member should be more concerned about what is happening in the Province of Alberta rather than worrying whether Mr. Davis was right or not.



April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-9

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

Weed Cutting Operations

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. A few weeks ago in the House I asked the hon. Minister of the Environment, with regard to weed cutting operations on Lake Wabamun, and I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Lands and Forests. In regard to the weed cutting operation on Lake Wabamun would the harvester be available for harvesting operations on Lake Isle, if the weed harvesting operation on Lake Wabamun is completed early this year?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the weed harvesting equipment is owned and handled and operated by the Parks Division of the Department of Lands and Forests, and its use in Lake Wabamun is related to the fact that we have the Wabamun Provincial Park there. It was utilized last year on a full basis and during the time of the summer months it was not possible to do such a complete job of weed cutting as to prevent there being a need for further work this summer. It would remain to be seen how successful they are in using the weed cutting operation in Lake Wabamun in order to ascertain whether it could be spared for other uses. But I might caution at the same time, Mr. Speaker, that were it to be released for other uses in other places besides Lake Wabamun, we would first be considering any needs that we have within provincial park lakes in other locations in Alberta.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, if I might expand on this item just a little bit. The weed cutting operations on Lake Wabamun were turned over to Calgary Power and the weed cutter that was available to the Department of Lands and Forests, plus one transporter, was turned over for their use this spring and they are buying one more cutter and three more weed transporters and one more loader. They are going to operate on a two-shift basis beginning in May and the weeds will go to an abandoned gravel pit about two miles away from the Wabamun plant. If in fact, there is additional capacity available, then consideration will be given to using the machinery or equipment on other lakes, but at this particular time it is considered necessary to increase, not only the weed cutting capacity, but as well the transporters and the loaders to handle the Wabamun situation this summer.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is Calgary Power using government equipment for this clean-up?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated when I first got up, the existing cutter and one transporter have been loaned to Calgary Power and they will undertake the complete responsibility of weed control in the lake.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the province paying anything to Calgary Power for this or charging rent for the government machine?

23-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to check that, but to my knowledge at this particular time I don't believe there is a rental charge, they have simply taken over the equipment on a loan basis and are going to maintain the weed harvesting in the lake.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister tell us why the people of the province should be supplying Calgary Power with equipment at public expense?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What about the Brazeau? What about the Bighorn?

MR. TAYLOR:

Answer the question! Answer the question! Don't ease your conscience -- answer the question.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I think we, as a province, can consider ourselves to be very fortunate indeed that Calgary Power has recognized the need for this type of service on Lake Wabamun. After all Calgary Power hasn't been under any real obligation to, in fact, undertake this work and they, through their own volition, have undertaken not only to do what we have been attempting to do in a very unreliable fashion up until this year, but they have undertaken to purchase additional equipment, and as a result undertake a task which is a difficult one at best, and maintain the lake in what we have said we will maintain it, as an area for excellent recreation for the people of the Province of Alberta.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. What did the machine cost that we are now providing, in turning over to Calgary Power?

DR. WARRACK:

I would have to accept that on the Order Paper. The information is readily available since the purchase was made under the old administration.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I really wanted the answer from the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, not the echo from the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The echo came all the way from the Brazeau!

MR. COOKSON:

I would ask the hon. Minister of the Environment what grant was given to Calgary Power by the former government of Alberta?

Catelli Lockout

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Labour. Is your department aware of the lockout at the Catelli

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-11

-----  
Plant in Lethbridge, and if so, what is your department doing to alleviate this situation?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, we are aware of the lockouts. For a current report on the exact circumstances and our department's involvement, I'd be happy to bring the answer to you tomorrow.

Irrigation Rehabilitation

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, a question to, I believe, the hon. Minister of the Environment. Yesterday the hon. H.A. Olson, in speaking to over 300 farmers in Taber, was quoted as saying that 1) he was anxious to complete negotiations regarding the irrigation rehabilitation and, 2) he was concerned with the eight month delay in bringing arrangements to a final agreement. Has the hon. minister made any plans to meet Mr. Marchand and Mr. Olson in this urgent and vital matter?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the same question was asked several weeks ago, and I indicated at that time that negotiations were very active at this particular time. It is a case of establishing or solving some technical aspects. The main problem, as I indicated at that time, was one associated with the terms and conditions under which we would take over the Bow River project. Also, a second point under consideration was a continuing contribution by the federal government to irrigation rehabilitation in southern Alberta. We considered that both of these areas need some resolution before a final contract can, in fact, be resolved. I do want to suggest again that the area is under very active consideration, and the last meeting was held between our officials, I think about a week and a half ago.

MR. BUCKWELL:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. As the hon. minister, do you make counter proposals to the federal government to the plan that is already offered to the provincial government?

MR. YURKO:

Very definitely so, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, we have indicated what our position would be on these two questions and we have indicated to the federal government what this position would be, in fact, and the conditions under which we would be prepared to negotiate these conditions.

Grants to Calgary Power

While I am up, Mr. Speaker, I think I ought to answer the question raised by the hon. member, Mr. Cookson. I would like to indicate that the provincial contribution to the Brazeau project was \$20 million and to the Bighorn works, the provincial contribution was \$5 million or a total of \$25 million.

MR. BUCKWELL:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. As the Irrigation Projects Association knew the terms and conditions that the federal government was making to the province, did the province then give this information -- this counter proposal -- to the Projects Association to whom it means so much? It means very little to the rest of the province, but it does mean a great deal to the Projects Association, that they may study it.

23-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the Irrigation Projects Association has had ample opportunity to make their viewpoint known and they have certainly taken that opportunity. They have met with me on, I believe, several occasions and I have had some correspondence from them. So they have had every opportunity to make their representation to us. At this time I would like to suggest that the negotiations are still of a confidential nature and we are not about to divulge them to the Irrigation Projects Association.

Grants to Calgary Power (cont.)

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Did I understand him correctly to say that the government made a contribution of \$20 million to the Brazeau Dam?

MR. YURKO:

My understanding is that it cost the provincial government \$20 million in connection with the Brazeau reservoir project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Tch, tch.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the hon. minister aware of the arrangement other than the point that he is just making? -- [Interjections] -- Mr. Speaker, I want to raise the question again and I feel that it is very important at this point in time. The House is being left with a misrepresentation and I suggest that the hon. minister ought to give the House more facts than what he is giving at the present time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. YURKO:

I believe I could stand to be corrected in what I said, Mr. Speaker. I believe the actual arrangement was a \$20 million dollar interest-free loan that was made by the previous government to Calgary Power in connection with the Brazeau reservoir. In connection with that contract, I believe that they received water for no charges -- it was free water.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. In view of the fact that the legal counsel in a listening position at this hearing did conduct cross-examination, can the hon. minister supply the House with any precedent for the government choosing from one firm which is representing another party -- a private party -- at a hearing? Can he supply any precedent to the House for this kind of representation?

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, there is all kinds of innuendo in that question. You called me to order the other day; I believe this is improper.

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-13

MR. SPEAKER:

This is not the type of question which is contemplated within the ambit of citation 171 of Beauchesne, if the hon. member would like to refer to it.

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

Removal of RCMP from Magrath

MR. FARRAN:

Have you been made aware of the threatened removal of the Mounted Police detachment from the town of Magrath? It is a town with an Irish name in the Cardston riding where law and order may be threatened.

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have been told that the RCMP are considering, or are in the process of transferring the office from the Town of Magrath to the City of Lethbridge and I have received that information recently and I'm making inquiries about it.

Cost of Grande Cache Power Development

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of the Environment. Could he tell this House how much the former government paid for the power development in the Grande Cache area?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I don't really know at this point in time. I'd have to look it up.

Replacement of Campsite

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways. Is any action being taken to replace that portion of the highway campsite located at the junction of Highways 14 and 21? This land was taken due to the expanding of Highway 14 at that point to a four-lane divided highway. Incidentally, this is one of the highway campsites that is used extensively.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether the highway has taken the whole of the campsite or not. I would assume by the question that the hon. member has put forth that perhaps it has. If it has, there has been no further negotiation in that area to re-establish a campsite at that particular point.

MR. RUSTE:

A further question to the minister. Would he look into this matter and see if it is not at all possible to expand that one? There is some left of it.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, we will be looking into all of these areas and where a campsite as such has been terminated, we may not necessarily establish another one in that area, but may in some other area at some other point that would supplement and serve the same purpose.

23-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

Removal of Smith-Roles to Alberta

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Industry. Are you aware that the large manufacturing firm of Smith-Roles is planning on leaving Saskatchewan to set up shop in Alberta?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I am not.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary question to the minister. If you contact them, or if they should contact you, would you assure us, Mr. Minister that you will recommend to Smith-Roles that they seriously consider moving into one of the less populated areas of the province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The question is hypothetical, but if the hon. minister wishes to answer it anyway...

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd be delighted to answer it. Yes, we will certainly do that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller, and then the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals, free from any insinuations whatsoever. Can the minister cite any precedent for the same firm representing both the government and a private party at hearings?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is striving mightily to get around the fact that he is asking a question of legal advice and legal propriety, which, as I have suggested before, he should seek outside the House.

Release of Experienced Workman

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests? Was the experienced workman released from your shop in North Edmonton and replaced by an inexperienced workman by direct direction from you as minister?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, no.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary question. Can the hon. minister tell us why an experienced workman was released when he was giving satisfactory service and replaced with another man?

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-15

---

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Surely this isn't the kind of question that the question period is allocated for. This is the kind of thing that should be brought up in estimates and the hon. member knows it.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, it might not be serious to the hon. Minister of Agriculture who has a job, but it is pretty serious to a man who is conscientiously doing his job and is then released for no reason and replaced with another man. If we are talking about humanity first, let's be humanity first. I'm simply asking if he does not know about it that he investigate it and that surely is the proper use of the question period.

DR. HORNER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller, Mr. Speaker, can allow his blood pressure to rise at a moment's notice. Still, the problem isn't that, and he knows very well, being an experienced member of this House, the question he raises now is a matter of opinion and is one of debate, and should properly be raised on estimates of the department of the minister involved. And that is parliamentary procedure, and has been for a long time.

Just because the hon. member wants to make a loud noise about something, it is not necessary for him to really make a farce of the question period in which urgent questions are made. That has nothing to do with the question of whether a man's job is urgent or otherwise. I know the hon. member likes his hearts and flowers speech. But, at the same time, it is a question of whether or not this question period is going to be usable for urgent, public policy matters, and not the kind of thing he is raising right now.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I am not asking for a matter of opinion. The hon. member, if he wants to make a speech, chose a very bad item to make a speech about, because there is no substance to what he said, at all.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. There was some suggestion of innuendo in the question, but I would leave it to the hon. minister as to whether he wishes to answer it or not.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member did not, in the original question, ask me to investigate it. If he would like to give me the particulars and ask me to investigate it, I would be most happy to do so.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. minister was in the House yesterday, he would have heard the whole details when they were properly given.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame, shame.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I am really sorry I hurt the hon. member's feelings yesterday.

23-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Member for Calgary Bow is next.

Loss of Harness Racing Tax Income

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General. What steps, if any, is the government taking to try to preserve the customary tax income from harness racing in Calgary, which now appears, may not be forthcoming this year?

MR. LEITCH:

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I did not hear the earlier part of the hon. member's question.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, it has been announced that harness racing may not occur in Calgary this year. Inasmuch as the Provincial Treasurer received something over \$67,000 in taxes last year from this source, I was wondering what steps the government is taking this year to try to preserve or increase that income.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the answer seems to me to be one that will appear in the estimates under the department concerned.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Did the hon. minister receive a brief from Mr. W. E. Finley, president of the Alberta Standardbred Horse Association, with a suggestion as to how that income may be preserved, or at least part of it, through Mr. Millican?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I don't recall that brief. I recall discussions with various people interested in horse racing in Alberta, and I have met with several groups since September 10th, at which time they discussed the take from the money wagered, and we discussed the amount of the tax, but I don't recall meeting with or dealing with any brief specifically dealing with the question of harness racing and the tax on the money bet on harness racing.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister like to have a copy of the brief, together with an accompanying letter I received?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. This is not a question. If the hon. member wishes to offer the hon. minister some documents, he may do it outside the question period.

Educational TV

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the hon. House Leader has the information that he was going to give us in regard to the question on TV.



April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-17

MR. HYNDMAN:

I will have that by tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

Natural Resource Hearings

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. The question of clarification, sir, in your statement last Wednesday on the Natural Resource hearings. It is my understanding that when the tentative position of the government is prepared and a motion is presented to go into the Committee on Public Affairs, Education and Agriculture, at that time, consideration will be given to a cut-off date for organizations making submissions on the royalty issue. I am wondering if that is a fair assessment of your statement, or whether the government is perhaps considering setting a cut-off date within the next week or so, so that organizations would be able to consider whether they can make submissions or not.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that is a very reasonable question and one that we have given some consideration to because of the problem of timing that is involved. On the other hand, it seems to us that it is a matter for the committee to decide, if the reference is made to the committee, and for that reason, having regard to the thoroughly widespread understanding by the public at large that there will be such a hearing, and that the hearing is tentatively scheduled for mid-May, we felt that the wiser course of action was to present our tentative proposals on the matter, have a motion that the proposal be referred to the standing committee and the standing committee, hopefully, could meet very quickly and determine its own terms of reference and guidelines relative to the point that the hon. member raises. We would hope that this would be done in such a way and quickly enough that there would still be a reasonable amount of time for people to prepare their submissions, although it might have to be a fairly short time for them to express their intention to make a submission, but we, in balance with the difficult timing problem, felt that it should be a matter for the committee itself to resolve.

Competence of Practising Physicians

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. It refers to an article in The Calgary Albertan where the president of the Alberta Medical Association says that it is only a matter of time until practising physicians will have to prove their competence. My first question to the minister is, is this situation serious at the present time?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the statement of course, is referring to the continuing education program that the doctors have been developing over a period of time, and no doubt plan on continuing.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Would this be one of the matters for study by the Legislative Committee that studies the professions acts?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I don't see that aspect of it coming into the purview of the committee study but I suppose, Mr. Speaker, when the committee's

23-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

terms of reference are examined by the committee they could literally consider whatever is really relative to their terms of reference but I don't think that would be.

Production of Hansard

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. government House Leader? Is the Hansard staff running into some severe difficulties? We are somewhat concerned over the lack of Hansards that we have been receiving and I am wondering if there is some difficulty or some explanation for it.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, I will certainly look into that Mr. Speaker. I think the concern has been evident on both sides. I gather that there have been some personnel problems in getting adequate people to get the start-up going and also in linking in with the government computer for fast publication, but I will certainly check into that through the Speaker and give a report to the House, hopefully tomorrow.

Cancellation of Special Use Applications

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Mr. Minister, have there been any requests by any municipality in the province to cancel the special use applications for development which have been issued for the past year or two but have not been acted upon. Maybe some have gone back as far as four years ago. Is the government contemplating any legislation to take care of this situation at this session?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I have received no requests from any municipalities in that regard.

Gas Pollution at Hussar

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment? Is there anything being done about the heavy pollution, particularly at night, from the GPOG gas well near Hussar?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that question under advisement and report to the hon. member in a day or so.

Task Force On Urbanization

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. Has there been a firm decision to close out the work of the Task Force on Urbanization?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I refer that question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-19

MR. RUSSELL:

I am sorry I was preparing a follow-up answer to the hon. Member for Calgary Millican and I did not catch your question. Would you mind repeating it?

MR. FRENCH:

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, I should say I received a petition, a resolution from various communities, and I think this question should be directed to the Premier. Communities of Trochu, Three Hills, Acme, Carbon, Rockyford, Standard, Hussar, Bassano, East Coulee, Wayne, Rosedale, Drumheller, Hanna, Delia and Morrin. This resolution requests an extension of one year for the Task Force on Urbanization so they may complete their work. My question is to the Premier - have you received this resolution, sir?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have the personal knowledge of having received it yet. I will make an inquiry to determine whether I have received it, but perhaps the minister would like to respond and give an updated report with regard to the status of the Task Force on Urbanization.

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to attempt to clarify this, because the work of the Task Force on Urbanization and the Future will continue for another two complete fiscal years to finish the three year program as outlined by the previous government. All that has been changed is the method of conducting the work for the last two years.

The member may recall that during the first year a number of committees working on rather an experimental basis carried out this work, and we have essentially asked the committees to bring their work to a halt, and in their place have appointed a permanent co-ordinator who will ask agencies from the private sector to carry out various specific projects as he sees fit. But the committees have had their terms extended until the end of June of this year, rather than the end of the just past fiscal year, at their request. So I think the important thing to remember is that the work is being carried out over the next two fiscal years.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, it occurred to me after I sat down, in response to the question from the Member for Calgary Millican, there was more or less an indirect request along the line you mentioned from the City of Calgary who submitted a resolution to the 1971 convention of the Alberta Municipalities Association and that association passed that, and that in turn was passed on to the government, so indirectly we did have that request from the City of Calgary.

MR. FRENCH:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Are you satisfied with the work of the committee up to this point in time?

MR. RUSSELL:

Not completely, Mr. Speaker, and this was one of the reasons for the change.

MR. FRENCH:

A supplementary question to the minister. Are you aware of the fact that there are many, many people in rural Alberta today who have spent considerable time at their own expense and time in trying to serve the purpose for which this committee was set up?

23-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and the member is making an excellent point. This is why the three month extension was agreed to at the request of the committees, in order to essentially complete this work that had been started. I indicated earlier that I was not completely satisfied with the way things have been going, as a result of feedback we were getting from various municipalities and through the board of directors of the Task Force, and this change in direction is an attempt to keep going what, we think, was an essentially good idea.

MR. FRENCH:

A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Are you prepared to reconsider your position to close out the work that this group has been doing so that they may be able to complete their task?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I should emphasize that there has been no decision to close out, and I repeat again that the three months extension and a sum of approximately \$61,000 was allotted in this year's estimates to accomplish the very thing the hon. member is referring to. For the two year period beyond that we want to go into the final stages and additional work. But the community work that has been carried out will be incorporated in final reports which I expect to receive at the end of June. So I do not believe that there has been any wasted citizen effort.

MR. SPEAKER:

We have fairly extensively exceeded the allotted time for the Question Period and perhaps the matter could be left over for the next Question Period.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I had an important question from the hon. Member for Calgary Bow. He drew to my attention an advertisement in the Calgary Albertan which had been placed by a firm from Great Britain, indicating summer jobs available for students in the United States and inviting students to apply for them. I wish to inform you, sir, and the members, and the House, that I have instructed my department to conduct a complete and immediate investigation into all the circumstances surrounding this advertisement and the validity of the information it contains. We feel it is extremely important that students not be exploited, if this happens to be the case.

In this connection I am advised that the matter is already under review, both here as well as in the United States and, in fact, in Great Britain, by our own Canadian Federal Immigration officials and officials of the American State Department. The management of the Calgary Albertan, I am happy to report, indicates that the advertisement will not run again until the situation has been clarified, and to that extent we will work to clarify the situation and to bring full information to the House.

My department will consider any necessary further action in this regard because the Department of Labour issues the permits for advertisements in Alberta. When the investigation is complete I will report again.

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-21

I should point out that a similar ad has run in Bermuda, Australia, Africa and, indeed, all over the world. The ad was placed by what appears to be a reputable agency and this is what we want to establish. I thought this was information important enough to bring to the House this afternoon.

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise at this point and set the House in order, and especially the hon. Member for Drumheller, with regard to the borrowings that AGT will be making during the calendar year 1972 in the amount of \$50 million. The hon. member indicated, I think, that this would be repaid by the taxpayers of the Province of Alberta, which is not correct. The \$50 million will be used to pay, in part, for the capital expenditures required by AGT this year in the amount of \$84 million, and this amount will be repaid by telephone subscribers. And if you want to work that down over 20 years of the debenture borrowings, it will come down to less than \$5 per telephone per year. The number of telephones at this point in time are in excess of 556,000, so that individual Albertans will not be repaying the \$50 million, and the cost will be repaid out of the rate of return that is allowed to Alberta Government Telephones.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might revert to introduction of visitors.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and draw to the attention of the members of the House, the attendance of a man in your gallery who spent many, many years in this House and I am sure made a very valuable contribution to the development of the north country. I refer to the former hon. member hon. Mr. Ira McLaughlin, from Grande Prairie. I would ask him to stand and be recognized at this time.

#### QUESTIONS

158. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question:

1. Do the 140 people against whom judgments in District Court have been filed for non-payment of Medicare premiums represent all of the people who are in arrears and have the ability to pay?
2. If not, why have judgments been filed against some people who are able to pay and not others, and by what criteria were they selected?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I request that Question 158 be held, I wish to obtain a legal opinion and I am a little concerned about confidentiality of records.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. minister wish to have it put over without date or to a certain date?

23-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

MISS HUNLEY:

I don't think it will take very long but I am just not prepared this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. minister like to suggest a time so that we can --

MISS HUNLEY:

Next Tuesday.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do the hon. members agree to the matter going over until next Tuesday? I didn't want to appear persistent but it seemed to me that in order to deal with the matter in an orderly way we would have to do this.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

159. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question:

1. Why did the appeal hearing of Dr. John Jenkins, suspended as a psychiatrist at the Oliver Hospital last March, 1971, last more than eight months, and why was it never completed?
2. Why was Dr. Jenkins never allowed to testify?
3. Was he forced to accept a government settlement because of the long delay during which he could not collect his salary?
4. Why is he now being evicted from his home by the Alberta Housing Corporation?
5. How many other appeals have exceeded more than eight months before settlement is reached?
6. What does the government plan to do in the future to ensure speedy appeals to ensure employees are not forced to accept settlements because of financial problems that result from lengthy suspensions?

DR. HORNER:

I rise in regard to this question as I did the other day to ask the hon. member if he would consider withdrawing the question as it is now structured and to restructure it to protect the confidentiality of personal documents of everybody and particularly the individual named. I'd like to suggest to the hon. member that in some of these cases, perhaps he could get the information by a personal visit to the minister or some other method rather than having them made public documents because I do think that in consideration of the matter of confidentiality of documents that we have a pretty grave responsibility in this Legislature in relation to tabling these kind of documents.

Further, Mr. Speaker, if I might suggest, in addition to that, perhaps to relieve the conscience of some of us who are very concerned about this matter, that the consent of the person so named in the question should be made available in relation to these matters.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, just in response to the hon. minister's position. First of all I would certainly have the consent of the individual

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-23

involved in submitting this question. However, I am prepared to rephrase it if it is of concern to the government but I do want to make it clear to the Assembly that I sought the consent of the individual before posing the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it then that at the present we may take the question as having been withdrawn subject to it being rephrased and reput.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

#### MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

160. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to this Assembly:  
Seconded by Mr. Ludwig.

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

1. In regard to the Government Grazing Reserve at Wanham, Alberta:

- (a) What is the total acreage of the reserve?
- (b) What is the total improved acreage?
- (c) What is the total cost of improvements for the past four years (1968, 1969, 1970, 1971)?
- (d) What is the amount and cost of fertilizer used in each of the past four years?
- (e) What was the cost of spreading the fertilizer in each of the past four years?
- (f) What is the assessed value and annual tax of the reserve?
- (g) What is the manager's current annual salary?
- (h) How much has been paid out in wages for employees other than the manager in each of the past four years?

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to table the answer to Motion 160.

161. Mr. Taylor proposed the following motion to this Assembly:  
Seconded by Mr. French.

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

1. How many students in the Bow Valley region did not return to school following the end of the Teachers' strike last December?
2. What are the ages of the said students?
3. What grade had each student fully completed as at December 1, 1971?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, concerning this motion, I might point out that the Department of Education in the normal course of events takes only one count of pupils each year and this is taken on September 30th. However, in 1971 in December, we did take a second count of students, but they were high school students only, so I think it can fairly be said that some of the information which the hon. gentleman requests may be and is in the department, but other information is available and attainable only from School Boards or schools.

I can say that we would be able to provide statements showing for each school system in the Bow Valley area, a consolidation of the

23-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

-----

enrolment as at September 30th, 1971, by schools, and a consolidation of the schools and also a worksheet showing the enrolments as at December 1971 for each of the schools affected, the high school students only. Now that is the only information we have, but we would be happy to provide that and in order to facilitate it I'd like to move an amendment, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the hon. Mr. Miniely, that the motion be amended by adding immediately after the words 'that an order of the Assembly do issue for the return showing', the following words, 'copies of reports or statements in the file of the Department of Education regarding the following', and this could relate to the three items referred to in the resolution -- if that is acceptable.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, that is acceptable. I wonder if I could ask the hon. minister if that would include the students who are on the semester system?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker. If that information is available, we would certainly include it, and I'll make a note of it at this time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Taking the amendment as read, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Motion 161 as amended was carried without further debate.]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Driver Education  
(Adjourned Debate)

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, it has been some time since this Motion was before the House and so in order that we'll give the people in the House and those in the gallery an opportunity to know what we are discussing, the Motion reads.

Moved by the hon. member, Mr. Hansen and seconded by the hon. member Mr. Appleby.

Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta give consideration to driver education in Alberta schools being rapidly expanded to all parts of the province.

I believe that any motion that has anything to do with the improvement of safety on our highways and streets, of course, is an excellent motion. I would like to congratulate the two members opposite for bringing this motion before the House and giving this House the opportunity to debate such a motion with the idea of encouraging further development in driver education in our province.

The members opposite may be quite interested in knowing that the man who originally promoted driver education in Alberta was a Conservative MLA from Calgary by the name of H. B. Macdonald. He pioneered the idea of driver training in schools when he was president of the Alberta Safety Council some number of years ago. I remember at the time, when he brought it into the Legislature, that there was a great deal of opposition to his program, in particular by some of our daily newspapers. I believe the fact was that it was such a new program that it was hard to fathom why we should have



April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-25

driver education rather than the ABC's of the ordinary education as we know it.

So I think that Mr. Macdonald had a vision that many other people did not seem to have at the time. He saw the vision of the great need for safety on our streets and highways, and in particular by training our young people in the safe methods of driving. It was not an easy program to implement, because right away people had ideas, and particularly school trustees, that it was going to be a costly program and therefore, on that reason alone, they were hesitant to promote it.

I would like to say that over the years the program was accepted, and I would like to congratulate the previous administration and in particular, our Minister of Education at that time, who recommended driver training be implemented in Alberta schools. I would also like to congratulate the insurance companies and the school boards, and in particular the car manufacturers who, I feel, have gone a long way towards encouraging driver education in schools. The hon. minister, Mr. Dickie, of course, will realize that the Chrysler Corporation, General Motors, Ford, American Motors, and the major car companies have consistently supported the program and have donated time and money towards the success of the driver education program in each province of Canada and in many states of the United States. Just as recently as last week most members received from General Motors Corporation a driver education digest which is a further effort by General Motors in the field of driver education.

Alberta has made a good start in the driver education field, but it has been slow in spreading to the other parts of our province outside of our major cities. Saskatchewan has had a program which I feel has been superior to ours as far as getting it across to the whole province -- all the pupils in the province. The driver education program has been going in Saskatchewan for ten years. The Saskatchewan government subsidizes the program \$25 for each student graduated from an accredited driver education course. The student is asked to contribute to the program which I think is a real good idea, because if students have a financial stake in the program they are not so liable to drop out of the program as if they didn't. So I think the students should be encouraged to not only take part, but also to help contribute to the costs of the program. The contribution in Saskatchewan is adjusted for low income areas -- and I was thinking of the Metis areas and other areas where the student may be hard pressed for money and it can be adjusted -- but by and large, he is asked to contribute a certain amount to the program.

Another good part of the Saskatchewan plan is that private enterprise is allowed to participate in the plan. Savings have been made. Rather than the school board operating the program, private enterprise in many parts of Saskatchewan operate the program and savings have been obtained.

Another thing they have in Saskatchewan is the fact that all students graduating are tested by the Highway Traffic Board which adds to the success of the program. In other words, a student has to pass this test before he or she is qualified to receive a certificate as having passed the test.

Good driver education courses pay dividends in many ways, in lower insurance premiums which is a monetary advantage to driver education programs, but most important in my opinion is the early education of young drivers, in particular in attitude and responsibility. These are so important, I believe, in good driving practices.

Many times we speak of driver education and refer only to the automobile, but in 1972 we have many other vehicles where we need

23-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

driver education. I'm thinking of the great increase that we are facing on our highways as far as motorcycles and scooters are concerned, also bicycles and snowmobiles. I know hon. members if they have read the local newspapers at all recently will have seen quite an increase in bicycle accidents. We had one fatal accident as recently as three days ago in our City of Calgary. And I think we should concentrate in this field of safe driving to a greater degree than we are as far as the bicycle is concerned, and the scooter.

Traffic accidents take a terrific toll in property, injury and death in our province and I was so pleased to hear the hon. the Attorney General in his budget debate refer to the interest that his department has in helping to promote the driver education and safety as far as law enforcement is concerned in our province. In 1971 in our province, there were 435 people killed and over 11,000 people injured in automobile accidents on Alberta highways and streets. The figures though are unimpressive until it is realized that each of those statistics could represent a member of one's family or a close associate. We read many times of accidents, but really I wonder sometimes whether we don't have in a great deal of concern unless we happen to know the person who was injured or killed; then we seem to take a greater interest in safety. So it's not an easy program to sell, but it's certainly a worthwhile program to sell.

As we enter the new year of 1972, I thought I might like to refer the hon. members to the month of January in 1972. Accidents are up 13 per cent, injuries are up 11 per cent and fatalities are up 30 per cent. To date we've had over \$3 million worth of property damage attributable to automobile and truck accidents since the first of the year.

The purpose of the motion we are debating today is a worthy and vital one which will be a factor in reducing the accident toll among our young drivers and is worthy of the unanimous support of this Legislature. One of the major problems facing society today is that of keeping motor vehicles moving with maximum efficiency and safety on our increasingly complex network of streets and highways. In Canada the volume of this traffic is increasing by 250,000 vehicles annually, indicating that we may expect a greater density of vehicles travelling a greater number of miles with each passing year. The number of drivers is also increasing. Our problem in the future will become more acute, since it is impossible, for numerous reasons, to expect the number of miles of highway constructed to keep pace with the two other increasing factors.

Assuming that highways could be maintained to allow a flow of non-congested traffic, our streets and highways will never be any safer than the drivers who use them. The major problem, then, centres around the education of the man behind the wheel. The task that lies before us is to educate future drivers and, if possible, to re-educate the older drivers. Driver education and training has been acclaimed as a vital factor in reducing the accident toll among young drivers. In several controlled studies, the reduction is estimated to be as much as one-half, while other studies vary between a low of 30 per cent and a high of 60 per cent. The significant issue in all studies, however, is that they agree on one factor. Driver education can and does reduce accidents by a considerable margin. The main question, therefore, appears to be not whether we can afford to have driver education, but whether we can afford not to have driver education. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to get my two cents worth in on this driver education motion. I think it is a very worthy motion in its own right. I believe in driver education. I believe in every type of education, as a matter of fact. I'm certainly not going to split hairs as to driver education or driver training, as has been brought

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-27

out from time to time in the debate when it was on the floor the first time.

The area I would like to zero in on, Mr. Speaker, is the area that was touched on by my hon. friend to my right, the hon. Member for Cardston. That is, on attitude. Herein lies, I think, the whole solution to driver education. You cannot teach attitudes in six, eight or 12 or even 24 weeks, or almost any short period like that. This is what is important. Because attitudes, Mr. Speaker, are a way of life. They must be developed all through the school years, throughout the entire curriculum, and also in the home, of course.

We have to teach our children to be concerned for other people and other things. If we can get enough people concerned about the other fellow, then we don't have to worry about ourselves. When I say this has to be done throughout the whole school program, throughout the total curriculum, I am really serious about that. I think it has to start in Grade I, not in Grade IX about the time the child reaches age 16. This is far too late. If the attitudes are not developed at that time for consideration for other people and other things, I submit to you, that all the training in the world is not going to solve the problem we hope that it will. I can take English, science, social studies, psychology, enterprise, I can even take reading. You can teach attitudes because it is in the selection, it's the approach you take to these types of things, the kind of material a student reads that impresses their young minds. I think this is the area in which we have to put real emphasis in our total educational program.

We must worry about, as I mentioned earlier, if there is some way we can observe and improve the relationships of our students to other people and I mean even student to student. How does a Grade IX student react to a Grade II or Grade III student? In other words, when you have this age differential, at this time, do they really consider they are also important people? I think this is extremely important when we talk about attitudes towards one another. We have to be concerned, our schools have to be concerned, about action and interaction between students and teachers. Is there a real respect there? Is there a discipline they really respect there? How about students to their own student government? In junior high certainly they have a type of student government which can be of value in teaching attitudes which will reflect and carry on and show on these students throughout their entire lives. If they are not prepared to respect their own student governments, their own self-imposed rules and regulations, I think it's a hopeless case to think that in three months, six months, or even a whole year's driving training program, they will respect other people and even government laws.

I think these are some of the things that are extremely important and they must be brought out so that we can get responsibility and a good attitude for our students throughout their entire school years. If we can get respect for authority, if we can get values, if we can get discipline and obedience to unenforceable laws -- this is another thing that is very important -- don't forget that there is another person out there who has to be looked after. It is so easy; I could drive around any block in almost any city, I could cause an accident without being legally at fault, just because I wouldn't care about the other person. So I think if we can get into our schools good citizenship, this is really what we do, Mr. Speaker. This can only be done through a safety orientated and a considerate attitude by people toward others.

Now through education, in the way that I have tried to put it across, hopefully we can inculcate into our young people a concern for the safety and consideration of others. Now if this can be done, and I submit that it just must be if we are going to get anyplace, it might well be then that driver education, as we usually think about it, would be much better off and would be better put into the hands

23-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

of private enterprise. If we can get these attitudes squared away, then maybe the motor clubs, the driving clubs would do this on a private basis, would do the job just as well, maybe even better, and certainly more economically than we could do it in our schools. Because I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and I won't go into this into any depth, there is a limit to the number of programs that are marginal -- whether academic or not -- that should be going into our school systems as a whole. Because I can assure you that when we start putting a program like this into our schools and buying simulators and all this type of thing, which I have seen on display and which is supposed to be one of the great aids in this type of a program, the cost of education again is going to go up and up and up. So, with this in mind, I would say that driver education is good, but let us be careful how far we involve ourselves in it as a school system.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to add a few words on this particular matter, if the hon. member from Rocky Mountain House weren't in the House, and I see that the female page girls are not here, I would tell the story, of the comparison between a speech and a lady's dress, that the speech should be long enough to cover the subject but short enough to be interesting, but I can't very well tell the story with the hon. member being here. But hopefully, my remarks will fit into the category of at least being short.

I think four points should be made with regard to driver education. I don't question the motives of the hon. member who moved the motion nor the members who have spoken on the matter. But the portion of the resolution which does give me just a bit of concern is that part that says "rapidly expand in all portions of the province". I think, Mr. Speaker, that if we are going to become involved in rapidly expanding the program in all areas of the province, then obviously this is done by one of two ways. Either we do it by compulsion, and we take it out of the area of options altogether, and the thing is done on a mandatory basis. It must be done, it must be one of those things that are done in the school system. The other way, of course, is to offer the carrot. And the carrot that has generally been offered has been the carrot of "if a school board will do this," the government will give them 50 cents or 75 cents or 45 cents on the dollar. And it seems to me, that all members of the House would likely agree. This is a pretty crude way of establishing what needs to be done in the school system or how much money you can get out of the Department of Education irregardless of who the government is. So, I suspect Mr. Speaker, that whether we use the compulsion or whether we use the carrot, I am not so sure that we want driver education on an across-the-province basis to the extent that we go in either of these two directions, that we make it mandatory or, in fact, if we get involved in a system of giving grants to school boards who become involved in driver education; I would support either of those approaches.

The third point that I would make is that it gets back to the matter that I have touched on one or two other occasions in this House this session, and it becomes a matter of who really controls education. If the department, or if the government, or if the legislature is going to make driver education mandatory, then of course, this asks some of the very same questions all over again about who is really making the decisions in the field of education. Is it the legislature, is it the department, or in fact, is it local school systems?

And the last thing that I think we must all keep in mind when we are battling this matter around is how far does the education system go in providing social services or picking up social responsibilities in the community? We look back over the past 10 years and see the numbers of programs that have been added for good,

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-29

sincere, genuine reasons, the numbers of programs that have been added for credits and some non-credit courses, in the Grade I to XII system in this province. You will be quite surprised at the growth, whether it is driver education, whether it is family life education or whether it is a number of other programs that we have got involved in.

Some place along the road, someone -- and I suspect it will be this Legislature, along with teachers and school trustees and the public at large in this province -- is going to have to decide how far we are prepared to go to have the education system pick up many of the responsibilities that previously were carried on by other groups, namely the family and local communities.

I trust that those people who will be involved in making that decision -- I hope they are pretty good drivers, because from where I sit, or perhaps I should say, from where I stand, I see some rather dangerous signs. To bring it back into this discussion, I see some red lights. If the Department of Education, or education in general, is going to continue to provide additional services in areas where people would like to opt out -- if we continue to pick up these kinds of responsibilities in education over the next 10 to 15 years, at the rate we have had in the past 10 years, then as far as education costs are concerned and the direction education goes in the future, we had better see some red lights; not only in the area of paying for it, but what this is going to do for responsibility as far as families are concerned, and as far as organizations and local groups across this province.

I am prepared to support the resolution, but let us next year not have another resolution here, saying we should take on some other program and rapidly expand it across the province. At the same time let us please not get involved in making one that is a compulsory program across the province, and secondly let us, for goodness sakes, not get involved in some of the mistakes we have made in the past by offering the school boards, if you will teach driver education on a mandatory or a voluntary basis across your system we will pick up half the cost. I hope to gosh we are in the stage of education where we are not going to be doing those kinds of things in the future.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Before the hon. Member for Bonnyville closes the debate is there anyone else? Please continue.

DR. HOHOL:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I had not really intended to enter the debate and I am not really debating. I would like to indicate my support for the resolution. I think I share the concerns for the language that the previous speaker did, very rapidly. However, since the resolution asks for a feasibility study, I backed off from making the same point, because it is likely, though we cannot prejudge this, Mr. Speaker, that the people who do the study might find that a rapid expansion is impossible, and if this is the case this would be very instructive.

I think the resolution is timely for the reasons that many people across the province have argued this point for many years, as you well know yourself having served on school boards.

The question of cost becomes important, but this is a point of feasibility. I think we will have this kind of information from the study for use by the Alberta School Trustees' Association, the Alberta Teachers' Association, the businesses and industry. The Legislature will have then in their hands the kind of information on which we can make some value judgments as to whether it is too expensive.

23-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

I share the thoughts of the opening speaker this afternoon from Calgary Millican -- that this is not a program that can be too expensive; it is too expensive not to pursue it. It may be however, as the hon. Member for Lethbridge pointed out, too expensive for school boards, and then some kind of sharing with the total community may be in order. I agree entirely that this kind of expense cannot be borne by school boards at this point, but the feasibility study may show something else. I think that a study of this kind in education costs will assist us to set priorities for the community, for industry, for education, for school boards, and for private citizens to use this kind of information to assist us in making the priorities. It is on this basis that we are looking to a resolution that intends to instruct and assist the Legislature to make the final judgment. I think the case for this kind of study has been very fully -- and to my mind -- properly made.

I am convinced and satisfied by the mover, by the seconder, and the afternoon speakers, that the feasibility study is a good one. By the very nature of the kind of subject we are talking about -- driver training or education -- it can't move too fast, to get the instructional staff, to get the space, to get the programs.

In the City of Edmonton I know that the Public School Board has three schools in which we have driver training and education; one an after-school program, two in-school programs. And I don't know, Mr. Speaker, the real meaning of the fact that the two schools in which there is driving education happen to be special education schools, L. Y. Cairns and the W. P. Wagner. The students at Victoria Composite High School have access to this kind of instruction during the summer vacation and after school hours. I am not sure, also, that there is a black and white circumstance with respect to who is in charge of education. I think it is a joint enterprise, and given certain funds and certainly not cost-sharing funds, but given certain funds for education, then the local people will make the judgment as the Edmonton Public School Board made the judgement that it will have this kind of instruction in three schools but not in the other 149 schools, if my memory on the number of schools is accurate. So it is in this spirit, Mr. Speaker, that I would endorse this legislation.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of becoming involved because I wasn't here the first night when the resolution was brought up, but with all due respect to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour, I now have to rise because the wording of the resolution is important and I see we are about to vote upon it. The Resolution No. 2 on today's Order Paper asks for a feasibility study, but Resolution No. 1, which we are discussing now, asks that the government 'give consideration' to driver education in Alberta. I recall that for some time we have not been permitted to ask the government to give favourable consideration because that would be in favour of the resolution. Now I don't know how hon. members read it, but giving consideration to driver education may be different than doing a feasibility study on it, and so with that in mind, and considering the fact that we are considering the Alberta schools being rapidly expanded to all parts of the province, this gives me some fear of supporting the resolution. But I think that enough debate has gone on to give those who will be considering it enough idea of what is concerned, and so probably we can let it go at that. But this is asking for more than just a feasibility study in fact.

MR. HANSEN:

Mr. Speaker, as I rise to close this debate I will not take very long. I think it has been well spoken on, on both sides of the House, and I would like to thank the members from both sides who have supported it so far. I would like to bring up to date a few things that I had in my first speech, things that I feel show why we should

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-31

support this. I think one of the main things was the safety factor, that it would provide safer drivers to the province and to Canada. Also, it would set a standard of driving which everyone would know, and you would know more or less what the other person was doing. This would make driving a lot safer. I would also like to say that the cost which has been brought on during the debate on both sides is very hard to evaluate the cost of such an education and what it is going to save in the long run over the years of less accidents and less insurance.

Now, one of the main things for our young drivers, the cost of their insurance, is a real hardship and I think that this driver education would be a great thing to bring insurance costs down.

That is another thing, and I believe very strongly that you have to teach these things when they are young. This is why in my first talk on this, I spoke on driver responsibility, also the traffic laws and the habits of driving and your mental attitude. All these things I believe -- the only time you are going to really teach is when they are young, and it is easier to teach them when they are young than when they get into a habit which is hard to break. This is why I'm asking the whole House if they will support this motion. I don't think I will go into a real long detailed speech on this because I believe it has been covered on both sides very well, so I'm just going to ask the House to support my motion, and thank you very much.

[The motion was carried without dissent.]

Provincial Power Grid  
(Adjourned Debate)

Moved by Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. J. Miller:

Be it resolved that the Alberta Government investigate the feasibility of a provincially owned and controlled electric power grid system.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I found myself speaking on this resolution somewhat off the cuff as the saying goes, and at that time I found myself speaking about energy resources in general, about our potential in Alberta, about the methods of conversion, about the methods of transmission and distribution, and particularly about the need to manage our energy resources in accord with the wishes of the people of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, today I don't intend to speak too long on this subject, though it is a subject on which one could wax loud and long. And it isn't my intent today to examine the technical aspects of this particular resolution or the technical aspects of a public grid, the pros and cons of such a grid, nor is it my intent, Mr. Speaker, to debate the philosophy of a private grid versus a public grid, or for that matter get into the whole area of discussion regarding private enterprises versus public enterprise. But it is, Mr. Speaker, my intent to speak today somewhat broadly and politically rather than technically, and before I begin to make my political remarks on this issue, I would like to read the resolution:

"Moved by Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. J. Miller:

Be it resolved that the Alberta Government investigate the feasibility of a provincially owned and controlled electric power grid system."

Mr. Speaker, Alberta is very generously endowed with resources -- very generously endowed with mineral resources, and water resources, energy resources, forest resources, and land resources. I

23-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

believe that after having the opportunity to be in government for a few months, I have a realization, or some small degree of realization, of the extent of these resources, and I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is my belief that the people of Alberta are quite knowledgeable generally as to the extent of these resources, the work and value and use and distribution of these resources.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the fundamental issue before the people of Alberta today is the management of these resources, and the question is, the formula, the formula that is to be used in the management of these resources. This is the central issue before the people of Alberta. It is a vital and critical issue, and I might suggest at this time, Mr. Speaker, that the government of a year ago was rejected by the people of this province and they were rejected primarily on one basis. They were dissatisfied with the manner in which the previous government was managing Alberta's resources. They were dissatisfied with the formula that in fact was being used. They were dissatisfied with the management of the mineral resources. They were dissatisfied with the management of the water resources. They were dissatisfied with the management of the energy resources; dissatisfied with the management of our forest resources and our land resources.

The people of Alberta elected this government on this side almost seven months ago because they felt that we had a new formula, a formula which was different from the formula of the old government, and a formula which I believe is tuned to the realities of today. This formula that we said, and stated, and reiterated to the people of Alberta was designed to create more jobs, was designed to hold the line on taxation. It was a formula which we felt would reduce misery amongst those Albertans who were incapacitated or who had been bypassed. And it was a formula which we felt and knew and the people thought we knew, would in fact maintain the educational system for our young. And it was also a formula which the people of Alberta felt would maintain a quality environment in which to live. As a result the people of Alberta put their trust in us. This trust was to manage in their interests these vast resources.

Mr. Speaker, it would really be the height of folly if we as a government simply reverted to the old Social Credit formula and simply extended this formula that was sustained by the old government for 36 years, and extended it into the '70's and the '80's. If we did that, Mr. Speaker, we would surely deserve being relieved of the trust that the people put in us. I believe that if we did this we would certainly be turfed out at the first opportunity. But, Mr. Speaker, this government recognizes this trust and this responsibility that it has been given and it has undertaken. And in this recognition it is my belief that it shall carry out this trust. It is my belief that no stone will be left unturned. No alternative will be discarded without close examination.

Mr. Speaker, the concept of a publicly owned electrical power grid is just such an alternative, and it must be studied. This resolution says that the Alberta government should investigate the feasibility. Now on what grounds?

MR. HENDERSON:

Will the hon. minister permit a question?

MR YURKO:

Mr. Speaker . . .



April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-33

---

MR. HENDERSON:

Is the hon. minister suggesting that there is not already a power grid in the Province of Alberta?

MR. YURKO:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought I was going to be asked an intelligent and very substantial question. But, in fact, I must honestly indicate to the House that when that type of a question is asked, I must indicate that I must continue without paying too much attention to comments coming from the other side of the House. Of course there are power grids -- there are several power grids in Alberta as a matter of fact -- different voltages.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Is there a tie?

MR. YURKO:

There is a tie. Of course we recognize that. Why ask me a stupid question?

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Alberta can do no less than accept the challenge of thoroughly examining this alternative. Now there is nothing in this resolution that says it must accept it, that it must do some type of integration. It simply says that we should be examining this particular alternative and one of the justifications for this examination is because basically most of the other provinces in Canada do have a publicly owned grid.

There must obviously be some advantages to a publicly owned grid, and I would suggest that we must examine this alternative for several reasons. The first reason, I would say, is that there appears to be a need for flat-rating power across the province if we are to give substance to halting centralization and reviving the growth of rural Alberta. Cheap power must be provided to our towns and our rural areas if we are to locate industry in these areas.

Secondly, I would like to suggest that there is a need to determine the most economical methods of harnessing the potential of our mighty northern flowing rivers. We must be cognizant of the fact that one-half of the main river flowing north lies within Wood Buffalo Park, and that in order to harness this potential we will have to negotiate with the federal government.

Thirdly, we must recognize that our province is a vast exporter of energy and we need to carefully examine the export of electrical energy beyond our borders. It will not be long before we shall be party to negotiations directed towards the establishment of a national grid, so that power can be transferred from one province to the other quite freely.

And fourthly, we shall have to look seriously at the use of our waste coals for fueling very large base load stations which would give Alberta the lowest power costs on this continent. These base load power stations may be tied into commercial complexes for gasification of coal or even in situ processes for extracting bitumin from tar sand. I would like to say at this point that this province is doubly blessed, in that its vast waterways flow northward and thus provide an ideal heat sink for the thermal pollution arising from large base load power stations.

What I'm really saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the new formula of managing the resources of this province that is being instigated by the government of today, the new formula upon which we were elected must and will be based on knowledge -- not on guesswork or emotion, but on knowledge. As a result, Mr. Speaker, if we are to adopt that

23-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

type of a stance, that type of a posture, then we must investigate various alternatives before us.

It must be recognized, as I said earlier, that the rest of the provinces do have a publicly owned grid system. There must be reasons for this. Even in the Conservative province of Ontario power is generated, transmitted and distributed through a publicly owned system, and we can do nothing less, Mr. Speaker, than examine this type of alternative for Alberta. In that light, Mr. Speaker, I support this motion. Thank you.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I want to get in this debate, too. I haven't had a good chance to make a political speech yet. You know, there are lots of interpretations as to why the old government was turned out and the new one put in. But if I were to divine, I would simply say that once in a while you can fool most of the people. On this occasion, our people were fooled a little bit by extravagant promises. I am going to propose on our side that maybe we should try promising that people can go to heaven no matter how they live. But to get back to the question at hand, I think from my investigations, there would not be one man in 20, if you went out this afternoon, who could give you any idea what the government's formula is for managing resources. I would go so far as to say that if we examined all the hon. members on the other side, the marks wouldn't be very good.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. HINMAN:

Another thing I have learned over the years in the House is that the only way you can exceed the stupidity of a question is in the stupidity of the answer. Now, if this resolution is simply to investigate the feasibility of a government-owned power grid, I am going to support it too. I don't know if the time is very ripe for this to happen. I do agree with what the hon. minister said about the potential of our power. The fact that we do have in the future a very great market for cheap power from Alberta and that it may well be one of our choicest resources.

However, when you talk about grids and public ownership, you are talking about two other things. The stupid question was, "Is there now a grid?" And we are all aware that there are grids. The grid serves two purposes, one is to gather the power which many people produce into a system for export or marketing for other purposes. The other is, of course, to distribute that power in the areas where it is needed. I submit we have the grids, and if Alberta is going to own them it has to be done by a purchase, I hope, or else it has to be done by a take-over, which I would deplore.

I think in investigating the possibilities we have to keep these things in mind. The grids we currently have don't gather much power from many sources. They gather it chiefly from Calgary Power, from Northland Utilities; Lethbridge is prepared to put in a little once in a while, and so is Edmonton, and to purchase it back.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should adjourn the debate as the hour is 4:30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-35

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT ORDERS  
(Second Reading)

Bill No. 200: An Act To Amend The Legislative Assembly Act  
(Adjourned Debate)

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, when we were last on this bill I had finished making some preliminary remarks in regard to the question of elections, and I hoped at that time that the hon. Member for Calgary Millican was going to give us the benefit of his great wisdom as to how the former government could have stayed in power until some figure well on into 1973. I never did hear his calculations on that. I would like to hear about how he thought they were so good they should continue ad infinitum.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, that I tried to make originally was that there were some real problems constitutionally with a fixed election date in one province and not in the others, and not federally. I think we have to give some consideration to that. The question, also, as to whether or not the time mentioned in the bill is an appropriate time of the year I think needs also to be discussed.

In Alberta, since 1905 we have had a number of dates for an election, most of them have been at a variety of times, but not necessarily in June. Again, the question of whether or not June is the best month, I have some question about. I have always felt that the best months for elections were in the wintertime and certainly in the farming communities this is when they like to have elections, because they aren't as busy then and they do like to take their politics seriously in rural Alberta, and to get involved.

I would like to suggest that if you are going to have a fixed date, we think about a fixed date in March sometime, rather than in June, because it would allow for that kind of discussion that is required. But on overall balance, Mr. Speaker, I can't support the bill on the grounds, as I pointed out before, that we would have a continual political campaign for the four years, gradually working up to the fixed date that everybody knew was coming. I think it would worsen the atmosphere in the Legislature and wouldn't be helpful in getting the province's business done.

Again, I suggested there is a constitutional question in relation to a fixed date in Alberta and not anywhere else, the question of the timing of a fixed date for elections. I suppose everybody has their various preferences and while I like March somebody else might like August, and so you pick one out of the hat, it doesn't really mean anything.

It also means that then you can't refer to the people in the Province of Alberta the important issues, on the basis of an election campaign. I think this would be unfortunate and unwise. I think that at all times, we shouldn't feel that we are so all-important in this Legislature that the people in the Province of Alberta can't decide a question better for us, and if necessary by a general election outside of the times designated in any bill. And I think we would be usurping the power of the people of Alberta by having a fixed election date as it is set out in the bill before us.

I really believe that to suggest that if you couldn't go to the electorate on a major issue, and didn't have that choice, would be something that we couldn't decide here, because we are taking away a very important right from the individuals of Alberta, and I would suggest that before you can have this kind of a bill passed, you

23-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

should have a plebiscite on it in a general way, so you don't take away the very important rights of being able to decide important major decisions that are going to affect everyone in Alberta.

So for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that should this bill come to a vote, I will be forced to vote against it.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have grave doubts about tampering with the British parliamentary system we have inherited whatever personal opinions might have been expressed by people in high office at various times. I believe that one opinion is held by a person in high office on that side and now they have changed, and there have been opinions on this side. But certainly the system has grown and has been changed and modified over the centuries since King John signed that Magna Carta on Runnymede Island, but apart from the changes designed to speed up the business of the people, I don't believe the basic framework has reached a point where further modification is desirable. It has been modeled as a fine tool over the centuries and I think we tamper with it at our peril.

Basically, the continuing ship of state is the constitutional monarchy, and our respect for this perpetual keystone of our system makes it unique and it gives us all the well known advantages over a republic. Republics with appointed presidents, elected judges, politically biased armies and police forces with a general legalistic sort of approach to a written constitution. We don't really have a written constitution, maybe we are even talking about changes to the unwritten constitution on a federal level, at the moment. But I refer you to page 199 in Beauchesne where it points out that the constitution of Canada and its provinces really derive from the practice of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The BNA Act actually mentions a constitution similar in principle to that of the United Kingdom: "Politicians may come and go but the ship of state under its royal figurehead goes on forever". I think we make a mistake if we do not see ourselves in the context of history in the context of both the past and the future. It is this concept, that politicians may come and go, while the state rolls on its historical way, that makes me wonder whether this fixed date for elections is even constitutional.

Certainly a government may not stay in office more than the five years in normal time. But as I understand it, after an election the leader of a party which holds the majority in the House, seeks the permission of the Queen to form a government. The defeated party traditionally offers its resignation. If a leader holds the confidence of the majority in the House the Queen will naturally call upon him to form a government. But it is possible if that leader fails to maintain the confidence of the majority, and yet some other person in the Assembly does have the confidence of the majority, the Queen may call upon that other person to form a cabinet without an election. There have been several precedents.

I think it has happened several times in history, certainly in recent history there are examples. Some such regrouping must have happened in Britain at the time that Mr. Winston Churchill took over from Neville Chamberlain, early in the Second World War. I presume that when a national government was formed at the time of the great depression in Britain, with a combination of both sides of the House, that this was done in a similar fashion.

Of course, if the government is defeated on a major issue in the House then the proper, traditional outcome is for an election to be called. But there are other circumstances which may persuade a government to offer its resignation, to offer it to the Queen, not the people, and to go to the country for a test of public opinion. The Queen must be confident, of course, that this Assembly does truly

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-37

represent the people. One obvious example is when the country is divided over an extremely controversial issue. This may be a question of national emergency or something of extreme economic importance. It could be a general strike, conscription, taking one leaf out of Canadian history. It might even be something as simple as the imposition of a new but very controversial tax. In such a case, I submit, that it would be absolutely proper for a government to seek a renewed mandate from the people.

A more common reason for going back to the people is the emergence of a deadlock through balancing factions in the House as the result of an election. Can you imagine that situation in Newfoundland having to be perpetuated for five years? It is either a stalemate that could happen because the government's majority is too small to give a working majority for orderly government, or because a minority government is in danger of becoming the tool of a small faction that holds a balance of power in the House, and that small faction may not truly represent the majority of the people. In Newfoundland in the first go-around the member from Labrador emerged in an extremely powerful position. Fortunately in the second race he received his just desserts from the people. But what a situation it would have been if they had had to continue for five years with that sort of operation. A minority government has the right to try to continue, but surely it must also have the right to go back to the country for a clearer expression of the public will.

Now, finally, there must be the rare possibility of a government confessing that it has failed to cope with some horrendous problem and to offer its resignation on a point of principle -- offer it to the Queen. I mean if it's a free society the government and all the members of the Assembly must have the freedom to throw in the towel, throw in the sponge, if they feel inclined. If this bill became law you just imagine the complications if say, a Premier died or went crazy, or committed some crime and was disbarred from the House. We might have to -- and you can laugh -- we might have to put up with an ineffective substitute for a number of years, for three or four years maybe. I mean since Canadians are basically fair, if the substitute went back to the people for a mandate, I think they would be fair enough to give him a run. But if he made the mistake of not going back the situation might be a little different. I think the people would resent this and it has been proven a number of times in history -- and even in recent history -- that they resent a substitute continuing without the invitation of the people.

I am not pretending I am Senator Forsey or anything but I would submit that this proposition really violates the basic precept of our system. You can imagine what would happen if for some tactical consideration we happen to go along with this, which I consider would be a strategic mistake. As in the United States, the year before the fixed date, will become a year-long election campaign, where the opposition will obstruct and orderly government would be minimal. I could buy a reform such as half of the reform as suggested by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview much quicker than I would buy this reform. The part that I would agree to would be that campaign expenses should be limited by law. The Conservatives set up a commission under Art Smith, former Member for Calgary, and it sat for many years on this question in Ottawa, and they came in with some pretty sensible conclusions. Of course I would never go along with the compulsory disclosure of the source of funds, for I think that would be an intrusion on the confidentiality of the donors, many of whom might give to both sides and may not want to be identified with any party.

The second Monday in June -- an extremely bad day anyway, for many reasons. Well, it's unkind to June brides . . .

23-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please yield the floor until the point of order is stated.

MR. HENDERSON:

I haven't done so with other speakers, Mr. Speaker, but I think we're debating the principle not the detailed clauses of the particular bill and a lot of the debate which has taken place has been on details, which we have sat and listened to, and which was of interest too. I wonder if the hon. member could speak to the principle of the bill which is elections at fixed dates, not the specific date itself.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order raised by the hon. member, surely when you're fixing a date that is a fairly firm principle in the bill.

MR. FARRAN:

Well I think it is in order to refer to this date which has been proposed by the hon. member of the opposition isn't it Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Well, the hon. member is asking me to draw a line which is so extremely fine I don't think I might be able to draw it.

MR. FARRAN:

Well, if it's not unkind to the June brides it is certainly unkind to the young voters. It is unkind to the newspapermen, because it will cut off advertising on a Saturday because we don't have any Sunday papers in this province. It is bad enough to have to go to work on a Monday morning anyway, without having to go to vote. You have to get up early, rush there to get to the polls in time, or rush supper in the evening in order to vote on a Monday.

It's unkind to the rural members who would be required to campaign through the seeding season and there might be a few of them who do a bit of early haying in June, it's not a common practice in Alberta, but maybe it should be. And it's too close to the end of the spring session for any meaningful assessment of new legislation. I believe that this is wrong, you have this year long campaign in the United States and I think this would be a step towards the American system -- and it is not that I am xenophobic and oppose it because it is American, I would oppose it if it was a step towards any republican system.

Under the British parliamentary system one of the prerogatives left to the Prime Minister or the Premier is to call the date of election at any time with proper statutory notice. I suppose the opposition, it doesn't matter who is sitting on the opposition side, always resent this tactical advantage that the Premier might have. When they might be on this side they would recognize that there was a small tactical advantage there. It's only a very small one of being able to set the time and the place and I think in history there have been dozens of other reasons for calling an election, and I'm not talking about a non-confidence motion.

So I will vote against this despite the eminent supporters it might have on both sides of the House because I do believe that it is a departure from the well-known unwritten British constitution according to which we have to abide under the BNA Act.

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-39

MR. DIXON:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to get into this debate until the hon. Minister of Agriculture invited me -- he was quite interested in my theory on when the election should be called. And I'm amused too by the hon. member, I mean the hon. minister without responsibility from Calgary North Hill who is making like a Cabinet Minister all the time and trying to tell the front bench how to run their business.

Now the hon. member will recall in recent changes, the elections in this province, we've had a recent change in the Municipal Government Act which allowed for every three years, and I can remember the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill saying; "Don't pay any attention to the senior government, the most important government are the municipal governments." And yet he gets up here today and he's talking about "how wonderful" and "the British Monarchy and all this" -- as far as we're concerned -- and sure we're an important government, we are one of the governments recognized under the British North America Act.

As far as the hon. Minister of Agriculture when he starts talking about, "we haven't got authority to set an election date, it is going to be unconstitutional," we have every authority in the world. We can name a date, of course it is up to the Premier when he wants to go to the country at the present time, but actually it's up to this Legislature and particularly the Premier and the Executive Council in their wisdom as to when they should go to the country. So I don't think there is any problem even if the federal authority said they didn't like the date, I think we could forge ahead with any date that this Legislature or the government in power wishes to set.

I think this bill has been brought about by the comments that were made prior to the last election. I can remember, and I think the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill in all honesty said; "there's criticism when you're on this side of the House about the government's taking advantage of the fact they are playing cat and mouse with the election date", and just a year ago now I can remember, "when are you going to call the election", and some of the editorial writers who favour the government on the other side of the House were berating the former government for not naming a date, and we all remember that.

But the reason that I'm on my feet today, Mr. Speaker, is more to touch on the fact of when an election can be called. I don't go along even with this Bill No. 200 as far as the four years is concerned, I can't see why we can't have an election every fifth year, and I've said so publicly. A member is elected for a five year term. I recognize the five year term both in this Legislature and in the Federal Legislature, and so I think that we should look at the five year term if you are going to bring out a bill of this kind rather than the four year term. You could be just as successful. If the present government carries on, in the constructive way they believe they are carrying on, they have every reason for not calling it for five years. I won't be a bit surprised if the hon. the Prime Minister of Canada decides not to go into an election until next year rather than in this present year. That is right. I do, Mr. Speaker. I say I am not a good forecaster but I am saying what he could do.

If members will recall in the last provincial election in British Columbia, Premier Bennett announced that he would give serious consideration not to call the election for a five year term unless the government was defeated in a money bill or some issue they wanted to go to the country with. But as far as he was concerned, he would carry on up to a five year term.

I think, in particular, here in Alberta where we have allowed municipalities to go for the three year term and a set date, I cannot see too much problem really with a set date, Mr. Speaker. I believe Bill No. 200 has a few weaknesses too, but I do not want to touch on

23-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

that until the bill gets before committee. One in particular I would refer to would be the 48 hour notice of motion, but I will leave that to when the bill gets into committee.

I would like to place into the record, because I am sure hon. members on both sides of the House, are quite interested in how long they can actually stay in office in Alberta if they wish to under our present legislation. The present Legislative Assembly Act continues unless sooner dissolved, until midnight on September 19, 1976. For example, five years from the date of the return of the writ of the last election which was September 20, 1971. That does not mean that the government cannot stay in a bit longer than that, and I will touch on this a little later. What I am talking about now is the actual Legislature.

The Legislative Assembly Act requires that there be a session of the Legislature at least once every year, so that 12 months do not pass between the last sitting of the Legislature in one year and its first sitting the next year. It takes at least 60 days to hold an election, and if the government wished to wait until the last minute before calling the next election it would have to continue the 1976 session until September 19, 1976, or call a one day session on September 19th. It would then have to hold an election and call another session not later than September 18, 1977.

Just get that date -- September 18, 1977 to comply with The Legislative Assembly Act and The Election Act. The last date that the writ of election could possibly be issued would be July 19, 1977. However, if the 1976 session ended before September 19, 1976, then the last minute a writ could be issued in order to comply with The Legislative Assembly Act, would be calculated by adding one year to the date the session was prorogued and then deducting 60 days -- that, subject to holidays which would be the last day a writ of election could be issued.

I would just like to touch on some of the relevant parts of the sections of the act, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to say, regarding the dates I have given you (those calculations), I did not have a 1977 calendar so they could be out one or two days; if the date happened to fall on a holiday, you might have to move it over one day ahead or one day behind. In any case, those dates are the actual dates that this Legislature could continue in office.

You will all recall the last election date, August 30, 1971, polling day of the last election. September 9, 1971, was the date on which the announcement of the results was needed under Section 13(1) (e) of The Election Act. September 20, 1971 was the date for writ returns, and September 20, 1971 plus five years brings it to September 19, 1976. The present Legislative Assembly Act dissolves midnight September 19, 1976 and I am not recommending this to the Premier, I am only just pointing out to the hon. Premier what he can do, if he wishes. But I think if he listens to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, he may have difficulty coming to any kind of a decision.

The Legislative Assembly Act requires a session to be called no later than 12 months after the previous Assembly, which I touched on. The last possible date an election could be called if the 1976 session continued until September 19, 1972. So I will touch on these other dates.

I won't go on until later, Mr. Speaker, but I can even tell the hon. Minister of Agriculture when he can have this nomination date if the Premier does listen to his suggestion of holding office as long as possible. July 19, 1977, the writ of election could be issued. August 13, 1977 could be nomination day, 25 days after the writ is issued. August 27, 1977 could be voting day, 14 days after nomination day. September 6, 1977 -- maybe this is when the



April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-41

government will change -- is when you announce the results and September 17, 1977, the date for writ return.

I just wanted to read this into the record, Mr. Speaker, to show you that what I have advocated over the years was a final date that any election could be held. But of course, as the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill has pointed out, under our present system, we can go to the country on any issue; we can go to the country if the government loses the confidence of the House. There are many things we can take on, but I thought the principle of the bill -- and I think the hon. member that brought this bill in, and he can say so himself when he speaks further on the bill -- I think the fact is members on the other side got so excited about the fact that we were playing cat and mouse when we were in government and wouldn't issue a date and now we've given you a chance to name the date. I can't see any reason why you won't support this bill.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill is asking a question of the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member says this bill was actually drawn up in June or July last year. Who drew it up?

MR. DIXON:

I've got these dates on it because I did some research on it last year. I think it was in February of last year that I brought out my first report and of course, for the benefit of the hon. members opposite, we don't want to thrash old straw. I'd like to bring it into the future, which is the future date you can call the election. But the research was done in February of last year.

ONE HON. MEMBER:

Here we go!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker --

ONE HON. MEMBER:

Bring it in.

DR. BUCK:

What a difference a day makes. After the results of the catastrophe that befell this province on the 30th of August, you would think, Mr. Speaker, that the members on this side of the House would ask the government to call a date immediately so that we could get a return to good, solid, experienced, government on that side of the House with the honesty and integrity the former government was always known for.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

23-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

DR. BUCK:

So really we are defeating our purposes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

True, true!

DR. BUCK:

But, Mr. Speaker, I really think that we have to, more importantly than what we personally think, think about what the average man on the street, the elector, thinks about this matter. Politicians are the only people that really want elections. The man on the street -- the voter -- he is not all that fired up about having an election every two years or every three years. As the hon. member, Mr. Dixon, said, when they elect us to this Legislature, they really think that we're going to be here for five years. And when you look at the monetary aspects of it, the last general election cost the people of this province approximately \$1 million. Now when you project that, every 20 years you save one election with the pattern of going to the polls every four years. So there is a saving of approximately one million bucks every five year period.

ONE HON. MEMBER:

What's a million bucks?

DR. BUCK:

Now I know that the hon. members across the way say, "What's a million or two?" but that's what C.D. Howe said, "What's a million here or there?" When the hon. Provincial Treasurer said, "Well, what's \$15.5 million to service the debt?" we can see that the new government who are commonly known as the Cadillac Conservatives are living up to this.

In answering the hon. minister responsible for the affairs of the constituency of Calgary North Hill, I would like to say that there have been coalition governments that have worked, and worked very well. When the voters go to the polls, they are not really concerned if there's a majority government or not. They think that the fellows down there, let's say in Ottawa, the 265 of them, they can surely run this country for five years, because they are elected for that length of time, and the same in this Legislature.

ONE HON. MEMBER:

How naive!

DR. BUCK:

How naive -- ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. BUCK:

I would like to say something to many of the rookie members over on the other side of the House. When you think about campaigning for a whole solid year before the fixed date of the election, I would like to warn the hon. members that if they haven't been campaigning from the date of the last election, there's going to be an awful lot of them that are not going to be back in four years, or three years, or whenever the hon. Premier happens to decide to leave and the Deputy Premier will have to take his place. They will probably call it in three years.

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-43

The thing is, these campaigns must go on. And they do go on from the date you are elected until the time that you seek re-election. But in just a brief summary, I would say we have to look into the fact that there is money involved, it is taxpayers' money. As the hon. Premier said last year when he stood over here in high righteous indignation, he thought it was an excellent idea and he was all in favour of fixed dates. So I would like to see him act upon this, and I would ask him to ask his team of 48 to support this resolution.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, you know, it is very strange to see what August 30th has done. They stand there and say, "Well, I thank Thee, God, we are not like all other men." Well, if these saints on the other side propose Bill No. 200 and they propose to enforce it, I would say, maybe we should look at what the Leader of the Opposition said last June. He said, "I am the man that will pick the day. I know it, and nobody else, not even my wife. . ." Do you remember it?

If the saint who is sitting over there, the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, had introduced that bill some five years ago, or even two years ago, or even last year, and it was voted down by his government at that time, I would certainly say he was sincere. But he is not sincere. All he is proposing is that the Lougheed team should be in power some three and one-half years, although they had 36 years, and they didn't accomplish too much.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is this. I think the Lougheed team should have four years. The hon. member over there, if he wants to cut us off by about six months, I think perhaps we should go back to the people, and then, of course, we won't have any Social Crediters on the other side. We will probably have to say, like the predecessor of the former premier, we will have to get an opposition from this side and put it on the other side.

I think when people make statements like that, they come out and show their colour real clear. I think the colour of the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, when he said it was a good idea, well, if it is such a good idea, why didn't they get it into legislation some ten or fifteen years ago? Why now, all of a sudden, do they decide this is the bill they should have? I didn't campaign on the idea that we should have an election in three and a half but every four years. The people knew that when I was campaigning there would be an election in four to five years, and this is the prerogative of the hon. Premier who has to call the date.

If the hon. members on the other side propose that they want me to vote for this just because it was their idea, there is just no dice.

DR. BUCK:

You are the one who wanted it.

MR. ZANDER:

I think if the hon. Leader of the Opposition is so sincere that he is going to vote for this bill, then he should have at least had the honesty to stand up and say, "We will propose this bill at least a year before we call the election." Not, as he got up on radio and TV and said, "Not even my wife knows the date." I say, Mr. Speaker, that when a bill of this nature comes in from the opposition, it must be a sheer dream. I can only say this, he must have had a nightmare the day before. If he goes back, and looks over, and wants to be sincere and honest with himself and with his group over there, he would certainly not propose it.

23-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

If this would have come from this side of the House, I would have said, "This is a new ball game. This is the government that is doing it." But, when it comes from the other side, certainly without any warning some years ago, they can come along and say, "We can have an election every four years and we will have it in June." Just the minute the farmer is going to try to get a holiday, they are going to have an election. I think if the hon. member goes back to Wetaskiwin-Leduc and he says, "I proposed that bill," he won't be in this House. They will get rid of him real fast, they almost did it last time.

If the hon. member from Calgary Millican is so sure this is such a good bill, I think he should go and propose it to his electorate. You may not be here either. And furthermore, if an election was called in three and a half years, I must give you a warning. You members in the opposition won't be here. You will have an odd one in there, but there won't be very many sitting there, because I think the people have shown on August 30th that they will not put up with that hogwash that they had for 36 years. So let's be sensible. If you are going to have a bill of that kind, it must come from this side of the House, and not from that side. I propose that this side of the House vote this bill down.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I won't speak very long on this bill -- [Applause] I see I draw the normal round of applause. I do think, Mr. Speaker, though, that a bill like this can only be presented to a Legislature when those sponsoring the bill have made it clear that it is a matter of policy of theirs, that the people have an opportunity to assess before they take a position of responsibility. It seems to me that when the electorate in this province were voting in the last election, and have been voting, those who have been old enough to vote for a series of elections, and those who were coming in to vote for the first time, were voting under a tradition that they had grown up with and which they understand. I don't think that any group who do not first propose this as a matter of policy, would have the right to come into the Legislature and propose it as a bill after having been elected. I think I can vote against this bill for that reason alone.

Now there are other matters. Some of our members have raised them and some haven't. One way perhaps you could resolve that matter if you decided that, having been elected, and without running it as a part of your platform, you are convinced that maybe you should do it, somewhere during the four years, you should then run a plebiscite, I believe, in some way, so that the people, again have an opportunity to express themselves.

Another reason is, of course, who would agree on the date and I don't like this date either. I didn't like the last date as a matter of fact. It was called, for one thing, on my birthday. For another thing, we had to campaign completely during the racing season, and when normally you might have had holidays. As a matter of fact -- a member mentioned that it saved me some money. I think it probably did.

I was interested when you mentioned that the last election cost one million dollars, and I am not sure if you heard the member on our side who said, "that was the best investment the people ever made." Then I thought when the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, I believe, mentioned that it could go five or six years, I thought of the problems that would pose. Certainly you could see the problems of the NDP party. If, in four years they ran a public opinion poll all over the province to find some spot where they might get someone elected, and then if you waited two more years, the public opinion poll would probably be no longer in effect and then, you know, they would have to run another one or they would have to try and gamble

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-45

and try to get someone elected some other way. But in any event, that is another of the problems that could be encountered.

Then there is the problem of other governments, other provincial governments and the federal government, and while the hon. Member for Calgary Millican presented it very well that we can do virtually whatever we want in calling an election, I think we have a responsibility, however, to consult with other governments. I think it would only be a matter of courtesy to consult before you came up with this kind of a proposal because, I think, you are talking about something pretty basic and I think it would only be reasonable to consult with the federal government -- then go ahead and do whatever you want -- but there would be nothing wrong with consulting with them first.

So those points, plus the fact that every government under our tradition should have the right to go to the people when they feel that they have an issue of sufficient magnitude that they require a clear cut mandate to enforce it. I think those reasons are important enough to me that I could not support this bill.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, if I may speak twice in one day. This is not a very consequential bill. I am reminded in the House today of what I used to call wcmens' logic. The women I dealt with would not want to do something and I would say, why? They would say, because, I would say, because why? And they would say, because.

I can agree with some things that have been said. I think perhaps the bill should have come from the party in power at the time, I can see some logic in that. I do resent a little bit, however, any intimation that an idea coming from the opposition ought to be voted out just because it comes from the opposition. We have heard some rather strange things. Over the years that I have been following elections I have never heard of the perfect date. We learned to live with Christmas on the 25th of December, and we have lived with Queens' and Kings' birthdays and it did not seem to matter, you can adjust to these. I think that no matter how you go about it you will not find any better date than the second Monday in June unless you want to make it Tuesday, to give the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill time to get ready. It is possible we could just run the elections in the afternoon anyway.

One of the things that tickled me was that he said, "suppose that the Premier went crazy". Mr. Speaker, history shows you that premiers have even become crazy, and still are able to get along.

Now I think as far as adjustment of dates, you do not have to worry that the governments will not fit in fairly well. If truly the government of the day wants a mandate, there is nothing in this bill to prevent it; if there was the bill could be amended to cover it very easily. I am somewhat taken up with the idea though, that perhaps this government might whenever it decides to have an election, include in it a plebiscite such as we had over daylight saving time and see whether the people would go for it or not. If it were to be that way, that we did not try to influence them too much politically just to see whether they would like it or not.

I think there certainly are some advantages in the people knowing that the election will be in four years. I think the date is not so consequential as we have been lead to believe. I think you will find that it might do something else too. If there is anything wrong with party politics, it is the idea that when your houses are fairly evenly balanced the government is always on the defensive. Its members must support the government.

23-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

Now I think the new government will not be in very long until it discovers that its members are never going to see everything the same way. The old question of whether you like it or not, when you get in the House you'd better support the government because it's not the matter of what's right, it's the matter of what is expedient, we have got to stay in power. Perhaps if we did have an election every four years it would make less of the point that a government can be defeated in the House. Unless the balance is very close, governments are not defeated in the House. They are defeated by the things that they do wrong, the miscalculations they make. That may be true of the new government. I hope not because we are looking forward to the kind of government the people will like. I am not concerned with who governs as much as how it is we are governed.

I am just going to say this, if you put all the silly little arguments aside, and if you think about it, maybe the people would like to know that there is an election every four years. We have already pointed out that the campaigning starts the minute this House starts. I sit here bored by the questions that go back and forth just to embarrass somebody; in the hope that somebody outside will hear it and, truly, they aren't going to remember these silly things in four years. This isn't going to have anything to do with it, just foolish politics, a little childish if I may say so.

What I would propose is that if we are determined not to go along with this bill, even amend it to overcome some of the objections that have been voiced, that we consider that whenever this government does decide to call an election a plebiscite be held to see what the people do think, and if we are for the people before the party, that will be a good way to find out. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. APPELBY:

Mr. Speaker, unlike the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, I fully intended to get into this debate. In fact I found it rather remarkable that since he didn't intend to get into the debate he had some very pertinent material at hand that he could quote for the purposes of helping out on his points. I can appreciate the fact that the hon. members go through a great deal of agonizing and anticipation wondering about an election date. I went through five of those between 1958 and 1968. I wasn't a candidate, I didn't even have a vote, I was a federal returning officer at the time and I used to think how wonderful it would be just to be a candidate and only have to try and get elected. Otherwise I had the responsibility of trying to find about 1,000 people, enumerators and deputy returning officers and what not, and to see that they were in the right place, at the right time, on the right date, or hoping they were anyway. And then going through the election day itself and wondering if they had been.

I think that there are some areas in The Legislative Assembly Act that certainly could have some revisions, and I appreciate very much the remarks made by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West when he spoke the other day about the amount of subsistence allowance. I think this is something that I could agree on with him most heartily.

In addition to The Legislative Assembly Act there are a great many parts of The Election Act, as well, that could have improvements to them. And I am thinking of things that could probably be in the way of trying to maintain permanent lists of electors or voters, semi-annual revision of the polling division boundaries, and the returning officers could maintain permanent lists of election officials which would save a lot of work when the elections came along. And I know we have a committee working on these sort of things and I would recommend to them that they take a good look at The Federal Election Act because many of the things that are in that act could certainly be implemented into the provincial act. There are some good ideas there. I think that's important.

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-47

In this debate the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo brought up the suggestion that, if we had a rigid election date here in Alberta it could perhaps create confusion sometime, because there might be a federal election at the same time. I think it was the hon. Member for Highwood who said this wasn't a very likely thing to occur. Well I would like to assure the hon. members, that it has occurred here in Alberta and I know because I was a participant in one of those elections, in fact it was the first time I had a chance to vote.

I wasn't a candidate but I was the agent for a candidate in a federal election. The provincial election was called along about this time of the year, I think it was some time in March, and the federal election was about a week or ten days later. Just to show how much confusion this must have created in the minds of the electorate, in the provincial election in the federal constituency of Athabasca we had a number of provincial constituencies, either whole or the major part of them in the federal Athabasca constituency. In the provincial election all these provincial constituencies voted solid Social Credit and then a week or ten days later the people in the same area turned around and voted a solid Liberal -- the same people.

My candidate didn't get elected. However, that just goes to show it could happen and how confusing the issues can be, for people that could be involved in this sort of a situation. How could it develop? If we had a rigid election date here in the Province of Alberta and then in the House of Commons in Ottawa, due to a non-confidence vote, or due to the fact that the Prime Minister just decided to call an election, we could be involved in two campaigns, with many confusing issues at the same time. And I think this is something that should be very seriously considered.

There are other problems that could be created which would have to be considered before we voted on this motion or this bill. In this age which we live in we are all very much aware of the sociological changes, the technological changes, the rapid fluctuations in the economy and a government from time to time has to take action to cope with these sorts of things as they arise. If this situation did arise here in the Province of Alberta, and the government found themselves approaching a rigid election date, and wondering what course of action they should take, whether they should legislate in order to cope with the situation that had arisen in the economy, whether they would have time before the election to get the legislation through and then the period of development time after that, to get the necessary machinery set up to get this into the administration, it could create quite a problem.

I think they would be faced with with several alternatives. I have three of them in mind. They could say, "Well, we'll rush this through and hope to get it working in time before the election." They could say, "We'll stall it off and let the people of this province suffer along under the difficulties that have arisen until after the election," or they could repeal the act, The Election Act. Don't think it hasn't been done, there's a precedent for that here in the Province of Alberta. I did some research on that here not too long ago.

When the Social Credit government was setting up an election platform prior to first taking office in this province, part of the platform they had, said, "We will fit into our program a Recall Act, then if you have a member, an MLA who you feel is not representing you properly, who is not carrying out the wishes of your constituency, then we'll allow you to recall that MLA, and have a by-election and send somebody else in their place." And so they were elected, and in an act assented to on April 3rd, 1936 they brought out an act called, An Act Providing for the Recall of Members of the Legislative Assembly. And -- this was part of their election platform of course -- and it had certain provisions. You put up a

23-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

\$200 deposit, you had to get a petition signed by 75 per cent of the registered voters in that constituency.

During that election campaign the leader of the Social Credit Party, the Hon. William Aberhart, was not a candidate in that election, but he had enacted a pledge from all the people who were candidates, that if the party was elected and came into power, that anyone of the MLA's in any constituency where he decided he would like to run, they would resign and allow him to become the MLA or to run to be the MLA. So the election was held and the Social Credit Party swept into power and the Hon. William Aberhart decided he would like to have the seat of Okotoks. So the member resigned and he was elected, and they had their first session and the people in the Okotoks constituency became a little bit disillusioned, a little bit unhappy with the representation they were getting and they started proceedings to recall their MLA. They went to work and they deposited the necessary \$200, and they started to get verified names on the petition, and they were proceeding quite nicely with all of this. However, they ran into the next session of the Legislature and suddenly the act was repealed. That could be a situation where it might be necessary for any government to find themselves in, if they could not implement the programs they desired to implement. The repeal of this act came about in October 1937.

However, I would commend the Social Credit party for this action in repealing that act. I think it was good that they did repeal it. I think they were smart in repealing it, because it was not a very good act in the first place. It was hastily conceived. I would be critical, however, because they did not anticipate the complications that might develop from such hastily conceived legislation as that. They did not have the foresight to see the situation they might get themselves into. This was the indication. Something developed in haste and of course, all of a sudden it had to be done away with in haste too.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few more remarks but I would like to move to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House wish to call it half past five?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

We will reconvene at eight o'clock.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:30 pm.]

\* \* \* \* \*

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



April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-49

-----  
COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Provincial Treasurer that you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of Supply for consideration of the Estimates.

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Diachuk took the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Supply will come to order.

Department of Agriculture

Appropriation 1101 Minister's Office

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, I believe it's customary that the hon. minister gives an outline of the department and what is intended in the budget. Is it his intention to do this tonight?

DR. HORNER:

If the hon. member would just wait for a second or two, I intended to do that under 1102, General Administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, I think there is a cross-reference here that I would like to check out, and that goes back to page 102 in the minister's office. There is reference there to income account, particulars, Supplementary Estimates of Expenditures. There's one item there in the minister's office for \$4,500 which I understand is over and above what was estimated last year. I'd like an explanation of that, please.

DR. HORNER:

That was for the purchase of cars.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, then what is the other car doing?

DR. HORNER:

I understand that the other car is in the department.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Any further questions? Are we agreed now on salaries?

23-50

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

MR. STROM:

Is this car in the Department of Agriculture, or in some other department, and would the minister care to outline for us the use that car is being put to now?

DR. HORNER:

I'd be delighted, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition is concerned about it. Prior to this operation, Mr. Chairman, the department had a car rented on some sort of a rental basis, however government does that kind of thing. With the purchase of a new car for the minister's office, the other car took the place of the rented car and that contract was cancelled.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the minister would care to outline to us the members of his staff who have the use of that car and under what terms of reference it is being used.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, the same terms of reference that the other car was under that was rented by my predecessor in the department, for general use between the head office, if you like, and the Longman Building, and other assorted offices around the city that the department is housed in.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well. Agreed?

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, let's not rush this. I wonder if we could have an outline of the salaries and the number of people who are involved.

DR. HORNER:

Under 1101?

MR. TAYLOR:

Yes.

DR. HORNER:

I'd be delighted. The salaries are related to the minister's salary, plus the salaries of the two secretarial staff that are presently employed in the office, and there is a --

MR. TAYLOR:

How many?

DR. HORNER:

Two, and there are arrangements for a third secretary.

MR. TAYLOR:

And one secretary included in the content of that?

DR. HORNER:

That's right.

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-51

---

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well, agreed now?

MR. TAYLOR:

Under Other Expenses, could we have a breakdown of the item?

DR. HORNER:

The other expenses are fees and commissions of \$100, freight express \$50, equipment \$1,275, miscellaneous \$100, office material, paper etc. \$680, postage \$200, rentals \$100, telephone and telegraph \$1,200, and travelling \$2,850. The details of the equipment, if the hon. member would like it, are a replacement -- electric typewriter \$500, and an additional dictaphone.

MR. TAYLOR:

Perhaps this would be just as good a place to raise it as any. Is the postage in every office included in that particular vote, or is there a general vote in each department to cover postage?

DR. HORNER:

I would think that part of that would be in each of the various votes under the various sections of the department. In other words, the postage figure that I gave you of \$200 is for the minister's office.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, another one. I wonder in which vote there would be reference to the task force payments? I believe one of the hon. members opposite referred to the fact that he had been in Ottawa a couple of times. Where would that show up in this, in the Department of Agriculture's vote?

DR. HORNER:

Under General Administration.

MR. RUSTE:

And secondly, there is reference, under aircraft, in Lands and Forests to income from other departments. Where would that show up in this department, or does it show up in agriculture as such?

DR. HORNER:

It doesn't show up in agriculture as such.

MR. RUSTE:

Could we have that information, where it might show up then at this time?

DR. HORNER:

It is not my responsibility insofar as the question of the aircraft is concerned. This will be under Lands and Forests. They are operating aircraft for the Government of Alberta.

MR. RUSTE:

If I am not wrong in my study of the estimates, there is reference there in Lands and Forests to income from the use of the aircraft from other departments, and I am just wondering where it comes from. Maybe Dr. Warrack can correct me if I am wrong in that assumption.

23-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Would the hon. minister's answer indicate that there are no expenses to an aircraft?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, there are no expenses in the vote that we are now considering in relation to aircraft.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

To aircraft from this department? Is that clear, Mr. Ruste? Agreed now? Yes?

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, it mentions in the note that there is an increase of 8.8 per cent due to additional responsibilities in the expansion of department functions. Is this increase spread over every one of the items that you outlined? Or is it all in travelling?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, it is spread over a number of the items in relation to the general operation of the office.

Appropriation 1101, agreed to \$ 43,205

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Appropriation 1102 General Administration

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, I did want to take this opportunity to make some general remarks with regard to where we are going in the Department of Agriculture and to say something with regard to the general philosophy that we intend to follow in regard to the administration of this department. I could have, I think, on this occasion, chosen to make a political speech very easily, and with a fair amount of --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Go ahead, you're entitled to [and other interjections].

DR. HORNER:

If the hon. members will bear with me for a moment, I will give them the reason why I don't think I should.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Bashful? [and other interjections.]

DR. HORNER:

Well, a little bit, but bashful only to the extent that I don't think that doing that or reciting, as the hon. Member for Wainwright did the other day, a number of federal programs, would really be of any help to the farmers in Alberta. I consider my responsibility, first of all, to them, secondly to the Premier who has shown the kind of grasp of the problems in rural Alberta that have been missing in this province for a number of years, and I want to say to him, very publicly and very openly, that we in agriculture and in rural Alberta

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-53

-----

appreciate very much the kind of understanding that this budget and these estimates indicated have been applied to the problems that face us in agriculture. And because they face us in agriculture they face us in rural Alberta. I think that, in assessing that kind of responsibility, it is important that we do not get into a political harangue. As I say, I am not above that on occasion, and I can be, if forced. Let me put it that way. As I say, I am not above that, on occasion. I just, however, want to stick to the general philosophy that we intend to follow in relation to agricultural policy in Alberta, and the philosophy we intend to follow as a provincial government responsible for the individual needs of the farmers of Alberta.

First of all, it might be wise if we set forward our position in relation to Ottawa, because our position is that we do have some responsibility to the farmers of Alberta in a general way and in an individual way, and we consider that we share the responsibility for agriculture in Alberta in a major way with Ottawa. For that reason we believe that no program should be developed in Ottawa on a federal basis that affects the farmers of Alberta without prior consultation with the Government of Alberta in relation to how it may affect the farmers in our province. I want to make that very clear that this is the position we take in relation to agriculture, and this is the position we put forward to both the hon. Mr. Olson and the hon. Otto Lang and other ministers of the federal government in Ottawa.

If I could go on from there that we believe in the philosophy of having regard to the situation generally in agriculture throughout the world and throughout Canada, that if we accept the kind of philosophy that says we can close our boundaries, either as a province or as a country, then, in my view, agriculture is doomed to failure, and our attempts to improve the standard of living and the returns to farmers and other people in rural Alberta are going to be doomed to failure. If anybody wants to object or argue or debate that particular point, I refer them again to the situation in the European economic community where, for a number of years, they put up artificial barriers, and have maintained exceptionally high support prices to the individual farmer. And yet their major problem in those countries is rural poverty and farm poverty. In fact, that approach just hasn't worked.

I refer you also to the kind of approach the United States has taken in which they, too, have had a substantial subsidy program, a substantial program of support to agriculture, but their support was not limited, and in fact, their program in the United States allowed the richer farmers to get richer and the poorer farmers to get poorer. So you have that real anachronism in the United States where you have tremendous wealth in agriculture and tremendous poverty almost side by side. Surely, if we are conscious of these things that are happening around us in the world, it will take the combined wisdom of all of us, plus the leaders in the farm organizations, to develop policies that will, in fact, not allow the rich farmers to get richer and the poor ones to get poorer. Nor will we, hopefully, end up with the kind of situation prevalent in the European economic community, where, in fact, in spite of something like \$14 billion in support price mechanisms over the past few years, the major problem is still rural poverty and poverty in agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that we start out with the kind of philosophy we think will help, and that philosophy is based on no barriers, on freedom at every particular place that we can get it. That philosophy is based on the idea that there are people in the world who will buy our products, but that we have to get to them. That philosophy is based on a pragmatic approach that our policy should be flexible, variable and should be keyed into marketing opportunities for our farmers.

23-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

So if we are going to set out, as we have promised in our platform, to do something about saving the family farm, to do something in relation to the general economic income levels of the farmers in Alberta, then I hope we would follow the philosophy that we would want the barriers broken down, that we would want access into markets, both here in Alberta, here in Canada, and around the world, wherever we can get into them. And that is the approach we are going to take.

I have said before in this Legislature, Mr. Chairman, that the easiest thing that I have found to do, in looking after this department, is to bring in regulations stopping people from doing a variety of things. I think that we have to be bigger than that and better than that, and rather than bringing in regulations to stop people from doing things, we should be bringing in policies that will allow people to do things that will allow some freedom, that will allow the little farmer to grow and will allow marketing opportunities for them.

If then, I could sum up the idea of our philosophy; we still believe in the idea of a Canadian dream; we still believe that there is a place for people who would dream, that there is a place for people who will work towards attaining that dream, and that government should be responsible for helping them in attaining it, not putting roadblocks in their way.

In that regard, Mr. Chairman, the initial changes that we have made in the Department of Agriculture have been a new organizational set-up, based on the thrusts that we have been talking about, based on the idea that marketing is a key, and that marketing has to take a major responsibility in our administration. So we have divided the department primarily into the three major areas, that of marketing -- and under marketing comes all of the variety of things that we will go through as we go through the estimates which include market intelligence, market research, new product development, and a variety of other ways in which we can improve the marketing of the produce that our farmers produce.

The second division of the re-organized department has to do with the family farm development. Under family farm development such divisions will be relegated to extension, to the credit field, to costs, and to rural development.

The third division of the re-organized department has primarily to do with the production end of agriculture and this was the end -- I say in all fairness to my predecessor -- the production end of the Department of Agriculture in Alberta was a good part of that department and they were doing a good job; we have now segregated them into the production section, if you like.

Each of these three sections has a deputy minister in charge of them. We have not filled all of the new positions in relation to the re-organization, but that is in the process at this time. We do intend, under marketing, to have a major expansion in relation both to domestic marketing -- in other words having commodity officers that are involved in our own domestic market in Alberta -- and an expansion of the foreign or overseas marketing people under Harry Hargreaves. We are very fortunate, in my view, to be able to obtain some very able people in this area of exports, both in domestic and export marketing areas. One is David Durksen, formerly with Federal Grain, and the man that was responsible for developing the special crop section of Federal Grain and who had probably done the most work of anyone in private industry in relation to developing contracts with the Japanese for specialty crops. We know that Mr. Durksen's abilities and contacts in the Pacific will help us immeasurably.

So that, very briefly then, Mr. Chairman, is the new organizational set-up in the department. To go along with that new

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-55

organizational set-up or administrative set-up, we intend to bring into the Legislature very shortly, new legislation modifying the marketing legislation that is now in the books and the statutes in Alberta, and a new Agricultural Development Act, which will be primarily concerned with all manner of credit facilities. The other major piece of legislation will be new legislation to protect the rights of farmers in regard to their surface rights. There will be ample opportunity in the Legislature as these new bills come in, to have debate on the principle of them as we go through them. But I think it is only fair, in looking at the estimates, that these estimates are related to the new legislation that we are bringing in, as well as the present programs that are underway.

One of the new areas under General Administration in the new set-up is a secretariat which will be responsible for policy formulation and policy evaluation. Too often, I think, all governments in past have brought in new programs, haven't properly evaluated them and have kept them on because they didn't really know how to get rid of them. I think that we have a responsibility to government and to the people generally in the province to evaluate our programs, and if they are not doing the job they say they are doing then they should be cut out.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I just want to do another thing tonight before we get into the main bodies of the various votes. That is to review very quickly on a commodity basis the general situation as we see it in the department in relation to the agricultural situation for each of these commodities. Insofar as grain is concerned, I am sure that all hon. members are aware of the problems that are facing the grain industry, but are also aware that we are making major strides, in spite of these problems, in the amount of grain that we have sold and the amount of grain that we have, in fact, shipped. And in fairness to the railways and to the ports -- it wasn't very many years ago when people were saying that 5 and 6 million bushels was the total amount that you could move. We are now moving 700 million and we hope to move 800 million in total from the prairies. We do need the kind of things that we have talked about in this House before in regard to transportation and we are moving in that area. We believe that one of the important areas that we need to move in is in stabilization of income to grain farmers, and this can be done on two fronts. It can be done by a conservative approach to Ottawa in relation to the western agricultural situation, and this was the approach that we took after meetings with the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, a joint approach to Mr. Lang in regard to a stabilization bill. We asked for a variety of changes in that bill. The bill was finally withdrawn. I'm sure that everybody is aware of the history and I don't intend to go into it. But we asked for a number of changes to make sure that the kind of stability we were talking about was, in fact, the kind of stability that he was talking about.

In addition to that, Mr. Chairman, we have set up, as the House is aware, a Grains Commission for Alberta. We have given them wide range in terms of reference and charged them with the responsibility of improving our marketing ability in all kinds of grains. We have charged them with responsibility in trying to stabilize the price in non-board, or the coarse grains going into local markets in Alberta. We have had discussions with Saskatchewan and Manitoba in relation to a joint approach on this problem, so that we are at least all working towards the same end. There has been some criticism, of course, by some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, with regard to the Grain Commission, and I find it rather amusing, Mr. Chairman, because I wonder whether they thought I should have appointed a bunch of Social Creditors to the Grain Commission, charged with going off in a new direction. How could they go in a new direction if they believed in another kind of philosophy? Could they go in a new direction if they were devoted to the idea that government should own all the land and

that the farmers, should, in fact, become peasants? So I would be less than candid, Mr. Chairman, if I didn't tell you immediately that, in fact, all of the appointed members of that commission agree with my views and where we should go in agriculture. I would like to say though, very sincerely, that the chairman of the Grain Commission is a civil servant of some years duration, and it wasn't one of the points that we talked about when I talked to him about coming to Alberta. I didn't ask him what his politics are and I still don't know. I don't really care as long as he believes in doing something for the farmers of Alberta in improving the economic return that our grain farmers get. So basically I hope that we can put that one to sleep, Mr. Chairman. All of the appointed people on the commission believe the same way I do in relation to the new direction that we should go in grain marketing, that we should get up off our fannies and be doing things and at least exploring markets, and I have no apologies to make whatsoever about any of those appointments.

Further, in regard to the question of grain marketing, we, of course, have had the studies that the grains group have done in relation to the entire matter of the elevator plant, if you like, in Alberta. These still haven't been released and are still confidential as far as Mr. Lang is concerned. I can say to the Legislature, generally, that while a lot of work has been gone into, we think a lot of work needs to be done from the provincial level to make sure that our input is into any rationalization that takes place, and we have directed our Grain Commission to follow that up and have that input in relation to that.

Let me move on then to some of the other commodity groups very briefly, Mr. Chairman. Let me talk for a minute with regard to the chicken and egg war and the present situation in regard to eggs and in regard to broilers and turkeys generally. This has been a very frustrating experience for the producers, I am sure, and I know for the people that are involved in the Egg Marketing Associations and the Egg Marketing Board. It has been a frustrating experience for me as the minister who doesn't like quotas and boundary barriers and this kind of thing. We have had a number of meetings and a number of discussions and I have come down to the major points that I have made to the Egg Marketing Board and I would like to review them for the members of the Legislature because I think they are important.

1. We have said to the Egg Marketing Board that we want a review of the kind of quotas they are giving out. That we think there should be a limit to the size of the quota given out.
2. We have said to them that if a producer is in the business of producing eggs, he shouldn't be in the business of wholesaling them, that vertical integration must stop, and that we'll take steps to see that it is dissolved.
3. We would want the Egg Marketing Board to set up the necessary facilities to make available processing and grading facilities for marketing facilities for every registered producer in the province, no matter how small he may be. We intend to do this and hopefully we'll be in a position within a matter of days or weeks in which such a facility will be available to the Egg Marketing Board. From there we intend to ask them to develop, on a commission basis, grading and receiving stations at strategic positions throughout the province so that, in fact, our family farmers will have a marketing opportunity in the egg industry. We have asked them also to have a look at the entire question of how we can make fair, or make fairer, the responsibility for the egg surplus removal program so that all eggs marketed in Alberta will pay a share of that surplus removal program.

We intend to follow up on these suggestions to the Egg Marketing Board, and if legislation is required it will be forthcoming.



April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-57

-----

Insofar as the broiler and turkey situation is concerned, we agree with the resolution passed by the Broiler Marketing Board and the Turkey Marketing Board that vertical integration in these industries should stop. We intend to have discussions with the vertical integrators over the next several weeks so that, in fact, the quota they now have to produce broilers and turkeys will be available for re-allocation to family farms in Alberta. I am sure that all members will appreciate that this may take some time, that in fact it may have to be done over a period of years, but I would want to set out the policy very clearly that we are not going to allow vertical integration to continue in the province of Alberta and that the primary production opportunity shall be reserved for the farmers in Alberta.

Insofar as the hog situation is concerned, we appreciate very much that the hog producers generally have gone through a very serious year in the past year, with depressed prices because of over-production throughout Canada and the United States. The outlook ahead is much better; the outlook generally is better, and on the domestic scene the export outlook is also better. We have been working very closely with the Hog Marketing Board in developing a better marketing system, we hope, for the family farm producer. We have arranged so that the names on the manifest have been removed and that the notification to the packers has also been removed. We are working with them in co-operation, in a monetary and marketing sense, in developing ideas or new concepts on how we can have continuity of supply for the export market. We would appreciate any views that any member has in relation as to how this can be carried out in a realistic way. But, surely, if we don't develop some way to supply a continuity of supply for the export marketers, then we had better forget about export markets, because what we have been doing to date is, that when a packer or a processor has some surplus supplies, then he looks around for an export market, and he in effect dumps a substantial amount of product that happens to be surplus at the time, and that is his export drive for the year. We're not going to get into the export markets in any realistic way until we tackle and solve this problem of continuity of supply. And I would hope that we would get the kind of support from all members in this Legislature in developing that continuity of supply. It's going to be difficult. It has to be done so that the domestic market isn't impaired. It has to be done so that in fact our producers benefit from our expenditure in this area. We're moving ahead, as I've said, in co-operation and in close conjunction with the Hog Marketing Board in developing in experimental ways new methods in which we can develop this kind of supply for the American market and for the far eastern market.

Insofar as the cattle situation is concerned, again let us discuss the two things. The prices in the cattle industry and the cattle market generally have been good. The general outlook is for some sort of stability. The danger, of course, is over-supply, and these are the things that one must balance in relation to incentive programs in the cattle industry. There has been a fair amount of pressure from members in central and southern Alberta to extend the guaranteed loan for beef cattle to these areas. So far, there has been a mixed reaction from the Alberta Cattle Commission and the Western Stock Growers to this extension. I welcome the views of members in this area and suggest only to them that we are trying to keep on top of the situation in relation to the number of cattle that are involved in the loan program, whether or not this is, in fact, an increase in cattle, a transfer of cattle from one area to another, or a loan on cattle that are already there. However, it is important that we do develop our industry, but that we don't develop it too fast so that we start a surplus situation and force prices to a drastically low level. I accept the responsibility, as the minister, to try and juggle this thing and I guess that is part of the responsibility of the job.

23-58

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

I wanted to say a word very briefly in regard to the potato industry. This is a different kind of farming, if you like, from some of the other areas, in that it takes a fairly large amount of money, both for capital and for operating, and the potato industry generally, in the irrigated areas particularly, has had an extremely difficult time over the past couple of years. The question of marketing, the question of having adequate finances to operate is the one which really concerns us. As I said in reply to a question from the hon. Member for Bow Valley the other day, we hope to announce very shortly a program in relation to the potato industry, in which we will help them with capital loans and also with operating loans. It would seem to me that the operating loans are, in fact, the ones that are needed the most.

I might say a word, while we're talking about that area, about irrigation in general. There has been some questioning in relation to the situation. As some members may be aware, the whole irrigation division was transferred originally to the Department of the Environment along with the transfer of the Water Resources Department prior to our taking office. Since that time the basic land development area of the irrigation division has been transferred back to Agriculture and will be under the Irrigation Secretariat, and under the general administration of the Department of Agriculture. The engineering competence and engineering assistance will come from the Department of the Environment, and I know, after having numerous discussions with my colleague, the Minister of the Environment, that we can make such a co-operative effort work rather than duplicate the engineering competence in both departments. This is the route that we intend to follow. As my colleague has said previously, we are now in the middle of negotiations with the federal government to try and solve the whole question of long term irrigation rehabilitation. As the hon. members across the House appreciate very well, this isn't just simply a question of some joint financial set-up. I'm sure that my friend from Little Bow and the hon. Leader of the Opposition appreciate very much what I'm talking about in relation to the Bow River Irrigation district and the St. Mary's district and what is involved in the takeover by the province of these areas.

Generally then, Mr. Chairman, those are some of the areas that we are concerned about. I might just go back to the matter of cattle for a moment to alert all hon. members that from the time that we changed the original very modest program of the former government, where they had guaranteed loans up to something like a quarter of a million dollars -- from October 1st, until March 1st, we had guaranteed loans up to \$5 million in the greywooded soil areas of northern Alberta. In my view, this had a tremendous impact on the amount of money that was available in those areas to the farmers in those areas.

In a general way, Mr. Chairman, those are some of the things in the commodity situation, if you like. There are, of course, a number of other areas, especially in relation to vegetables and to what we are trying to do in the promotion of the farm operation in southern Alberta, and other specialty crops that we hope we will be able to promote in Alberta.

I did want to touch very briefly on the question of farm costs, and there have been also questions in relation to The Farm Machinery Act and The Farm Implement Act and there are negotiations with the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba. We now have a report from our study committee, and I have written to the Minister of Agriculture in the Province of Saskatchewan who initiated the study committee. I'm trying to get concurrence from the other two ministers to table the report that we have so that we can have a general discussion, not only in the House but outside, of the economic and other implications that are involved in a joint machinery testing program for the prairie provinces. I hope to have some reply from them in the very near future and will be quite

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-59

-----

willing then to table that report and to have a general discussion on it. We intend, in the meantime, to set up an Appeal Committee within the department in relation to farmers having complaints against farm machinery companies, and dealers having complaints against manufacturers. The committee will be made up of representation from the manufacturers, from the dealer organizations and from the farm organizations to assess these things and make recommendations and to develop, if necessary, additional legislation that may be required in the future.

The other area of costs which concern us all is the question of utilities and my hon. colleague, the Minister in charge of Rural Development, will be saying something more about that under that division. But we are concerned that power, gas and telephone be made available at the lowest possible cost to farmers, because it's an integral part of their production costs. We are also concerned with other costs that have to do with animal health needs, the provision of chemicals and fertilizers and all of the other inputs that go into agriculture. We intend to develop some competence in relation to these costs so we can hopefully maintain -- or at least try and maintain -- the family farm squeeze.

At the same time that we are doing these things under the family farm and under marketing, Mr. Chairman, it's incumbent upon us that we have to maintain the excellence in our production department, and this we expect to do. As I noted earlier, this has been a good part of the department, and we intend to improve on it where necessary and maintain it where it isn't.

That generally, Mr. Chairman, and very briefly takes up some of the directions that we intend to go on. I would like to say, before closing these introductory remarks, that we are quite willing to take the responsibility for the additional investment that the Premier and the government of this province has made in the agricultural industry. We're quite willing that it should be judged by the increased returns to the individual producers of Alberta and by the increased net income to those producers. I only ask that a judgment be given three to four years from now. I am quite willing to let the farmers of Alberta make that judgment. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the hon. minister for a very good report on his department. In the last half of 1971 -- in fact in 1971 -- agriculture across Canada, particularly in Alberta, made quite a comeback, especially in the cattle marketing industry. I don't think the hon. minister or the former government need take any particular credit for this comeback. It was a comeback that hit a high cycle, and it was natural. Had we had markets, and this is the whole basis on which the hon. minister is basing his new thrust -- he is on markets -- had we had new markets we would not have had the family farms in the trouble they were in. It was not a matter, as he mentioned, of production, in fact, the production from Alberta farms in quantity and quality was some of the best in North America. It was the lack of markets that pushed the farmers against the wall.

I want to be something like the hon. minister. I don't want to get into a political talk. During the campaign and since, the hon. minister has raised very high hopes, not only in the farming communities but also in the small rural areas. He has raised high hopes and high goals, and as I mentioned before in this House, this is not the place, possibly, where he should be. He should have been the hon. Minister of Agriculture in the Federal House. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because I think he probably has the ability, and what he lacks in ability he makes up for in bluff.

Mr. Chairman, it makes me wonder at times when you see on a beautiful summer day that we are going to have a thunder storm and it

23-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

is all lightning and thunder and very little rain. Or else, we turn around and have a great big gully wash. Now neither of these two storms ever raised much of a crop. I suggest the old steady shower is the one that puts the bushels in the bin.

We are talking about the family farm. I have yet to find from Unifarm, from the hon. minister or any agricultural experts on the other side of the House, what is a family farm. Except for a corporation farm, say, belonging to an oil company or a packing company or an oil millionaire or a doctor, the rest of them are family farms; they are run by families. It doesn't make much difference whether it is ten sections or one quarter section. If they are run by a family they are called a family farm. When we say we are out to save the family farm, we are all for motherhood, too. We all like our sisters. So why pick out the family farm? We are going to save the family farm. What is the family farm? Is it a viable farm, or a non-viable farm or is it the marginal farm? I suggest what we are concerned about are the marginal farms and this is what we have to try to save. This all relates to markets. The other night when we were at Unifarm, we talked about broilers -- 118 growers I believe. One was raising 30 per cent, so if you took away the 30 per cent and broke it down and handed it out to more growers, you would have only 150 growers, and you have 165 at the moment trying to get in.

What I am trying to point out, Mr. Chairman, is this. That each and every one of us in our commodity groups is trying to protect the group we have. I have a letter here written to the hon. minister from the Peace River Stock Growers Association which is an illustration in point. They quote: "We are gravely concerned by the matter and lack of concern by the Canadian Cattlemen's Association for our northern industry dictates to us to formally ask you to instruct the Alberta Cattle Commission to withhold further payment to the Canadian Cattlemen's Association until that organization is prepared to adopt policies which are acceptable to all Alberta cattlemen. Policies which will fulfill the needs of all regions." My heart goes out to these people. But the Canadian Cattlemen's Association -- and as the hon. minister mentioned, the Western Stock Growers Association -- are a powerful lobby in this country. They are not going to see the cattle industry ruined just because some people have not got cattle. We are taking care of our own.

The broiler people are taking care of their own; the dairy men are taking care of their own. So where are the markets going to be? Within the province for our marginal farmers? They are already taken up and it isn't going to be long -- if we continue the trend we are going, with marketing boards and the like and quotas -- before the small farmer is going to be pushed to the wall and it is naive to think that you are going to save them. I say that trying to be serious and yet trying to be sympathetic too. What we are doing today and what the hon. minister is trying to promote is that there is a great market -- there are markets for everything we could grow, and outside our country in the export market if these people have the money to pay for it. But we are not the only ones that are out to seek that market. Saskatchewan, Manitoba, in fact the Dominion of Canada, United States, Australia, even the European countries are all in this market. As the hon. minister has pointed out, many of these countries have subsidized farms or their farmers get subsidies. We are the only ones in Canada that are not subsidized by grain or any other. We have to meet the market and this is maybe a condemnation of the federal government.

I wish the hon. minister -- I don't want to be negative -- but I want to get it across to the hon. members that you have come, as I have mentioned before with stars in your eyes, and a heart full of pity and sympathy for the poor underprivileged Albertans, but I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that you start looking at things with your head and with practical ideas. Because all the money that you

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-61

are going to pour into rural Alberta is not going to save rural Alberta unless we get substantial markets outside of our own country. Foreign markets are great, but we are not going to, unless we get a substantial -- and I'm talking about a substantial -- market. It has to be at least 25 to 50 per cent of our present market if we are at least going to try and save part of our marginal farms. Some of the things that the hon. minister has mentioned -- as far as I'm concerned, I am not a grain grower. As far as his Grain Commission, it is immaterial to me who make up the personnel, as long as they are going to do a job. The only thing I am afraid of is that the employees already told him they think the same as he does. I'd like to think they had some other thoughts besides the hon. minister's, because we are just going to have an extension of a one-man show further down. It's like -- we're not going to get very far.

I'd like to think some of you 48 had some ideas. I've talked to individuals, and yet when we were on the other side of the House, we were condemned as backbenchers because we stood up and voted with the government. I am surprised now that you even have to stand up, you even have to be cued so that we can all pound our desks together. Well this is fine, I'm not knocking it, but I'd like to hear some of you fellows -- I know some of you, you are farmers, and I know some of the things that they have talked about are contrary to your own thoughts, not what the 48 have within the House.

We talk about the chicken and egg war. I realize the chicken and egg war is a very serious thing and broilers and turkeys and the commissions and all these things. These are what the minister has mentioned in his philosophy and I am not going to oppose. I feel that the time has come that we have a minister who is going to be forceful. As I said, what he lacks in intelligence he will make up in bluff. If he can put it across, then I am 100 per cent behind him.

As far as irrigation is concerned, the minister quite candidly admits it is a very serious proposition; it is not one of our making, and it is not one of his making. It is one in which we are caught with a tight-fisted federal government and I don't think that they have played fair with the irrigation districts. It is going to be a problem that we are going to have to face, because if our government here does not make a good deal with the federal government, the rest of Alberta is going to have to pay for this rehabilitation and I don't think this is fair.

So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to belabour the point too much. I wish the minister every success and as far as I'm concerned, I'll do everything I can to support him and, as I said before, if I think he is wrong I'll tell him so.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you. I wonder now that we have had this short presentation by the minister and a brief rebuttal by the hon. Member from Macleod whether we can now deal with Appropriation No. 1102, General and Administration Grants. If there are any questions -- I appreciate that -- but if there are any questions with regard to grants, let us work with grants. Let's have no more debates please.

DR. HORNER:

There is a general debate allowed on the item of General Administration and I would hope that we would have the thoughts of everyone.

23-62

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I appreciate that, but would the Assembly please stay with this and leave all the rest of this out? Please, would the minister then --

MR. BUCKWELL:

With respect, there is no restriction when you're talking on the item of general administration, in relation to all the items that are covered by the department.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well, will the hon. Member for Drayton Valley now --

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Member for Macleod recognizes this paper. May I only read you this portion of it, as he says he does not remember what the family farm is. There it is. Should I read it to you? It says; "I am sure by now you are aware of your Social Credit government's commitment to support the family farm way of life in Alberta." It goes on and on and on and it says, "we are going to pour \$20 million into the Alberta Farm Purchasing Board and we are going to pay 25 per cent of the crop insurance." This is the family farm. Was he campaigning all the time? It seems to me that to simply go out and criticize a bold step that has been taken forward -- I thought we were not going to have the agricultural budget get into a political arena.

It seems to me that the hon. members over there have forgotten that this government has gone on a bold venture to market the products that the former government refused to do. Now, when we consider that step that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has taken -- and it is a bold step; it is exactly the direction, the new direction that was given to the minister, and I am fully assured that with the minister's capabilities, and I do not think that it is all hot air -- coming from Macleod you will have to agree that this was one step that was taken in the right direction. He admits this.

If we are going to say that we are not going to sell and produce -- and I will say this, Mr. Chairman, in all due respect to the former minister of agriculture, that we did do a good job of production, but we ended up pouring into a 30-inch pipeline and we were trying to take it off with a quarter-inch pipe. This is the only thing. This was only a research department to make us produce more.

I am a farmer and there are many more on this side and that side. I think that when this government has taken the step to go and market the products of agriculture, and if we look around -- I have driven this province from one end to the other -- and I am assured that the hon. members opposite cannot say that agriculture was in the worst condition that it has been since the hungry thirties, considering the value of the dollar today. When we are willing to go out to research the costs of electrification to our people who are one half mile away from a line -- it is going to cost them \$2,200; those that are a mile away, it will cost them \$5,600 -- surely we should be broadminded enough to turn around and find out what the costs are. If these are not true costs, then the Department of Agriculture must take hold, and find a solution.

How many of the farmers in your area have natural gas? I wager very few. We are piping the gas down south of the border and selling it every day and the gas lines are running within a few hundred feet of our farm homes and our farmers are not entitled to gas. Do you think for one moment that these farmers are going to sit and wait when the former government made no effort whatsoever to give the farmers of Alberta at least a chance of using the same conveniences

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-63

that are in the urban areas? I am fully convinced that if we follow this program with the minister we now have, and, as the hon. Member For Macleod said that he should be in Ottawa, I agree with you. I am sorry we will have to keep him here a few more years so that we can clean up the mess that you people have left here.

It is not only to stand and say you are going to look at it, it is a wild dream. It is not a wild dream, it is going to be a reality. I am sure when the people of Alberta see what is going to happen to agriculture in the next few years, that at least they will say the salvation has come. I know in the past years as the hon. member has mentioned in the beginning of the year of 1971, we were selling pork at 18 cents a pound and this was dressed weight. This has never occurred since 1951. Do you call this a real nice situation for the Alberta farmer, to sell 50 pounds of meat for \$27? The man at the grocery store was picking that meat up for about 91 cents a pound. I think there has to be a comparison between the production and what the consumer has to pay. When a farmer goes and sells his eggs he gets 15 cents a dozen. When the people in Edmonton go to buy a dozen eggs they pay 55 cents. What is the justification? Where is it? I believe unless we approve this budget as is for the Department of Agriculture, then we have broken faith with the farmers of Alberta.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I'm sorry the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview tried twice and I ignored him then.

MR. NOTLEY:

In making some general comments on this question I would first of all like to say that I find the non-political Minister of Agriculture a great improvement over the political Minister of Agriculture. It is a very becoming change. As a consequence I'll try and reduce my remarks to some observations on agriculture and divorce them as much as possible from the politics of agriculture.

I want to say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that I think that this government has undertaken a number of very important initiatives, which I support. I am fully in favour of their study to determine whether or not natural gas can be provided to farms in this province. Something like this is long overdue. I think all the members of this House are fully behind the study, I think it can be a very important one and can indeed do a great deal in the future to provide modern world rural residents with many of the facilities of the city.

I am also in general favour with the thrust in agricultural marketing. There is really no doubt that we have to seek markets outside of Canada and all of us recognize that prudent administrations in this country will be seeking to expand our foreign markets. I would, however, suggest that the major responsibility here is going to have to remain with the federal government and I would caution, too, that there are some fairly serious problems on the horizon which I think we would be rather foolish to overlook. I am not suggesting that the government is overlooking them, I rather suspect that the government is cognizant of them. But as one of the former members of the Liberal Cabinet in Ottawa, Mr. Kearns, claims the world today seems to be drifting to where in the next 10 years there will be three major trading blocks in the so-called western world -- the European Common Market, the United States of America, and Japan. All these blocks, especially the Common Market and the United States, particularly the United States, I want to underline that, will be competing with Canada in supplying agricultural commodities to other parts of the world. I suggest then that we are going to be facing tougher competition on the international market and this reinforces the need for us to put a great deal of stress on

23-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

agricultural marketing and perhaps underlines the need as well, Mr. Chairman, for the provinces to work more closely together than ever before.

The minister in his introduction made some general observations about subsidies in other countries. I recognize that this is clearly an area of federal jurisdiction and not something which is really relevant to our provincial scope of responsibility. Since he did raise this in a general sort of a way I want to at least make several observations. I think it would be wrong to discount the success of the subsidies in Europe and the problems of the US subsidy and just ignore the advantages of both these programs. In Europe, for example, there is admittedly a great deal of rural poverty. I think most of the members are cognizant of the fact that agricultural conditions in Europe are somewhat different and that farms are much, much smaller. The subsidy system, however, has at provided some basis for fairly full scale agricultural production by smaller units. In the United States, I completely agree with the hon. minister that the American subsidy program has been a failure inasmuch as there are no limits placed on the subsidies and that large corporate farms, in some cases, have got a great deal of money. I know that in California some of the large corporate farms in that state have received over a million dollars each year from the federal government in subsidies. Well, this kind of thing is not really very good, but I don't think that we should just throw out the whole proposition because of the fact that there are no limits on the American subsidy programs. What seems to me to be a better approach is that if we are going to provide some form of deficiency payment, it's necessary to have those deficiency payments on a limited level of production so that, in fact, we are providing a basis of a reasonable income for our smaller producers.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this sort of proposition is not terribly wild or radical, but as we look at our economy today most of our industrial sector is subsidized in one form or another. If we were to dismantle all our tariffs, the so-called infant industries of Ontario and Quebec would collapse like a pup tent. If we were to take away all the indirect subsidies that we provide to the oil industry, for example, that industry would no doubt be in trouble. By the same token, it seems to me only reasonable that our economy should bear a reasonable form of subsidies to make sure the small producers stay in business. But I would agree that there should be a limit on the amount paid out and we should try and avoid some of the pitfalls of the American subsidy programs.

But let us not, Mr. Chairman, dismiss these programs *holus bolus*, because I think if we look at them carefully, if we analyze them carefully, we can find that perhaps there are some lessons to be learned that are valuable to us and that there are, within these programs, some ideas which would be very worthwhile, were we to implement them in our country. I say this, recognizing that this is largely a federal responsibility, but I do think that since the hon. minister raised this in a philosophical sense, I should offer at least some comments on it.

He also mentioned that he didn't want to see freedom challenged and I take it that as much as possible we want to get away from regulations. Yet he went on to point out that there perhaps should be a limit placed on the size of quotas allocated by the Egg Marketing Board. I agree with that. I think perhaps, Mr. Chairman, there is not as great a difference between some of the members in this House as we might like to believe. That while there is a need for as much freedom as possible in the agricultural production field in this country there are, nevertheless, certain prudent steps that must be taken to protect the smaller operator. The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc has introduced a resolution in this House which I support, that there should be a statutory limit placed on the operations or the size of production of operators coming under



April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-65

provincial marketing boards. I think that such a move is not, in itself, going to solve the problem, but it is a reasonable step in the right direction.

I would perhaps go one step further though than most of the other hon. members in this House, in suggesting that we do face a fairly serious threat from corporate farming in Canada. I don't want to overstate the case, but I think that there is at least some evidence to indicate that this is a problem. I know that just across the border from my constituency, in the province of British Columbia, a large syndicate from the United States has purchased many, many thousands of acres and are setting up a giant corporate farm which will be capable of producing 20,000 head of cattle a year. This is the kind of thing which, if permitted right across Canada would, I think, clearly imperil the future of the smaller operator.

That's why at times we have to balance the traditional freedom that farmers have enjoyed on one hand, with reasonable efforts to protect the smaller operator. And I might say, Mr. Chairman, that these demands for protection have come repeatedly over the years from organized agriculture itself and while, I think, it is not an easy question to resolve, it is nonetheless important that we need some protection if the small family operator over the years from organized agriculture itself and while I think it's not an easy question to resolve, it is nonetheless important that we need some protection if the small family operator is to stay in business.

I want to say a little bit about the recent Grain Stabilization Act, and flowing out of that the co-operation of the three prairie provinces. The Grain Stabilization Act as proposed by the federal Liberal government last spring had a number of very serious shortcomings. It would in fact stabilize poverty. It took no account, Mr. Chairman, of increased production costs, increased land taxes, increased fuel costs, increased power costs, all the other costs that go into the farmers' input on the cost price ledger. Then, of course, it makes very little sense to say that this is a program which is going to really help the average farmer. As most of the hon. members in this Legislature know, the Prairie Grain Stabilization Act became one of the important election issues in the province of Saskatchewan, it was one of the reasons no doubt why a change in government occurred in that province.

I do want to congratulate the minister for working closely with the provinces of Manitoba and Saskatchewan and making very strong representation to Ottawa on this act, because as it was originally drafted, it would not have really aided the average grain producer in western Canada. It was based, I think, on many of the presumptions inherent in the federal task force report on agriculture and its basic assumptions left a great deal to be desired. Co-operation among the three prairie provinces is important in many other respects, and I am glad to hear the minister say tonight that he is going to table as soon as possible the report on a joint effort on farm machinery testing. Certainly this is one area where we can work closely with Manitoba and Saskatchewan. I think that there are many other areas of agricultural responsibility, as well, where the three provinces should act in the very closest possible sense.

One comment, that while the minister was generally non-political, he did manage to get in the occasional jab, and I think we're all aware that he has rather pronounced ability to do that on occasion. One might say almost an excessive ability to do it on occasion. But he mentioned something about the government taking over all the land and making peasants out of the farmers, and this no doubt was a reference to the Saskatchewan Land Bank -- I suggest to him, as he well knows, the Saskatchewan Land Bank is a completely voluntary proposition, it's something that has the support of organized agriculture in Saskatchewan. It's the kind of thing that I think we should watch from this province, analyze whether it works or

23-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

not, and with all due respect to him, I think that the co-operation needed among the three prairie provinces is of such impact that this really isn't a wild socialist scheme designed to make peons out of Saskatchewan farmers. I think the record should really be set straight on that.

The Grains Commission! Well, it's interesting to hear that all the members think like the minister. As the hon. Member for Macleod pointed out, it would be very nice to learn that some of the members had very definite ideas of their own. But I think it would have been wiser -- and I say this, not in a political sense, but with great sincerity -- had the government formally consulted with the farm organizations in the province and asked them to make appointments to the Grain Commission. I think it is very important in government to work as closely as we can with the organizations that represent people, whether it be agriculture, or if we're making changes in medicare, that we work as closely as we can with the College of Physicians; or if we're making changes in the education legislation of this province that we work as closely as we can with the Alberta Teachers' Association and trustees and so on. And I think it would have been wiser had the government formally sought representation from the major farm organizations in the province.

One final point. I'm pleased to see that there is going to be a greater accent put on improved credit facilities. The riding I represent of Spirit River-Fairview has in it a very large number of younger farmers who are just getting started and a large number of homesteaders. And of course, homesteaders have a particularly difficult problem in that they don't have title to their land, and as a consequence it is almost impossible for them to secure credit in order to expand their operations. I think that the guaranteed livestock loan program in northern Alberta is worthwhile, and I commend the former government for introducing it, even though I had some critical comments to make about it at the time. I think, however, in retrospect as I look back on the last year, the idea had some real merit when it was introduced by the former government and I applaud the present government for continuing it and expanding it. In addition to that, I'm pleased to see that up to \$6,000 will be made available for the development of dairy barns for the dairy industry. Again, as I look at my own riding, I have a group of extremely hard-working eager beavers in a rather remote area of the riding, as the minister probably knows, who are very concerned about getting into the dairy business, and they will be looking with a great deal of interest on the specifics of the improved credit facilities provided by the provincial government.

Just in general summary, then, Mr. Chairman, let me try to close as I began, on a non-political note. The farmers of this province are facing, I think, a very difficult time, and even though things have improved slightly in the last few months, we must work as closely as we can together to try and devise policies which will save the family farm. Because the preservation of many of these units which are marginal units, such as the hon. Member for Macleod was talking about, is very important to maintaining the whole fabric of rural life in Alberta. And because I believe quite strongly that it's important to preserve rural life, I think there are times when we should set aside our political differences -- not always, mind you, because I'm a politician just like the Minister of Agriculture -- but there are times when we should set aside our political differences. I think that, in general, the department seems to be going in the right direction, to the extent that it is headed in that direction. I applaud the new thrusts, and where I can co-operate with the government, I assure them of my co-operation.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, in rising to make a few general remarks on the Department of Agriculture. If I would be permitted, I want to first

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-67

of all say to you, Mr. Chairman, that I appreciate the responsibility that has been given to you as chairman of this committee and I want to assure you that we shall do everything that we can to co-operate with you to make your job as easy as possible.

I was a little disturbed when I thought you were going to move on to another vote, and I'm certainly very pleased that the hon. Minister of Agriculture joined with us in pointing out to you that there is one vote in which we can have some very general remarks. I had thought that it would be on the minister's office, as I recall it, but again, I am certainly not going to debate the point because I think the main fact that we must keep in mind is that there is a vote on which we can ask some very general questions. So, certainly we appreciate the opportunity, and again we wish you well in your responsibility as chairman of this committee.

I would then also like, Mr. Chairman, to express my very sincere appreciation to the staff of the Department of Agriculture and for the very excellent work that they are doing. I am sure that the hon. Minister of Agriculture will agree with my colleague, the former Minister of Agriculture, and myself that we have some very dedicated civil servants within the Department of Agriculture who are sincerely trying to do a good job on behalf of the farmers of this province.

I would have to say, Mr. Chairman, that possibly the best days of my political life were during my association in the Department of Agriculture. I suppose because of my past association with agriculture as a farmer it helped me to make my stay within that department more pleasant. Nevertheless, I think there is something very basic about working with people who are close to the land that sets it apart from other departments and gives it a special status that is different, in my view, from other departments of government.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I also want to make it very clear that I think we have a very progressive group of farmers within the province of Alberta, who are, in fact, doing a very creditable job in their location. Those of us who have been privileged to work within the Department of Agriculture have been fortunate to have the progressive kind of people who are within our province working in agriculture. I am sure the hon. minister would agree with me, that in making assessments of past programs it is rather important that we consider the decisions that were made in light of the circumstances that prevailed at the point in time in which we made the decisions.

It is certainly not my intention this evening to spend any time in trying to justify positions we took during our years of office in the Department of Agriculture. That's past. We tried, to the best of our ability, to do what we thought was right and good, and we make no apologies for it. I appreciate that the hon. minister has said this evening that he makes no apology for the policy decisions that his government will be making, and I respect him for it. I think that is as it should be. Certainly, all I want to say is that even at this point in time, reviewing it in reverse, I make no apologies for all the decisions we made during our tenure of office as far as agriculture was concerned.

We hear an awful lot these days about the family farm. I don't have any difficulty, Mr. Chairman, in providing a definition that is satisfactory to myself as to what a family farm is. I think it has different meanings to different people, but in my mind it simply denotes an operation that is handled by the family. It may be large, it may be small, it really doesn't matter. I think what we are interested in, and what we are talking about, regardless on what side of the House we sit, is that we think it would be disastrous for our province if, in fact, we were to depart from this philosophy, the philosophy of a family operating a farm unit. Because I think it will continue to be a sound basis for an agricultural operation, whether it be in the province of Alberta or any other province in

23-68

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

Canada, or, in fact, in any other province of an agricultural land in the world.

Really, when an hon. member rises in his place and tries to take an hon. member to task because of what we have said in relationship to the support for the family farm, all I am trying to say is that I don't think it matters on which side of the House we sit, we still recognize the value of supporting the concept of the family farm.

Mr. Chairman, I noted the hon. minister made reference to the special relationship that he was going to seek to establish between the provincial government and the federal government. Let me make it clear at the outset that I don't disagree with the concept or the policy enunciated by him; I support it. I simply point out that the B & E Act provides a different relationship between the federal government and agriculture, than it does in several different areas. I think there is no disagreement really on that. But having said that again then, of course, we come back to the understanding that we want to have with the federal government in relationship to any policy that they intend to establish for our farmers, or for any other group in society. I have certainly shared your view for a long time. My only regret, Mr. Chairman, has been that we could not, and I say it again, we could not get the kind of support that I think we should have had from several other provinces, particularly those who share our view. They were prepared, and I say this just as kindly as I can because I happen to have faced this not only as a Minister of Agriculture, I've faced it as the premier. It was unfortunate that we could not get the support of other provinces for this concept and I say, Mr. Chairman, that had we been able to get it, that our relationship with Ottawa would have been different today than it is right now. I say I give you my pledge of support in anything that you can do to establish that proper relationship between the federal government and our province and, in fact, between all of the provinces of Canada.

Again I come back to this and I simply say that when we make judgments, let's try and make them on the basis of the circumstances that prevailed at the time the decisions were made. To me that is all important. I for one have no intention of trying to judge this government on the statements that they are making today; I am going to be quite prepared to judge them on the results that we will get after a period of time in operation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I did not maybe take the same meaning from the statement of the government owning all the land as my hon. friend on this side of the House, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. I took from the remark that the hon. minister was making that he felt there was not enough help being provided to our farmers and that eventually because of this the government would, in fact, wind up owning all the land.

Now, I am going to take the reverse, and I hope that the hon. minister will give some very serious consideration to this. I speak now, not only as a former Minister of Agriculture, I speak with some experience as a farmer, and I speak with some experience as a man who has been associated with farming all my life. I can think of nothing that will create a situation that will take land away from farmers faster than too much credit, or an extension of credit to the point of where they cannot pay. And I would have to ask the hon. minister just as sincerely as I can, is he thinking in terms of extension of credit that will be written off? This has been done in the province on many occasions and I don't have to review to illustrate my point. I simply say that there are many of us here within this Legislature that are well aware of the credit plans of previous administrations, the credit plans of previous associations that have got into great difficulty simply because they over-extended credit.

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-69

Let me just make this point, and I recall with a great deal of pleasure my earliest association with annual municipal meetings. I found them fascinating as I used to go to them and listen to the old-timers talking about the problems of the day. I can remember some of them and I hope I shall not be misunderstood when I refer to them as the hard-bitten old farmers who had gone through the mill, who would stand up and say: "if I had known that I would not have to repay it, I would have gone for that extra credit." And I am sure that the hon. minister will recognize that in the credit programs that he intends to establish, there are going to be a number of people that are going to seek the advantages of this that really don't need it, and if they can see an opportunity of crawling out of their obligation, I happen to know that this also will happen, and so my suggestion to the hon. minister is that in this full area of credit, it must be handled very carefully. It must be handled with discretion, and the advance or the giving of credit is not necessarily a solution to the problems that we are facing at the present time.

I want to deal with this just very briefly when I close, but before I do that, I want to say a word or two about marketing and marketing boards. I appreciate the remarks that have been made in regard to the progress that has been made in production. There is no disagreement in that particular area and I think the farmers of this province, as well as many other farmers in other provinces, have done a terrific job of production, but it has created some real problems, not in all commodities but in many commodities. Let us take, for example, in the area of broilers, eggs, turkeys. If we think in terms of removing quotas -- and I think I heard the hon. minister correctly when he said that basically he does not like quotas. In other words, if I can place an interpretation on your remarks, I would take it that you don't like marketing boards -- well you didn't say it but if you want to deny it I would appreciate that because I think it is pretty important that this point be clarified. Does the minister believe in marketing boards or doesn't he? He hasn't really said --

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, may I say --

MR. STROM:

Sure, go ahead.

DR. HORNER:

I have said many times in this legislature, Mr. Chairman, that I don't like restrictions of any kind but I accept in a pragmatic way that we have to have some restrictions along the way. I think that we need marketing boards. I believe that marketing boards should, in fact, be marketing boards. That they should be out seeking markets in an aggressive way, not just being a clearing house.

MR. STROM:

I appreciate the hon. minister giving us his definition of it, and I buy that. I accept that wholeheartedly. I am sure that if there are any members here -- when we introduced the marketing legislation some years ago they well know, the emphasis was on orderly marketing, not on control of production. But I think again we have to be a little realistic. Let's not bury our heads in the sand and say that you can have orderly marketing without some restrictive control on production. I have yet to find how this can operate and what I fear, of course, Mr. Chairman, is that when they gain the ability to establish orderly marketing, there is a tendency on those who fall under the canopy of this protection to immediately try and curb production in order to protect the available market at

23-70

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

that point in time. And so I don't think there is any basic disagreement on the point that we are making, except that I want to say this, that I also understood the minister to say that -- and I want to be correct in this -- that the registered producers must be able to sell. And again I say, fine but how much? Are we talking about the total production? Because I think this is also pretty important. What do we really mean?

DR. HORNER:

I was talking specifically about the marketing board in which there are now quotas, and these quotas are related to the registering of the producer. In other words, every registered producer also has a quota, but as has happened in the past couple of years, as my hon. friend from Wainwright appreciates, is that in fact some of the wholesale outlets refuse to accept deliveries other than from registered producers, even though they had quotas and they just snuffed them off.

MR. STROM:

Again I appreciate having the explanation on it and I would only want to add this further point that the hon. Member for Macleod certainly brought out very clearly the inability of providing opportunity for all farmers to produce all that they want in all commodities.

We have to be prepared to accept some regulations, and I say that this has to be handled very carefully -- but some regulation that will not destroy the producers that we need to have in order to provide the continuity of supply that the hon. minister referred to. Because, as I have said on many occasions, a farmer does not have a choice of getting in and out for too long. This is the way many of them operated, and I speak with some experience from southern Alberta, where we have farmed in the Palliser triangle, where it was either a feast or a famine. And there isn't any question in my mind that there was a total inability, many, many times to sell the kind of production of which they were capable. But I will support that every effort be extended to obtain markets as much as possible.

This does lead me to another point that I would like to make. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that I will not be out of order in raising it, but I want to refer to the hog industry. It has been my feeling that there is a potential hog market -- if I can just use that simple term -- available for us if we go after it. But I am a little concerned because of one group who has been very interested in coming in here. I am not suggesting that they are desirable or that they can meet the criteria that we want them to meet in order to operate here. But I am concerned when I hear the government say that they are interested in developing industry, and I find that there is a lack of any indication that they have attempted to run this down, even to the point of having sent the man over to his previous place of operation to determine whether or not he was a desirable kind of operator. And so it seems to me that when we are talking about the increasing of industry, the increasing of potential markets for our farm commodities, then it is most important that we run down every opportunity of increasing that production, regardless of where it may be or regardless of what the circumstances are. Maybe the government has some answers for it, but up to this present time I certainly have not heard them.

I should say too, in marketing legislation, that at the time of introducing amendments to it one of the objectives we tried to establish was that farmers would have the ability to choose the method that they wanted to use for marketing. It may have gone astray; it may not have worked as well as it should. And I simply say that the choice was left to the farmer. If there is a need of

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-71

correcting, if there is a need of changing, by all means let's look at further amendments and let's see if we can improve.

Now the last point that I want to make is one that I think is more important than any that has been dealt with until this point in time. The minister did not refer to it, at least not directly. He referred to the fact that there have been increased costs facing farmers and the difficulties stemming therefrom. I am going to make a statement - I don't know whether it will be accepted or not - but it is my conviction, Mr. Chairman, that we can continue to skirt around on the fringe areas in trying to solve the agricultural problem, but until we come to grips with the problem of inflation we are not going to solve the problems of the farmers. And I say, therefore, that to me the most important item facing this government is their ability to get to the federal government and come to grips with the problem of inflation. Until they do we are not going to solve, hon. minister, the problems facing agriculture. They are at best going to be stop-gap measures that will give help, and I will support him for that reason, but I would hope that this government will use every effort at their command to bring to the attention of the federal government the need to come to grips with the problem of inflation. I was amazed, in raising this question with a former federal Minister of Agriculture, and I said to him; "You know in my view we are not going to solve the problem of the farmer until we can solve inflation." And he said to me, "Well, Harry, we're going to have to live with it." I said, "How are you going to deal with it then?" And his simple answer to that problem was simply that we would have to face a situation of continuing subsidies. If that is the only solution we can see on the horizon then I see we are in for some very troublesome days as far as agriculture is concerned, and I am extremely concerned as to their lot in the years ahead.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say again that we appreciate the outline that the hon. minister has given. There will be certain items that I would like to question, but I hope that these remarks will be given some consideration by the hon. minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Chairman, while I realize that this a committee, I nevertheless would like your permission to introduce to you and to the hon. members of this Assembly, a very distinguished constituent of mine. He is sitting in the members' gallery, a former member of parliament for the City of Edmonton, Mr. Terry Nugent. I would like him to stand and be recognized please.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I guess you may now speak.

MR. HO LEM:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to take this opportunity to stand up and speak as an urban member on the subject of agriculture. I think that I am the first urban member to do so thus far. Now I do appreciate the comments that have been given by our hon. Minister of Agriculture, but I notice in his talk that he has omitted a subject very close to my heart, and this is the equine industry in Alberta. Because of the growing interest in this industry, as a result of the massing of our population into our urban centres, more and more do we want to seek the activities of the outdoors, and as a result we find many city people, as well as rural people, going towards this hobby of raising horses. In fact, every child I am sure would like to own a horse but because of the limited

23-72

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

facilities, because of the high cost, and so on, this is very prohibitive.

I would like to refer to a point I have noticed in Calgary, and that is in regard to our horse sales. In this industry we have progressed to a point where we have attracted many eastern buyers into our province and, of course, you will appreciate the vast amount of revenue coming into this area from this source. But the fact is that the type of horses we are exporting, I am sorry to say are, in the main, many of the grade type of horses. While we would like to improve on the breed so that we can bring more money into this area in the way of selling and exporting better horses, I feel that this is an area that we should strive for.

In the fall sales of our thoroughbreds in Calgary we have now reached the point where we have called it the fourth annual sale this coming fall. Here again, we have some very good horses for sale but then, because of the limited numbers available, because of the limited breeding programs in Alberta, many of our buyers go to the east or across the line to buy horses. I feel that this situation could certainly be reversed where we can be exporters of horses rather than importers. The climate of the land that we have here lends itself to this type of development and this is an area I feel that can be developed and should be encouraged.

Now in the way of what our local people are doing in the promotion of horse shows. In Calgary and Edmonton we have some very fine quality horse shows; in fact we are recognized throughout Canada as having some top breeds of horses in the way of quarter horses, Arabian horses, and various other types of breeds. Now I feel that the breeders themselves should be given encouragement to breed more of this type because we have passed the experimental stages. People are indeed coming in to see our horses and to see our competitors and to see the exhibitors perform. It has been very encouraging because of the audience participation. I think that only a few years ago there was very little audience participation. We have come to a point where we have broken even financially. We're just getting ahead in this area, and I feel that if we can encourage more competitors, more exhibitors, we can certainly improve on the attendance and quality at these horse shows.

An area that I feel can be really expanded is in the area of junior horse shows. This is the area where the student, where the children, 18 and under, can participate. It is a well known fact that currently as well as in the past this sport had been reserved for the more affluent members of our society. I feel that this is regrettable and is not fair to the children that really want to participate and can't afford to do so. I feel that more facilities, subsidies, and higher purses should be granted so that more children can become active in this. We know that we would like our children to be interested and get a sense of responsibility in animals, thus preventing them from going astray in other areas. The temptation of course, is very great in today's society.

In the way of incentives to breeders, I feel that a breeder's fee, or subsidy to the stud fees for the breeder should be provided. When you consider that when you breed a horse, it takes three years before it gets to market, one year before it's foaled, the producing and growing of this animal takes two years before it becomes a yearling. The buyers themselves don't like to buy a horse any younger than a yearling, so I feel the hon. minister should give some consideration in this area.

Now in the area of thoroughbreds and standardbreds. This industry certainly has been a very lucrative industry for Alberta because horse racing is a big business in Alberta. It provides a good revenue for our province and I feel that more contributions towards our purses would encourage horsemen to get better stock into



April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-73

-----

this industry. If you would go to the shed row and take a look around and just see what is happening to some of the people that are working in this area. For these people, it's a labour of love, the pay is very small, some of these people work for \$75 a week, they get up at 4 o'clock in the morning and their day doesn't end until possibly 8 or 9 o'clock at night. These people year after year go through that just to support this industry that we all love so much. And I feel that unless the government is prepared to look into this situation and give them some encouragement, that even the thoroughbred business, the horse racing business, would be on a decline before too long. In this area we should try to improve it because other provinces are taking a stand and going ahead with it.

Now, in conclusion and certainly in addition to my previous remarks, we should take a good look at the need for an equine clinic and college in Alberta. I see that in the estimates here that you speak of additional grants being given to people going to Saskatchewan. I understand that this is for students attending the University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon. Now -- I beg your pardon?

MR. COPITHORNE:

What happened to that college under the former administration?

MR. HO LEM:

Well, I feel that certainly in Calgary this would be a wonderful place for it because it is right in the heart of the area where many horses are raised. The climate is good and also it provides not only a service to the horsemen, because now whenever we have problems with horses that need clinical care, many times we have to send them across the line to Pullman, Washington, or to Saskatchewan. I feel that there is a need for this type of a clinic that also would allow our students experience so that they can get into this in practical ways. I would certainly urge the government and the hon. minister to give really serious consideration to the establishment of such a clinic in Calgary.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the hon. minister for his opening remarks, and using his own words of the other day in one of his saner moments, I think it was a credit to him. I was interested in some of his comments in referring to the previous administration in the number of federal programs. I would say though -- he mentioned the grain we had sold -- that I think the grain sales are the result of a lot of work that has been done over the last couple of years, some that were just, and some that maybe were in error, but nevertheless they were done.

I would submit that when they are talking about no barriers and freedom every place we can get it, certainly this is fine, but I submit, Mr. Chairman, that what we, as producers are interested in, is a fair price for the product we produce. We all recall a short time ago -- it was referred to earlier -- about 18 cent pork. We know what led up to it in the fact that many of us as grain producers had surplus grain we just couldn't move at almost any price with the result that many went into the production of hogs. When that production number fell, then the prices started to come back.

I would like to commend the hon. minister for continuing the marketing as a key, and certainly with the establishment of Mr. Harry Hargreaves as Alberta's Market Commissioner, I think this was a first for Canada by the previous administration and that he is building on this solid foundation.

I would like to mention something the hon. minister didn't mention -- maybe he will a little later -- and I'm looking at The

23-74

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

Farm Purchase Credit Act where I'm trusting they will carry on on the basis that they provide there for funds at somewhat reasonable rates of interest, and along with that a life insurance coverage to those who borrow the money. The production end has been mentioned, of course, as well.

I would like to mention that the minister and myself, along with others, today met with the group that were in the Milk Market Sharing Committee that has been working for some two years but that led up to the vote that was held. They had their last meeting today. Certainly this is another step in the marketing and I think an indication by the producers of this province of their vote is in support of this type of an operation.

Now reference was made to the Grains Commission, and I would certainly hope that co-operation, and close co-operation is had with our prairie provinces. I think there is an organization that hasn't been mentioned, as I recall in this House, that is doing a commendable job in this area. It's the EXCAN group that was set up not too long ago that is a producer group that is working for the sale of grains. I think my colleague has mentioned the matter of the government owning all the land. Certainly as an administration we don't believe in this. I was rather interested though in the hon. Minister of Agriculture in the setting up of the Grains Commission. I had hoped to have been able to have the grains group studies which I understand from Mr. Lang is confidential. The previous administration, and this one, worked with him in establishing them. But I have a feeling that maybe the 'now' Minister of Agriculture has been able to utilize that information in the setting up of his Grains Group, and more power to him.

MR. RUSTE:

There has been a lot mentioned here and it is not my intention to repeat, but certainly a meeting that I held last summer with the boards and commissions in this province, I think, is one of the historic ones in that we sat down together to see what could be done in the field of marketing, market promotion and product research. I was also rather interested in one of the remarks the hon. minister made regarding the danger of over-supply in livestock. I think he recognizes this, not only in livestock but in many other things. Another one that there was no mention made of was the matter of disaster payments. I think in the previous Legislature he made many comments on this, and I would like some information on that.

I think it boils down to the fact that what the farmer or agricultural producer in this province wants and deserves is a just price for that which he produces. Certainly, it is my hope that the increased amount that is put into the agricultural budget will be utilized toward that end and not end up, a large portion of it, in the administrative end. Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make three or four comments on the agricultural vote generally. In the first place I'd like to congratulate the hon. minister on the statement he made, that the chairman for the Grain Commission was chosen on his ability. He said he didn't even know what his politics were, but he was satisfied that he would do a job for the farmer. I think this is a statement of a statesman. Actually, when we are dealing with agriculture and the business of the province, I don't think it is the responsibility or the right of any of us to ask people what their policies happen to be. They are all human beings and we believe in freedom of choice, and consequently, their politics should be immaterial. I was somewhat disappointed in the statement the minister made about the personnel of the Grain Commission, suggesting that all of the other members thought the way he did. He thought maybe the opposition

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-75

considered they should be members of the Social Credit party. We don't think any such thing. We would prefer having able men, not knowing what their politics are, were or will be. I go along, to some degree, with the comments of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview in that the farm organizations have a lot of able men. From those able men, certainly, some excellent members of this Grain Commission could have been chosen.

I don't know anything about the ability of the men who have been chosen. It appears that a number of them, or some of them, are defeated Conservative candidates and some were nominees of Conservative candidates. When that does take place, it smacks somewhat of a reward rather than ability. That is the danger of this type of an appointment. If people in the province get the view that people are being appointed because of their politics and not because of their ability, it weakens the structure and it weakens the confidence in the entire board.

I would hope that these men are all men of ability in spite of the fact that they may incidentally happen to be also members high up in the Conservative party. I am more concerned about their ability and the job they will do for the farmers, too. I think the Grain Commission has a real challenge, and I commend the government for appointing the Grain Commission. I hope it would not duplicate any work being done by the federal authorities, but would complement the work of the federal authorities. I think there is a real field there and a real challenge for this commission.

The second point I would like to comment on, is the matter of The Farm Machinery Act. There is a real need in this province for some revitalization and some great changes in our Farm Machinery Act. When a farmer spends \$17,000 or \$20,000 for a machine and gets a lemon, today he has little recourse. I know of a case, and the hon. member knows of the same case, where a farmer had such a machine off of his land more than it was on his land during the last summer. The farmer can't do his work and he can't have peace of mind when he is continually trying to fight a large machine company to get a machine that he paid for, that won't work and won't do the job. I think that we need laws in this province and in this country whereif a large corporation must stand behind the machine and must replace it, if it is a lemon. Surely the farmer should not be expected to have to take that kind of loss. He just can't do it and he can't stay on the land if he is going to do it. I commend the hon. minister for the suggestion he gave that The Farm Machinery Act is being looked into. I hope that we can make some substantial and meaningful changes in that act, because certainly we need it very badly in this province.

The third item I would like to mention is markets. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview mentioned that we were gradually getting in or drifting into three trading blocks, I think there is a danger in trading blocks. I remember when it was my pleasure to represent Canada at the opening of the Pan-American Highway, suggesting to some of the people there, from South America and Central America, that here was a wonderful opportunity to form a trading block in the western hemisphere, in North and South America. And most of the people in the discussion group agreed that there is a tremendous potential market. Somebody spoke up and said, "The only thing I'm afraid of is that if we divide the world into a few trading markets, what happens to the other people who don't happen to be in those particular common trading markets?" Now, I don't know what the ultimate will be, but I know there is a tremendous market for the things that we have to sell in Central America. I know there is a market in our country for items that the people in Central America have to sell. And I can see the Alaska Highway being the black line that can bring the people of this continent and South America closer together through trade, by benefiting both ourselves and the other parts. We have wheat and we have cattle and we have scores of other

23-76

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

things that the people of Central America need. They have bananas and they have their tropical fruits and so on that we need. And with a highway where trucks can move rapidly, today when refrigeration is possible, the Alaska Highway can be one means -- the Alaska Highway right from Anchorage to the southern tip of South America. When that last little stretch is built south of Panama it can help to develop a tremendous trading area.

I think the hon. minister is to be commended on his effort to get more markets. I agree with the hon. Member for Macleod, we need markets. If we are going to provide the proper incentive to our farmers and give them the reward they need after they do produce, then produce the real wealth, then we do need markets. And I think every one of us should be behind the hon. minister in trying to develop more markets because the future, not only of our farming community and our family farm, but also the future of our urban people depends on that.

We have to emphasize more and more to the hundreds and thousands of people who are living in our cities who do not produce real wealth, that their best chance of having food at a reasonable price is to retain the family farm. If we ever get to the place where hundreds of farmers are no longer there and they are replaced by a few large corporations, then the people in the cities will really know the score because the price of food will rise. No corporation can produce the food at the price the family farm does. And I agree, too, that we need to stabilize that price, to give some incentive, because there are scores of people on our land today who would move off tomorrow if they could get a buyer for their land. They become frustrated and they become disillusioned and they have heard for years that agriculture is the backbone of this country, but the backbone is getting pretty weak and they want more than just praise. They have to have an incentive and a reward. Not that many of our farmers aren't doing well, but hundreds of them aren't getting the standard of living they should have on the farms today because they can't sell their produce; they are subjected to a small quota and things are not as bright as they should be on our farms.

Well there is one other point on marketing I would like to mention. As a matter of fact, there are two other points. I would like to see the small vegetable market encouraged and developed. We have in the irrigation areas -- and it's really just getting into the Strathmore area because of the irrigation -- people who are risking their capital and who are spending their time and their efforts to develop carrots and small vegetables that we now we import from California and other places. I would say that we are perhaps capable of producing millions of dollars worth of these vegetables in this province if our farmers are given some incentive to do so, but they need credit and they need some encouragement in this area. I am glad to see some encouragement being given because these small vegetable producers do need encouragement and they can make a real contribution to the economy of our province.

There is just one other point that I would like to mention. When we are talking about markets, we should not forget the people's market that is right at our doorstep, there is underconsumption that is taking place throughout this entire country of ours. We are prepared to spend money to get markets in other parts of the world, and I am not sure that we wouldn't be making greater progress or as great a progress if we were prepared to spend an equal sum of money in developing our home market. There are a lot of people in Alberta who could eat more bread, who would eat more bread, if they had the money to buy it. There are a lot of people who would drink more milk, if they had the money to buy and pay for more milk. There are a lot of people who would eat more steaks and more beef or more chickens or more turkey if they had the money to buy meat. I don't think we should for one minute think that our own people are getting all of the food that they want. Here is a real market if we can

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-77

increase the buoyancy of the economy. Get more take home pay in the pockets of our working people and we would find we are getting an increase in our markets for agricultural products. I would like to see more emphasis made on developing this market right in our own province, right in our own country, so that we could say, "charity does indeed begin at home." While we are our brothers' keepers and try to help to feed the hungry stomachs of people in Korea, India and China and other parts of the world, we should be extending our efforts to make sure that people right in our own province and in our own country are getting enough to eat, too, and by doing so we will be helping the agricultural industry a great deal indeed.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I have a few brief comments I would like to make and hopefully, the hon. minister might respond on two or three of the subjects. Firstly, I am not going to start to congratulate the minister on the tremendous job he has done. I know he is an expert talker. I have seen evidence of that in the last few years in this House. I certainly am going to wish him well and I am going to reserve judgment until I see what he really does, other than talk about a lot of things.

One of his earliest comments, the first quite in his introductory remarks, Mr. Speaker, which I think were quite appropriate, contained a comment about concern that the poor farmer gets poorer and the rich farmer gets richer, and that they weren't going to let this happen. I think this is a commendable objection, but I think some of the actions that this government has taken already are indications of what they are going to do and really contradict that basic statement of philosophy.

I want to refer specifically to the question of the third degree removal of the 30 mill foundation plan on behalf of citizens 65 or over, as it relates to the property tax. Certainly this is not going to be beneficial to the small farmer. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, it's going to encourage farm people not to transfer their farms over to the younger people in their family, but basically to hang onto them until death do us part in the interests of saving something like 40 per cent on their property taxes. So while this program of taking the property tax off senior citizens has some merit so far as residents are concerned, when it applies across the board to all the land that the individual farmer owns, it certainly can't be argued that this is doing anything along the line of making the poor farmer better off, because what the elderly farmer that has the ability to pay doesn't pay, the low income farmer is going to have pay for him. Somebody else is going to have to pay those taxes. I seriously hope that the government, when they talk about introducing this legislation, are going to seriously consider the implications of that particular aspect of their program.

One other thing that concerns me, Mr. Chairman is the question of credit. I would like to hear the minister's comments as to where he puts the priorities. I think the idea of having extending credit to farmers who can use it effectively is indeed sound. But I get a little bit concerned, Mr. Chairman, about the prospect of the government making substantial loans to encourage more people to get into farming, and consider such action on an equal priority with the question of trying to do something to alleviate circumstances relating to the people already in farming who are in the lower income category. I would hope that the government, in its programs on credit, is certainly going to place a higher priority so far as credit is concerned on the part of those that are already in the business, as opposed to using public money for credits to encourage the development of even more uneconomic small farm areas.

I think our leader's statements on this particular matter are relevant. Some years back, one of my constituents came to me and was

23-78

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

most unhappy because he claimed the government wasn't doing anything for farmers. It turned out his plight was that he had \$120,000 in credit to build a milking parlour, or he had \$120,000 invested, that is what he put into it over and above what he paid for his farm units in the first place. Out of the \$120,000, \$100,000 of it was credit. Well, the only thing I could admire the man for was his ability to get credit, because obviously he had far more credit than he could effectively utilize and manage. In the final analysis it didn't do him any good and I suspect it maybe deprived those that really could have used it beneficially from getting credit that was necessary. I think everyone is concerned with the problems facing the small farmer with low income. Credit in itself doesn't necessarily provide all the answers, and I'm sure the hon. minister knows that, but I would like to know where he puts his priority and what his views on this are. I have only got about three other points and I'm sure that the hon. minister has a lot that he wants to say at this point.

Another thing I would like to comment on and have the hon. minister's views on, Mr. Chairman. We heard him comment about the bans on vertical integration; as he said it's banned by legislation but he has let it be known that it's a matter of government policy that this is what this government's position is. I certainly concur with him and I also agree with his approach that government by speaking softly and carrying a big stick doesn't have to have legislation to get some of these things done. So I don't quarrel with the position that he has taken, nor the approach that he has taken to do it, because if the way he is trying to do it will work I think it is far better than the question of legislation. In addition I'm not sure that you can do it by legislation; there is always a loophole someplace that people can get around.

But I don't think that talking about banning vertical integration as a matter of policy really deals with the entire problem. From my standpoint the large operation that is individually owned, that's turning out sizeable amounts of production presents a situation that's comparable to a vertical integrated operation. The large individual producer is just as much of a problem as the vertical, integrated operation, so far as the small producer is concerned.

And I note, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. minister made the statement that the government has told the Egg Marketing Board that something should be done about limiting the quotas on large egg producers. Did I understand you right Mr. Minister? Well in that regard, Mr. Chairman, I can't quite see how you could ignore the question of some of the large producers that are also involved in the beef business and in the hog business, regardless of whether vertical integration is involved or not. I can't quite see how you can ignore the questions of the large producers that are also involved in the beef business and the hog business regardless of whether vertical integration is involved or not. I can only conclude that when one doesn't take action on two of these products as opposed to eggs that it must be because of the lobbies involved that the hon. Member for Macleod spoke of. I would also appreciate hearing the hon. minister's remarks on that particular subject.

A third matter I would like to hear the hon. minister's views on, is in relationship to the studies into the rural natural gas distribution system. I think this is probably a worthwhile study. I must confess, Mr. Chairman, I have some scepticism about how economical this is going to be and in the final analysis regardless of how desirable it might be. I can only hope that when the hon. minister is setting up the terms of reference for this study that it isn't just a study into natural gas distribution but rather that it will be a study into the comparative costs of supplying fuel at low prices for the farm consumer. There are many cases where it simply is not within the realms of common sense to pipe natural gas to isolated farm buildings. In many such cases fuel oil simply can't be

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-79

-----

competed with as far as the prices are concerned. I also point out, Mr. Chairman, that when one looks at the reserves of energy in this province where we have got something like an 800 year supply of coal at the present rate of production. When you include the mineable portion of the tar sands, we have several hundred years of reserves of oil in Alberta. But then you take a look at the natural gas situation where we have at the present rate of production, something like 23 years or 30 years reserves. This is a comparatively small reserve as compared to the other different types of energy. Certainly I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that notwithstanding the intentions of the government to try to protect the consumer in Alberta from increasing prices of natural gas, there are going to be tremendous pressures on natural gas prices in Alberta in the final analysis. Coming up with public money to subsidize and support rural gas installation systems that are really, basically, not economically sound under the present conditions could prove quite a financial disaster ten or fifteen years from now. I hope the study will be a comparative study into supplying low cost energy for farmers and not just limited to the economics of installing natural gas.

The last item I would like to hear the hon. minister's views on, Mr. Chairman, is the question of where the government stands relative to the federal government's propositions for two-price wheat? This is basically a subsidy. What recommendations has the Government of Alberta made to the federal government on this particular question? In my own view, Mr. Chairman, I would hope the government doesn't favour an across-the-board subsidy for large and small producers, based simply on the number of bushels of wheat, but rather that the money is distributed to the low-income farmers in preference to seeing it go to the large producers who really don't need it.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could deal with some of the points the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc brought up very briefly. First of all in relation to credit. In my view, as I have said in this Legislature before, credit needs have to be tied to a marketing opportunity and therefore a production opportunity. There is absolutely no point in loading our farmers with any additional debt if they don't have the cash flow to retire that debt and at the same time improve their income. And our objective in any of our credit programs, whether they be guaranteed loan programs or direct lending programs on a similar basis, or an extension of the kind of basis in relation to the old Farm Purchase Board, will be based on that philosophy primarily. Credit should be provided where we know there is a marketing opportunity where, in fact, when we sit down with that individual farmer and give him that additional debt, he is going to have the cash flow to retire the debt and improve his income. If we can't do that then I don't think we are doing him any favour at all by making any more credit available to him.

The other point the hon. member makes and which I also tried to make is the entire question of operating credit to present farmers, and this is one that has become a very serious matter in all of Alberta, primarily because there has been some reluctance in the traditional banking areas to finance the kind of operations in the total amounts that are required in ordinary farm operations. I think in those two areas, generally, that there is our policy, to make sure that there is a marketing opportunity for the additional debt so that it can be repaid. That we do look at the area of operating credit which is so important if the farmer is going to make use of the pretty extensive capital investment that he has.

Then if I could jump quickly to the question of the two-price system, we have, as a party, always been in favour of a two-price system. When the hon. member says it is a subsidy, I agree. It is a consumer subsidy paid for by the federal Treasurer. I don't consider it a subsidy to agriculture, I consider it a just and responsible

23-80

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

payment in relation to the cheap food policy that is advocated and has been put in effect in Canada by the federal government for a number of years. In my view again, it is a consumer subsidy. Our representations to the federal government in relation to the two-price system were two-fold. Initially they were part of our counter proposals of the three western provinces to the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board in regard to the stabilization bill. We suggested that we would like to see a two-price system enshrined in that legislation as part and parcel of the Stabilization Act so that the stabilization would take into account some of the costs of production, some of the other additional costs that are involved in farming and would be a more meaningful stabilization bill rather than just stabilizing at any price.

In addition to that we made representations after the two-price system was announced, on the way that it should be paid. We made them on the grounds that we felt that all of the grain producers in Alberta should be benefited by such a payment. The permit books that they were going to use to make the payment were the same permit books that were very seriously affected by the operation lift. If you're then going to turn around and say, "we're going to pay you to take land out of wheat, but now we're just going to make the payment to wheat growers," it seems to me it would be patently unfair. The difference, if you take the total amount payable under the two-price system at \$63 million, if it had been paid on the basis of only wheat, the allocation to Alberta would have been somewhere in the neighbourhood of -- I have these figures somewhere exactly -- but somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$17 or \$18 million. If you make it on the basis of the permit book and on a general cultivated acreage basis, having regard to all grains, Alberta's share of the \$63 million goes up pretty dramatically to something like almost \$27 million. It's now going to be paid on that basis. Alberta's share should be \$10 million more than we would have got if we had been on a strict wheat acreage basis. So those are our representations to Mr. Lang in relation to the two-price system and how it should be paid and also in relation to the question of having it enshrined in legislation in Ottawa so that in fact we wouldn't have to keep fighting for it every year.

That deals with the question of credit and the question of the two-price system. In relation to the rural gas situation --

MR. HENDERSON:

Would the hon. minister permit before he leaves the question of the two-price system? I was concerned in knowing what the government's position is on the allocation of the two-price funds that would be coming to Alberta within the farmers of the province, between the small producer and the large producer. Was there a limit to be put on?

DR. HORNER:

We also advocated that there should be an acreage limit on the amount of acreage paid and again as a general statement we discussed with Mr. Lang the number of alternatives and I might say this, we were in general agreement with; the future acreage that he has come down with as I understand it, it is 300 acres and I think this is a fair and appropriate level.

In regard to the question of natural gas, we of course appreciate that there is no point at all in government getting involved in a scheme whereby we're going to saddle the farmer with high cost fuel. On the other hand it is my view that I would hope that out of this feasibility study will come the possibility of servicing a great majority of the farmers of Alberta at a reasonable cost and a reasonable rate and would go a long way to improving the quality of life in the farms of Alberta. I appreciate that we're not



April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-81

going to put gas into areas where alternate fuels may be cheaper. I see nothing wrong with having a multiple policy in that area so that in fact we might be able to do something in relation to other fuels like fuel oil or propane, where it wouldn't be feasible to extend a natural gas pipeline.

While I'm up, Mr. Chairman, if I might just comment in relation to some of the statements made by the hon. Member for Drumheller, particularly in relation to the idea that because one is publicly joined to a political party, that he can then no longer be appointed to any boards. Of course we have had instances in the past when some pretty prominent Social Crediters, defeated and otherwise, were appointed to pretty prominent boards and I have no doubt they were appointed for their ability. I can refer to a couple of defeated Cabinet Ministers, for instance, and I can also refer to the chap that I defeated in Lac Ste. Anne who just happened to get a fairly good job with AGT the day after the election. I have nothing against him having that job mind you but if the hon. member is suggesting for a moment that that wasn't one of the considerations of the former government, then he's trying to push something down our throats that is pretty unpalatable.

Yes, well, I am sure the hon. Member for Clover Bar is very aware of the ability in question there. I did want to cite, though, in a general way, the representations that he has made, and also the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, with regard to the farm organizations, going to the farm organizations and asking them to place members on various boards. I think in certain instances this may be fine. But I would ask both hon. members to give some consideration to this thought: that once you do that, in fact, then, the farm organization doesn't have as good a chance to make general representations to the board or commission generally because they already have a man representing them on it. I think then, and I have given this a lot of thought, that the farm organizations may be able to make better representation by sitting down as a general body with a group like the Grains Commission, and having a general discussion. In my view, they would have more impact and be better able to get their views across to that commission than if they had one member on the commission. Because where do you stop when you start asking people for nominations to such a commission? Do you stop with the pools, the Unifarm, the NFU, the Line Elevator Association, the Feed Manufacturers Association, the Western Stockgrowers, the Alberta Cattle Commission, the Hog Marketing Board? All of these are using feed grains ad infinitum. I could give the hon. members a list of about 25 organizations that are involved and I suggest to them very sincerely that I think these organizations will be able to have a better impact by meeting with the commission as a body than they would have if they had an individual on that board.

I want to also clear up the other point that my hon. friends were making a little bit of a pun with. I said that the gentlemen that were appointed to the commission generally believed in the new directions in which we were going. I didn't say that they agreed with all of my ideas, but we do have to have those new directions and we are bound that we are going to get them.

I hope that I have covered all of the points that the hon. member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc wanted me to -- which one?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, the question to do with vertical integration as opposed to the threats of large producers -- privately owned operations.

23-82

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

DR. HORNER:

Well, I think that this is a continuing thing that one has to keep a view on. As I've said, in the egg industry we've asked them to limit the quotas. I think that we have to -- in the other areas -- and it only applies to where you have quotas, because certainly there is a limit now of 700,000 pounds in the dairy industry placed there by the Canadian Dairy Commission, and we will continue that limit under the market share program that's now in effect. That's the only area at the moment where you have quotas where you might want to put a maximum ceiling on the amount of production. I think that it has to be done on a flexible basis --

MR. HENDERSON:

Did I misunderstand what the minister said that you had suggested to the Egg Marketing Board that the limit should replace total limits on some egg producers?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, I suggested for the egg industry, because of the nature of that industry that, in fact, there had to be an upper ceiling and in some of the others there may have to be also. I think though that in general again, it's more a question of a continual review, if you like, or a continual matter of overseeing the thing to make sure it doesn't get out of balance. Certainly in relation to the integrated companies, I think that most of them, after having some experience -- and there are a number you could recite -- are only too pleased to start to make arrangements to get out of primary production because they know that individual family farms, however you define them, are much more efficient at it.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if I could just raise another question which is related directly to this. When you speak of integration, do you look upon the sugar beet industry in the south as a vertical integration operation, and if you do, then do you intend to prevent that one from carrying on?

DR. HORNER:

No, I don't think that it can be looked on in the same way as another. I think the sugar beet operation certainly has to be classified in an area all by itself because of the nature of the markets for sugar, the problems that they have in relation to the tariff. As a matter of fact, today I had another copy of their submission to the Tariff Board in Ottawa in which we are trying to substantiate their representations to The Tariff Board in relation to the sugar beet industry in Canada. As the hon. Leader is aware, Alberta is the last remaining area in which there is any major acreage of sugar beets. I think it would be really sad if that acreage had to be put back into other ordinary crops. I think the sugar beet industry has to be classified in a different way and would have to be looked at as a special case in any regard, whether or not you classify that as integrated or otherwise.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter this debate just for a few moments to, not only express my appreciation for the remarks that have been made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, but also my appreciation for the concern that has been expressed by hon. members opposite with regard to the development of the family farm and the development of agriculture generally in Alberta.

There have been some points raised, however, by those opposite that I would like to respond to. I sat through a lengthy debate some weeks ago that questioned the validity of task forces. I have

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-83

-----

listened to comments from the hon. Member for Calgary Millican and the hon. Member for Wainwright with respect to a trip I made to Ottawa in connection with federal provincial relations in agricultural policy.

I have listened briefly tonight to some concern that has been expressed with regard to the makeup and the ability of the members of the Alberta Grain Commission. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, at the outset, that I do not now and hope I never will, have to apologize in this House for the contribution I have been making during these past six months in the development of agriculture policy, or the ability I might have in the development of that policy, or the ability I might have in representing my constituency as a politician in this Legislature. I come from a family background which has many generations of activity in both the field of agricultural development and political activity, including, as some hon. members opposite would know, a grandfather who spent some 12 years sitting with the Social Credit party in this House. I would like to say a little more on that later.

First of all, with respect to the Task Force on Agriculture, the hon. members opposite have on three occasions expressed the opinion that it is desirable for this province to consult and confer with federal government officials on all occasions about all matters reflecting on agriculture in Alberta, and to ensure that we, in Alberta, are not handed agricultural policies from the federal government, and that we have some input in developing them. If any of the hon. members opposite are concerned about the things I did on a trip to Ottawa in regard to development of agriculture policy in the Province of Alberta, I'd appreciate you coming to me and asking me, and I can certainly tell you a lot of things, in my view, that are worthy of that trip.

Another trip I made out of the Province of Alberta, which the hon. members were not aware of, was to Regina to the Prairie Economic Council meeting, where I had the good fortune to represent the hon. Minister of Agriculture in talks regarding farm machinery testing, the very thing you have said tonight. It's great that Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta have been able to work together.

I might add, Mr. Chairman, that I have been looking forward these past two or three weeks to finding a couple of days when I can travel to Vancouver with the chairman of the Alberta Grains Commission to have a first-hand look at the situation there and a discussion with people in the grain handling and moving industry so that we might better follow up the terms of reference that have been provided to the Alberta Grains Commission.

With respect to the Grains Commission itself, there has been some concern expressed again tonight by the hon. Member for Wainwright that our position in agriculture should be to provide for a fair return for what we produce. I would just like to read for the record, in case the hon. members are not aware exactly what the terms of reference of the Alberta Grains Commission are:

- (1) To examine all facets of the grains, oil seeds and other crops industry in Alberta including storage, transportation, marketing and stabilization with a view to developing positive policy recommendations to the Minister of Agriculture whereby net income of Alberta farmers will be improved. That is one of the major terms of reference of the Alberta Grains Commission.
- (2) To maintain liaison with other governments, groups, or boards outside and within the province as may be necessary in carrying out the objectives of the Commission.

23-84

ALEERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

- 
- (3) To develop and carry out operational plans to achieve such policies, goals and objectives as may be designated by the minister.

MR. RUSTE:

Would the hon. member just read that first one again? I have a copy here dated March 22nd and was just wondering.

MR. MOORE:

Revised terms of reference dated March 30th.

MR. RUSTE:

I'm sorry.

MR. MOORE:

Those terms of reference, Mr. Chairman, were derived in consultation with the Minister of Agriculture and members of the Alberta Grain Commission at a meeting on March 30th which was a week ago yesterday, I believe. At that first meeting the Commission's terms of reference, it was suggested, are far reaching, and Mr. Channon, who is the chairman of that Commission, said that its main objective was to develop positive policy recommendations to the Minister of Agriculture, whereby net income to Alberta farmers will be improved - that was a press release of March 30th.

With respect to other members of the Commission there have been some comments from the opposite side, and very sincere ones, with respect to the people who work in the Department of Agriculture as civil servants. I too have a great respect for those people and I realize that they are sincere and responsible in the job that they are trying to carry out. I think that you should also show that same kind of respect for those farmer members of the Alberta Grains Commission, who are not being paid a fabulous salary but are taking some considerable amount of their own time to try and improve a situation in Alberta which really has not had a vehicle within the provincial government prior to this date, to work with.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, just in relation to the comments that all of the members of the Grains Commission, and for that matter I suppose include all the members on the government side of the House not on the Executive Council who are required to think as the hon. Minister of Agriculture does. Now I think he explained in his earlier remarks that they are going in somewhat the same direction. I spent a good deal of time over the two or three years prior to the last election attending some 12 or 13 meetings throughout this province, from Lethbridge to north of Peace River and developing policy not only in the field of agriculture but in other fields as well, that the foundation of this government was built on. I hope the hon. gentlemen will recognize that there is a difference between thinking exactly as the hon. Minister of Agriculture does, and having some policy directions that follow the same line of thought.

Just in that regard, I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks that I had a grandfather who sat in this legislature for a good number of years as a member of the Social Credit party and I would have to say in closing, Mr. Chairman, that he was finally rejected by that party because of his ability and his desire to speak for the people that he represented rather than the party that he was a member of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-85

---

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I believe the hon. Member for Highwood has tried to get up twice.

MR. BENOIT:

I am not going to make any remarks, Mr. Chairman, but I do have three or four general questions that cover the entire department and they have to do mostly with procedure. One of them has to do with the question that was raised the other day regarding the detailed estimates of revenue for each of the departments. Maybe the question wasn't put clearly and I didn't get the answer, but we won't have anything in our possession that compares to those detailed estimates of revenue. Is that correct?

DR. HORNER:

Well, the hon. Provincial Treasurer indicated the other day that the revenue estimates are in the budget speech and in the other documents attached to the budget speech and --

MR. BENOIT:

I appreciate that but they do not give department by department revenue in there nor do they give the details. We have some 50 minor details in there.

MR. MINIELY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I will refer the hon. member again to Table C1, which provides not only the previous year's estimates but estimates over the last several years and also our estimates. The revenue is not, as you say, broken down into departments but the revenue would be covered in the discussion of the Treasury Department estimates.

MR. BENOIT:

Yes, but not broken down by departments?

MR. MINIELY:

That's right, but we will. And when the Treasury Department estimates reach that stage you can fully debate the revenue items at that time.

MR. BENOIT:

Fine. That's what I wanted to know. Now, the second question that I have deals with the third column on the right-hand side of the left page, the 1970-1971 Actual, and throughout the entire agriculture estimates it has N/A which I presume means not available, or does it mean not applicable?

MR. MINIELY:

Not applicable.

MR. BENOIT:

Now why is this the case -- not applicable in the entire department in this case -- as compared to other departments where it does apply?

23-86

ALEERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

DR. HORNER:

Well, because of the changes in the transfer of certain sections out of the Department of Agriculture, such as water resources, the agriculture colleges, then also some transfers to the Department of Agriculture such as the Co-operative Activities Branch and the Right of Entry Arbitration Board --

MR. BENOIT:

Is that the case in every N/A then, because throughout the entire department it is N/A? That is the point I am confused about.

MR. MINIELY:

I wonder if I could also add some clarification to that. You are referring to the Expenditure Estimates where you see N/A in certain appropriations --

MR. BENOIT:

In all of the Department of Agriculture? Every one of them is that way.

MR. MINIELY:

No, that is the 1970-1971 actual.

MR. BENOIT:

Yes.

MR. MINIELY:

Well, basically at that time, the actual expenditures were provided for the year 1971-1972 forecast and we have the actual '70-'71 estimates. But you were correct in your initial statement that, with respect to the actual expenditures in 1970-1971, they are not provided for in those appropriations in the Department of Agriculture -- the actual expenditures for '70-'71. The actual expenditures for '71-'72 are included and the estimates for '71-'72 are included.

MR. BENOIT:

Well I may want to raise it again, because the Department of Agriculture is the only one where it has N/A throughout the whole department; the others have some figures on that column instead of N/A you see. This is the thing that bothers me, but we may be able to raise it in another one.

Another question that I have, there is nothing to indicate which votes have been removed and which ones have been changed so we will just come to them and discuss them as we go along, is that the idea?

MR. MINIELY:

We will be tabling a reconciliation of all votes transferred between departments. I believe, although I am not sure of the timing of this, but it reconciles our budget with all the previous estimates presented to the Legislature, vote by vote, and it includes all the transfers. Okay?

MR. BENOIT:

One final question, with regard to the farm machinery committee investigating the companies, I may have missed it. Did you say when that committee would be established or is it already established?

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-87

---

DR. HORNER:

It is in the formative stage at the moment.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, there is one remark made by the hon. Member for Smoky River that I have to take exception to. And that is in reference to his grandfather, when he said he was rejected by the party. I have to say that this man ran as a candidate in a nominating convention and was defeated, but there was no rejection by the party as such that I have ever heard about and certainly this is news to me.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Leader of the Opposition hasn't heard of the events surrounding that rejection, I'd be only too happy to fill him in at any time. I might advise that the minutes of the nomination meeting in the Spirit River riding back in 1955 were destroyed shortly after the meeting, and I can fill him in on many other details too.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I realize that we are discussing an item that I really don't think appears in the Department of Agriculture and I hesitate to rise on it, but I simply point out to the hon. members that if we are talking about rejection by the party, then we have to assume that the hon. Member for Cardston was rejected last, or four years ago. This time he is back in -- are we to assume that he is accepted? These are the normal procedures that take place at nominating conventions, and I simply have to point out that I have had enough experience in a lot of them that I recognize much of the feeling that develops, but again I have to say -- and I speak of the party and its operation from headquarters -- that there has never to my knowledge been any direct interference in a nominating convention of this government.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder if we could now give the hon. member --

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to prolong this type of a debate. I think it has no place in here, but quite frankly, I was trying to point out that the criticism coming from the other side of the House with respect to how members on this side think is not justified in view of things that actually did happen in that party some years ago, and I am sorry if I offended the hon. --

MR. STROM:

But when we are discussing items and a member sees fit to raise something in this House that casts reflection on a party that is represented in this House, and I happen to be the leader of it, then I must take exception to it. Maybe I should have objected to it when it was raised, because I don't think that it is part of the agricultural estimates that we are discussing. I simply say that it should not have been raised in this discussion. I would be happy to sit down with the hon. member to get the details and check it out, but I feel that I must at this time point out it is not part of the agricultural estimates, and it should not have been raised. I think we should keep the debate to the subject at hand. If we get out of order, then certainly, I think it is up to the hon. members to bring us into order and also yourself, Mr. Chairman.

23-88

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well. I will now have the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill speak.

MR. FARRAN:

I wanted to deal briefly with a point raised by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc which again doesn't specifically refer to the estimates, but it was raised by him. It touches on a particular area of mine, and it related to the removal of education tax from senior citizen farmers. He used the most extraordinary logic when he said that this was against the principle of maintaining the family farm. Now the hon. Minister of Agriculture didn't deal with it, perhaps he didn't think it was worth answering, but --

MR. HENDERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I think the hon. member, as usual, is quoting me out of context. I was saying with reference to the matter of making the rich farmer richer and the poor farmer poorer, and that was the context in which I offered the remark.

MR. FARRAN:

. . . that the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc said this would encourage the farmers of over 65 years of age to stay on the farms and not turn them over to their sons. Well, first of all, I dispute the logic that seems to say that the rural dweller should be treated in any different manner in this sort of policy than the urban dweller. I think this is utterly wrong. We are grouping together town and country in this province and they should be treated alike as far as possible, when we recognize that farm dwellings are not assessed so we have to apply it to land. But when he talks about rich farmers, there is a limit of assessment of \$40 an acre. On a quarter section, for the best land in the province, this would give an assessment of \$6,400. You multiply that by 30 mills and it comes to \$192. If you take off the \$75 homeowner grant, if he chooses to take the foundation plan levy if given this option, he gets a total benefit of \$117. Now if you think that is making the rich farmer richer, I just don't follow the logic at all.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to report to the hon. member's comments since he referred to me by saying -- if we were only talking about every farmer owning a section of land, I could agree with the member 100 per cent. But what I am talking about is the farmer that owns ten sections, the large farmer. I didn't bother mentioning the question of the urban dweller, simply because we were not talking about urban estimates. We were talking about farming estimates, and I thought I would save my remarks on the urban subject until they get around to the appropriate part of the estimates.

MR. KING:

Mr. Chairman, I have only two very general questions that I would like to raise at this time, and in point of fact, they may more easily be answered as we come to specific estimates. I only want to ask the questions and not make any comments since the hon. members of the House are well aware of my feelings at any rate.

I would like to know, with respect to the Department of Agriculture, what plans there are for the decentralization of any of the programs of the department, particularly any of the boards, commissions, laboratories, or research facilities of the Department of Agriculture? As I say, the hon. minister may prefer to answer on specific appropriations rather than now.



April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-89

I would secondly like to know what plans there are, if any, for rotating into the department and out of the department, personnel on a short-term basis, either from the business community, the university community, or the interest groups who are associated with agriculture. I am thinking of bringing people in to initiate or to head up a new thrust or a new direction in a specific program for a one year, 18 month, or two year period and then release them back to their former community and bring in someone else to bring a different perspective.

DR. HORNER:

I think both questions are well worthwhile. We intend to work very closely with the Task Force on Government Decentralization, headed by the hon. Member for St. Paul. We intend to review all of the activities with the department in relation to whether or not these activities can, in fact, be decentralized.

In relation to the second question asked by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands, that is a problem in personnel that my deputy minister has looked at in some detail. We would be quite willing to develop this kind of a program. We hope to develop it with the federal Department of Agriculture and have an exchange of personnel, if you like, to work in their department and in ours so that we can have people who are knowledgeable about both areas and improve our contacts with Ottawa. But I think it would be worthwhile developing the industry and farm organizations as well. I appreciate the comment.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, there is one other point that I feel compelled to speak on before the general discussion closes. That was raised by the hon. Member for Smoky River also. We on this side have never raised any objection to the terms of reference which he outlined. The terms of reference are fine. We have never raised any objections to hon. members travelling to see what is going on in other parts of the world. We certainly have no objections to people going to conventions or to conferences or to see items of interest to them, such as the Vancouver port. Our objections are that when these things are done, they should be done under a proper legislative committee and not as a caucus committee. Our objection is that it is unsound for this to be done as a caucus committee and to be paid for by public funds. I want to make the record very straight with regard to that item.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a couple of questions of the hon. minister. Perhaps he may not wish to give a reply this evening, but I think it pertains to this matter. I note that a number of boards have been formed and appointments made. However, I haven't had any information as to the permanency of these appointments. I am of the opinion that very few of them, if any, should have permanent positions. I would also like to know what the minister's views are on women representation on the boards, and in what numbers. I am sure that it is not going to be a token answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, if I could take the last one first in relation to the question of women on boards, I think that this is an excellent idea and that we intend to include them in the structuring of some of the boards down the road, particularly in regard to consumer

23-90

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

representation, in relation to some of the marketing boards in councils. We think women should be on those particular boards. I'm sure that as we go through the estimates you'll see a major expansion in the use of home economists in our urban areas and as a total part and parcel of our marketing thrust the use of home economists in a major way in this area.

In addition to that, in the planning and policy secretariat, we intend to have a woman employee of the department on that policy secretariat to make sure we get the input from the better halves, and in relation to their contribution that they can give to agriculture generally.

I think in the area of family farm development that the addition of farm housewives to some of the committees or boards as they may be structured would be an excellent idea and would give the input that is required in that area. So we are looking at this very seriously and do intend to make much greater use of women on our boards generally.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I just wonder, it's getting very close to closing time. Just so that there is no confusion about the N/A, with respect to all departments you will find that there are certain categories of appropriations that do have this designation. I think that all hon. members will appreciate that this is really supplementary and additional information that we've tried to incorporate in the estimates this year, along with much other additional information that has been included in the estimate books that have been presented. This placed a tremendous amount of additional pressure on the departments with the short period of time we had available to present and draw up the budget for presentation to the Legislature. And so in certain cases the departments simply were not able to provide the actual in this particular year. That is the situation, but I would like to be clear that it is really supplementary information that has not been provided in the past and we've tried to include as much as possible.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman while we're on this particular point, would the hon. Provincial Treasurer explain why there is a dash after Grants under the '71-'72 estimates, because there is actually a \$50,000 vote in the 1971-72 -- on 1102 -- it says \$50,000 for '71-'73 and nothing under '71-'72 and there is actually \$50,000 in our last year's estimates under that item.

DR. HORNER:

This particular grant under 1102 at this time is an additional grant fund. The other grants are in some of the other votes that were there under 1103 and 1104 and there are additional ones in 1111, 1121, 1124 and 1123. This is an additional amount of money for grants under general administration.

MR. TAYLOR:

But the point I'm raising, Mr. Chairman, is that in 1102, in last year's estimates there is \$50,000 shown under Grants. This year there is a dash which would indicate there was nothing provided last year, which is not accurate. If you want time to check that out, that's all right.

While we're on that, Materials and Supplies again is shown as nothing in '71-'72, and in the estimates there was an estimate for Materials and Supplies of \$8,500. I can't understand why the dash is there. Similarly under Travelling Expenses in '71-'72, there is an

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-91

-----  
expenditure of \$5,100, and it shows nothing, and under the last one, Other Expenses, it shows \$75,550 and I can't even find that figure in 1102 in last year's estimates. I wonder if the Provincial Treasurer could check these and find out what is happening.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, when we get to 1102, firstly, there were substantial transfer votes in the reorganization that we undertook. I'll certainly provide that answer to you and bring it back. We're not on that particular vote now so --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

We are, we are.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes, we are on it now.

MR. MINIELY:

I will get that information back to you on it before we close tonight.

MR. HENDERSON:

On that particular point, if there is much of this going on in all the estimates it is going to be a very confusing and slow procedure, if we have to ask all these questions each time. It would certainly, I think, expedite the affairs of the House if the hon. Treasurer could make available to us all the information about these transfers. It would make it a little easier. Have you got it here?

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. Provincial Treasurer mentioned that there were other departments where this took place. Now I have scanned through here and I can't find it. I do find in other departments where there is a blank or just a line through, but I can't find any other where there is this same terminology.

MR. MINIELY:

There is one other point, Mr. Chairman. I -- oh, I'm sorry.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, just while we are on this particular matter, I would refer the hon. Provincial Treasurer to the supplementary information that went with the estimates in the last three years. As I recall, it started about three years ago, wasn't it, at the request of the opposition at that time? It may all be in there, but with all due respect, I'll be darned if I can find it. If I could just go on, could I say that I am at a bit of a loss to understand how, if we could have the 1971-72 forecasts as to what is going to be spent and not spent, how come we can't have the actuals for 1970-71?

So I would ask the hon. Treasurer in the course of, perhaps until tomorrow or whenever we get back on these estimates -- to give some consideration, especially as far as agriculture is concerned, in light of the number of changes that have been made in this area and the interest that all members have expressed, that if we couldn't have the actuals for 1970-71, going back to the supplementary information which has been prepared in the past -- and this is for the 1971-72 fiscal year, the members discussed the estimates for 1971-72, the estimates for 1970, and the actual expenditures for

23-92

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 6th 1972

---

1969-70. And I do appreciate that that is in a number of other areas other than agriculture.

But certainly with the amount of discussion that has gone on here this evening, I think it would be very helpful to members if we could have the actuals for 1970. I appreciate people in the department are more than up to their ears, but now that the budget storm is out of the way and you might be able to get someone who could do this, I think it would be very helpful to members.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I will look at this, and if it is at all possible we will certainly do so. The reconciliation of votes we will table before the next evening's budget session. This includes all the votes transferred between departments.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, along those same lines, would the hon. minister consider on page 102, which shows supplementary up to March 31, 1972, and have a reconciliation of those as well?

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one other suggestion. The hon. minister stated that he was endeavouring to make this so clear that a layman could understand it. I wonder if he would also endeavour to make it so clear that MLA's may understand it.

MR. MINIELY:

I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that the former government is so used to a system that they carried on for 36 years that we have confused them a little bit, and we will try to clarify that for them.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

In that case is it agreed that we hold off proceeding with No. 1102 until we get the additional information?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, I move that we adjourn.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The Committee rose at 11:10 p.m.]

\* \* \* \* \*

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain estimates, reports progress, and begs leave to sit again.

April 6th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

23-93

MR. SPEAKER:

It has been moved that the Committee be given leave to sit again. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, briefly, concerning tomorrow's business, we will continue with the Department of Agriculture estimates until four o'clock tomorrow afternoon, at which time we will move to consideration of second reading of government bills and orders on the Order Paper on page 7. This afternoon I sent to the hon. House Leader opposite a list of those bills, all of which I think are non-controversial, but will generate good debate which would be considered, starting at four o'clock, starting with the Department of Education Amendment Act No. 19, and then Nos. 5, 8, 13, 14 and 17.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I express appreciation to the hon. Government House Leader for giving us this advance information. It is very helpful.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister moves that the House do adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 11:13 p.m.]

