

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, April 11th, 1972

(The House met at 2:30 pm.)

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 26: The Beverage Container Amendment Act 1972

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being The Beverage Container Amendment Act 1972. An objective of the bill is to further reduce the litter problem by extending the provisions of The Beverage Container Act to make further items refundable such as the liquor, wine, and imported beer bottles. Further, the bill will permit substantial improvements to the depot system in Alberta for the convenience of Albertans in obtaining refunds for beverage containers.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 26 was introduced and read for a first time.]

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, that The Beverage Container Amendment Act be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. GRUNWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of very important guests in the speaker's gallery that I would like to introduce to you and to the hon. members of this Legislature. The first one is -- being ladies first -- is Mrs. Sue Wearmouth. I am sure that the people on the other side of the House will recognize that name, incidentally. I would just like to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that she is a member of the Calgary Separate School Board and the Vice-President of the Alberta School Trustees' Association. She is also accompanied by Mr. Raymond Clark, who is from Bow Island. He is the immediate past president of the Alberta School Trustees' Association. He is also the Mayor of Purdett. He is a very energetic and enthusiastic community worker, I can assure you, and is a very successful businessman. These people are both richly endowed with special blessings, insofar as they are both from the fringe area of Lethbridge. Would you please stand and be recognized?

26-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of this Assembly, 13 students from Victoria Composite High School in my constituency of Edmonton Centre. The students, Mr. Speaker, are accompanied by Mr. Scragg, Mr. Simbalist, and Mrs. Shadlow. It is particularly pleasing for me to introduce this group, as these students are enrolled in our government's Priority Employment Training program. The students and their instructors are seated in the members' gallery and I would now ask that they rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to introduce to you and through you to this Assembly, 50 students, young men and women from the Drayton Valley Junior High School. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Newell and Mr. Sawchyn. They are seated in the member's gallery. Would they please rise and be recognized.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure this afternoon to introduce to you and to the members of this Assembly 33 students from the Stony Plain School. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Maronick and the bus driver, Mr. Yoist. This morning they visited the Edmonton Journal, went over to the museum and then came to watch us in action this afternoon. Would they please rise and be recognized.

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to direct your attention, and that of the members of this Assembly to the public gallery, which is practically filled with the finest in the land -- 90 Grade IX students from the J.R. Robson School in Vermilion. They are accompanied by their teachers, Mrs. Jack, Mrs. Stangland, Mr. Pachmann, and their driver, Mr. Stevenson. I do hope that what they see and hear in this Assembly today will help them in their social studies. I ask the students to rise and be recognized.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might take this opportunity to table in the Legislature a letter that I sent to the Prime Minister yesterday. I'd like to read the contents of it:

"The Canadian Press reported today that in your address to the National Newspaper Awards dinner in Toronto, you stated that as part of a proposed new northern transportation system, the federal government is considering an all-weather highway, being the first highway to join southern Canada with our third ocean coast.

"Because of the geographic position of Alberta, and the fact that Alberta is a natural staging area and logistical centre for northern transportation, I wanted to assure your government at the earliest possible time that the government of the Province of Alberta is very interested in working with you on the planning of such an all-weather highway subject to appropriate financing arrangements.

"I trust it will be in order for our Minister of Highways, the hon. Mr. Clarence Copithorne, to contact your Minister of

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-3

Transport, Mr. Jamieson, as a follow-up to your address and to this letter.

"Because the Alberta Legislature is now in session, and due to the public interest that has arisen as a result of your remarks, I propose to table this letter in the Legislature."

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table two documents, being the Impact on the Environment of Surface Mining in Alberta, which is a documentation of the proceedings before the Environment Conservation Authority, held during the fall of 1971. As per the policy of the government, a copy of these hearings was prepared for each member of this Assembly.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report of the accounts of the Alberta Commercial Corporation for the year ending December 31, 1971.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, some days ago, the hon. Member for Drumheller inquired about correspondence between the hon. the Premier and the Civil Service Association. It's my pleasure now to table the letter from the Premier to the president of the Civil Service.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Ombudsman's Telephone Number

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier. Hon. Premier, is it the intention of the government to implement the recommendations of W.S. Shandrowsky, the Co-ordinator of Government Telephone Listings, and print the telephone number of the Ombudsman in all the telephone directories in the province?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot respond specifically to the hon. member's question, but I have read an interesting article in the Calgary Herald of April 10th regarding an effort by staff writer, Mr. John Bennett to contact the Ombudsman. It was my intention to pass this news report on to the hon. Minister of Telephones so that there could be some improvement in the general ease with which the public may communicate with the Ombudsman. Certainly, what the hon. member generally suggests with regard to his question is something that I think has considerable merit, and follows up questions raised by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow several weeks ago.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the government go one step further and accept a suggestion from a Socred -- that of listing a government information Zenith number in all directories throughout the province?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we are always very open as the hon. members opposite know toward suggestions, and certainly that is one that has been made on prior occasions. We will be taking a look at the feasibility of it.

26-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

MR. PUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplemental to that. As it relates to calls to the Ombudsman, if the name was listed in the directories, and I am thinking of the northern, central and so on, would it be possible to have that on a Zenith call so that the individual, no matter where he lives in the province, would be able to call without having any long distance charges?

MR. LOUGHFED:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, I believe it was answered by the previous answer given, and that is certainly something we will look into as part of an effort to make it easier for the public to get in touch with the Ombudsman, and a greater degree of awareness by telephone companies as to the Ombudsman's role and proper function.

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, on this question, at the present time AGT is conducting a study of all government services in providing information and accessibility through the rural areas, and to provide a greater accessibility. The study will be completed very shortly. I think the point raised with respect to the Ombudsman is a valid point, and I will direct the attention of that study group to that specific question.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

The Farm Implement Act

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Is the hon. minister aware that by taking advantage of Section 9, Subsection (2) of The Farm Implement Act, manufacturers have effectively shielded themselves from any action by a farmer for breach of warranty? I am referring more specifically to the case of Arndt vs. Schultz Motors and J. I. Case, which was decided on March 28th, and which effectively rules out the impact of Section 5 of The Farm Machinery Act.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, may I first say that we are in the process now of recruiting a director of The Farm Implement Act. Why this wasn't done before I don't really understand, because the Act was passed last spring. Subsequently, after our taking office we had a look at this entire operation and have decided to try and implement it. I am quite interested in the legal decision the hon. member refers to for a number of reasons, and will be quite willing to, later on, develop alternate legislation if it is necessary to effectively improve the warranties that farmers receive.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. It is my understanding of the legal decision that if the Subsection (2) is eliminated, we don't have a problem. Although I understand there is no intention to bring in a complete overhaul of the Act at this session, would the government consider bringing in an amendment which would eliminate Subsection (2) and at least alleviate this particular problem caused by the legal decision?

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-5

DR. HORNER:

There are a number of problems, Mr. Speaker, in this area that I would like to get cleared up. If we cannot do it by regulation, then it may be necessary to bring in an amendment to the Act.

Cloud Seeding Program

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry, who, I understand, is chairman of the Alberta Research Council. Does the Alberta government plan any direct cloud seeding programs this year for hail suppression?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture.

Veterans' Hospitals

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. A meeting, Mr. Minister, was held in Calgary last Sunday to discuss the possible closing or takeover of the Colonel Belcher Hospital. This meeting was called by the members of the Royal Canadian Legion, Alberta No. 1 Branch, and invitations were extended to some civic officials as well as MLA's from both sides of the House. Were you aware of this meeting?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, but at the time the meeting was held I was not aware of it. I became aware of it on Monday and have received an oral report on the meeting, which I understand relates to the concerns of the veterans as to what could happen if the federal government pressed the policy, which it is tentatively pursuing at the present time, to continue their efforts to have veterans' hospitals taken over by authorities other than the Department of Veterans' Affairs. My understanding as of yesterday is that the group that called the meeting in Calgary, either the Legion or a branch of the Legion, in Calgary is providing me with a copy of their brief by the mails, and it has not yet arrived.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker...

MR. LOUGHEED:

I would like to add that in addition to that I believe the House would be pleased to know that we received a full report with regard to that meeting from the Mayor of Calgary. I personally had a discussion with him about it, and it is something about which our government has considerable concern and intends to give it that sort of concern.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. The concern expressed at the meeting was perhaps to the second paragraph of this letter of invitation. And it reads: "Recently while in Calgary, the Deputy Minister of Veterans Affairs over a local news media, invited on behalf of the federal government any civilian groups interested in the takeover of the Colonel Belcher Hospital. The Royal Canadian Legion in the Province of Alberta vigorously oppose such a proposal."

26-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

And I was just wondering if at this time the hon. minister might like to make some preliminary comments on this proposal.

MP. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think Dr. Hodgson is flying a balloon, and I think that the talk show referred to was some three or four weeks ago, and I know that this has been an area that the federal government has been trying to move towards for at least ten years.

MR. HO LEM:

I have another supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Recently, a wing at the Colonel Belcher Hospital was closed, thus putting additional pressures on the already bed-shortage on the overall hospital picture in Calgary. As a result of this we find that there are some veteran patients in or on the waiting lists of other hospitals. Now, having consideration into the peak-load of veterans which has not yet been reached from World War II, what does the minister feel he can do to alleviate this problem so that the people concerned may have some peace of mind?

MP. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the assurance that I want to give to the House -- although I must say that the area is one of federal responsibility and I don't want to be in the position of announcing policies of any federal government until after the next general federal election, but the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View is not involved in that in any way. Now, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say that despite the concern and sensitivity to the needs of the veterans as we may show and may wish to show, I still have to bear in mind the fact that it is an area of federal responsibility. And when the hon. member asks for an assurance in any way, all it can be is that we will do our utmost within the area of responsibility that we have.

MR. HO LEM:

One final question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the statements made by the hon. the Premier that they have been in touch with the association, I would take it that you will be in touch with the group involved in Calgary, namely the Royal Canadian Legion.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier's statement was that the Mayor of Calgary had given a full report on this subject and I had earlier said that my understanding from the Legion in Calgary is that they are forwarding a written presentation through the mail, and every necessary follow-up will be made.

MR. HO LEM:

They have asked me to forward this to you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, and the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, and then the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

Alternative Edmonton Airport Site

DP. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Industry. As a result of the extensive preliminary favourable studies that have been carried out regarding an

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-7

alternative or additional airport site 10 miles northeast of Edmonton, and with the resultant delay -- despite the fact that the federal authorities have approved the site in principle -- I would like to ask the hon. minister what are the results of the meeting you have had with representatives from this site, and was the City of Edmonton represented at this meeting?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we had a meeting with a group from Edmonton and recommended that they include the City of Edmonton in any further negotiations that they may have with us or meetings that they may have with us and get their approval first.

DR. PAPROSKI:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the hon. minister means that he's not planning to take any further action unless the City of Edmonton moves first?

MR. PEACOCK:

That's right, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Credit Buying

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier. Given the fact that many senior citizens and low income people cannot obtain credit cards, plus those who do not want them, what steps are you or your government planning, if any, to protect these cash buyers from subsidizing credit card losses, expenses and fees?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, there's a presumption in the question that I don't think is accurate.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. Premier or his government aware of recent statements along this line in the Alberta Consumer magazine?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the question of various reports of this nature, and the very fact that they have been published, does not make them accurate. We're aware of the problem and we're giving it consideration. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour might want to add a comment, but I think it's a matter that is under review.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary on the same vein then, Mr. Speaker. Are you planning any steps to protect Alberta citizens from having to notify clubs and companies not to send products that they don't want?

26-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think the evidence of positive contention and immediate action on that matter was illustrated effectively by the hon. Minister of Highways in the same area a few weeks ago with his announcement.

MR. WILSON:

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I didn't make the question clear enough...

MR. SPEAKER:

Strictly speaking the question is out of order because it involves the use of the mails which is a matter of federal jurisdiction.

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Red Deer College Inquiry

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education regarding the Red Deer College inquiry, a follow-up on the question that I asked last week. Will the hon. minister follow the direction established during the SAIT dispute in Calgary, when the government made a statement saying that the results of the public inquiry would, in fact, be made public?

MR. FOSTER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. Premier has dealt with this as I did last week. There is an important distinction to make here and that is that SAIT then, and SAIT now, is part of the Department of Advanced Education and is in one sense therefore different from a college because, as we appreciate, a college is a relatively independent and autonomous body.

Perhaps I should go a bit further, Mr. Speaker, on the matter of recommendations of this inquiry and what we intend to do about them. I would like to say, as a matter of my philosophy in terms of a public inquiry and report to this minister, that I believe very strongly that public business should be done in public, and since we have declared that the matter of the Red Deer College is a matter of public concern, therefore, the report is a matter of public concern and should, as much as possible, be dealt with in public. But at the same time I think we have to recognize that the report of the commissioner will probably touch very directly upon the lives and the roles of some people in that college. And I think that until government has had a chance, in my view at least, to assess the recommendations of the commissioner and perhaps to deal with them to some point, it would be inappropriate to perhaps -- again I'm dealing in a very gray area -- make the report public early, and therefore add to the prejudice or to the uncertainty of the role or the lives of people who may be dealt with in that report.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I feel that once we have had an opportunity of reviewing that report, or any other report, and taking some action, it would be appropriate for the public to know what was in that report and for this minister in particular to respond for, perhaps, not complying with some recommendations. Now maybe I'm not making myself too clear, Mr. Speaker. It depends a great deal on the report -- I will go back to my first principle -- I think public business should be done in public and as much as possible, recognizing the rights of individuals. I will certainly endeavour to do that.

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-9

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Bearing in mind once again the rights of individuals and the fact the report will be finished I understand in early May, and that it's not very long after that time when the students start to decide where they are going to school in the fall, would the hon. minister also keep that factor in mind so the enrolments of the Red Deer College continue in the direction they have, because it is very important that we deal with this matter and get it out of the way, and the show on the road.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. member's opinions expressed and I merely wish to assure him that I am not unminful of the problem here, both as minister and as MLA for the City of Red Deer. I can assure the hon. member and this House, that the matter of the Red Deer College inquiry is obtaining my very personal attention.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright and then the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Stolen Motor Vehicles

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Highways, and perhaps I should pose the problem first and then the question could be more easily understood. Last night the police appeared at the door of one of my neighbours and took away his car which he had purchased two years ago. He was astonished to discover that the car which he had purchased two years ago was a stolen vehicle. He'd taken the normal checks through the Motor Vehicles Branch of registrations and nothing . . .

DR. BUCK:

The question!

MR. KOZIAK:

I appreciate your concern, I think that perhaps if I can put this in proper perspective the question can then be better understood. On checking the registration at Motor Vehicles there is nothing disclosed to the purchaser that would make him aware that the car was stolen or that he was dealing with somebody that did not have proper title to the car. Now my question is; has the department considered making or allocating licence plates to motor vehicles rather than to people so that you have one licence plate allocated to one car for the life of that car and with that particular number allocated to that car for the life of the car rather than having licence plates that are transferable from vehicle to vehicle over the course of a year?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, the question is well taken because it also is very pertinent in regard to motorcycles and these type of vehicles and we are taking it under consideration.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplemental question, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct this to the hon. Attorney General because it deals with a very similar case to the one raised by the hon. Member for Strathcona. Has the government given any consideration to expanding the scope of the Crimes Compensation Commission to cover victims of fraud such as

26-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

the gentleman in Strathcona and also the case of a constituent of mine who suffered the same loss?

MR. LEITCH:

That problem has been brought to my attention. I think it is a very difficult one and involves some very complex matters and while it is a matter of concern, and something we are considering, at this moment I can't be any more definite than that.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the Attorney General, you will recall that recently in Calgary similar incidences had happened regarding the stolen car ring. More specifically a 1968 or 1969 Lincoln was sold and later the police had taken it away, and of course, upon investigation they found that this particular person that was selling this car had sold numerous cars throughout the city during that month. Now would this be perhaps linked up with an organization throughout North America -- organized crime.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! The supplementary has an extremely tenuous connection with its predecessor and I wonder if I might, just at this point, say that I am concerned about the fact that the preambles to the questions are becoming longer and longer and I wonder if we could get them down to their essentials so that they are, in fact, questions rather than speeches.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Clover Par and then the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

MR. RUSTE:

Question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, re dealership. Has he any further information?

DR. HORNER:

No, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would like additional information, I invite him to put a motion for return on the Order Paper.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary basis, I understood that in my earlier questioning that you offered to get the information for me and you didn't mention this prior to this time.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. And this is related to a question I asked several weeks ago, hon. minister. This was in relation to increased representation on county council from Sherwood Park. At that time I believe, you said that there would not be any increase in representation on a county council. My question is; I have heard on

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-11

one of the local news outlets, that there would be an increased representation up to three. I would like to know if you could inform the House if this is so, or not.

MR. RUSSELL:

Yes that's so, Mr. Speaker. At the time the hon. member asked his previous question, I'd have to check the wording, but I think he asked me if there were any moves or legislation being considered to increase the representation and at that time there wasn't. I've been having continuous meetings with the hon. member Mr. Ashton, with the former councillor from Sherwood Park, Mrs. Stewart, I've met with the new councillor, Mr. Jim Ford, and I also had one meeting with the existing county council. As you know this is an old problem. The previous administration didn't act on it, we have acted and we're adding two more representatives from Sherwood Park.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, and then the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put a question to the hon. Minister for Foreign, uh, Intergovernmental Affairs. Regarding the Colonel Belcher Hospital. Inasmuch as Alberta veterans appear to be again threatened by a federal initiative to reduce their rights, will you express concern to the federal government on behalf of veterans in this province, even though the matter may be under federal jurisdiction?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to and I've already had an opportunity to discuss it briefly with the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, so in answer to the hon. member -- yes, by all means.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways. Has he received any representation or complaints concerning the illegal closing of road allowances to rivers, to recreation areas, etc. in the Calgary area?

MR. COPITHORNF:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've received various complaints in this regard and they are taken in due course and careful consideration.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Did the hon. minister receive any correspondence concerning this issue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Point of Order, point of order.

MR. COPITHORNF:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've received correspondence on this.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister table the correspondence and his replies for the benefit of the hon. members here. Would he

26-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

also indicate to the House what stand if any, he is taking, what recommendation is he making with regard to these illegal closings of the road allowances.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Out of order, out of order.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I think that we might be able to table some of that -- it's very difficult, but I think we can probably table that, and he's expressing, the hon. member is expressing his own opinion on the legality of road allowance closures.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, if I'm expressing my opinion, I'd like to . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this a question or . . .

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, and I would like to know in relation to the question I just asked, if -- I would like to know, as the population of this hamlet increases, will they be adding new members, or will they eventually be asked to incorporate?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking a hypothetical question.

DR. BUCK:

May I ask a supplementary then? [Laughter]

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed, agreed.

DR. BUCK:

Will there be further increased representation on county council?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a fair question. I spoke with Reeve Parker at two o'clock today about that, because that is a concern of their council. When I made the decision to act under The County Act, and it is the minister that eventually has to act under that Act, I took those matters into consideration because this was a genuine concern of the council. I also considered the fact that the council, as it is now constituted, is one of the smallest, if not the smallest county council in the province, having only five members. It has only one member representing the area of Sherwood Park, which has in excess of 16,000 people. So there is a great imbalance insofar as representation by population is concerned. We also discussed the matter of the potential incorporation of Sherwood Park as a city, because if it did incorporate right now, it would be Alberta's sixth largest city and it could have a council completely of its own.

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-13

The matter is further complicated by the position of the City of Edmonton, as now put forth, which has requested the provincial government to annex all of the Sherwood Park area and most of the County of Strathcona into the city limits of Edmonton. To that extent, I think the question is legitimate. Whether or not, down the years, some other government or some other minister would respond to the growth in the Sherwood Park area is a hypothetical question. I gave Reeve Parker my word today that insofar as I was concerned as long as I was minister, the balance would remain as it is now in favour of the county area, and that I thought that three members for the council was a step forward and was a good step towards a proper balance.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff, and then the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, and then the hon. Member for Spirit River-Pairview.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Has he had any discussion with Ottawa about the possibility of the Province of Alberta taking over the responsibility for the payment of family allowances, as has been approved by the Province of Quebec? The reason I ask that -- I was wondering are we interested in the transference of this responsibility or will it be used as a bargaining point in perhaps the transference of other responsibilities, such as shared programs?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, when the announcement was made by the Prime Minister of Canada regarding this matter, he not only wrote a letter to Quebec, he wrote a letter to all the provinces in Canada, to our hon. Premier also, presenting their change in thinking. That letter is being assessed, both by our department to some extent, and by the Department of Health and Social Development, and we will be making a reply to the Prime Minister of Canada. We will also be discussing it with other provinces, and then I am sure we will be able to make that information available to the House.

Indian Sit-In at CN Tower

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Is the Cold Lake Indian band still picketing the CN Tower?

MR. GETTY:

I am not quite sure. I have read about it in the Edmonton Journal, the same way as some of the others do. But I would refer that to our hon. Minister without Portfolio in charge of Native Affairs.

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, the last that I heard about it, they were still up there. There was a story just recently that stated that dealings with the federal government were almost at the completion stage and that they may be returning home, I would think possibly within the next week or two.

26-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the hon. Minister of Education a supplementary question on that issue. Has there been any further representation -- I mentioned this question a few weeks back -- has there been any representation to get the Indian children back to school, or are they going to write them off for this year?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, there haven't been any representations made, insofar as I think even the Indians themselves feel that the primary obligation from a constitutional point of view rests not with the provincial authority, but we have, of course, been keeping a close watch on the situation.

MR. WYSE:

I would like to ask a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Have any contributions been made by this government to the band to help them carry on this peaceful picketing?

MR. ADAIR:

I can take that, Mr. Speaker. As I said earlier, quite some time ago as a matter of fact, the situation was being watched by our department, and that we would, if requested, assist them in any way that we could. We have not had any requests as of late, to assist them in any manner over the last two or three months.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Hon. Premier, do you not feel that possibly your government should be looking at this situation a little more closely than you are? I mean, we're saying they are a federal matter, but the children are being educated here, and I feel that possibly we should be taking action.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to respond to that question. No, we do not. And we do not for the reason that we feel in these matters it's very important that before any action is taken by a provincial government in the area of Indian affairs involving the federal government, that it only be taken if there has been a request by the native people who have been involved. As the Minister without Portfolio has answered in the previous question, that did not happen. I think it's very important from a constitutional point of view that the responsibility is the federal government's, and rests with the federal government. If the provincial government assumes unilaterally that responsibility, without first being asked by the native people, we could run into a circumstance where we have prejudiced or jeopardized the rights of the native people of this province relative to their relationships with the federal government.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Have any contributions been made at all to the band since they have been here?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the question has been answered by the hon. minister.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. minister said that during the past two or three months there had been no assistance, and

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-15

certainly left the impression that there may have been some help prior to that. That's the reason the hon. member is asking the question.

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I can respond to that if I may. The request that came -- I believe it was back in late September -- from the representatives at Saddle Lake, Cold Lake and Kahiwin reserves, for us to come up and have a look at the situation, and after looking at the situation then to send a letter to the Prime Minister. We did this. We sent a telegram asking if they could resolve it as quickly as possible, and that was the last correspondence we had and the last request that we had from the people of that area.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Listen to him tell it!

Government Payrolls

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, it must be rather complex here trying to figure out what the firing order is. I'd just like to ask the Government House Leader, Mr. Speaker, if he could give me some indication as to when Return No. 147 might be forthcoming. It refers to the number of employees on payrolls on certain dates starting last year, and so on and so forth, by department. Now that we're in the estimates, we'd like to have it.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, we're working on this question as rapidly as we can. It's an extremely detailed question. The reports have to come in from every department of government, then these have to be catalogued and categorized under the common headings, else the information would be non-usable. And I have to say to you, sir, that we are working at this with real dispatch, but it will take some more time and I would beg the indulgence of the House in this matter.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister give us any idea if it's going to be a week, two weeks?

DR. HOHOL:

Well, it will take more time than that, Mr. Speaker. It will also take a great deal of money. This is an expensive question, and it will also be an expensive answer.

MR. HENDERSON:

That's nothing to you fellows.

Regional Libraries

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. Can the minister advise the House whether he plans to introduce any legislation this session with respect to libraries?

26-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, we have asked all the libraries of Alberta to reply to us what they consider important, should any changes be introduced in the session. They now have replied and we plan to introduce, if possible, legislation in the fall session of this Legislature.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Does the government plan to implement the recommendations of the Leeson study regarding the establishment of 20 regional libraries in the next 20 years?

MR. SCHMID:

We have introduced some regional libraries already, Mr. Speaker, and of course, this submission will be part of our recommendations, if necessary, to this Legislature.

Civil Service Association

MR. P. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour with regard to the hon. Premier's letter of January 5th that you tabled today. I would like to know if since that time, you've had any discussions with the CSA with regard to renegotiating or discussing the present 1972 agreement?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, as you know, and as the Assembly knows, we have joint council meetings ten times a year. We met as recently as Monday. The subject in question will be on the agenda of the next joint council. It was on the agenda on Monday, but at the initiative of the Civil Service Association membership, they asked that it be moved to the next month's agenda.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. At the present time, is it the government's position to support the mediation settlement that is presently in force for the year 1972?

DR. HOHOL:

That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the hon. minister. Would he agree that this position at the present time is a position through a unilateral decision of the present government?

DR. HOHOL:

It is not a proper question, Mr. Speaker, but I will simply say this. We inherited the situation as it was, so I have no opinion on it. We accepted it as it was and moved through with it.

Patients in Mental Hospitals

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier. He announced recently that the means test will not be applied for social responsibilities that the government has anything to do with, as far as Albertans over 65 years of age are concerned. I was wondering if his government is giving any consideration to

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-17

relieving those Albertans over 65, who are confined to our mental hospitals against their will. I say that because there are some patients who volunteer to go in. But those who are confined there against their will -- is the government giving any thought to relieving those patients of the costs they have to bear?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a matter to be properly dealt with when The Mental Health Act is at the committee stage. It certainly seems to me a more appropriate occasion.

Direct Seeding of Crops

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the hon. the Deputy Premier. In view of the answer given by the hon. Minister of Industry in connection with money being spent on hail research, did I misunderstand your answer yesterday when you advised that there was no money being spent this coming year for direct seeding?

DR. HORNER:

I said there was no money being spent in my department. The program the hon. Minister of Industry is talking about is under the direction of the Alberta Research Council.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. There is money being spent, then, by the Research Council for direct seeding this coming summer?

MR. PEACOCK:

There will be money appropriated for that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GETTY:

We have gone through several copies and we are now working on what I hope will be the final, which will be going to him.

Anti-Inflation Measures

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In view of the seriousness of inflation problems facing all Canadians, what policy is your department adopting to combat this escalating cost?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I think some days ago I was asked that question, when I indicated I had one meeting with Dr. John Young. I'd like to make it clear that in my meeting with Dr. Young that the contingency plans he referred to were clearly plans which they had on a contingent basis, and with which I indicated to him our government was not in a position to agree or disagree. It was simply a matter of discussion of the problem of inflation. I think the hon. Premier very eloquently indicated, with the fiscal imbalance as presently exists between the federal government and the provincial government,

26-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

that the ability to control inflation, largely because of that fiscal imbalance, rests to a very high degree at the federal level. Dr. Young assured me that before any plans would be implemented, if they were, they would meet with our government in Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In view of the fact that the federal government is talking about contingency plans, do you have a Cabinet sub-committee, or is there a special committee in your department, that is analyzing the economic data available, with the view in mind of presenting the government with concrete ideas to make an adequate response whenever federal plans are introduced?

MR. MINIELLY:

Well, certainly I think that the hon. member knows well that several times in the House we have mentioned the Economic Planning Committee of Cabinet, the Industrial Development Department of the hon. Fred Peacock, of course, is involved in the statistics area. The point that I wanted to make very clear to the members was at this stage that the federal government has the contingency plans. We indicated our interest and our concern regarding inflation and advised the federal government on our views, but that clearly with the fiscal imbalance that presently exists -- whether we like it or not, it presently does exist -- the actual ability to move in this area is at the federal level and we are happy to provide them with any suggestions we have through our various economic committees.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary, Mr.

MR. SPEAKER:

We are just about out of time and the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest has a question which should perhaps take precedence over the other supplementary.

MR. DRAIN:

My supplementary question is now that the Province of British Columbia has moved into the position of enforcing price and wage controls, is our government going to also consider taking this position?

MR. MINIELLY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I just answered that question. At the time firstly, I would like to -- I think it is quite well known that although we are concerned about inflation -- both the Canadian government and the provincial government -- that Canada shows a more favourable picture with respect to the control of inflation than any other modern industrialized country in the world. And that does not mean that we are not concerned about inflation. Clearly, we are and we will be watching it with interest and clearly, we will want to advise the federal government. At this time no, with respect to price and wage controls.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I could have possibly raised this on the question period but it relates to the business of the House and I would like

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-19

to ask the hon. Premier if at this time he is able to provide for the House any firm information in regard to the proposed oil royalty hearings. You will recall that some days ago you suggested the possible time at which we might be having these hearings. We would certainly be interested in knowing if a firm date has been set or is being considered. And then also, I think that the hon. Premier will recall that he expressed a grave concern as to the length of time that the hearings might go on. He suggested that there might be some need for a committee at that point in time to consider the method in which we would proceed, recognizing of course, that the government has within its power to determine, to quite an extent, the procedures that might be followed. I am wondering if he would be prepared to give us some indication as to whether the government has given further consideration in this regard. It also runs in my mind that a statement was either made in the House -- and I didn't check the Hansard Record -- but I am wondering if the Premier would care to tell us whether or not the government is going to provide position papers in regard to the royalty matter and when we might be able to expect the presentation of the position papers.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, with regard to the first question the answer is the same as it was before, mid to late April. With regard to the second question the answer is no, it will be a decision made by the Standing Committee on Public Affairs, Agriculture, and Education. With regard to the third question, we will in fact put in a tentative position paper. It will be a tentative one because the purpose of the hearing, of course, is to give an opportunity for the public to be heard. With regard to the first question -- I mean to make it clear -- is that the tentative position paper will be made available to the members, as I said, before, mid to late April.

MR. STROM:

(inaudible)

MR. LOUGHEED:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Did the hon. Premier intend to say April or May?

MR. LOUGHEED:

I want to make it perfectly clear that what we are proposing is that the tentative position paper will be laid before the House and be referred to the Standing Committee in mid to late April.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview some time ago in this House asked two questions of the hon. Premier, which the hon. Premier undertook to respond to when the information was available. The first question was whether or not the Automotive Petrolers Association of Alberta had been in correspondence or discussion with the provincial government regarding the development of a code of ethics for the gasoline marketing industry in this province. The second question was whether or not any submissions had been received from the Co-operative movement with respect to the possibility of aid provided by the provincial government being granted to the Co-operative movement to facilitate gasoline marketing by the Co-operative movement in this province. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to table the answer to those questions.

26-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

DP. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a short announcement in relation to two or three matters that are of significance to the agricultural industry in Alberta. First of all we have taken some important steps to meet our commitment to the farmers of Alberta and I am announcing Cabinet approval today of \$161,000 in grants to encourage the expansion and marketing of Alberta farm products. The Alberta Sheep and Wool Commission will receive \$58,000 to encourage the expansion and improvement of the sheep and wool industry in the province; \$45,000 will go The Alberta Hog Marketing Board to improve export opportunities for pork products; the Alberta Fresh Vegetable Commission is to receive \$22,000 for the improvement of marketing facilities for fresh vegetables and for the direct promotion of Alberta corn on the cob; \$13,000 has been allocated to the Alberta Potato Commission to promote Alberta grown potatoes, we would hope that with that allocation that a program to rid the warehouses in Alberta of processed potatoes would be undertaken with some vigour; the Alberta Egg and Powl Marketing Board will receive \$13,000 for the purpose of developing markets for egg and egg products; \$5,000 goes to the Alberta Vegetable Growers Marketing Board to assess market possibilities for processed vegetables; the Alberta Corn Committee is to receive \$4,500 to seek markets for quality corn production. In this area, Mr. Speaker, we had hoped to increase the amount of acreage seeded to corn in southern Alberta in relation to industrial development in that part of the province as well.

We expect this to be a major start in the marketing thrust that we have been talking about in this Legislature for some time, since the budget was brought down. We have stated in our platform that we are going to do something about the family farm and the important way to do that is by this marketing thrust. We are looking for access into markets, not only in Alberta and Canada but around the world and in co-operation, as I've said earlier, with the federal Department of Trade and Commerce and the Alberta Department of Industry and Commerce. Mr. Speaker, just to elaborate for a moment, these grants will be used in conjunction and in consultation with the people in my department. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table two copies of the new regulations having to do with the special program for potato growers in Alberta. Also two copies of the new Dairy Development Loan Guarantee Regulations, and we hope to have available for all members copies of these regulations by tomorrow.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say to the hon. Minister of Agriculture that we certainly appreciate the announcement that he has made today. As far as our side of the House is concerned we are not prepared to debate the proposals that have been made. I am reminded that last night it was suggested that we should be rising in our place and patting the hon. minister on the back for being so generous with his support for marketing. All I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we shall save our patting on the back until later when we are able to assess the results that will accrue from the proposals that have been made. I'm not in any way suggesting that there may not be results, but I for one would want to reserve judgment until we've had an opportunity of reviewing results that will accrue as a result of the proposals that have been made. I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister of Agriculture that we are getting very close to the end of the estimates of the Department of Agriculture. I would hope that even though we are not maybe dealing directly with the estimates that refer to marketing, if any of our members on our side of the House would want to raise a point in regard to the announcement that has been made we would be permitted to raise it on the discussion of the estimates, even though it may not be directly related to appropriations that are already covered.

DP. HORNER:

Agreed.

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-21

MR. STROM:

I appreciate that opportunity and again I am not serving notice on the government that we will necessarily do it, but I suggest that any time that announcements are made, as they are without any warning, it does not give us much opportunity to respond, and so, therefore, we certainly appreciate having that opportunity. Mr. Speaker, we certainly appreciate at this point in time the emphasis must be placed on marketing, and we are prepared to support any thrust that will improve the marketing possibilities for our primary producers in the Province of Alberta.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give a brief but important summary report on the labour force employment and unemployment figures for Alberta, March, 1972. The important figure is that the unemployment rates dropped from 5.0% in February, 1972, to 4.9% in March, 1972. The significant point, Mr. Speaker, is that traditionally, and normally, the unemployment figures rise in February and this year we have been able to reverse this. The number of unemployed in Alberta in March, 1972, decreased by 1,000 from February, 1972, which resulted in the unemployment rate dropping from 5.0% in February of this year to 4.9% in March of this year. This is a decrease, Mr. Speaker, of 1.7% from the March, 1971, unemployment rate of 6.6%.

The number in the labour force in March remained at 657,000, the same as for February, 1972. However, this is an increase of 16,000 or 2.5% over the March, 1971, labour force total of 641,000. The number employed in the labour force in March reached 625,000, an increase of 1,000 or 1.6% over February, 1972. This is an increase of 26,000, Mr. Speaker, or 4.3% over the same month of the previous year.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, will this information be tabled for the information of the MLA's?

DR. HOHOL:

I will be very happy to table this information, Mr. Speaker, and while I'm on my feet, while I wouldn't want to editorialize, I do want to comment that surely the significant information here means some credit has to be given to the private sector and the public as well in discerning possibly more accurately than ever before, the importance of making specific efforts to reduce unemployment.

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?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in regard to question No. 158 I would like to table the answer.

162. Mr. Ludwig asked the Government the following question:

26-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

-
1. Which Ministers of the Executive Council of Alberta attended the Finance Ministers Conference held in Jasper, Alberta, in the Fall of 1971?
 2. How long did the conference last?
 3. How many staff members from each Department accompanied each Minister attending the conference?
 4. What secretarial staff accompanied each Minister?
 5. Were any dinners, luncheons, meals provided at the expense of the people of Alberta during the conference at Jasper? Enumerate please.
 6. What was the cost of all meals and entertainment provided for at the expense of the people of Alberta during the Finance Ministers Conference at Jasper?
 7. What were the transportation costs to the Alberta Government in relation to the said conference?

MR. GETTY:

With respect to Question 162 I would like to table the answer.

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

1. How many provincial judges are without formal legal training in Alberta?
2. When does the government expect they all will be replaced by legally-trained judges?
3. Do they receive the same rate of pay as provincial judges with legal training?
4. If not, what is the difference in pay rates?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, in respect to Question 167, we accept the question and I move, seconded by Dr. Hohol that it be made an Order for Return.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

168. Mr. Drain asked the government the following question:

1. (a) Is the Department of Highways planning to widen the River Road Hinton West this year?
(b) In the meantime what steps are being taken to ensure the safety of the boys and girls riding in school buses on this road arising out of the danger of joint use of the road by Northwest Pulp and Power trucks, school buses and other traffic?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answers to Question 168.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

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

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

- (1) The amount of funds paid out by the Alberta Government to farmers in the province from the Wildlife Damage Fund.
- (2) The amount of funds paid out by the Alberta Government to farmers in the County of Mountain View from the Wildlife Damage Fund.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would say in explanation that I used here the designation of the County of Mountain View. If there's a more

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-23

convenient designation as far as the department is concerned, I would be quite open to any change that would make the information easier to get.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I'm happy to table the answer to the question. It's a bit late to consider an alternative but it is set up in the second part of the question with respect to the County of Mountain View.

164. Mr. Ludwig proposed the following motion to the Assembly seconded by Mr. Wilson.

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

- (1) How many Crown counsel are employed in the following cities: Calgary, Edmonton, Red Deer and Lethbridge?
- (2) How many private law firms are employed in each of the above-named cities to conduct criminal prosecutions?
- (3) How much money has been paid out to each law firm conducting criminal prosecutions on behalf of the Crown during 1971 in the above-named cities? Enumerate, please.
- (4) How many law firms are engaged in conducting criminal prosecutions on a continual basis? Enumerate, please.
- (5) How many permanently appointed provincial judges are there in Edmonton? in Calgary?
- (6) How many Traffic and Criminal cases have been prosecuted in Calgary during the year 1971? In Edmonton during 1971?
- (7) How many convictions of traffic and criminal cases have been recorded in each of the cities of Edmonton and Calgary during 1971?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to refer to the seventh part of that question, I had intended, and I hope that that was the meaning that was taken, that for the number of convictions of traffic and criminal cases that have been recorded in each of the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, that there be a breakdown, not just a figure -- but how many criminal and how many traffic -- if that distinction could be made. That's the only difference that I have.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, in connection with that question, I have one or two other questions for clarification, and perhaps the hon. member who has moved the motion could clear them up now or otherwise they may require an amendment.

The first question is whether with respect to part (1) the hon. member is referring to Crown Counsel employed only on criminal matters, because we have counsel in those cities who do civil work.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, that is correct, I had intended to inquire entirely with regard to criminal prosecutions only and traffic prosecutions -- criminal court proceedings here.

MR. LEITCH:

The next question I have, Mr. Speaker, for clarification is whether in part (5) of that motion, the hon. member is referring to those provincial judges who hear criminal matters, because again we

26-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

have provincially appointed judges in those cities who hear civil matters.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'm interested in the magistrates' court judges.

MR. LEITCH:

One last question for clarification, Mr. Speaker, deals with part (7) and that is whether the hon. member is interested only in the convictions that were recorded in those cities or in the trials as well?

MR. LUDWIG:

Question (6) states, how many cases have been prosecuted in Calgary and Edmonton, so that clears it. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER:

Taking the question as clarified in that manner and without a formal amendment, does the House agree to the question?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

165. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ho. Lem.

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

- (1) Copies of submissions, all correspondence and minutes of meetings regarding public land negotiations between the Department of Lands and Forests and the Metis people in the area of Grande Cache since September 1, 1971.
- (2) Copies of all correspondence regarding this issue from people other than the Metis people since September 1, 1971.

DR. WARRACK:

In regard to question 165, Mr. Speaker. I'm happy for myself and on behalf of the department to comply with the question. However regarding the second part of the question, I do wish the opportunity to obtain the courtesy of approval from the people with whom the correspondence was conducted.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House wish to have the motion deferred or would you prefer to pass it, subject to the condition mentioned by the hon. minister?

[The motion was carried, subject to the condition specified, without further debate or dissent.]

166. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion, seconded by Mr. Ho. Lem:

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

Copies of inspection reports and recommendations regarding inspections carried out by the Deputy Minister of the Department of Health and Social Development, Dr. P. B. Rose, and the Director of Veterinary Services, Dr. J. G. O'Donoghue, governing the use of laboratory animals in colleges, institutes of technology, and high

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-25

schools in Alberta, as mentioned in Sessional Paper Number 32-72, required under Section 50 of The Universities Act.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Chemical Defoliating Agents

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, my motion reads as follows: Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta give consideration to placing a three year moratorium on the use of chemical defoliating agents for use in clearing pipe lines, transmission lines, railway rights of way, oilfield battery sites, and lease roads.

and that during this three year interval the government give consideration to conducting extensive investigation and research into the effect of such chemical use on wildlife as well as the general environment.

and that the government through the Environment Conservation Authority give consideration to holding extensive public hearings on this matter to determine public reaction.

Mr. Speaker, a great variety of herbicides are in general use today. These have been designed to do specific jobs, to selectively destroy or suppress undesirable trees, shrubs, grasses, and weeds. Some of these formulations have the following trade names: 2,4-D, 2,4,5-T, MCPA, Dalapon, TCA, to name but a few. The first five names are the most commonly employed in Alberta with the 2,4-D and the 2,4,5-T being the prime material that is used for brush control.

My resolution has been pointedly directed toward brush and tree control along power line, railway line, and pipeline right of ways and to along oil field lease roads, and battery sites. Agricultural lands and municipal road allowances were excluded for what I thought to be good reasons. There can be no argument but that the phenomenal growth of unit agricultural production -- the so called world wide green revolution -- has been due in large part to the successful development and use of agricultural chemicals and fertilizers and pesticides. The result has been the saving of millions of people the world over from starvation and malnutrition. Certainly I don't think we have heard too much of world wide famines in recent years, as have occurred in the past. This is probably attributable to this green revolution as it is called.

It has been estimated that this technological revolution, if fully implemented, will provide sufficient food for the world for sustenance for at least three more decades. Since there appears to be no alternative to the use of chemicals to forward this green revolution, it would seem therefore in my view, to be irresponsible to legislate a moratorium on the use of chemicals for agricultural purposes.

Municipalities also depend heavily on the use of defoliating chemicals to suppress brush growth along rural roads. I think we are all aware that brush growth along narrow and winding country roads, certainly minimizes visibility and poses a severe traffic hazard for school buses and for general road traffic. Many lives are at stake here and for municipalities to be able to control this brush growth within their financial means, the use of chemicals appears to me to be a necessity, in this case, and worth the risk, therefore, that is imposed by the use of these chemicals.

However, with regard to the rights-of-way named in the resolution, the implications of a moratorium are not so drastic, because what we are essentially talking about here in these cases

26-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

that are in the resolution, are dollars and not lives. Right of way brush may be controlled through manual or mechanical means, although probably at a considerably higher cost than through the use of chemicals. The chemicals that are commonly used for brush control are 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T for deciduous trees, and Tordon or sodium TCA for coniferous species. The latter chemicals are considered to have a much greater safety factor than either 2,4-D or 2,4,5-T, and therefore are generally considered to pose no problem. 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T are complex compounds of carbon, hydrogen, chlorine and oxygen, and have been in use since the late 1940's. 2,4-D has by far the widest usage, with some 1,723,000 pounds being applied over some 4,233,000 acres in Alberta during 1971. 2,4,5-T, although generally a more effective herbicide than 2,4-D is considerably more expensive and therefore, not so widely used in the province.

The teratogenic effects from the use of 2,4,5-T -- you know, when I first encountered that word, teratogenic, I ignored it and hoped it would go away, but it kept coming up in all the literature that I researched on the subject. While I'm sure that it's familiar to the medical people that we have in the House, for the benefit of the other engineers, including Mr. Henderson and Mr. Yurko, it refers to the effect on embryonic development. Anyhow, the teratogenic effects from the use of 2,4,5-T first came to light in Viet Nam in 1969, when the South Viet Namese newspapers reported that there had been an increase in human birth defects in parts of the country that had been defoliated by the American army. A study subsequently released, showed that the test by a chemical laboratory in the USA, indicated that mice treated during the early pregnancy with large doses of 2,4,5-T gave birth to malformed offspring. This report resulted in the placing of restrictions on the use of this chemical. That was on 2,4,5-T, not 2,4-D.

At this point, I think it would be worthwhile to recite a principle well-known in scientific circles as Karnofsky's Law, which states, quote that: "any drug administered at the proper dosage, at the proper stage of development, to embryos of the proper species, will be effective in causing disturbances in embryonic development." Although Karnofsky's Law specifies only drugs, it undoubtedly holds true for many, if not all other chemicals. Defoliating chemicals would probably fall into this category, since they were, in effect, engineered to destroy living organisms.

Mr. Speaker, it might be interesting to point out here that many substances in every day use by humans may be toxic if taken in high enough dosage. Common table salt, for example, if large enough quantities are taken is toxic. So is aspirin, some alkaloids such as caffeine and nicotine, tranquilizers, antibiotics, including penicillin, the drug cortisone, I think most solvents, most pesticides, and very many industrial effluents. In fact many other materials that we either use or encounter daily are toxic if taken in large enough quantities. Digitalis, which has saved the lives of many people that have heart problems is extremely lethal if taken in much larger than the recommended dosage.

Now, there have been many reports on the adverse effect of 2,4,5-T on human reproduction with often conflicting advice. Some tests have indicated that an impurity in the chemical called dioxyn or TCDD is the real culprit. The teratogenic potential of 2,4,5-T with a dioxyn content of less than 0.5 parts per million is considered to be minimal. The Canadian government has apparently begun to relax restrictions on the use of 2,4,5-T, provided that the dioxyn level is kept below 0.5 parts per million.

Direct toxicity is generally referred to a so-called LD-50 scale, which represents the lethal dose, measured in milligrams of the compound per kilogram of body weight, that's required to kill 50% of the test animals involved. Test data on rats indicates that for 2,4-D, it takes between 300 and 1,000 milligrams of this compound of

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-27

2,4-D per kilogram of body weight to induce acute oral toxicity. In terms of a 124 lb. human being this would equal approximately 2/3 of an ounce of pure 2,4-D. That is the amount that would be required to kill half the test species, or the equivalent to a 124 lb. human.

The volume of the chemical which might be ingested by an animal after spraying brush would seem to be a very minute percentage of the amount that we have said here would be required for direct toxicity. In fact, 2,4-D, which has been generally used in this province since 1945, has generally been considered quite safe. However, recent reports from France, I think this was in the past few months, indicate that 2,4-D in test cases, can cause malformities in quail eggs.

Fortunately, 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T both have relatively short life cycles after they have been applied. Exposure to sunlight and oxygen tend to break them down rapidly. Studies have shown that the half-life of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T in plants is in the order of two weeks. So, these chemicals have probably been mostly dissipated over the period of one month or so.

Some evidence has been presented which indicates that there is a transfer of 2,4-D residue from grasses to the milk of dairy cows. The quantity is a relatively low amount, in the order of .1 part per million. But, this is apparently sufficient to taint the milk slightly. This residue has been found in milk for a period of up to seven days after a brush spraying in the area where the cows were pasturing.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to present the facts incomplete though they are, on both sides of the question regarding these chemicals. The conclusion I have drawn is that they are probably safe if used correctly. However, an element of doubt remains. Is it possible for these chemicals, the way they are applied in Alberta, to cause birth deformities? It is not likely, but I don't think we know for sure.

Has the use of 2,4-D resulted in a decrease of the pheasant population in Alberta? Probably not, but I don't think we know that for certain, either. Therefore, it seems obvious to me, that we do need to conduct extensive investigations and research into the effect of using these chemicals.

Furthermore, I think the people of Alberta should be given a chance through public hearings, to present the public view on this important subject.

Mr. Speaker, the imposition of a moratorium would also produce some adverse effects. Certainly, it would have an adverse economic effect on our chemical application companies and the chemical producers. This is a consequence which I hope this Assembly will give serious consideration to.

Furthermore, considerable tree growth along the rights of way would result during the proposed moratorium period. Apparently, the best time to kill the right of way brush is when the trees are from three to six feet tall. At this point, when they are sprayed and killed, the grass takes over and no unsightly mess remains. However, trees greater than 15 feet tall, when they are chemically killed, are unsightly and create visual pollution problems.

The cost of manually or mechanically removing brush and trees, is estimated to -- at least according to some estimates I've seen -- be in the order of ten times the cost of using chemical defoliants. One estimate I saw, covering right of way clearance costs for a 20-year control period, showed a total cost of \$1,125 an acre for mechanical maintenance, vs. \$120 an acre for chemical control. While this estimate is quite possibly on the high side, nevertheless, the

26-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

permanent discontinuance of chemical control could conceivably result in an increase in product cost.

On the other side of the coin, Mr. Speaker, reverting to manual and mechanical clearance could provide many jobs for native people and for students and for others in need of work, and therefore might result in an overall reduction of unemployment in the province.

Further, when the need arises, technology always has arisen to the challenge. Large mechanical tree harvesters that are used and have been used since the war in timbering operations are a good example of what good technology can do. There has been a lot of progress in that area during the last 20 to 30 years. As you know, these timbering operations were previously horse operations. Now it is essentially done mechanically through very modern and efficient tree harvesters. It seems quite possible therefore, that if chemical treatment is discontinued, industry will soon develop good mechanical equipment for right of way brush control. Further, a good job of mechanical clearing might produce more aesthetic looking rights of way than does chemical treatment.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this Assembly will debate this matter in depth. It is a serious subject and the implications of the moratorium are significant regardless of which way we decide. Mr. Speaker, although I suspect that the proposed extensive investigation and the hearing would result in the chemicals being cleared for continued use, in my view, we cannot afford to take the chance in not calling a halt during a period of investigation. I think there has been far too much tendency in our society in the past to develop and use chemicals of all kinds first, and then afterwards, discover the effects of whether or not the effect is adverse or not. I think the time has come when we must thoroughly investigate and prove the effects of chemicals before we expose the general public to them, and I therefore request the approval of this Assembly on the resolution. Thank you.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to second the motion regarding chemical defoliating that has just been read and moved by the previous speaker, the hon. Member for Edmonton-Caldor, Mr. Tom Chambers. The hon. member, I feel, has very adequately dealt with the scientific and technological aspects of the motion that we should consider in relation to this subject. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution specifically asks for a three year moratorium on the clearing of pipelines transmission lines, railway rights-of-way, oil field battery sites and lease roads.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that this resolution could be extended to cover rights of way of all forms including municipal roads and perhaps this might have been included in the motion. However, Mr. Speaker, I think that rather than discuss these sorts of specifics, our concern here has to be the principle in general. Now, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that this motion will undoubtedly initiate considerable discussion and a great variety of views from the members of this Assembly. And I would like to bring into the debate myself, two items which I personally consider quite pertinent and which perhaps may be considered by some as rather novel in this situation.

The first of these items, Mr. Speaker, has to deal with the beekeeping industry here in Alberta, and the hazards that chemical spraying of various rights of way may introduce for the honey producer. Mr. Speaker, some herbicides and some fungicides are toxic in varying degrees to honey bees. And with the acceleration in the production of honey in Alberta in the last two years, it is quite conceivable that chemical defoliating spraying could become a major problem in this respect, and I say this, Mr. Speaker, because in recent years, this very topic and this very problem has become very

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-29

serious in California where most of our package bees come from each year.

And it has reached the stage in California, Mr. Speaker, where it has been necessary to introduce remedial legislation and regulations to help overcome this threat to the beekeeping honey producing industry.

This threat arrives in two ways, Mr. Speaker. The first of these is contamination of the foliage which the honey bees use as resting places as they travel back and forth within the range of the area of their honey gathering foraging. And, Mr. Speaker, research has shown that this range of the honey bees in their foraging area can be up to as much as seven miles in some areas. However, one and a half miles is much more of an average. Here in Alberta, if we do have our clover, rapeseed or whatever forage crop the honey bees are working on close to the colonies, the range may be even less.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, one might ask how can control of defoliating spraying be so significant if the fields over which the bees range are going to be sprayed anyway. However, we find that in most cases where these colonies are located on farmer's land, and this is always done by previous arrangement with the farmer, that there is co-operation with regard to the times of spraying and as much as possible the types of spraying so that the hazards are considerably reduced in these circumstances. Also, Mr. Speaker, the sprays that are used in the spraying of the field crops are considerably less severe in nature than those used in the defoliating work.

Another hazard to the beekeeping industry is the contamination of the water supplies which the bees use along the roads and along the ditches in these types of areas. These are the types of areas that the bees quite generally use for their source of water supply. The contamination of such water sources, because of spraying by strong chemical defoliating agents, can be of quite a lasting nature and the residue from the spray will remain for considerable time after the spraying has taken place. Now that's my first item that I wanted to introduce into this debate, Mr. Speaker.

The other one, as far as I'm personally concerned, is that of the aesthetic viewpoint and I think this should be considered. I'm sure all the hon. members in this Assembly have seen the results of this type of spraying in many instances. Mile after mile of ugly, dirty, dreary looking, dead types of foliage, contrasted with the fresh, green, live look of that beyond the sprayed area, is something to consider, Mr. Speaker. Surely if we here in Alberta are so concerned and so proud -- and justifiably so concerned and so proud -- of the natural beauty of our land, with the attractions of our countryside and with all the appeal that the Alberta natural areas have to tourists coming to this country, then this should be something we should take into consideration with regard to the method of defoliating along these right of ways.

There might be a question raised, Mr. Speaker, that if we don't use this chemical means what are we going to do? And the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder had mentioned the matter of costs in relation to mechanical control in these instances and I think this was well put. But I'm also reminded of some of the things that have gone on this past winter in the matter that a great deal of clearing along rights of way and along roadways in particular has been done through winter works programs, which in many cases has relieved the necessity for unemployment insurance or welfare payments, and I think this is something we could take into consideration too. Also we should all think in this case, what is the most effective way of permanently controlling this foliage anyway? Is it the mechanical means or is it the chemical means?

26-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

So Mr. Speaker, I very whole-heartedly second this motion, and I hope this resolution will be passed, and I hope that it will not just end up as a three year moratorium, but it will be something of a more permanent nature. Thank you.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to this resolution. Firstly, I would like to congratulate the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder, Mr. Chambers, and the hon. Member for Athabasca, Mr. Frank Appleby. I think they have chosen a most timely and urgent topic. My comments will be to the point; man lives on a spaceship called Earth, and it is a closed environment. The environment is polluted and it is being polluted constantly and his survival is being threatened. The earth resources are exhaustible, and we know that, and environment is deteriorating. Man and all forms of life are in peril, and we know that. Man is having difficulty adapting.

There are many areas of the environment that are being polluted, and just to briefly enumerate some of these to refresh our memories; there is fossil fuel, combustion, industrial wastes, municipal sewage, solid waste disposal, strip mining, fertilizers, thermal pollution, pesticides, radioactive wastes, oil spillage on oceans, deforestation, noise, carbon monoxide, sulphur oxide, hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxide, particulate matter, lead, arsenic, plastics, pesticides, and so forth. Just mentioning all these items, Mr. Speaker, to the Assembly sounds like pollution and I can assure you that it really is that.

Let's look at the positive side. There is no doubt that agriculture and the production of agriculture, the increased capacity and the processing has increased tremendously as a result of pesticides and chemicals. There has been unprecedented development in this area and there is no doubt, as the hon. Member for Calder had stated, that many lives have been saved as a result of increased food production. Chemicals have offered much in the area of science and medicine and comforts for man. However, to understand the complexity of chemicals requires a background in many, many disciplines: toxicology, biochemistry, enzyme kinetics, entomology and so forth, and wildlife biology. It is interesting today, as we talk in the Assembly, that we have some disciplines represented such as engineer, doctor, teacher, and so forth and maybe we can arrive at some consensus from other members. In other words, what I am saying, it takes a multi-disciplinary approach even to understand the chemicals that are polluting our environment, and it involves all the economic structure of our whole society and it involves also, and it should involve, local, provincial, national and world-wide authorities.

Let's look at the negative side. The leaders and authorities in these areas, the scientists, eminent scientists, men like Sir Julian Huxley, who is an eminent biologist around the world, W. D. Waddington who is an eminent geneticist, Peter Scott who is an eminent naturalist, and many, many others, world renowned scientists, have indicated to us there is nothing to worry about -- we're all going to die. We are going to die within 30 to 50 years unless we reverse this trend of pollution caused by chemicals and overpopulation. In other words they are saying, sabotage the technocratic society with all the pollutants and the chemicals that we have.

Now you can see why I am wearing this red jacket to brighten the day because of these dark remarks. However, it is something that we must contend with and we must listen to, and as man is typically what he is, he is a non-believer unless he is personally in pain himself. And we know that behavioral scientists have indicated quite definitely that we have the remarkable ability of denying the problem when we can't face it or we can't resolve it; and I am afraid that

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-31

man, not only in Canada, not only in Alberta, but around the world is doing exactly that.

So, as this resolution deals with man and his environment, I feel it is very important to step back for a few moments and have an over-view of where, in fact, we are going. We talk about progress. What does this mean? This means we are going forward towards some goal. What is that goal? Well there are many people who will tell you there are many goals. I suggest to the members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that they consider three concepts of progress; one is the religious concept -- we believe in life after death -- terrific, that's a better life, and I am glad most of us believe this. Some believe in a materialistic concept of progress, and this is well shown in the United States and Canada and the western world -- that means more and better, more and better, and beyond our income.

I suggest to the hon. members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that they consider another concept of progress. A scientific, philosophic, religious concept of progress, which makes use, not only of science and knowledge -- and knowledge is science -- but uses science and the wisdom of how to balance that knowledge, and to indicate to the rest of the people in our society where we are going. So this scientific, philosophic, religious concept of progress -- a goal for society -- opposes that the individual is the most important, because he can't be in this philosophy. But it also opposes the state and the society as the most important, as we have in communistic countries. It is a balance of both; and that word 'balance' rings a note of survival, and I can understand why the Premier has used it so often. So I am saying here, let's get together as a multi-disciplinary approach, let's develop our generalized concept for a goal for progress, and let's work towards that goal, and that goal must be only one thing -- a quality of life and survival on this earth, and that's progress. For if we do not do this, then due to over-population and mass pollution in the next 30 to 50 years, eminent scientists have told us that we're going to all die. Now we can ignore this; or do something about it. The priorities therefore, must be over-population control, pollution control, man, quality of life, to survive. Using imagination, knowledge, the wisdom that we all have; reason, and not authority alone.

Now we talk about adaptation. Everybody has heard this term. Just briefly to comment on this, adaptation is essentially biology. It is the essence of biology -- we adapt to live; and if we don't adapt, we die. I submit to the hon. members of this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that there is not enough time to adapt like normal evolution as we know it, as exemplified or proposed by the Darwinian theory. This adaptation, even if it could occur, just the sheer mass of pollution in our society would destroy us. So we have adaptation; we could have evolutionary adaptation, or cultural adaptation, and if we don't have cultural adaptation we have cultural shock. But if we have physiological adaptation, and we survive -- fine; if we have chemicals polluting our environment -- and this is what is happening -- then we have problems at the cellular level, at the biochemical level, what do we have -- physiological shock. The same type of shock that you get with blood loss. So I repeat -- there is no time to adapt, unless we act on over-population and on the excess voluminous amount of pollution that is going on, and the artificial nature of the type of pollution that is going on.

Now I stated that the use of chemicals by agriculture and others is placed within the problem of general pollution, and most of these substances in our environment are of serious and sincere medical concern by everybody; for inevitably, as it goes into the environment, it gets into land, sea, air, into the food, into the plant life, and gets to man. The result of pollution is due to industrialization, urbanization, and over-population, and do you know, Mr. Speaker, and for the hon. members of the Assembly, there

26-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

are some 10,000 such chemical compounds produced or synthesized every year and they find their way into the industrial aspects of our society, into our social activities, and then into the environment and to man.

Now, toxicity is easy to measure when it's acute -- how much you take before you die, and/or develop symptoms. But it's the chronic toxicity that we're also concerned about and it's very difficult to measure, because this takes many, many years. For example, the average American has 10 to 12 parts per million of DDT in his fatty tissue; those who are fatter naturally have more, and I'm worried. However Canadians, fortunately, have only 4.9 parts per million of DDT in their fatty tissue, but there are some areas in Canada that have already 13 parts per million of DDT in the fatty tissue. Well, this is an inert subject, or inert compound, it doesn't cause any problems, up to this point or at this level -- but what is the level that it will in fact cause certain problems? We don't know this. And what about the other added chemicals -- spraying everything. Spraying your hair, spraying your shoes, spray this, spray that -- and the children are being sprayed constantly and so is man, and now you have the synergistic activity of other chemicals besides the chemicals that we do take as a matter of necessity in medicine.

Therefore, these are real concerns and these are concerns everywhere in the world, and the province must play a very important role, and it can't neglect this because the National Health and Welfare Department is saying we are safe. My statements here is to make a plea to the province and the government, that to measure the toxic levels, not only on a short term basis, which is relatively easy, but also on a long term basis, and, I repeat, if the chemicals are used and the result of the toxicity on an acute and a chronic basis over a long period is not known, we don't allow any of these chemicals to be used in the Province of Alberta at any time. We should establish very close communication between the Federal Food and Drug Directorate who have, apparently the statutory responsibility for the drugs and so forth that are consumed by people. We should establish tolerance and assure that these tolerance levels are acceptable, and not on a presumptive or an assumptive basis. We should ensure that the inspectors are in fact inspecting the various items -- the food, the soil, and so forth. As an example here, in 1966 -- and this goes back quite a few years -- 3,628 foods were inspected in Canada and 6% had a pesticide residue that was of serious concern. I suggest that this is still continuing.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, hon. Members of the Assembly, I think it is an important aspect that this province not wait for the National Food and Drug Directorate or National Health and Welfare to act. We should be acting on a preventive and on-going basis to add the precautionary measures that are necessary. We should check the samples, if necessary; we should do our own monitoring or assure that, in fact, the monitoring is being done. We should set the pace and the direction for the rest of Canada. I say without any hesitation, even for the rest of the world. I think that it is high time that we as a province, and Canada for that matter, not hesitate to say this, because who else in the world is doing it? We are polluting ourselves out of existence.

Mr. Speaker, with these comments I support the resolution. It is a bold resolution -- I think it should be bolder. I have no hesitation in supporting any resolution like this that, in fact, will protect and offer a better chance for man to survive. We cannot ignore those statistics. I congratulate both hon. members for moving this. Let me say to the hon. Minister of the Environment, he has a critical job. To you sir, we hope you are listening, we are entrusting our lives. Use the power you have for all of us. Thank you.

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-33

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Whitecourt.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few brief remarks on this resolution. But first, I would like to propose an amendment. I propose an amendment, seconded by the hon. member Ron Ghitter, that the motion that Mr. Chambers listed as Motion Other Than Government Motion No. 1 on the Order Paper be changed as follows -- and I would like to be brief on this and I would say that if each hon. member would just take their proceedings and taking the words "be it resolved that the Government of Alberta give consideration to investigating" and removing the words "placing a 3-year moratorium on" -- remove the six words -- and the next change would be, in the second paragraph, "and during this period of investigation", we would remove the 3-year interval and that would be the amendment that I propose.

I want to say briefly that I agree with the hon. members that moved and seconded this resolution, but I might add that there are ways that we can control this spraying. One thing is, we could use a spray after the birds have done nesting, and I would say later on in the summer -- say July or August. This would in no way interfere with the nesting of our birds and also any animals that might be in the right of way. I would also suggest that we spray brush in its early growth. I would say four feet or less. I have seen in my area, brush sprayed 15 or 20 feet tall and it just looks terrible and creates a real fire hazard when it dries up. I believe that the large brush, willows, and poplars higher than four feet should be destroyed by other means, such as manual clearing during the winter. It is recorded that only 4% of chemicals used is on roadways, pipelines, well sites, and so on. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that 96% is agriculture chemicals and they are still going to be used.

If we allow weeds on roadways, railroads, oil lines, well sites and lease roads, to grow, then we'll have a grave situation with weeds growing into farm land. And here again, the farmer will be losing ground, because if he keeps on spraying and these weeds are allowed to grow, and we know they do, then where is he at? I would like to say that we might appoint a Legislative Committee to look into this, and possibly co-ordinate this committee to act quickly, and maybe we could have a solution by this fall sitting.

I would like to ask for your support in supporting this amendment, and I think the points brought up by the two hon. members are very good indeed. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, if I may make a few comments with respect to the amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Whitecourt. Firstly, I wish to congratulate the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder and the hon. Member for Athabasca, from the point of view of the debate that they have offered with respect to a very important motion. I would also say to the Member for Athabasca that I think that his new glasses are much better since he broke his old glasses this morning. I was a little worried that he wouldn't be able to see you, Mr. Speaker, today, but I think he well can with his new glasses.

Now I suggest at the outset on looking at the motion, Mr. Speaker, that the use of the term moratorium that was in the original motion was to me somewhat of a severe approach with respect to a motion of this nature. With the use of the term moratorium I think that we must feel that there is a very drastic problem existing in the province in this area, in order to utilize a moratorium, which

26-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

indeed, would stop the use of this chemical and would have some economic adverse effects upon industry in the Province of Alberta.

We are familiar in this province, indeed, with moratoriums. I think that the Social Credit government in past years has used moratoriums. During the depression there was a moratorium placed on debt, Mr. Speaker, when people were not able to meet their debt obligations. And so this was good legislation and this was legislation which was invoked at a time when there was a severe circumstance which existed in the Province of Alberta, and when a moratorium was of great use. However, in order for a moratorium to be validly established, I submit with respect to this motion, I think we must determine whether or not there is a severe circumstance which exists which would require us to close up shop until an investigation was completed.

I think the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder, in fairness, stated in his debate that herbicides, if used properly, are not really a problem. I think that from evidence and information that I have seen with respect to herbicides, it is doubtful as to whether or not there are severe problems from the use of herbicides. I think the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder also mentioned that when he balanced the interest from the point of view of the use of herbicides for agricultural purposes and for purposes other than the matters that he has discussed in his motion, that he felt that herbicides should continue to be used from the point of view of the municipal districts and from the point of view of agriculture.

And, of course, the motion in question that we are looking at this afternoon merely deals with the clearing of pipelines, transmission lines, railway rights of way, oil field battery sites and leased roads. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that with respect to the use of these herbicides, some 96% of herbicides that are used in the Province of Alberta are used solely in the areas within the municipal districts and particularly in the areas of agriculture, and but some 4% of the herbicides that are used in the Province of Alberta, Mr. Speaker, are used in the areas that are mentioned in this motion. So of course, what is suggested would be a moratorium on the use of a herbicide that is only utilized basically by 4% of the sales of these herbicides in this particular area.

I think then that it is not a critical enough issue, from the point of view of the information that we have at our disposal at the present time, that a moratorium should be used. However, I heartily support the attitude of additional research in this area to determine what problems, if any, the use of herbicides will force upon us. Whereas the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway stated so eloquently this afternoon, there are indeed many problems in the use of chemicals on which we must obtain an added expertise and an added alertness and awareness for whatever harmful effects they may impose upon us.

I would like, as well, to leave a few other suggestions for the hon. members for their consideration and hopefully their response, that I believe should be considered with respect to the motion as amended. Certainly, as has been expressed, the added cost, from the point of view of using mechanical means, from a clearing point of view, instead of a chemical means must be strongly considered by this Assembly. It has been suggested that the costs are ten times more if mechanical means were to be utilized, rather than the chemical means. Of course, this might have an adverse effect on the costs of power to rural Albertans for indeed, chemicals are used in the clearing in our rural electrification areas. And from the point of view of the cost to maintain these areas, the power lines, the transmission and the maintenance of these lines, indeed, the costs would go up. We must, therefore, consider the costs in avoiding the use of chemicals during this period.

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-35

I think we must also be concerned from the point of view of the costs which are attributable to the pipeline companies. After all, the pipeline companies clear their pipeline rights of way to be able to easily determine whether there have been any oil spills. Possibly, they will not have as suitable clearance of their pipeline rights of way by the use of mechanical means as they do by chemical means. I think we are all very concerned to ensure that, if there be a pipeline spill, it would be readily determinable so that the adverse pollution we have experienced somewhat in this province -- in the Swan Hills area, for example -- would not be met again with adverse environmental effects. So, I think, we must as well, consider the problems that would evolve from this point of view.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, although I endorse the motion as amended, in principle, to move into the investigation of herbicides and other chemicals, I would submit for the consideration of this Assembly, that the consideration of a moratorium is too severe under the circumstances and that the motion as amended would solve the problems that the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder is concerned with. On that basis, I would request the support of this Assembly to the motion as amended.

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder if I might make an observation before we continue with the debate, having regard to debate which we had on an amendment on a previous occasion. I respectfully draw the hon. members' attention to Rule 42B on page 16 of the Rules, just to mention that any debate while an amendment is before the House -- as all hon. members who have been in the House before will undoubtedly recall -- must be relevant to the amendment. In other words, the question before the House now is, whether or not the main motion should be amended in the manner suggested.

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on this resolution currently before us, I would like to also congratulate the initiator and the seconder of this motion on bringing this issue to the attention of the House. It is a matter that is perhaps of greater concern in rural areas than in urban areas, and it is gratifying to see an urban member show such interest in this matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

May I ask the hon. member whether he wishes to debate the question of, should the motion be amended, or does he wish to debate the main motion? He is speaking with regard to the amendment?

MR. BATIUK:

Right. Mr. Speaker, I must take a stand against the resolution originally. However, with the amendment it may be different, for I feel a moratorium on the use of defoliating chemicals is not a wise policy. Had such a resolution been presented ten years ago, and had I been in this House, I may have supported it. However, in the past decade, my experience with agricultural service boards has given me an insight into the problems of brush control. I firmly believe herbicides play, and should continue to play, a vital role in dealing with the problem.

There are numerous reasons for such a stand. The first and perhaps the most important consideration is financial. A Department of Agriculture report indicates that the average cost of spray of chemicals is \$40 per acre, while brushing averages at the cost of \$225 per acre. Taken over a long span of time, the difference in cost is even greater. Over a period of 20 years, for example, spraying one acre would cost approximately \$160, while brushing would

26-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

cost \$1,125, which is seven times greater. The huge difference in cost is due, in part, to the effectiveness of the method of brush control. Brush control by mechanical means would mean that it would have to be carried out roughly every four years.

In addition, brushing leads to regrowth of more dense brush area which means that each succeeding brushing would mean more work. With spraying on the other hand, application would have to be made every five to seven years. Such chemical sprays inhibit regrowth from the roots. Regrowth is usually small, slow and scattered. Subsequent spraying is usually a smaller problem than the first. When one considers the cost of destroying brush over a great number of acres, it is an undisputed fact that chemical spraying is more advisable. Brush control by any other means would require greater monetary commitments and indirectly the residents of the province will be adversely affected. If we require power companies, for example, to cease chemical spraying, they will find their costs of brush control rising. Rather than suffer the increase they will pass it on to the consumer by raising the power rates. And, Mr. Speaker, I think this is most inadvisable since we are endeavouring to see that power is provided at cost to Alberta residents, which means keeping our power rates as low as possible.

Another concern is that of inconvenience. Chemical spraying can be completed regardless of obstructions such as fences. With mechanical brushing, however, many farmers would be forced to take down their fences in order to give the machinery working room, and then put up those fences again. When one considers that this must be done every four or five years, it turns out to be quite time-consuming, a nuisance and an inconvenience to the farmer who already finds his time consumed by tasks necessary to the maintenance of his farm.

I can appreciate the concern of the environmentalists and those concerned with the preservation of the environment when they express their concern over the effect of chemical spraying. However, all evidence indicates their fears of environmental destruction are unfounded. First of all, the spraying is done by licenced applicators using chemicals such as 2,4-D which have the approval of the Canadian Food and Drug Directorate, and the various departments of health and welfare, and the various agencies concerned with human health and environmental quality. The known technological properties and their effects on the environment of each chemical are documented, and only those considered safe are registered. Evidences have been produced that herbicides currently in use are non-toxic and the possibility of poisoning humans or other animals with these chemicals is remote. Anyone wishing such documentations as to the safety of these chemicals can obtain them from the Weed Control and Field Services Branch of the Department of Agriculture. Those who fear that chemical spraying will endanger the lives and nesting grounds of birds should consider the effects of both herbicides and brushing. In the latter, everything is destroyed, as the trees, ground shrubs, weeds and grass are destroyed, plus there is no possibility of any type of habitat existing for the birds until the regrowth, and then only until the next brushing. With herbicides, however, the broad leaf plants are destroyed while the grass is not affected. Those habitats for birds would not be completely eliminated. Many species of birds are rapidly becoming extinct, and preserving grass may be one of the insurances of existence of some species instead of endangering them. With chemical spraying we can first destroy the bothersome brush and yet protect our wildlife. We must admit that it is also most advantageous to have our roadside and railroad tracks sidings in grass and backslopes with brush, rather than be left with no protective covering. A grass cover, such as would be left by chemical spraying, would reduce a dirt problem that could be quite hazardous in some areas and could result in the loss of some valuable top soil. A second problem that grass cover will prevent is in soil

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-37

erosion, a problem that could gradually wash away the soil that is used in building up the railroad track.

It must be admitted that one disadvantage of chemical spraying is that the appearance of the sprayed area is not a very appealing sight. It may take up to one or more years for trees killed by spraying to be decayed. However, with brushing, tree roots or remains of branches or even black upturned dirt cannot be called a pleasant sight, and the next year the beginning regrowth cannot be compared to the neatness of the grass remaining after spraying.

Aside from the physical arguments that may be presented concerning this resolution, the resolution itself has certain discrepancies.

For example it is suggesting that railroads, power companies and oil industry be denied the use of herbicides, while counties, agricultural users or anyone else may carry on with their spraying programs. Figures show that counties, municipal districts and agriculturalists use approximately 96% of all 2,4-D and MCPA that is sold in the province and that the industries that I just mentioned use only 4%. A moratorium on 4% of the chemicals would prove nothing to anyone. The industries of this province, whether it be railroad, the power companies or the oil industry, may favour the use of chemical sprays as they are most effective, while costing a reasonable low cost.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I outlined, I oppose a moratorium being placed on the use of chemical sprays in Alberta. I realize there are disadvantages to using herbicides and that in the future evidence may be produced that would indicate more disadvantages of herbicide usage. I understand the Environment Conservation Authority is scheduled to hold extensive hearings on the subject of brush control, but at the moment I don't believe we would be justified in imposing a ban on herbicides. I appreciate the fact that in some areas herbicide usage would not be desirable and that other means of brush control would be more advisable, just as some areas would require chemical spraying to the almost total exclusion of any other method of brush control. I believe that it should be left to the discretion of the parties responsible for brush control to decide which method could be best used.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the resolution as amended I cannot help but wonder about the original resolution. My reactions on reading this particular resolution were that the hon. members on your right, Mr. Speaker, had lost complete faith in the hon. Minister of the Environment. And I was very disappointed because, after all, he has worked very diligently at his job and I am confident that he is doing a very good one, and I would feel that I have far more faith than to wash him out in seven months, and imply, as this resolution so does, that the hon. minister should resign. This, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, is not my particular thinking.

Being the sixth in line speaker here, the area that I could cover without beating old hash over is very, very limited. My one specific objection that I had to the original resolution as it was, was that it sets up two classes of citizens in the Province of Alberta -- first and second class citizens. Presumably the railroad companies and the oil companies are in the second class category, whereas they only use 6% of these particular products. So from that standpoint alone I would be opposed to this particular resolution. Also we have had pronouncements by scientists -- the credence that these people are given. Scientists' texts say so-and-so -- 25 years down the road everyone will be eating hay or 35 years from now the world population will be such that people will be stacked 20 feet one on top of the other. So this man makes a pronouncement and it's

26-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

picked up and the oracle has now spoken. Great words of knowledge have been expounded and this man feels great so he comes out with something else. We had this experience when we had the Delta debate last year when we talked to some of these particular eggheads. So I would think that we should look at things from the standpoint of logic, reason and utility. Suggestion has been made that an alternative method could be used, such as tillage or some other particular form and this, of course, would limit the mechanical method of inhibiting this particular growth. However there are limitations to this particular process for reasons such as the physical ability to get into various areas, lack of mobility, seasonal factors, such as frost coming out of the ground and so on. And then what happens when you destroy the soil? You immediately set up an erosion cycle -- so then you have to start up some defence mechanism to deal with this, either by reseeding with grass or some other process. And in certain areas of wet ground it is not particularly advisable.

So I for one am not prepared to follow the lemming-like approach to these scientific pronouncements which say that our time in this world is limited to 25 or 30 years. I am prepared to look at it and say it might even last 35 or 40.

However, I believe that man has solved many problems in the 5 million years or so that he has been on this earth; he has been able to deal satisfactorily with the mammoths; he has reached a plateau in living where mankind lives longer than he has ever lived in any time in given history, and further lives better and healthier. If anyone who is a traditionalist is prepared to look back in time, even 100 years, as to how our forefathers lived and the life expectancy of people at that time -- and all these things were brought about by scientific progress, by great advances in medicine. I am sure that all of us will agree, and especially the hon. doctor who spoke so eloquently on this particular resolution, that these medicines have side effects. My mother would try to convince me that castor oil was good for me at one point in time -- I never did agree with her. I am sure that in limited amounts it could be, but in large amounts it might not be quite that good.

So we can look at any particular application of anything. If we are going to say in Alberta that our Department of the Environment is not going to police, or properly evaluate, or permit the use of noxious substances which will be dangerous -- and there are many dangerous things, and all things are dangerous if used in large enough quantity -- well then we should say properly that we should support the resolution as is. But if we are going to accept the thesis that man can reason, that we can approach problems with understanding, realize the benefits, take heed of the hazards, and deal with the problems, I would suggest that the resolution, as amended, would make far greater sense.

A point has been made, and I think that of all the pesticides that have been banned in the world, the one that has probably been the most potent, and the one that is most frequently quoted, is DDT. It has been quoted that the people in western Canada have four parts per million of DDT in their system, and in other areas in the world they have 12 parts per million of DDT. So we say, "So what?" We had the mercury scare. Fish were prohibited from being sold and taken off the market, and somewhere along the line people dug up prehistoric fossils of fish from 60 million years back, and after subjecting them to analysis they found that the mercury content of these fish was in excess of the toleration level as set out. So obviously mercury in fish has been around with us for a long time. Even with DDT, reputable scientists all over the world have backed away from the statement that this is a great hazard. Certainly the billions of people -- and I say over a billion people -- that are alive in this world because of the DDT control would disagree very violently in the thesis that this had not done any good.

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-39

So I would say that consideration and care should be given to the use of any particular product, and I believe that we have the mechanism through our government, and through the Department of the Environment, to properly protect Albertans, and for this reason I support the motion as amended.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the resolution, as amended. Last year in our beautiful Alberta there were thousands of miles of country and municipal road allowances, powerline and pipeline rights of way that were sprayed with a mixture of 2,4,5-T ester and diesel oil, for the destruction of all broad leaf plants and trees. And what a job this mixture of rocket fuel does! It is a true tree-killer. Not only does it burn the bark off the trees, Mr. Speaker, but anyone who believes that no harm can be done in any way to bird life as well, has, may I suggest, taken leave of his senses.

MR. SPEAKER:

May I just refer again to the rule I mentioned a moment ago. We are not strictly speaking, debating the motion as amended, because it hasn't yet been amended, and the hon. members would have the right to speak later. After the motion is amended, they would then be able to speak on the motion as amended if the amendment carries. At the present time, what is under debate is whether or not the motion should be amended as moved by the mover and the seconder of the amendment. The hon. member would have the right to speak to the amendment, and if the motion were amended then to speak to the motion as amended.

MR. STROMBERG:

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, you got me rattled here. I'll speak against the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking against this amendment, I don't think we realize just how serious this spraying is in the counties and the municipalities. A person should follow a country spray truck that is in operation. It is not a spraying operation, it is a hosing or washing job. The foliage is completely saturated. No wonder it has been years since we have heard or seen a meadowlark -- no wonder our pheasant population is fast dwindling. The cost of this defoliation on road allowance varies from \$10 to \$60 per mile. Cheap -- yes, but look at the mess it leaves. So Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the results of spraying carried out by Calgary Power in the Rose constituency last June on Highway 21 near Bashaw.

[Mr. Stromberg handed dead branches from a tree to a Page for tabling. The Page took them to Mr. Speaker who indicated they be placed in his water glass.]

Mr. Speaker, mile after mile of dead trees with their leaves still left on deface our highways and roads throughout Alberta. Mr. Speaker, these branches were gathered last Sunday on highway 21. The leaves are still there ten months after spraying, and these leaves will still be there ten months from now. And five, six, seven years from now the same dead branches and trees will be standing on Highway 21 to welcome our tourists to the beautiful Rose constituency.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Highways and the Department of Telephones cut, pile and burn the trees on a right of way. But, may I read to this Assembly a letter written by Calgary Power to their customers in my constituency regarding tree control.

"To All Rural Electrification Association Members:

26-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

"It is required under The Electrical Protection Act that power lines right-of-way be maintained free of brush and trees to eliminate any possible contact with lines. The conductors create hazardous conditions dangerous to life and property." -- Well, we all know that, that's the farm electrical story -- "Farm Electrical Services Ltd. has scheduled a complete brush control program for the Rural Electrification Association power lines during 1972. The first stage of this control will be chemical spraying of all native brush and trees under or adjacent to power lines during June, July or August. Windbreaks and hedgerows will be trimmed. Dead trees and trimming will not be cleaned up because of the added cost."

I would like to quote farther down in the letter.

"This brushing program will be contracted out to Molsberry Chemical Spray Company, and the contractor accepts responsibility for any damage from chemical drift."

Mr. Speaker, I have contacted several county supervisors, and the cost of spraying a mile of county road varies from \$10 to \$30, and in their opinion, cutting, piling and burning of these trees would vary anywhere between \$30 and \$100 a mile. Would it not be more feasible or desirable for us, as a government, to pick up the difference in cost to the counties between spraying and cutting through our PET program for winter employment? Let the counties handle the supervision through their supervisors during what is generally a slack season for county personnel. It would put some of the able-bodied people who are receiving welfare payments and who are able to work to gainful employment, and at the same time replace a totally unsatisfactory, unsightly, and offensive method of tree removal.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak in favour of the amendment even though I don't altogether agree with the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest and do agree considerably with the hon. Member for Camrose. The breadth and width of the resolution and the amendment give us an opportunity to express a latitude of opinion that is really needed with regard to this subject. I want to commend particularly those who have put so much study and have been diligent in their research in conjunction with this matter. I was really concerned after I heard one or two speakers with regard to the moratorium, and so I favour the amendment to delete the idea of the moratorium. Because if no moratorium was to be put on the agricultural use or along the roadways, but it was to be applied on the rights of way through the fields that could be sprayed, I could hardly see the consistency of it all, for most of the power lines and transmission lines travel through fields that would be using herbicides, but the line rights of way would not be permitted to use it. It seems to me that there is a great need for some place for wildlife to set, and probably the one way they could have had a habitat for wildlife in the middle of a sprayed field was to have a moratorium on the rights of way permitting the vegetation to grow. I certainly agree with those who favour the idea of leaving a place for wildlife. If certain residual elements of the herbicides are hazardous or dangerous to embryonic life, then I don't think that they should be used any place where wildlife might reasonably be expected to exist. I say this in spite of the fact that there are problems arising if we don't use certain of these herbicides, like the increased cost for keeping down the brush and this sort of thing. What we need more than anything else today is not only a habitat for the wildlife, but some place where we can have nature in its original state along the cultivated fields.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway really hit the nub of the whole situation. I don't think it is a

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-41

moratorium that we need on the use of herbicides and pesticides and any of these other things that have been proven quite beneficial when properly used. I think that we need to get at the root of the matter. The hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway did say that we have pollution everywhere and in many forms. The problem is that the pollution stems from the very heart and minds of those who use the herbicides and pesticides, and in our greed and avarice we have a tendency to take every advantage we can without consideration to the damage that is done. In looking at all of these things from a dollar value instead of an aesthetic value, or an environmental value, we tended to use them indiscriminately. What we need to do is to have a very discriminate use of all these advantageous inventions that science has provided us with in our modern age.

Taking a look at the last two portions of this resolution, "that the government give consideration to concluding extensive investigation and research into the effect of such chemical use," I respectfully submit that there are many, many such investigations now being undertaken, as is proven by the fact of the information that was provided to us, particularly by the mover of the motion, and alluded to by several others who spoke on the motion. We have all kinds of information, but what we need to do is act on some of the information that we have, or collate the information and analyze it, and out of it draw some conclusions.

The third portion of the resolution says, "that the government through the Environment Conservation Authority give consideration to holding extensive public hearings," and I have no objection whatever to public hearings, but Mr. Speaker, sometimes I have found when the conservationists and the developers get together in public hearings that we are inclined to have more emotion than fact. Sometimes it isn't too beneficial or fruitful. We do need to understand what people are thinking, but the greatest advantage of public hearings is the fact that the people on both sides get an opportunity to be exposed to what the other side thinks. This is the greatest advantage of the public hearings -- not so much the information that comes out, but the fact that people get to be acquainted with one another.

I did want to say a word about the longevity of life referred to by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, who said that we live longer now than we ever did in the history of mankind and then he made reference to comments made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway. I should like to suggest to the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest that historically, man was living a great deal longer 6,000 years ago than he is now.

MR. DRAIN:

Were you there, Ed?

MR. BENOIT:

No, but Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is depending on some kind of historical information when he makes his statement that we're living longer today than we ever did. I'm depending on historical information to refute his statement.

I would like to also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things that I like about our countryside today is that it has been so well-developed, cultivated, and so carefully sprayed, cultivated right to the fence. In lots of places where they do not have cattle they have no fences and so they cultivate right to the edge of the roads in order to keep the weeds down. But some of the only natural places we have where wildlife can exist comfortably, if that term could be used in connection with the kind of existence they have -- the only place where we can see life as it is naturally, is along the roadsides where there hasn't been all that much spraying. We have

26-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

the hard surface roads and immediately beyond the ditches we have the cultivated fields. We have the same things as far as the railroad right of way is concerned. The only place you can find crocuses and buckbrush and roses growing, is along the rights of way of these railroads -- sometimes between a highway and a railroad. And I do not think that we need to use herbicides to the extent that we destroy all of this type of thing.

And so I should say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, speaking in favour of the amendment, I do not think that we should have a moratorium on the use of herbicides or pesticides at any time. By the same token, I do not think that they should be used indiscriminately by those who use them for their own personal advantage in any way. A good commonsense approach should be applied. They should be used only where absolutely necessary and as far as possible where they will not affect the wildlife of our country or the beauty of our scenery. Thank you.

[Two members rose to speak simultaneously.]

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lacombe.

MP. COCKSON:

I out-drawed 'im!

Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to rise on the discussion this afternoon for a number of reasons. But I would like to point out that when the amendment was made to the original resolution, it did not complete the intent as I would like to see it. So, I would like to propose a sub-amendment to the resolution which would reduce the discriminatory aspect of it as I see it.

If you take paragraph 1 in the resolution, and place a period after the word 'agents' and delete the balance of that paragraph -- I can table this for your information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. COCKSON:

Seconded by the hon. Member for Smoky River. Is that right? We have rambled around quite a bit, I think, on this resolution, and had quite a bit of interest and collected quite a few facts, although I find there is a tendency not necessarily to speak to the amendment, or perhaps in this case, to the sub-amendment. I find this, Mr. Speaker, rather confusing and I know you do, too, sir.

In speaking to the sub-amendment to the amendment, I would like to point out that that section which I have asked to have deleted, covers the use of defoliating agents on clearing pipelines, transmission lines, railway rights of way, oilfield battery sites and lease roads. But it does not cover areas where defoliating agents are used other than in the specific areas I am thinking of on privately owned land and farm fields, and in these areas. Therefore, I would like to have you support this sub-amendment to the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the seconder wish to speak? In order to be allowed to speak on the sub-amendment, the seconder is required to speak --

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-43

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, on a brief point of order, I wonder if we could have leave of the House now to vote on the sub-amendment and the amendment, so the hon. members might more properly be allowed the latitude we have all been taking in discussing the entire subject.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I'd like to speak to the sub-amendment very briefly if I could, rather than curtailing debate at this point in time.

Now, that I have the floor, Mr. Speaker. . .

Does the seconder wish to speak to the amendment, because I yield the Floor to him if he does.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Smoky River indicates he does not wish to speak to the sub-amendment.

MR. HENDERSON:

May I speak to the sub-amendment then, Mr. Speaker? I would like to commend the movers of the sub-amendment. One of my colleagues and myself drafted the identical motion. I think the fact that the sub-amendment has come forth is indeed commendable.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the reason we were going to propose a similar sub-amendment is that there is a tendency in our society to try to pick out a whipping-boy on some issue and blame all the ills that exist in that society on that particular offender. I think this is exactly what the first part of this motion did. Because speaker after speaker has pointed out the fact that this business of pipelines, transmission lines, rights-of-way, battery sites and so on, is really just the tip of the iceberg. I think it would be most inappropriate for this Legislature to single out a single group like that for mention in a particular resolution.

Certainly, I think that no subject in society today is more susceptible to whipping-boy approaches to dealing with matters emotionally than is the issue of environmental matters and pollution matters. So I can only urge, Mr. Speaker, that I think it is in the best interests of the public and the hon. members of this Assembly, we don't leave an erroneous impression in the eyes of the public, because there is the question of aesthetics involved possibly, as the dead wood up on the Speaker's desk points out.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, it really doesn't get to the root of the matter. So, I urge all hon. members to support the sub-amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the sub-amendment in this debate -- for a moment I thought the opposite side had abdicated their ability to move, until the hon. Member for Pincher Creek, who didn't let us down, took an active part in this debate. Of course, you know, Mr. Speaker, perhaps there was pollution when the hon. Member for Pincher Creek was a child because he talked about his episode with castor oil, and his mother. But he didn't tell you about, in one of these episodes, backing into a new-fangled gadget in the house at that time called the gramophone, and had a needle injected into his rear end, and I wonder if at sometime that had some

26-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

effect on his oratorical abilities in the House as he has demonstrated many times. Nevertheless, I like the tune.

I like the new amendment, the resolution as it is now amended, and certainly, this does take out the discriminating factors that the original resolution had. However, I think that we should have some faith in the national commission that scrutinizes the welfare of our health, namely the Food and Drug Directorate in Ottawa. Certainly, most of these herbicides and chemical contrivances as we say, have been developed in other nations, and are scrutinized in those areas as well. And usually the story has been that Canadians are slow in adopting these chemicals such as 2,4-D or 2,4,5-T or injections of various hormones etc., to look after the populace and in being able to provide a lot more food. Probably in many ways, many of our fears have vanished because of the safety factors and precautions that are taken care of early in the initiation of these programs.

When the hon. Member for Highwood talked about wildlife, and a habitat for wildlife, I had to think for a moment where he was referring to -- whether it was to some of the more sheltered areas where a .08 accumulation in the blood which I read a lot about in my department, was the wildlife that he was referring to. Sometimes they say, "a little drop will do you."

I had to be interested in listening to the controls and the terrible things that they do. Well, the hon. Member for Clover Bar has to put in his two bits worth. I am trying to tell him about how the production of his sheep farm out Clover Bar might become a viable unit, if he would sit still and listen. It reminds me of last year when the opposition, then on this side of the House, were chattering about their bewilderment, and how they were worried about all the descriptions we were giving them on how to make agriculture more viable, and they couldn't understand then. And when I listened to the estimates that my hon. colleague has been trying to put through this House, I have to believe that maybe they still don't understand, Mr. Speaker, bewilderment is still carrying over. And I say to them to be calm, to please be calm.

MR. HENDERSON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister isn't dealing with --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. minister permit the point of order to be identified?

MR. HENDERSON:

On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister isn't speaking on the sub-amendment - how on earth we got off into the agricultural end of it on this sub-amendment is beyond me. I think it's in the interest of the House to have the hon. minister stick to the body of the sub-amendment that we are discussing.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is very close to agriculture when you talk about 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T, because some of my hon. colleagues on this side have talked about food production; certainly when you talk about the good that 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T and other chemicals have done for the food production of the world, we could be faced today with starvation if it had not been for the development of these products. Certainly 2,4-D, which is another chemical that is an insecticide, has had a great deal to do with the development and the welfare of the people of the world, and certainly this does have to do with agriculture, very much so. It's not at all out of the realm of agriculture.

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-45

When we talk about banning the use of 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D I would ask the hon. members who are very interested in this to contact the director of the Forage Experimental Farm at Nanton, Alex Johnston, who is working out of the University of Lethbridge. He would tell you the great grass release that is developed when areas are sprayed and the herbage is killed, weed herbage, such as Canada thistle for one, snowberry for another, which comes from over-grazing. That gives a release to the more timid type of foliage which often used in developing and looking after the birds need for food. For instance, dandelions can take over whole fields because of the nature of their roots and leaves. But they are very susceptible to 2,4-D, and when this area is sprayed with this kind of herbicide that competition is eradicated and the release of grass, natural grasses in those areas, is unbelievable. In the first year it is estimated that the release of grass in the very first summer that 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T are applied, the release that particular year is as high as 60%, and the next year it is as high as 250%, and a field that is over grazed and a field where the grass is almost depleted of all species of grass other than the undesirable weeds, which could be dandelions, or snowberry -- these are caused by a lack of grass which provides habitat for the birds and animals. It has a tremendous grass release, and that area can be brought back to full production with good grass management within as short a period as three years.

Surely we have to take these sort of things into consideration. When we talk about interfering with nature, we have to think about years ago when Indians used to burn great tracts of the country off. All the hon. members will know, if they are conversant at all with the natural workings of the chemical reactions that happen with fire, that for instance in the month of May a fire burning amongst saplings, or young trees, causes almost 100% kill, just with the use of fire. And this is because it is at a critical stage of growth. And the Indians at that time used to burn off tremendous tracts of the country, not because they liked to have a fire running all over their territory, but they burned it off to sweeten the grass, to sweeten the grass, Mr. Speaker. The reason for this was to attract the buffalo into certain areas so that they could run them over the cut-banks and break their necks, and break their legs in order that they could get them for food. This was the way that they operated. But today with our efficient forest management there are not many fires now being allowed to burn wild for a long time and consequently, Mr. Speaker, you don't have the natural control on some of the weeds that we used to have years ago.

So it is necessary that these chemicals are available. Certainly they have been tested to the safety of human beings, because, for instance in one area in an experiment that was carried on quite a number of years ago probably when 2,4,5-T was first used in the province, it was used in an area where there was 800 head of female cattle during the months of July, August and September. In the early part of June this area was half sprayed with a mixture of 42 ounces of 2,4-D and five ounces of 2,4,5-T, which is a very potent application, in order to control brush. A month after that application was put on, the animals were let in there and they grazed until late in the fall. And of that amount of cattle in that particular area, there was a --

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. minister is not speaking to the sub-amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

26-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sure he is.

DP. HOFNER:

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the sub-amendment deliberately allows for wide ranging debate, because it takes out any reference to any particular area and therefore in my view the hon. minister is certainly in order.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MP. HENDERSON:

On a point of order! While I respect some of the opinions of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, I really can't see his suggestion being substituted for a ruling from the Chair -- the hon. minister is not being consulted here.

MP. SPEAKER:

I must agree that the point of order is well taken and the question that is before the House is whether the amendment should be further amended by omitting the words following the word 'agents' in the first paragraph of the resolution.

I should say, perhaps, while I am on my feet, in reply to a private enquiry concerning copies of the matter which has been tabled by the hon. Member for Camrose, that these are available in his constituency for any of those who wish to go into the subject and all its branches.

MP. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to bring before the House all of the ramifications this sub-amendment creates, and had the hon. members on that side of the House ...

DR. BUCK:

And that side.

MP. COPITHORNE:

. . . listened in the past . . .

DR. BUCK:

We did.

MR. COPITHORNE:

. . . to some of the arguments they are now hearing, they may not have been over there, but it was their choice. Well, Mr. Speaker, as I was continuing along --

AN HON. MEMBER:

The clock says to adjourn the debate.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to adjourn the debate.

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-47

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister begs leave to adjourn the debate on the sub-amendment, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

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

* * * * *

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

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that we revert for a few minutes to Introduction of Visitors, if the House so agrees.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, with great pleasure I would like to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of this Assembly, representatives from the Provincial Advisory Council for 4-H. They are from all corners of Alberta. One of them told me he can look across the United States border. The other ones are from northern Alberta, western and eastern Alberta, representing 11,043 members of the 4-H Clubs, whose membership rose by 24% last year -- last fall when the people put in their memberships to the 4-H Clubs. I also would like to say -- which may be of interest especially to our hon. Minister of Agriculture -- that they all told me they would start a sheep club in each one of the regions. I would now like them to rise and be recognized.

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

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 the Whole to consider Resolutions Nos. 1, 2, and 3 on today's Order Paper. His Honour, the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the motions, recommends the same for consideration of the Assembly.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent]

[Mr. Speaker took leave of the Chair]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of the Whole Assembly will come to order.

26-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

Resolution No. 1: Be it resolved that it is expedient to introduce a bill for an act being The Municipalities Assistance Amendment Act 1972.

HON MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Resolution No. 2: Be it resolved that it is expedient to introduce a bill for an act being The Alberta Loan Act 1972.

HON MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Resolution No. 3: Be it resolved that it is expedient to introduce a bill for an act being The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act 1972.

HON MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. FUSSELL:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Resolution No. 1 be reported.

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent.]

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, I move that Resolutions Nos. 2 and 3 be reported.

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

[Mr. Diachuk took leave of the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the following resolutions:

Be it resolved that it is expedient to introduce a bill for an act being The Alberta Loan Act 1972;

Be it resolved that it is expedient to introduce a bill for an Act being The Municipalities Assistance Amendment Act 1972; and

Be it resolved that it is expedient to introduce a bill for an act being The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1972,

and beg leave to report same and beg leave to sit again.

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-49

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent.]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Municipalities Assistance Amendment Act, 1972. The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to set the amount of the municipal assistance grants for the current fiscal year at \$42 million. That is the highest this amount has ever been, Mr. Speaker, and it was arrived at through early and full consultation with the municipal levels of government.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 39 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce two bills, the first being The Alberta Loan Act, 1972. Mr. Speaker, there are just a couple of things I would like to say about The Alberta Loan Act. This is the act that will authorize the borrowings for the fiscal year 1972-73, up to a maximum of \$200 million to undertake the province's long term capital financing program as outlined in the budget speech presented to the Legislature on March 17th.

The second act, Mr. Speaker, is The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1972. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this act will authorize a \$100 million increase in the aggregate principal amount of outstanding government guaranteed borrowings under The Municipal Financing Corporation Act. The purpose of this act, Mr. Speaker, is to offer low-cost financing of capital programs of Alberta's municipalities, school and hospital boards, and also to provide a convenient and accessible means to the people of Alberta of investing in the debentures and other securities of these Alberta municipalities and boards.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Provincial Treasurer could enlarge on what is going to make it an encouragement to Alberta investors to invest in the bill?

MR. SPEAKER:

May I suggest to the hon. Member for Calgary Millican that this perhaps might come up for debate when the bill is up for discussion?

MR. DIXON:

I'll be glad to bow to that request, but I thought the minister, in his enlargement, wouldn't mind mentioning this. But that's fine, I'll ask it on the second reading.

[Leave being granted, Bills Nos. 6 and 7 were introduced and read a first time.]

26-50

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply for consideration of the estimates.

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent.] * * * * *

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

MP. DIACHUK:

The Committee of Supply will now come to order.

MR. HORNER:

Prior to going on, I have some additional information here that I promised the hon. members last night in regard to the Planning and Consultation Secretariat. I have enough copies for everyone. In addition to that, I have some additional information in relation to the question of the milk loans that were made. I think the hon. Member for Wainwright was asking those questions.

In 1970 there were 48 loans made, totalling \$630,000. In 1971 there were 35 loans, totalling in rough figures \$510,000. On interim assistance loans there are 2,500 loans, totalling \$2,133,700 outstanding as of December 31, 1971, with \$647,864.

I think those were some of the outstanding questions. There are some others as well. I don't have all the additional information but we will be getting it.

MR. STROM:

On a matter of procedure. This afternoon I raised the possibility of raising a couple of points on the release the hon. minister gave to the House. It was suggested we would be able to raise it this evening. I am wondering, as a matter of procedure, if it would be agreeable if we let it go until we reach the end of the appropriations we are discussing. Then, if I may raise two or three questions in relation to the release itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

It is agreed then, that after Appropriation No. 1176.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well.

Appropriation No. 1173 Co-operative Activities and
Credit Union Branch

[All items were agreed to without debate.]

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-51

MR. STROM:

Before we come to the end of that vote, there is quite an increase in staff there, and I am wondering if the hon. minister would care to outline to us the expanded activities that he is anticipating for this particular branch.

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. The entire increase in staff in this department is related to additional co-operative development officers to supervise and advise the co-operatives in all areas. Included are the native peoples' co-ops, some of the cattle co-ops and a variety of such things. It has been a great concern to the government that additional supervision was necessary in the field in relation to business practice, in relation to viability of some of the projects that these co-ops were undertaking. With that concern in mind, and with cooperation of other field men, both in my department and additionally, in the direct agricultural section, and in the Department of Lands and Forests, with the cooperation of both of these field people in relation to cooperative development officers in the field, we hope to be able to give better service and in an advisory capacity to these cooperatives throughout this province. This is the requirement, then, that those additional eight people in relation to cooperative development officers in the field.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ruste.

MR. RUSTE:

Now Mr. Chairman, has the hon. minister considered in many of the legislative acts that we have -- where there are loans and guarantees, many of them relating to the regular lending institutions -- has he considered adding credit union loans because there are many credit unions in the province that are of a substantial nature and could well fill the bill?

DR. HORNER:

It is in the bill right now that credit unions can do so if they desire. Now my first inquiry some months ago was as to whether or not the credit unions would like to get involved in guaranteeing some of these loans. The reply at that time was that they couldn't see any interest in it because of the nature of the one percent over prime. Since that time, I think, perhaps from pressure from their own members in certain areas, they are now having a second look at it. We are therefore in the process of changing the relations in that regard so that the credit unions, if they wish to do so, can be eligible for the guarantee on some of these guaranteed loan programs, particularly in relation to their own members, in some of the rural areas where they have, in fact, not been dealing with the bank, but have been dealing with the credit union. So we hope that the credit unions, in fact, will take advantage of it.

MR. TAYLOR:

I wish to ask the hon. minister if the increased appropriation indicates any concern over the way the credit unions have been conducting their business, are any of them in financial difficulties, or anything of that nature?

DR. HORNER:

There is concern about the financial situation in some of the co-operatives. I would be less than frank if I didn't say that. We are also, because of the expansion of the credit union activities within the province -- out of those eight divisional people, two of them are specifically in the credit union field, and six are co-

26-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

operative activity people; one for each of the regions in the province to boost our field start to enable us to give better advice to these co-operatives and to help in a real sense in providing skills that they don't have. I might say that we've just made grants to the Feeders Association groups in the south to, in fact, provide us with that kind of skilled management in relation to some of the native people -- Indian co-operatives -- down there, so that we have these people who will be able to advise in regard to nutrition and in regard to feeding practices and these kinds of things. And, I hope that by so doing, we can make some of these activities of some of these co-operatives much more viable because I think it is very important for the native people as well as the government -- more important for the native people themselves -- that these projects that they undertake become viable.

MR. TAYLOR:

We are very pleased to hear this. I was thinking about some of the co-ops on the Blackfoot Reserve. The co-op store went under, largely I think because there wasn't enough assistance and counselling to the people and they get so tied up in credit that eventually it just simply sank. Their livestock co-operative I think, is going pretty well but they do need some counselling from people who have had experience and I am very pleased to hear that this is going to be done.

DR. HORNER:

You may be interested to know that one of the grants we made was to the Feeders Association adjacent to Gleichen, and this is a grant for managerial assistance and advice to the native people's cattle co-op there. Additionally we've done the same thing to the one in the Cardston area and we will do it to others to make sure these become a viable operation. There are a number of other co-operatives throughout the province which are having some difficulties, and it is absolutely essential that we not only provide the framework for them to get into trouble but that we provide them with some assistance to get them out of trouble as well.

MR. PINMAN:

On this particular score, when these grants are made, are they made directly to the natives? They are not? So they...

DR. HORNER:

Talking about the one at Cardston and the one at Gleichen, grants are made directly to Carl Anderson, the man involved in the Gleichen area. He is head of the Feeders Association in that area, and the grant is to that Feeders Association so that he can use other people in the association to come on to the reservation and give them skilled assistance in nutrition, and the same thing in your area.

Appropriation No. 1173 agreed to

545,960

Appropriation No. 1174 Municipal Relations

Other Expenses

MR. PUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, possibly the hon. minister could inform us of a rough breakdown in this. It refers to, I believe, three areas; the Agricultural board, the agricultural societies and then there's the Agricultural Manpower. Could you give us a breakdown proportionately of that? And then if he would mention just briefly, are there any changes in the housing for seasonal workers in the grants provided

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-53

there? And then report on the Warble control program that's been started and I think pretty well accepted.

DP. HORNER:

I might say the additional staff here are related almost on an equal basis to the three different areas that the hon. member is talking about. The additional agrologist in the manpower program, I think, as we talked in some of the earlier estimates, we were talking about developing manpower programs and apprentice programs in relation to the dairy industry, hog industry and in relation to other sorts of a specialist areas in agriculture. These are now more than under way, and we hope to have some agreement with federal manpower for next winter particularly in relation to that, and we're moving ahead well on that manpower program. While the the bulk of the appropriation, I should say, the grant section of course, is to the Ag service boards. Other than that the administrative area is about the three different areas. So there's an additional staff in the administration of a clerk-stenographer in the general agriculture service based program. There has been an increase in the Ag societies' activities with relation to the PEP program for the expansion of buildings, in which approximately \$1 million was committed under the Winter Works Programs to a variety of multi-use buildings through the agricultural societies of Alberta.

The Warble control program has pretty near universal acceptance throughout the province. There are still a couple of areas in which certain people have some doubts in relation to the problems of the application of the chemical and the question of the residues buildup in the cattle and so on. It may be, and certainly I know of one county that has voted against the Warble control program in the south, and I think they did it on the sincere basis that these are pretty progressive ranchers and they feel that they haven't been satisfied that there isn't a residue problem using Dieldrin or some of these things in that area. As is noted in your estimates book this was previously funded from the Horned Cattle Trust Fund and is now being funded directly by the department. I would hope later on to have an additional announcement during the session with regard to the future of the Horned Cattle Trust Fund, the \$1.5 million that is presently in the fund and how we intend to use it. I would expect that that will be along. We're having it analysed now to see what it is doing and where we think it should go. If there are any other questions that the hon. member would like to ask there....

MR. RUSTE:

How about housing for seasonal workers?

DP. HORNER:

This of course, relates to the continuation of the program for assistance of housing for seasonal workers in the irrigation and sugarbeet area primarily. We have also made some additional grants in that area on an experimental project for a different type of housing for them. We are hoping that this might be worthwhile but we are going to continue that program.

MR. RUSTE:

I take it then it is the expansion of the program that is in with some modifications?

DP. HORNER:

Yes, the idea of an experimental physical structure in relation to improving the kind of housing that they have.

26-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

MR. CHATPMAN:

Yes, Mr. Notley?

MR. NOTLEY:

I wonder if the hon. minister could give us some idea of what the cost was last year of that program for seasonal workers?

DP. HOFNER:

I think it was in the neighbourhood of \$40,000. This is primarily in grants to farmers to provide the housing on a shared cost basis with the provincial government, provided the housing was up to a certain standard.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. minister would give me some indication in connection with the weed control. How would an improvement district apply for some assistance in weed control, or could they, without a service board?

DP. HOFNER:

What they have to do is set up a service board, of course, in the local improvement district and this is related to the Department of Municipal Affairs. They hire their field men as a county or municipal field service board would do and go along with their weed control program. We have a number of them going in the north.

MR. TAYLOR:

Grants are only paid after a service board has been set up?

DR. HOFNER:

Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes, Mr. Lee?

MR. LEE:

I have a question on the training programs. Do you have a breakdown on the allocation of funds for the agricultural training for the native people? Is this funded under the Manpower Agreement or through Indian Affairs?

DR. HOFNER:

We have found that the manpower training that we have been doing with the native people so far has been by direct grants to other agricultural societies to provide that training as a package to them. But it is an area in which we would hope the new ARDA Agreement might give us some assistance in relation to manpower training for the native people in some of their agricultural pursuits particularly. Again, going back to the co-operative activity section, we're getting our field people, our district agriculturists, our home economists, involved in some of these activities of the native people in the agricultural co-ops and they are, of course, our resource personnel who we are using in the field in those areas.

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-55

MR. LEE:

One other question. The training on the job program just sort of began in 1971, and I wonder if there was any breakdown as to how expensive this was?

DR. HORNER:

Well, we just got initiated in agriculture and are in the process now of trying to gear up for a major program in manpower on-the-job training, or what we call apprenticeship training for certain areas in agriculture, as in dairy and hogs and so on, for the next winter season, and we hope to have a continuing program from then on.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Notley.

MR. NOTLEY:

Would the hon. minister be able to advise us what percentage of this increase in the appropriation stems from the increase in the Agriculture Service Board program, and to what extent are the increased services available across the province and what will those increased services be?

DR. HORNER:

It has been more a question of the Ag. service boards in the various areas taking up to the maximum allocation in the variety of areas, rather than any new programs at this time. So they are now using all of the grants that are available to them. In 1971-1972 the grants in that area were \$938,000 so that there is an increase in the grants of very close to \$300,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, one further question on the movement of workers. Some two years ago, I believe it was, when I was on a Cabinet committee in southern Alberta, there was severe objection raised in connection with the movement of workers because a very large number of them had been brought in from Saskatchewan. They were natives, and my own people in the Blackfoot Reserve later raised this with me, wanting to know why the Saskatchewan Indians were preferred to the Alberta Indians. Now I have nothing particular against Saskatchewan Indians, they're Canadians too, however, I do think charity begins at home and I would hope that our own native people, particularly those who are reasonably close to the area, who could move there easily and get home on weekends, should have first opportunity, and I would hope that the program would have some type of clause in it where the natives of Alberta would be given first opportunity.

DR. HORNER:

I can't answer the hon. member directly in relation to that. I can say to him that I didn't have any complaints last fall that there was this movement of workers from outside the province into the area. So as far as I'm aware that wasn't the problem last year, but I appreciate the comment the hon. member makes and we'll keep it in mind.

Appropriation No. 1174 agreed to

1,359,280

Appropriation No. 1175 Agricultural Engineering

Salaries

26-56

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

MR. PUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, I notice there is a substantial increase here in the Salaries part. Is that tied in with getting information out and assisting the farm, shall we say, in this field?

DR. HOPNER:

No, Mr. Chairman, this is the increase provided for the new Farm Implement Act activities and they weren't looked after in the previous budget. There was no provision for anybody to run The Farm Implement Act in the previous budget and the increase here is primarily all concerned with the administration of The Farm Implement Act.

I might say, the hon. member has asked a couple of questions with regard to the question of how many dealerships were closed out under the Act, and the answer is of course, there were none. This Act was formerly administered by the Plant Industry Division and in the reorganization of the department, has been turned over to the Agricultural Engineering branch, which is now the Engineering and Home Design branch in the Family Farm Development division. As a consequence, and because of some difficulty in establishing these positions through the personnel office, there has been some delay in setting up the director of The Farm Implement Act. However this is now in progress and interviews are going on at the present time. We would hope that we will be able to appoint the director almost immediately and then have the agricultural technicians who will have to be required to be inspectors under the Act. In the meantime we have contacted all of the 1,200 dealers in the area and forwarded them the whole information with regard to the Act, with regard to the new regulations, with regard to the forms that they are required to fill in, and we hope to be able to move quickly now once we have the administrator of the Act appointed and give him some staff to go to work with. As soon as we have that done we will be setting up the Advisory Committee in relation to act as an Appeal Committee where farmers would be able to appeal directly on individual cases in relation to warranty, in relation to the provision of parts, and any other matter which relates to the cost of farm machinery. We hope to get them -- at least this summer's operation of that Advisory Committee -- some valuable information that will allow us then to make some worthwhile changes in the Act.

MR. NOTLEY:

I wonder if the hon. minister would advise us how many technicians or field men are going to be appointed under the administration of The Farm Machinery Act?

DR. HOPNER:

There will be three agricultural engineers, one agrologist and eight agricultural officers and an additional steno -- eight agricultural officers. I might say that the three agricultural engineers will not all be only involved in the Farm Implements Act. They are associated with the general agricultural engineering section, with the eight agricultural officers which will be broken down into technicians and officers in relation to inspections and new development of techniques in relation to the Farm Implement Act.

MR. NOTLEY:

One small supplementary question on that. Are these men going to be distributed throughout the province or are they going to be based in Edmonton and travel out of the city?

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-57

DR. HORNER:

I would hope that they would be based on a regional basis rather than in Edmonton.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Dr. Buck.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make one or two comments here. I have been sort of waiting for the opportunity to make this statement because I feel, looking at this appropriation, that governments are moving more and more into areas that I think they should stay out of. Now it is fine if your philosophy is to look after people from the cradle to the grave -- like the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview believes in his philosophy. Well this is fine, but I think free enterprise governments should look more and more at staying out of fields such as this. When I see here, that we are going into home designing and expanded engineering designs related to waste disposal and so on, I really feel that politicians come up with a "harum scarum" schemes and they try and sell people on the fact, and they tell people that the people are demanding these things. In many instances, I think the politicians are the ones that instigate and initiate some of these programs. I think that if we looked at all levels of government I think we could probably save billions and billions of dollars by getting cut of some of these things. So I hope that the new government, when they are looking at this thrust -- and they are supposedly a free enterprise government -- I think that maybe they should peel off several millions of dollars in programs such as this.

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I am frankly quite surprised that the hon. member would pick this appropriation -- get up and make that kind of a speech. I am literally flabbergasted! We are talking about the farm machinery cost to the farmers of this province. We are talking -- I will get back to the other two -- but primarily this vote is looking after the question of The Farm Implement Act -- imperfect as it may be, but a product of the hon. members' wisdom.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, I didn't even say anything about that. I was talking about the other section. If he wants to make his speech, that is fine, but if he wants to rebut it he can rebut what I said, not what he thought I said.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I am confident the hon. minister will get to that too.

DR. HORNER:

The hon. member made a speech on this vote in regard to agricultural engineers and regard to the agricultural engineering without any knowledge about what he was talking about as usual. In this House, he continues to do that, so he gets up and makes his right wing speech now, the most inappropriate place in the entire department, because we are talking about family life structures; we are talking about...this vote is about that. And that is what you are talking about, the hon. member should become awake and know what is going on in this place...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

26-58

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

DP. HORNER:

...so that he doesn't make these kind of speeches which were totally irresponsible because if, in that case then, Mr. Chairman, what he is saying is that we should not have any policing of The Farm Implement Act, that we should allow farm machinery companies to do what they like.

DP. PUCK:

Mr. Chairman, I didn't even say a thing about The Farm Implement Act. I was talking about these other nonsense things about designing homes and designing these things that I was saying we should stay out of...[Interjection]

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Chairman he had his opportunity to debate the great speech. I think he should sit quietly now while he listens and learns.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

DR. HORNER:

If that is possible. We were talking primarily about vote 1175, when my hon. friend got carried away, very badly in my view. Because he will learn to regret it, because it will go down along the way. I hope it isn't Social Credit policy that in fact we should allow the machine companies to do what they like; that we shouldn't provide any engineering assistance to farm homes for farmstead planning; we shouldn't provide any specialized engineering service on a regional basis, on a consulting basis; or district agriculturalists to farmers in a general way with regard to their engineering problem in home design, if you like. These things are all available to urban population paid for by the taxpayer. My hon. friend is probably subsidized when he built his house in relation to design and relation to Central Mortgage and Housing contribution to these kinds of things. These aren't available to farm people as my hon. friend should know, because his constituency is primarily involved in the farm industry. I am really amazed, Mr. Chairman, that he had the absolute intestinal gall to get up and talk like he did about this appropriation. There are others, and lots of them in the entire estimates that he could have made a right wing speech on, but not on that one.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I'm sorry, Mr. Zander has been trying to get up. I'll get you next.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, what I have to say is not quite as controversial as the other subject was. But my concern is that a group of MLA's had attended a seminar by the International Youth Organization, which had their meeting this past week, and their prime concern was in the sugar beet industry and what relationship to subsidizing of labour occurs, and the deplorable state of the workers and the conditions under which they have to live, and the treatment they receive while they're doing their work. The first thing I'd like to know from the hon. minister is how much money is received in subsidy, or how much money on an hourly basis is subsidized to the sugar beet industry?

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-59

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Out of this appropriation?

MR. ZANDER:

No, generally.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Wake up.

MR. ZANDER:

The second question is under what housing conditions would these people have to live and try to make a livelihood for themselves and their families?

DR. HORNER:

Most of the people are...

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I suggest on a point of order that if we're going to discuss vote 1174, let's revert. We're happy to revert. I think that we should do it now that we're getting toward the end of the Minister of Agriculture's estimates...

MR. ZANDER:

We're talking about housing here.

MR. STROM:

I'd like to see us stay on the right vote. On 1174 it deals with seasonal workers and housing.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

1175 is the appropriation we're on now. I believe Mr. Zander, you're asking to get back to 1174?

MR. ZANDER:

No, Mr. Chairman, if we could go into it at the end, then?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Does the committee agree that we come back to 1174 after 1176?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

I'm glad to hear that we agreed to go back to that appropriation. I want to go back to it too.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Your question is now on 1175?

MR. HENDERSON:

Yes, it's on 1175, and more specifically, on the recent performance by the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I thought the minister has really been out of character thus far in his estimates. because he sat there in a very gentlemanly manner, answering

26-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

questions very politely and it's really been bothering me because it really contradicted all the performances he ever put on, on this side of the House. I'm sure he feels much better now that he's finally had the opportunity to get and launch into one of his usual political harangues. He has to get it off his chest once in a while. And of course, Mr. Chairman, I think it would have avoided some of the comments that the minister, I think, very inappropriately saw fit to offer, if he would have outlined to us what the breakdown in this appropriation is, as to how much of it is for the administration of The Farm Implement Act, which constitutes two words out of many in the first part, and how much of it is for the other services. And then maybe we can discuss the matter a little more intelligently on the basis of some facts instead of a bunch of political noise.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Minister.

DR. HORNER:

Well, I'm sorry that the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc is getting a little touchy....

[Laughter]

MR. HENDERSON:

Not as touchy as you did!

DR. HORNER:

He's quite in character, as usual, Mr. Speaker. As far as the administration of The Farm Implement Act is concerned, of the total appropriation of \$367,000, the administration of The Farm Implement Act would take approximately half of it.

MR. HENDERSON:

And the other half, do we understand, Mr. Chairman, relates to the proposed return to a joint testing program on farm machinery with the other two provinces?

DR. HORNER:

No, Mr. Chairman. As I announced initially, we haven't heard back from my colleagues in Saskatchewan and Manitoba to the suggestion that I made to them that we would table this survey or this study report in regard to the farm machinery institute. As soon as I hear from them and if they agree, we'll table that document, which outlines the financial contributions that might be expected from the province. But there is nothing in this appropriation for that at this time.

MR. STROM:

This relates to the agreement that might possibly be looked at and I was just wondering if the hon. minister would care to tell us whether or not he has suggested to the other two governments that Alberta would be prepared to share on a one-third basis the cost of machinery testing.

The reason I am asking is that I happen to know, regardless of any proposal we were prepared to make, Saskatchewan would not go back into it. Of course, I have to admit that that was under the regime of another government, and I was just wondering if our present government was prepared to make a firm proposal, so the other two governments might have something to consider.

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-61

DR. HORNBER:

I might advise the hon. leader of the Opposition that with the change of government in Saskatchewan, one of their very firm planks in their platform that they got elected on, as I understand it, was the re-establishment of a farm machinery testing unit in Saskatchewan. In our discussions last fall the proposition was put to us and the three ministers discussed it. The conclusion of those discussions was to set up a technical committee of people from each of our departments who would then bring forward a study report on how such an institute might be set up, and the financing of that institute, without any commitment by any government towards it. In other words, what they have done is put forward a proposal which is now before the three governments. My suggestion to the other two governments was that we make this study report public so we can have input from all sides of the Legislature, from farm organizations and from other interested bodies, so that we can get some public discussion about it. Then the governments would have to meet again after getting some feedback from the interested people in their various provinces. Then we would decide where we'd go from there.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, if I might just ask a further question in regard to the same subject, has the hon. minister given any consideration to discussing this proposal -- that is, I should not call it a proposal in the strictest sense of the term -- to discussing the testing program as such with the machine companies? Because at the time we were discussing this matter with the Saskatchewan people they had made quite an intensive review of the testing programs carried out by the machine companies, and for that reason, felt there was a tremendous amount of research and experimentation being done at the company level. I am just wondering whether the hon. minister has given any attention to that while looking at the other proposal.

DR. HORNBER:

Well, of course, that is part of looking at the whole matter of machine testing. On the other hand, I think this is more part and parcel of what the Barber Commission were talking about. As a matter of fact, the proposal we have does not include any federal contribution, which in my view, may be something that should also be negotiated. The question again, of the machine companies, the question of the farm organizations, the dealer organizations, I think all should have some input into the proposal that the study group will come up with. We might improve on it, otherwise we might reject it, but at least, we could have some discussion as to whether or not, in fact, we could get a joint testing program in the three western provinces.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister a couple of questions. In relation to the home design and the expanded engineering services towards building structures, the environmental control and waste management, and things of this nature which will help make the farm a viable business, how do we decide who is the smallest farmer who would qualify? Keeping in mind that we do have many small farms like hobby farmers in the areas close to the major urban centres and so on. Would they qualify?

Also, I am wondering how we justify this kind of assistance to farmers when, for example, I don't see a similar vote in the industry votes, and I am just wondering how we can offer such services to one segment of society and not to others. MR. WILSON:

I'm just wondering how we can offer such services to one segment of society and not to others. I'm sure there's many individuals in

26-62

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

small industries within the province who very dearly need similar assistance to this and if we're going to give it in one area, how do we justify not giving it in another? I'm wondering if this really could not balloon into another program which helps the successful farmer, the one who least needs it and how do we make sure that the little guy who really needs it gets the help?

DR. HORNER:

Again, I'm rather flabbergasted by those statements, particularly when we have seen the subsidization of industry throughout this country and throughout this province in relation to the many millions of dollars that were given in grants and forgiveness in relation to industry; the forgiveness grants that are available to municipalities, towns, villages and cities in relation to the sewer and water programs that they have in these areas. For the honourable gentleman to stand up and say that this is something we're doing for agriculture in an area where we are using about six agricultural engineers as consultants to the DA's in each of the regions in this province -- if he's suggesting that we're showing favoritism to the farmers of Alberta because of this small and actually almost token service that we have been able to provide and we're now trying to expand on. Is he suggesting that it is discrimination against the farmers of Alberta vis-a-vis the urban people who have the advantage of all these give-aways under CMHC and the industrial incentives program that have been going on both provincially and federally? Is he suggesting discrimination against the farmer who has to buy from a market which is protected by tariffs -- some pretty substantial tariffs -- and has to sell on the international market and provide the cheap-food policies of this nation -- if he's suggesting that we're being discriminated against because we're going to spend something in the neighbourhood of \$100,000 in relation to this kind of assistance in relation to improved sewer and water, improved engineering for the provision of farm buildings, well, Mr. Chairman, if the urban and town centres are in that bad shape, I'm sure that if I talked to the farmers of Alberta, they'll raise the \$100,000 to provide them with similar service.

MR. WILSON:

I sincerely appreciated that quick course in agriculture, but now I wonder if the minister would answer some of the specific questions which I raised. First of all, how did you decide how small a farmer can qualify, and how can we be assured that it will go to the farmers that really do need the assistance? I wasn't denying the fact there may be farmers who needed the assistance but asking if he could advise us how we can be sure that it will go to those who need the assistance.

DR. HORNER:

I have a great deal of faith in my field people, that they will try and get this service to the people that require it. This is a consulting service that is provided on a regional basis -- perhaps the honourable gentleman isn't aware of that for administration, and my friend from Wainwright can fill you in on it if you like -- on a regional basis and in each of these regions there is a consulting engineer who at the request of the district agriculturist can be called in -- in relation to engineering problems that a particular farmer may have in relation to his home, in relation to sewer and water installation, in the country, in relation to the ventilation and waste disposal problems that we're running into in agriculture. We hope that we're facing up to our responsibilities in that area by providing this kind of engineering service. It's available to everybody in the area, and the contact is through the district agriculturist. If the little fellow would like that kind of assistance, it's available to him by contacting the field men in our

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-63

area. If the housewife would like some assistance with regard to engineering, and perhaps prod for sewer and water which she doesn't have, I'm sure my home economists in the various areas would only be too glad to bring it to the attention of the consulting agriculture engineer in the area to provide this kind of service.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, I understand the hon. Minister to state that the assistance will go to any farmer, regardless of how small a farmer he is, how small an operation. Fine, that's the policy we're trying to establish. Thank you sir.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, now that the hon. minister has delivered his first tirade on the thing that I didn't even ask about, The Farm Implement Act, and it's quite obvious that the hon. Premier isn't here to keep him in line so he's running off, as he quite often does, at a tangent. We've established where our political philosophies lie, mine lies to the right of sin, and his is considerably to the left of centre. I just hope that the government doesn't carry on with this type of philosophy because then we're in more trouble than I suspected we were. But ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Is that your question Dr. Buck?

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, in fairness to you, sir, I think that too often you prejudge what a member may want to ask, so if I may have the freedom to ask the question - the question is this - in delivering these engineering services will the consulting engineers be spread out so thinly that the service might, in essence, be there theoretically but in practically it might not be available? Will there be that much of a dilution of the engineering service?

DR. HORNER:

Well there will be the consulting service to the farmers of Alberta in regard to engineering. Naturally and pretty obviously because of the number of people involved and the kind of money that is involved that at the moment that is all we can do, provide a consulting service to them, to try and show them some answers to the problems that they may have in an engineering way related to the problems of the farm buildings is essentially what it is all about.

MR. STROM:

I want to make it very clear at this point in time that I appreciate very much the explanation that the hon. minister has given as it relates to services for rural people to upgrade their farmsteads and their homes and that I support it 100%. I think that he and I, if we were to get together could certainly put up some real good arguments in this area of subsidization for one group of society as against the other. I think I wanted to get that off my chest because I think that we can get carried away when we discuss the amount of help that is provided. I say sincerely, I appreciate your explanation and I agree with the help that is given.

But if I might just turn for a moment to the problem of The Farm Implement Act and to say by way of a lead statement before asking my question - that I'm sure that the hon. minister recognizes that we are in a rather difficult area of interpretation as to whether or not a machine is giving service or not, to a farmer. It has bothered me very, very much. It bothered me from the day that we brought in the

26-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

act itself, because I realize that it can be abused. I'm not suggesting that it necessarily is, but I simply make the statement that it can be abused. In listening to the hon. minister explaining the qualifications of the men that are being hired and the work that they will be doing, to what extent will they be trying to assess the blame for the problem and then going to whatever party they have to go to, and demanding that corrections be made. I realize that when you set up a large staff, if there should happen to be a little bit of a slack period and somebody gets caught in that slack period they could be the recipients of some pretty harsh treatment. I'm just wondering if the hon. minister would care to give us his interpretation of how this would be handled, because I think it is very important.

DR. HORNER:

I would agree with the hon. member that it is very important. One of the real problems is defining the question of warranties. The Manitoba government has taken one view in that area, Saskatchewan has another and of course ours is different yet. So one of the things that I really wanted to do was to get the Advisory Committee going as soon as we get the administrator appointed. Part of their job will be to wrestle with these problems of interpretation, with the problem of developing amendments to the act that might be worthwhile and would be easily understood by both the farmer, the dealer and the manufacturer. We would have on the Advisory Committee representation from farmers, dealers and manufacturers. We would hope that through a summer of operation that if a farmer has complaint with regard to warranty, non availability of parts etc, that he would bring his complaint to this committee and they would sit, as a committee, hear this complaint, investigate it in all its manner and then make a recommendation to the administrator. If he couldn't handle it the recommendation would come to the minister. Out of that I would hope we would get some benefit as to the direction we should take in additional legislation in the area.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the explanation that the hon. minister has given. I don't want to make my next remark for the sake of argument but simply to express my feeling only. When we first set up the act we felt it would be well to leave it almost in limbo, as it were, to try and sort out the problems that could arise. I think that the man we chose to handle the administration was ideally suited to it -- I refer to Mr. Art Wilson who had spent years within the Department of Agriculture. He was a man who had the personality and characteristics that suited him for the kind of work that had to be done. I don't disagree with stepping up the administrative operation but I just simply make that as a statement of government policy at that point in time. I feel the hon. minister will certainly have to remain close to it in certain areas of administration because it could create some problems down the road. And I was glad to hear you mention that it is not only dealers that we are talking about but it is the manufacturers maybe, more often than the dealers, so that it is a three-way street.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Notley.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, first of all just to comment on The Farm Machinery Act, I am glad to see that there is going to be an advisory committee. I hope that the advisory committee this summer would look at other acts and other jurisdictions in Canada but wouldn't just restrict their examinations to Canadian jurisdictions; for example, I think that we might, with a good deal of profit, examine the farm

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-65

machinery acts in the Dakotas. I understand they have had some experience with some fairly tight legislation in those two states, South and North Dakota. I think it would be useful for us if we had some examination of the legislation of those two states.

Three questions relating back to the farm machinery testing program. Maybe the hon. minister answered this but I'm not quite sure whether he did or not. The technical committees set up to examine the feasibility of the joint testing program, do we have a fairly precise date as to when this committee will report? Following from that, is there any ball park figure of the total cost of the joint testing program? I know that we at least have the experience of the former plan in Saskatchewan and I am wondering if, perhaps, we have some general estimate as to cost. And the third point that I raise, and I say this a little bit with tongue in cheek. The hon. minister mentioned that he would like to get federal contribution to the farm testing program and I certainly agree with that. But again I think this just reinforces the need to get that technical committee report as quickly as possible. I suspect that if Mr. Lang and Mr. Olson tour the prairie provinces, the more we can bring to their attention, before the election, the need of federal funding for a joint farm machinery testing service the more likely we are to be successful.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, ...

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Let the hon. minister answer that first, Mr. Farran.

DR. HORNBER:

Sorry, the hon. member perhaps misunderstood me. We have our report from our technical committee. I am awaiting the approval of the other ministers to make it a public document. I felt that that was only fair, the three of us were involved in the document and I, therefore, would rather not say what the ball park figure is in the report in deference to my colleagues in Saskatchewan and Manitoba. I think if we agree to table it simultaneously in our three legislatures then we can have public discussions and feed back and so on. I am hopeful that they will agree to that suggestion that I put to them that we can, in fact, table it and have general discussion in relation to the costs and perhaps if we can table it then the general discussion will get a commitment out of federal government in relation to such a program.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes, Mr. Farran?

MR. FARRAN:

Do you think it's possible, hon. minister, that through this co-operation with the other two provinces on the prairies of such a huge market you can have some influence on the design of farm machinery which is still, although it's come a long way, crude in so many respects -- where they have open bearings, they have to be greased every go around the field, where there's no reliance on belts. All these things still exist to some degree in farm machinery. Is there some way to stop it?

DR. HORNBER:

Mind you, you can go on for some length in relation to some of the things you can do in relation to lowering the cost of farm machinery. Certainly the question of better engineering design is

26-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

one of them, but I'd like to suggest that the question of standardization is much more important, particularly of such things as hydraulic cutters. Just some of the smaller things would be a substantial saving to the farmers in Alberta if we could get some standardization. One of the things that the ministers in Saskatchewan and Manitoba and I talked about, is how we could, in fact, lead the way in Canada in improving standardization, particularly of attachments on tractors and some other relatively inexpensive items by themselves. But when you have to have a separate item for each piece of equipment it can become fairly substantial costwise. So I think standardization is one of the big areas in which, if you're ever going to do anything about farm machinery, that can be achieved. I think also one of the real things that a machinery institute could do, besides the ordinary engineering testing of the machine, would be to put the emphasis on a realistic, if you like, or workmanlike machine, rather than on the paint and the two-tone jobs and so on, and get back down to the basic mechanics of the machine rather than covering it up with paint and fancy jobs that really don't improve the machine, but improve it's saleability rather than its performance. So there are a variety of areas where a machine testing institute, in my view, would be of great benefit to the farmers of Western Canada.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I want to make two comments. First in connection with The Farm Implement Act. It is my view that there has been really murder committed on the part of some of our farmers by manufacturers, and sometimes with the co-operation of dealers in regard to machinery. Now I'm not suggesting for a minute that we don't want to be fair to the manufacturers and to the dealers, but I think we have to realize that the manufacturers don't need an advocate at public expense. They have the best legal talent they can buy now, and the farmer, the lone farmer is sometimes left in a very, very difficult position when he can't even afford to hire a lawyer and must cope with some of the best paid lawyers employed by machine companies. I'm not saying this is common, but the exception makes the rule, and it is my view that the farmers of this province do need some protection against the monstrously large manufacturers. I agree that all three should be heard, but I hope that these people who are going to be employed will not consider that they are going to be the advocate for the big companies. The manufacturers are well able to buy their own advocates and I would hope that these people would go the second mile in being fair to the farmer who he has a grievance. Now, if after all the facts are shown, the farmer are wrong, well that's one thing, but I know there are a few of these cases where the farmer in my view is right and he's not getting fair treatment. As a matter of fact, I wrote to a machine company just this week and suggested that they replace the machine -- that it is their responsibility. Now I don't know what my suggestion is going to do, or if it's going to carry any weight, but it just isn't right that the farmer who paid \$19,000 for the machine should be now left holding the bag with a machine that just won't work, and the machine company should replace it. I'm glad to see some money put in here and some people who are going to be of the standard and calibre that they can stand up against the big companies, because that's what we need. Certainly we want them to be fair, but we also want them to be firm in realizing that their main job is to make sure that the farmer gets a fair deal.

The second point I would like to make is one I feel I have to make, following some of the discussion, because I have said the same thing in my constituency. That is in connection with some engineering assistance for design in water and sewer for our farm homes. The people of the province using money belonging to all of the people, have improved the water and sewage in every town in the province and every village in the province, as far as I know. Part of this was money belonging to the rural population. I can go to farm

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-67

homes -- I am sure every farm representative here, every representative of a rural area here can do that -- where the living conditions are primitive, conditions that just simply should not be tolerated, where they are still using outdoor privies in 50 below zero weather; where their water supply is very questionable. Sometimes I have read stories about the natives and how bad their conditions are, they simply duplicated some of the conditions that are found on some of our farms. I think it is about time we gave some assistance to these farmers in that category in getting water and sewers. It is a service that they have a right to, in my opinion, and we are just simply doing for them what we have done for the urban people of this province. I am certainly very pleased to see this type of vote, and I hope that it will bring water and sewer to a great many of our farms today, where living is most primitive. It shouldn't be -- it should be modern.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, I commend the remarks that the hon. Member for Drumheller to his colleagues from Clover Bar and Calgary Bow.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well, no further questions.

Appropriation No. 1175 total agreed to 367,730

Appropriation No. 1176 Surface Rights

Salaries

MR. PUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, on this, I wouldn't want to let him get by without a question here. I understand that legislation will be coming in shortly, relating to this whole thing. Would you care to explain something on that, or is it too early for that?

DR. HORNER:

Well I can say what I have said in a general way before. Of course we are bringing in new surface rights legislation which will establish a Surface Rights Board which will take over from the Right of Entry Arbitration Board. There will be an expansion of the membership of that board and generally an expansion of the provisions for protection of the surface owner and his rights in this province. I might say that in regard to the question we were just talking about, we will be setting up within the department a farmers advocate to advise the farmers in relation to their legal rights, not only in relation to this act, but other acts which affect the rights of a farmer in relation to expropriation of his property. I might suggest that this is a major act and that when it is brought in we could have a major debate on second reading of the provisions -- the general provisions of the bill. In essence, this vote establishes the administrative monies that are required to administer the Surface Rights Act. In that administration, is primarily an expansion of the board members and the backup that is required.

MR. PUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, a supplementary question on that. I understand that at least one of the major farm organizations has somewhat similar position in their organization. Are you going to work together with item in this, or is this going to be apart from it or in cooperation with it?

26-68

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

DR. HORNER:

Well, we have co-operated with all farm organizations in relation to this problem of surface rights. We intend to continue that co-operation. We are concerned that, in fact, they haven't had access to proper legal advice in regard to their rights and regard to how they go about protecting those rights. That is just one part of the thing. I mention it here because, in fact, it isn't in the legislation, for some very good reasons that I will bring out when we bring in the legislation itself.

MR. RUSTE:

Just one further one. Do I understand then that the advocate would be preferably a legally qualified person?

DR. HORNER:

It would be Mr. Chairman.

MR. HENDERSON:

I'm pleased to see that the board is going to continue. I had some concern in light of the opinions expressed by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley -- in fact he's chairman of a Conservative party committee studying this business -- that maybe the government was going to get rid of the board.

I'd like to ask the minister, in light of the fact that they're going to set up these public advocates, what has happened, if anything, to the individuals that were in the pipelines division of the Department of Mines and Minerals who had a responsibility for going out on pipeline business particularly, and other business when business was being done with a view of informing the land-owner of his rights at the time. I don't know how many people were involved in this, but is that being phased out and being placed under here? Are the pipeline division -- I guess they are with the energy board now -- still providing something along this line?

DR. HORNER:

They're providing some advice under the pipelines division, but the inspectors that were with the Right of Entry Arbitration Board have moved, of course, with the Right of Entry Arbitration Board to the Department of Agriculture. One of the reasons that put the advocate section in the act is that there are a number of acts that the advocates should be advising on in relation to The Pipeline Act, The General Expropriations Act, a variety of acts that do, in fact affect the rights of the individual farmer, and I would hope that we would be able to have a service where we could at least give them some direction as to where they could go to get assistance, if required, in regard to legal aid, and a variety of other legal matters. And that's the essence.

MR. HENDERSON:

Just a question, Mr. Chairman. It may be that the minister feels that it's more appropriate to leave the discussion of this particular point until the bill comes in, but if he deems it appropriate at this point, would he comment on what the government policy is relative to the responsibility of the Right of Entry Arbitration Board re-examining old agreements made some years back regarding rental rates on well sites and roads, And also, if he would care to comment at this time on the implications on what the government's policy is relative to having a board, such as the Right of Entry Arbitration Board interfere in private contracts; 85% of the contracts in this regard are signed without difficulty between the two parties, so would the minister, if he feels it is appropriate, comment on this?

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-69

DP. HOFNER:

Mr. Chairman, I do feel that that would be much better debated under the second reading of the bill, but I can say that, of course, is one of the real problems in that no government, would want to break contracts in that sense. There is also a resolution on the Order Paper, on which I would expect some discussion, about going back and looking at contracts previously made, so that frankly, I do believe that the proper place to discuss that is when we're discussing the bill itself.

MR. FENDERSON:

Agreed.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Chairman, one or two things on this particular vote. To the minister, development has dropped substantially in the settled areas as far as oil and gas drilling are concerned, and there's a 42% increase in the vote. I noticed here you mentioned expropriation by companies. I wonder if your assistant -- this legal person you're talking about -- would he also be giving advice on expropriation by municipalities or by government as well?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, we would expect that he would develop not into a council but would give advice as to where they could get counsel or legal services, and so on. I wouldn't expect that he would be the -- I forget what lawyers call it going into courtroom, but he would be more of a directive service, rather than an actual servant. While the development work in regard to oil wells has gone down, the major proportion of work under this act has to do with pipelines and power lines. That activity has increased.

MR. DIXON:

My next question to you, Mr. Minister was going to be on pipelines and on power lines, and so you say that the basic work for this gentleman will be to recommend whether they should get legal advice regarding power lines, pipelines and oil drilling sites?

Appropriation No. 1176 agreed to

217,050

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Before we get back to the final sum we'll return back to 1174 as was agreed. Mr. Zander, you had a question. MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, if it is OK with this House I would forego the question at this time and bring it up in the question period tomorrow afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The total sum as on . . . yes, Mr. Strom.

MR. STROM:

We had agreed we were going to go back and question the statement the hon. minister tabled this afternoon. the first question I want to raise is one of policy. It says here that this philosophy is based on the idea that there are people in the world

26-70

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

who will buy Alberta products. It is the job of the government to find them. Now, what I am concerned about is, what does the hon. minister consider to be the government's role from that point on when they have found the markets?

DR. HORNER:

I would hope our role, after our initial contact, would be a catalyst with private industry and the commodity group to promote the next step, which is long-term trading agreements, sales agreements, or contract agreements in relation to the export market. Certainly, in regard to the domestic market, I would think the next step would be to confer with our colleagues in The Department of Industry and Commerce and with the private sector to try to encourage, as I said in Medicine Hat the other night, somebody to develop a TV Dinner operation in Medicine Hat -- this kind of thing, so that we follow it right up. This, I think, is government's role.

MR. STROM:

I appreciate that. May I ask then, and I think the hon. minister dealt with it, so it is not a new proposal, but do you anticipate there will be difficulty in assuring the importer of continuity of supply because I recognize that in the seeking out of markets, and certainly we are interested in it and we were interested in it. The government's role, in my opinion, becomes rather limited because I can visualize that we can do a great deal in seeking out the markets, bringing back the information and advising the commodity groups of the potential that is available to them. Of course, as you rightly point out, the responsibility of establishing trade agreements or whatever is necessary in that field, rests with the Federal Department of Industry or Trade and Commerce, I should say.

I anticipate that in this matter of supply, is where it comes back again to a provincial government responsibility, and I suggest, can become a real problem in order to insure that we can keep the market, and of course, make it expand if there is possibility there.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, in response to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I am afraid we are rather divided there, because I don't agree that the long-term contracts have to have any signing authority from the federal government. I think we would work under the umbrella of the Federal Trade and Commerce situation, but I believe the provincial government has an additional responsibility insofar as doing more than just finding the contacts. If necessary, and as I said earlier in the discussion of my estimates, it may be necessary for us to lead in setting up an import-export agency for the province of Alberta, which would be a joint venture between government, the commodity groups and private enterprise to give us a vehicle to enter into some of these market areas. I think this is absolutely essential if we are going to follow up and do more than just contact people in the marketing field.

That is the primary role as I see it in relation to the export markets outside the country. I think we have a much greater role than that in the domestic market, and as the news release points out, as a matter of fact, the \$45,000 going to The Hog Marketing Board, is a joint venture between both The Hog Marketing Board and private industry and a pilot project in relation to how we can tackle this problem of continuity of supply, as an experiment if you like, in relation to one approach to that problem of continuity supply. And so, I think, we'll have to do it on a commodity by commodity basis almost in relation to the question of continuity of supply. But this is the real crux of the matter.

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-71

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I didn't intend to leave the impression that I felt the federal government would have to sign. I simply point out that the federal government, if there are any regulations to be imposed, govern trade and it will of course rest with them and not the provincial government. The question that arises from the statement that the hon. minister has just made when he speaks of a joint operation between the provincial government and the commodities groups, is will it be the intention of the provincial government to sign agreements of supplying the market wherever it happens to be?

DR. HORNER:

Not as a provincial government. I see the position of the provincial government in the guarantee role and financing role and leadership role in bringing people together to form an agency, as I was talking about - or in certain cases perhaps to bring people together with the commodity groups to form a separate syndicate that might deal with a separate market or a particular product, and I think we have to have these vehicles if we are serious about getting into the export marketing field.

MR. STROM:

In the statement made this afternoon - I may have heard wrong - but I got the impression that the use of the funds would be determined by the commodity groups, subject to approval by the provincial government?

DR. HORNER:

Essentially that's true, Mr. Chairman. It will be a joint operation of the people in my department, in the marketing fields and in the production fields, along with the commodity group in each instance to develop the programs that they want to start. I mentioned the one to the Alberta Potato Commission. We would hope that they use that grant in relation to clearing out the stocks that are on hand of processed potatoes, hopefully by this fall.

MR. STROM:

I'm still not quite clear when you suggest that you have divided the grant, made it available to them - does it have strings attached so that they have to come back to your department and get clearance on specific uses? For example let's take the one to the vegetable growers, \$5,000 (it's one of the smallest sums listed here). but surely there wouldn't have to be any further clearance in the use of that \$5,000 that has been made available to them by your department?

DR. HORNER:

No, no additional clearance, but we would expect them to take advantage of the expertise, both in the production end and in the marketing end that our people have. In other words, I wouldn't want to see the commodity groups going out and duplicating the functions that are already taking place within the department, and I think that that's the main reason why we have to work together with them. We don't want them going and duplicating a function that's already been done with the idea that, in fact, they are going to expand their market. I'm very serious, I don't want to put any strings on the commodity groups, but I do think that they have to have consultations with the people in our department, both in the production end and in the marketing end, so that, in fact, we don't waste the money. We want to see this done in a useful way.

MR. STROM:

The Alberta Egg and Poultry Marketing Board received \$13,000. Now that includes two marketing boards as I understand it, is that

26-72

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

correct? How do they determine the amount of money that may be used for one or the other? Is that an arrangement that they will work out between themselves?

DR. HORNER:

I'm sorry I didn't get the hon. member's question.

MR. STROM:

In the statement here in the news release, the Alberta Egg and Powl Marketing Board - maybe I'm wrong in my understanding of it here - I'm trying to recollect from my own involvement in it if this is two boards?

DR. HORNER:

There's only one.

MR. STROM:

There's only one board? I see, then there's no problem then. I have a question, are there any commodity groups that form boards that are not covered by grants?

DR. HORNER:

In this group of grants - yes the Powl Marketing Board and the Turkey Marketing Board are not covered in this group. They had previous assistance and we are looking at programs in relation to them as well.

MR. FOSTE:

The hon. minister may recall, I believe it was almost two years ago, when there was a grant made to the Hog Marketing Board and there was a bit of controversy at the time from one of the other livestock organizations as to funds being put into a specific project. Has the hon. minister come across this tendency now, or are they accepting the fact that what one sells benefits the other indirectly.

DR. HORNER:

Well I hope they are accepting the fact that certainly that there has to be a different approach perhaps with each commodity group, and that certainly if one prospers it's in a general way. We can say that agriculture, generally, is going to prosper, but it has been my firm conviction that programs that will help the potato growers might not help the grain growers and so on, and I am very concerned that we use our programs, as I have said many times, tied to our marketing opportunities, and this is a direct objective in this initial group of grants, to get the thing off the ground.

MR. STROM:

Is this vote 1104 -- I take it that it is -- vote 1104?

MR. HORNER:

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. French?

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, in going through the various appropriations in the Department of Agriculture, I notice there is a large increase in the number of new personnel that will be employed by the department. I

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-73

presume that some of the personnel will be professional and some will be non-professional. Would the hon. minister have any indication of the approximate number of professional people and non-professional people that will be included in this vote?

DR. HORNER:

All I can say is that by far the greater majority of the people in the increase involved are in professional positions, and the only non-professional ones would be support staff that are required in relation to that. I point out in the commodity support, of course, the increase from three to sixteen. This is primarily in commodity marketing officers and in professional people. The planning secretariat that I distribute is, in fact, all professional people. The increase in the marketing intelligence, the increase in export trade commissioners, the increase in the various regions in regard to the home economists -- there are about ten additional positions for home economists in this group, and I consider them very professional and we hope to make much greater use of them. So I would suggest that perhaps 80% to 90% of the new positions are, in fact, professional.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, in view of that fact that in previous years we have had a shortage of district agriculturists and district economists in various parts of the province -- I know we have had to wait in our area for a district home economist until one is available. So now my question is simply this. Does the hon. minister anticipate any problems in procuring the professional staff that he will require in the department?

DR. HORNER:

Well, I think you always have some problems in getting these kind of people and fitting them into the right slot for the job that you want done. I am confident, though, that the kind of activity that I have had back to me is that there are a lot of professional people interested in what we are trying to do in relation to the marketing thrust and in relation to the family farm development and that they are interested in joining our team. It's going to take some time to fill all of the positions. I would be less than frank if I didn't say that, but we hope to reach that point where we can have a well-knit team in the marketing area and one in each of the other two areas of the three sections of the department, and that we can forge ahead as quickly as possible. I say again the major resource that our department has to offer to the farmers of Alberta are competent people doing a competent job. This is the primary resource that we have and the primary way in which we can help agriculture.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Sorenson, I believe.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Chairman, I just wondered if the hon. minister would allow me to make a few comments on the family farm? I have been very quiet during the agriculture estimates and . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, just until we get things straight -- at this point are we on the total income account?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes.

26-74

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

MP. P. SPEAKER:

There were one or two questions that I wanted to ask the hon. minister with regard to the Alberta Potato Loan Guarantee regulations that were set up today, and should I do that, Mr. Chairman, before some of the remarks are made, or..

MP. CHAIRMAN:

Go ahead now.

MR. P. SPEAKER:

Okay. There are two questions I had for the hon. minister. One was with regard to section 4b(3), and in there it mentions that he has a guarantee of market in the form of a contract or other suitable proof of market. For example in the Vauxhall area there the farmers are owners of the processing plant and does that mean that if they have a contract with their own processing plant that they qualify?

DP. HORNER:

Well in that area this is going to have to be resolved. I do appreciate that particular problem in the Vauxhall area. I might say that that particular regulation was at the specific request of the Potato Growers' Association themselves in relation as they felt, and as I feel, that the loan had to be tied to some marketing opportunities, and as I say, almost word for word, their request for one of the regulations.

MR. P. SPEAKER:

I guess what I was concerned about whether the term 'marketing' meant beyond the local market and, that is a market on the foreign market such as the States or into Britain.

DP. HORNER:

The local market. That there would be at least a one-step stage.

MP. SPEAKER:

The other question, Mr. Chairman, was with regard to the availability of credit to the farmer, and I was wondering if the hon. minister has talked to the various banking institutions to make sure that credit is available. We have found sometimes in the past that this type of guaranteed loan wasn't always honoured at the bank, and that there were some difficulties.

DP. HORNER:

Yes, I think that's a very important point, that in fact, and with this as with the others, we have tried to have discussions with the banks themselves prior to developing the program and that's very true of the potato program. We had some extensive discussions with the bank for a number of reasons. One, to assure ourselves that they would be interested in the program; and secondly, in regard to the potato growers' situation at the moment, particularly in southern Alberta, that in fact we could, that most of this money would be new money to the grower, rather than money just to take over some of his present debts, and we have in a way, or we have that understanding with the banks that, in fact, the money provided under the potato loan guarantee would be new money for them, because if we didn't do that I'm afraid we wouldn't have improved the situation.

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-75

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, just one last question. Is the hon. minister then prepared to, let's say for example, there are some difficulties in a certain potatoes farmer obtaining a loan. Is the hon. minister prepared to assist a farmer who is having difficulty in obtaining a loan by talking or discussing the matter with the bank?

DR. HORNER:

I would think that wouldn't be a good precedent to set on behalf of the minister, and the hon. Member for Little Bow is very aware why. I do believe though that if the grower will work closely with the Alberta Potato Commission and the Alberta Potato Growers' Association, and with my field people who are prominent in assisting the potato growers in his area and in the Bow Valley Empire area and in the Taber Warner area and the Lethbridge area, that if they will work through their association, that the association has had meaningful discussions with the banking institutions and with due respect I don't think the minister should get involved on an individual basis.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Benoit or Dr. Buck. Mr. Benoit.

MR. BENOIT:

Mine is just one question. I probably should have asked it on a previous vote but it's a general sort of question because it may pertain to some others. It's taken us awhile to become accustomed to having the 4H in the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation and in fact maybe we haven't become adjusted to it yet. But I anticipate some questions when I go home with regard to the switch of the co-ops and Credit Unions from Industry and Commerce to Agriculture. Could we have the benefit of the hon. minister's views as to why this change was made.

DR. HORNER:

Well the change was made, Mr. Chairman, because 90% or very close to 90% of the co-operative activity that was going on in the Province of Alberta was of direct involvement in the agricultural sphere and in the rural areas.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make sure that the record is very, very clear on one or two points, and the first point is that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the hon. minister. As a matter of fact, I think so highly of the minister that if the hon. minister was allergic to penicillin, if he was dying of some strange malady, I would even give him some penicillin; because he is honestly trying to do a good job, and I wish him well. I do want the record straight on this, Mr. Chairman, in that I feel that agriculture deserves to get, and we should give it everything we can to make it viable and keep it going. I want that point made very, very clear. The only reason I got into a discussion about philosophy is because I still feel very, very firmly, in spite of what the hon. minister said, and got my words all misconstrued and dissected and twisted, I still believe very firmly in the philosophy that governments are getting into sections, and that the sector where the private sector should be, and I think that we who believe in the free enterprise system should stand back and have a look at this philosophy and see where we're heading. I want that point made very clear. And, thirdly, I want to make the point that I'm all in favour of doing what we can for agriculture because I enjoy reading slanted news. I say that because I happen to read a few of the county newspapers, some of the weeklies, and it's really interesting to read slanted news because it reminds me how we as politicians get uptight when we

26-76

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

blame the news media for not being objective. But I mean I'm sure that when we all write our little news columns, we all slant the news a little this way and that way so I want the record very clear that I am in favour of anything we can do to support agriculture.

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There is a question or two that I would like to ask. One, anyway, to the hon. minister. Recently, well not too recent, I heard a foreign visitor say that it was his observation in the Province of Alberta that we weren't, or hadn't been very aggressive with respect to marketing, that we didn't seem to be co-ordinated; and it surely is true when you see the products on the shelves in the Province of Alberta, not marked 'Alberta', or 'made in Alberta.' I hope that we'll be able to follow this up and identify everything that's produced in Alberta, and have a policy in this regard. There are people in the world who will buy Alberta products, the minister said. I believe that too. I believe that we just haven't let people know what we have, nor have we ever had any plan to urge them to support the Alberta family of producers. I've long considered that the government can play a major role in developing a public awareness of Alberta-produced goods, and I would like to ask the minister if he envisions any retaliation from neighbouring provinces or from other parts of Canada against a movement of this kind, that we try to supply ourselves and support ourselves. This is my topic in meetings around my constituency. It has received universal support. I feel that if we put far too much emphasis on Alberta goods and buy other goods first, why, other provinces will retaliate against us. I'd like to have the minister's expression in that respect.

DR. HORNER:

I think that is a good point that the hon. member makes. I have tried in all of my directions and the speeches that I have made in this area, to take the positive approach. I think that no other province or any other area can have any objection to active, aggressive competition. We have said -- and I have given directives to the boards that did erect barriers on our provincial boundaries, that these were to come down; and they are down. We have no obstacles to other agricultural produce coming into Alberta, but that doesn't mean that we can't say to them that if they come in here, they are going to have to compete both with quality and with availability with the Alberta-grown product. That doesn't say that we can't, as a province, encourage and support a pretty aggressive domestic marketing program. There is nothing constitutionally wrong with that whatsoever. I can assure the hon. member that we do not intend to make moves which would be construed to be constitutionally wrong, in the sense of trying to exclude other products from coming. Again I say, we can take, and will take, a positive approach of aggressive marketing of Alberta products within the Province of Alberta, and in our domestic market. I see nothing wrong with that whatsoever. At the same time, we will pursue as aggressively in other provinces the markets that we think Alberta products should have there as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Sorenson, do you have a comment yet?

MR. SORENSON:

Yes, I am ready to give my comments on the family farm. I think in our concern over maintenance of family farms, we have first a problem of identification or definition. Whether or not the farm operation is incorporated makes little difference, nor is it of great consequence that family farms vary in size and self-sufficiency. It is the family farm as a way of life which gives it a claim to our

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-77

attention and assistance. For instance, does the family live on the farm? Number two, are all family members active in some way on the farm as a family affair? And number three, does the farm contribute to the family unit, other than in cash income? For instance, number one, is there a family garden? Is the family active in maintaining the farmstead as a place of beauty and family pride? Number three, does the farm provide such products as meat, eggs, milk, and so on? Number four, is the family identified with farm movements such as the NFU, Uniform, 4-H Clubs, and so on? Number five, is the family taking full advantage of opportunities to evaluate its agricultural procedures and to improve or expand these? Number six, is the family committed to a continuity of family farm life, even though it be necessary to supplement farm income by any means necessary or available? And number seven, is the head of the family farm prepared to report to designated officials, and consult with them on the success of programs initiated with provincial aid by grants and loans, etc? Indirect means of assisting the family farm through marketing thrusts, marketing boards, grants to commodity organizations, will be largely ineffective since the family farm is least able to take advantage of such help. History bears this out as, for instance, milk subsidies, wheat payments, and so on. Marketing thrusts which result in larger sales at higher, or at least acceptable prices, certainly give an economic boost to successful farmers and this boost passes on to the general economy. One result to be expected is immediate increase in production, not usually by family farms but by larger farms, well-financed farms, and those professionally managed, so the circle starts again. With a European economic alliance and consequent formation of other blocs of influence in agricultural production and marketing, we have to realize that competition will be keen and that price will be a major factor. In the end, the government's meddling in marketing may be only temporarily beneficial, and may result in mounting surpluses such as we have experienced in wheat. Thank you.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Chairman, in just making a few concluding remarks, I would be less than sincere if I didn't congratulate the hon. minister for the grasp of his department. As I put his notes down about half an hour ago, I said that he had answered all questions fairly and with little bias. He did show it a little towards the end, but I can imagine the situation he was in.

Mr. Chairman, I think no one in this House can say that the position of agriculture is not critical and that no amount of sympathy is going to help or do the job. For the magnitude of our problems I believe that the minister has come up with a very imaginative program and a very aggressive program, but I am afraid that in looking for markets, and when we class the family farm as a farm run by a family that includes 90% of all existing farms, I see little in it for the marginal farmer. This is the small operator that we are so afraid of some 18,000 disappearing in the next few years. I see what we have done today is actually, through all our programs and through our new thrusts, to set up a lot of chiefs. I could maybe call the hon. minister the head chief. I wouldn't call him Sitting Bull, because he's been up and down on his feet so often you could hardly call him that. All we've got to do now is to get these chiefs to tell the rest of the Indians throughout the province just what kind of a war dance we're going to have.

In all sincerity, Mr. Chairman, I think we on the opposition and all members of this House, allowing for the seriousness of the program and the aggressive and imaginative program that we have -- while I may not agree wholly with some of the things that the minister is trying to do, he will be judged a year from now on the progress of what he has suggested during these estimates. I think, Mr. Chairman, that we would be less than fair when the minister has asked for support, he has asked for our ideas, if when we go home to

26-78

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

our respective constituents, that we interpret fairly in our own areas the policy the government intends to follow. It's very easy to knock, and it's very hard sometimes to give the other fellow credit, but as I said before in this House, if the minister can pull off even 25% of what he intends to do, he deserves the thanks of the people of this province.

MR. P. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a few remarks at the conclusion of these estimates to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. First of all, I'd certainly like to compliment the hon. minister for his change in attitude and his change in posture in this House. It has added an air of sophistication that I certainly did not see in previous years.

But I think we must understand very much, Mr. Chairman, that each and every action of all of us, and I think particularly the Minister of Agriculture, has certain purposes and intentions. A year ago or two years ago he brought to my attention that often in an Assembly there may be a Crown Prince, there may be one or two or others. And as I observe the other side of the House, I observe that there is a growing Crown Prince at this time. I'm sure that things do change and things evolve, so that by the time the position of King is available, we certainly will have a man to take it. So I can only encourage the hon. minister to proceed and to maintain the positive and sophisticated attitude that he has at the present time. It is very impressive and certainly will mean a lot to the people of Alberta, I am sure.

There are one or two other comments that I would like to make....[Laughter]...however that was a start. As I indicated very briefly in the budget debate, I think one of the most responsible things that we have to do as an opposition is first of all give the ministers and then the government a chance to show what they are able to do and how they are going to do it. Through the discussion of these estimates the minister has explained a number of new policies, has shown that he has intention to meet his obligations.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, if it is OK with this House I would forego the question at this time and bring it up in the question period tomorrow afternoon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The total sum as on . . . yes, Mr. Strom.

MR. STROM:

We had agreed we were going to go back and question the statement the hon. minister tabled this afternoon. The first question I want to raise is one of policy. It says here that this philosophy is based on the idea that there are people in the world who will buy Alberta products. It is the job of the government to find them. Now, what I am concerned about is, what does the hon. minister consider to be the government's role from that point on when they have found the markets?

DR. FORNER:

I would hope our role, after our initial contact, would be a catalyst with private industry and the commodity group to promote the next step, which is long-term trading agreements, sales agreements,

April 11th 1972

ALBPRTA HANSARD

26-79

or contract agreements in relation to the export market. Certainly, in regard to the domestic market, I would think the next step would be to confer with our colleagues in The Department of Industry and Commerce and with the private sector to try to encourage, as I said in Medicine Hat the other night, somebody to develop a TV Dinner operation in Medicine Hat -- this kind of thing, so that we follow it right up. This, I think, is government's role.

MR. STROM:

I appreciate that. May I ask then, and I think the hon. minister dealt with it, so it is not a new proposal, but do you anticipate there will be difficulty in assuring the importer of continuity of supply because I recognize that in the seeking out of markets, and certainly we are interested in it and we were interested in it. The government's role, in my opinion, becomes rather limited because I can visualize that we can do a great deal in seeking out the markets, bringing back the information and advising the commodity groups of the potential that is available to them. Of course, as you rightly point out, the responsibility of establishing trade agreements or whatever is necessary in that field, rests with the Federal Department of Industry or Trade and Commerce, I should say.

I anticipate that in this matter of supply, is where it comes back again to a provincial government responsibility, and I suggest, can become a real problem in order to insure that we can keep the market, and of course, make it expand if there is possibility there.

DR. CORNER:

Mr. Chairman, in response to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I am afraid we are rather divided there, because I don't agree that the long-term contracts have to have any signing authority from the federal government. I think we would work under the umbrella of the Federal Trade and Commerce situation, but I believe the provincial government has an additional responsibility insofar as doing more than just finding the contacts. If necessary, and as I said earlier in the discussion of my estimates, it may be necessary for us to lead in setting up an import-export agency for the province of Alberta, which would be a joint venture between government, the commodity groups and private enterprise to give us a vehicle to enter into some of these market areas. I think this is absolutely essential if we are going to follow up and do more than just contact people in the marketing field.

That is the primary role as I see it in relation to the export markets outside the country. I think we have a much greater role than that in the domestic market, and as the news release points out, as a matter of fact, the \$45,000 going to The Hog Marketing Board, is a joint venture between both The Hog Marketing Board and private industry and a pilot project in relation to how we can tackle this problem of continuity of there are no contradictions and you do decide exactly what your position is - whether you're willing to tell us in the House - make it open to us - or present it here in the House, so that we can discuss it. Or present it to the people in the Vauxhall area - or any other to the irrigation committee - but I think it's significant that you decide exactly what your position is, before negotiating, and how you are going to co-ordinate what you are doing. I thought the other day, when the discussion went on about whether the people in the Bow River Development Project, East Block, were going to know whether their rates would be maintained or not, I felt that that was a very significant question and one that should have been rationalized or discussed between the two ministers. There is only one answer to that question - and it's either yes or no. I think that's all we can ask for at this particular point, because you have to make that decision. And I found that there was a conflict in answers and I only asked that you straighten that particular item out. So, Mr. Chairman, with those remarks I urge that the hon.

26-80

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

minister carry on and we'll certainly be looking with great interest. My constituents, as many others, have high expectations that we're going to do much evaluation.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I want to make just one or two comments in summarizing this department, also. The hon. Provincial Treasurer in his closing remarks mentioned that there were two main ways of dealing with the money situation. One was to borrow - as the government is doing - and the other one would be to raise or increase taxes. I think there's another way he may have referred to also, but whether he did or not I want to refer to it now and that is cutting down costs and keeping costs down. A family that has a limited income has to be pretty careful about the food it buys, the money it spends on pleasure and recreation and clothing. Much more careful than the family that has a very large income.

In this regard I checked through the Department of Agriculture and I think there are a number of places where we might say you could be cutting items out. But I decided to take just one item and see if there we could really cut out the lard without interfering with the program very much. I think I have found such a place. Going through the estimates I totaled up the amount of travelling expenses and I find that the travelling expenses comes to more than \$1,100,000 which is quite a high percentage out of an \$18 million vote. I know how difficult it is in departments to continually say no to departmental officials who want to go to conventions. As a matter of fact I one time said to my own department, when I had it, that I was afraid that when Gabriel came and blew the trumpet that half of the people of the department would not be there because they would be at conventions someplace across the country. And there's a danger of this. The conventions are good, and I'm not going to deny that civil servants don't learn a lot at them, but I think you have to cut down some of this convention business and also the number of people who are attending. I don't know how much of this \$1,100,000 is for conventions but I would guess it would be a reasonable percentage. And I want to emphasize that this is an item where you can cut out the lard without interfering with programs.

Again I know how difficult it is when I see civil servants in a department trying to do a job, who many times find it much easier to jump on a plane or jump in their car than to write a letter or to get on the phone. Many times one can get the identical information by writing a letter or by getting on the phone as you can by getting in your car and driving 200 miles, or taking an airplane, train or a bus and going that distance. It's difficult however, because you have to treat civil servants as grown up, mature people and unless a very careful check is made on travelling you will find that the civil servants are building an empire and travelling far more than is absolutely essential. Now I think this has to be watched very carefully.

There is another point that I think we have to watch, too, in travelling expenses. During the bus strike in Calgary, I was amazed at how full the cars suddenly became. Everybody stopped and picked up someone; you had five and six people in every car instead of one passenger per normal, and during the war we did the same thing. And yet it is most difficult in any department to try to persuade the various branches to combine and go in one car and do their job at one time. Now sometimes there are logical reasons why they can't do this, but I think that there are many cases where we can cut down on this travelling expense, not only within a department but inter-departmentalwise. I know one farmer who said he had three inspectors call on him in one day. One came to inspect something, one came to inspect something else and one came to inspect something else. There were three cars in all with equal mileage, travelling at his expense, and checking up on him. It is difficult to control; it takes a lot

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-81

of doing to control these things, but I would suggest that \$1,100,000 travelling is really out of proportion to the programs that are being carried out. I don't want to interfere with the programs; I don't want to interfere with logical inspections that have to be done, but I would think that if you cut out \$500,000 of that \$1,100,000 the people of the province would not know the difference and the only ones who would complain would be those who want to go to conventions or travel on duty. So that's the first place I would suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that there may well be lard in these travelling expenses when we have \$1,100,000 in a vote of \$18 million.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, just a few brief comments with respect to that. We appreciate what the hon. Member for Drumheller is saying. It's something that we are certainly concerned about. Firstly with respect to our attitude, I thought I had made it quite clear during the course of the budget debate. In the wrap-up we acted very extensively, within the few months we had available to examine the programs inherited and looked at the budget. I had indicated the fact that we were looking initially at \$250 million in required borrowings and we were pretty tough with departments in several areas in order to reduce this. This does not, however, take away from your comments with respect to travelling expenses and I think we would appreciate it any time, from any members of this House on any side, these kinds of suggestions.

I would like to say with respect to travel expenses, that we have given instructions to departments generally across the board to curtail travel. I think that to point it out in the case of the Department of Agriculture is perhaps not quite fair, because as a result of the hon. minister's extensive expansion of the regional operations in agriculture, it has resulted in a great deal of increased travel regionally and throughout the province in that particular department. However, in other departments the kind of thing you are talking about -- conventions, conferences, this kind of thing -- certainly we have issued instructions that this must be curtailed to a greater degree than has been the case in the past. I just want to point out that in agriculture's case it is as a result of what the hon. minister is doing that has given rise to this, and I think every member appreciates that the regional carrying out of the programs will, in fact, create substantial additional travel in the areas the hon. minister wishes to move on in the coming year.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes, Mr. Henderson?

MR. HENDERSON:

I have one or two questions I would like to ask the hon. minister before we leave the total appropriation and then I have one or two comments I would like to make.

I would like to hear from the hon. minister a very clear statement as to how much money is in the appropriations in his department that relates to expenditures on behalf of members of Executive Council other than himself -- or I should say, members of the Legislative Assembly other than himself -- and I mean direct or indirect expenses. How much is in the estimates and where is the money for the agriculture caucus committee for example, otherwise known as task force, and is there any money in any of the appropriations that will be used indirectly to pay the travelling

26-82

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

expenses of some of the messenger boys from the back bench that he chooses to send around the country?

DR. HOFNER:

Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, of course, is off on a witch hunt again. He doesn't really appreciate, I'm sorry to say, the nature and the extent to which we intend to use all of our members in relation to promoting the objectives that we outlined at the start of these estimates. I'm a little bit disappointed in that, in relation what has gone on in this Legislature before this. There is some accommodation for expenses in relation to what members of the various task force groups that are involved in agriculture may be contributing to the total benefit that we hope to get to the farmers in Alberta. The amount would be relatively small, in the neighbourhood of something like under \$10,000 in total. To suggest, as he has, that they're going to be messenger boys and this kind of thing, I don't believe really shows any appreciation of the problems that we're facing in agriculture and the real contribution that these members have already made towards the development of policy and towards the implementation of that policy. I would suggest to him very sincerely that, in fact, he should review his thinking in this area and make available to us in a constructive way some of his views as how we could improve the lot of the farmer in Alberta, rather than to go on in this witch hunt that he is on. It is a matter of record, of course, Mr. Chairman, that he has developed it through other mechanisms as well in this Legislature, and it's also a matter of record that the government has a policy in this regard on which we stand very firmly, and I don't want to say anything further about that.

I would like though, at this time, Mr. Chairman, just to make a few remarks and to thank most of the hon. members for the constructive approach that they have taken to the discussion of the estimates of my department. I'm quite willing to accept the challenge that the job that we do is to be judged on the results that we get.

MR. FRENCH:

Atta boy!

DR. HORNER:

And I'm willing that that judgment be carried out by the farmers of Alberta, not necessarily by the politicians.

The question in relation to, and I was rather amused -- and I'm sorry my hon. friend from Little Bow has left because having had so much experience.....

MR. P. SPEAKER:

Here I am!

DR. HORNER:

Oh! I'm sorry -- having had so much experience as a Crown Prince, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that his advice is very good and worthwhile and I'll take it all to heart.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-83

DP. HORNER:

I notice that he's now gone over and associated with the other Crown Prince, the Crown Prince of backtracking, Mr. Chairman, and we appreciate that backtrack too. I'm sure that the hon. member is enough of a politician to appreciate that he put his foot in his mouth and is trying very hard to get it out. I'm sure that the hon. Member for Fairview and myself will help him on any occasion we can to get it out and push it in again. [laughter]

On the whole, Mr. Chairman, I think we've had a very useful discussion in relation to the programs and the direction we hope to take in agriculture. I'm rather surprised about the approach that has been taken by the hon. Member for Drumheller with regard to travelling expenses. If instead of having just added figures, he would have had a look at where those travelling expenses primarily are, he would have seen that nearly half of it them are involved directly in the votes related to the marketing thrust that we're talking about. And if the hon. member thinks that we can in fact, get to the export markets without travelling; if he thinks we can get to the other markets that we have to explore without travelling, then I'd like to know how. The question in the other great majority of the travelling expenses are directly related in providing services to farmers in Alberta. I agree with him, of course, that there may be on occasion this nonsense of three people arriving at the farm to do a variety of inspections. I would hope that if that ever occurs and there are three people from my department, that somebody would let me know about it, because I don't think that that needs to occur in a well-run regional setup or a well-run area setup in relation to providing these services to the farmers of Alberta.

But, on the other hand, I want it to be very clear that it is a little more difficult to provide these services to scattered rural populations than it is to provide a service in the urban area where no travelling is involved. Certainly the travelling expenses, if my hon. friend will have a look at them, are primarily in those two areas. Marketing and the provision of services to farmers in their farms, veterinary field services, the livestock production, and so, in fact, a very minor amount of the travel expenses in this estimate is related to his idea of conventions. I would suggest that it probably would be well under 1%, so it isn't an unreasonable percentage at all, while I agree that this is an area that needs to have a continuing eye kept on it. I believe it isn't a good idea to try and make his point by overstating his case. That we have found is one of his predictions in the past.

So, Mr. Chairman, if I may say again, I appreciate the contributions that the hon. members have made. I say again, we consider the program that we have outlined as an investment in Alberta and as one of the departments that produces primary wealth in Alberta. We think that this is a wise and reasonable investment. Again I want to say to the government and to the hon. Premier, we appreciate the confidence that he has put into agriculture and we would hope that with the help of all hon. members, from whatever side of the House they are, we can do something for agriculture to make it a more viable industry and to improve the lifestyle and the incomes of the people in rural Alberta.

MR. HENDERSON:

I think it is regrettable, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. minister has chosen to so lightly skip over the question of what he calls a witch hunt. And of course, Mr. Chairman, the reason it has been necessary to stand up and ask this question as to how much money is hidden in these estimates for the benefit of the backbenchers on the other side of the House, because in fact, it is hidden. I think it is incumbent upon the hon. minister -- while we differ very definitely on the principle, and I think that is self evident -- to inform the hon. members of this House which appropriation is involved and how much money is in the appropriation. I think this is a matter

26-84

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

of public accountability and I disagree very strongly with the suggestion that if public money is to be used for the expenses of the hon. gentlemen in the back benches, that it should be a matter of obvious public information. I learned at this stage that it is scattered throughout the whole estimates. I can only assure the hon. minister and the hon. treasurer that in view of the position that the government has taken, he can expect a witch hunt from me at least, on every departmental estimate, because we want a figure and to know how much money is going into the pockets of the hon. members of the Conservative Party through governmental estimates that have not been properly identified.

Beyond that, Mr. Chairman, let me also say I reject categorically the suggestion of the hon. minister that anyone who challenges this principle is not in favour of agriculture and improving the lot of agriculture. That is absolute nonsense! Nobody knows it better than the hon. minister. So, Mr. Chairman, I am going to suggest, following which I would like to make one or two further comments, but suggest we hold this appropriation -- the income account -- until the hon. minister gives us specific information, identified by appropriation, as to how much money is buried in these estimates for payments directly or indirectly on behalf of hon. members of this Assembly other than the hon. minister himself. I think we are entitled to this. Beyond that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to add that I think the entire budget has been quite a revelation, so far as the hon. minister is concerned. We have heard him stand up in this House for four years and talk about all the fat that exists in government, about all the fat that has existed in the Department of Agriculture, and then to bring in a budget that adds 200 employees to the department, I suggest Mr. Speaker, is a complete contradiction of the past performance of the hon. minister. He either owes it to this House to stand up and say that all this fat he talked about, that he thought he knew about over the last four years, that he didn't know what he was talking about.

Or, if he isn't prepared to do that, he'd better stand up and give a little better justification of why he's seen fit to add over 200 employees to this department, the cost of which add up to an increase in salaries of \$2.5 million which is approximately half of the total incremental thrust. Certainly new programs and new policies, I presume, have to have more staff. But as I say, Mr. Chairman, the action of the minister in bringing these figures before this Assembly is quite a revelation. It's quite a turn-around from the past performance of the minister himself and the 'now' Premier of this province.

The other thing I think that's been quite a revelation, Mr. Chairman, is to witness the rather dismal performance of the 45 new members seated on the opposite side of the House. I can understand some of the Cabinet Ministers not wanting to get up and question the hon. Minister of Agriculture, but to witness the fact that they've got all these new members over there and there have only been about five of them who've seen fit, during the examination of the estimates, to get up and ask their minister a question of any consequence on the entire study of the estimates -- an expenditure of \$18 million. It hardly lends credence to all the propaganda...

MR. HYNDMAN:

Look who's talking about propaganda.

MR. HENDERSEN:

...that the Conservative members have been propagating, all their members have about the tremendous concern they have for the farmer. And as far as I can see, Mr. Chairman, the performance of the hon. members seated opposite, other than the minister, has been a very dismal one. I can only conclude that their main purpose in serving in this House is to act as a rubber stamp for a one man show,

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-85

and we're going to continue to witness this dismal performance from them throughout the rest of the study of these estimates. Certainly if a new member coming into this House at any time should have any enthusiasm and any interest in examining these matters, surely it should be the first year he's here. What do we hear? Nobody can ever accuse me, Mr. Chairman, of ever being really silent, and I think the hon. Minister, Mr. Hyndman, who is playing little Sir Echo over there probably would agree to that.

Now, I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that as we go through the rest of these estimates, that we're going to witness something a little more positive and a little more constructive from all this tremendous pool of talent seated on the opposite side of the House that we've heard so much about. Because it really wasn't very effectively demonstrated during the study of these estimates.

MR. HYNDMAN:

There's talent here.

MR. HENDERSON:

And I conclude, Mr. Chairman, by moving that...

MR. HYNDMAN:

You concluded that an hour ago.

MR. HENDERSON:

...the income account estimates be held in committee until the minister has tabled in this House the information relating to the amount of funds and the appropriation that the funds are contained in that's going to be used for the members of this Assembly directly or indirectly, expenses or otherwise, other than the minister himself.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Just a minute. Can I...

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, before we put the question, I think that there are a number of things that need to be said. First of all, it really alarms me that in spite of all of the things that some of the hon. members have said in sincerity in relation to the program we've outlined for agriculture, we now have the -- and I don't know his official title over there, the Whip or the second Crown Prince...

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, the title of the member is the Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

DR. HORNER:

Oh, I'm sorry about that. I appreciate that. We now have the Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc ridiculing the agricultural program of this government. We now have the Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc stating that in fact it shouldn't have been, that we didn't require any additional expenditure in agriculture...

MR. TAYLOR:

He didn't say that.

26-86

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

DR. HORNBER:

This is exactly what he said, and the record will show.

MR. TAYLOR:

No he didn't. He simply said....

DR. HORNBER:

He certainly did. He said that we had 200 extra people in the department and that we didn't require them. He said it, and the record will show, and it will also show what the hon. Member for Clover Bar said earlier in relation to the agricultural estimates.

DR. FUCK:

You said, not I said.

DR. HORNBER:

I'm really sorry that we should end them up on the note that the Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc is now bringing forward, Mr. Chairman, because it takes away from the very positive approach a number of his colleagues have taken in these estimates.

DR. FUCK:

He's irresponsible.

DR. HORNBER:

I will make a point of bringing his remarks to the farmers of Alberta in relation to the consideration of the estimates. I'm sure that they will appreciate it. I'm sure that the farmers in his area will appreciate the fact that we didn't need any expanded dairy programs, that we didn't need any expansion of the co-op system so that we might have a more viable and interesting life for our native people and for people in rural Alberta who have been in the co-op movement. I can understand his reticence in relation to maybe having additional people in the co-op department. If we want to have a really good debate about the activity of that department in relation to the past government, we can have it, and in no uncertain terms. The relationship in relation to cost to government, because we didn't have the kind of personnel we should have had in that department is pretty outstanding. In relation to the point that the hon. member makes with regard to this motion on the task force, the funds are in the Fees and Commission under General Administration. I have already told him as to what the maximum amount would be.

I don't feel -- and he has access to the public accounts of this Legislature as we go along -- he can bring before the public of Alberta, any monies that are paid to the members of this Legislature at any time. We are quite willing to let the people of Alberta judge that. But for him to set himself up as judge and jury and then the hangman, too, is a little much, and it is something we just won't accept, Mr. Chairman. We will vote this motion down.

MR. HENDERSON:

I would like to be clear on the statements of the hon. minister as to the appropriation that the funds are contained in. Would he repeat what he said, was it No. 1102? He said, General Administration.

DR. HORNBER:

I appreciate that the hon. member has a little difficulty in grabbing the necessary . . . yes, No. 1102 under the heading of Grants.

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-87

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, that is the point; he was talking Fees and Commissions. I couldn't see Fees and Commissions in the appropriation. So I thought it was another one of the snow jobs of the hon. minister. I can understand the hon. minister being perturbed about me getting up and making my remarks in light of his past performance in the House. Of course, the hon. minister, in his usual way, is telling a half-truth, and trying to peddle this as being the facts of the matter. Of course, the facts of the matter is, that the hon. minister, who has been a member of this House for a number of years had . . .

MR. HYNDMAN:

It is not in order, I suggest, in this Assembly, or in Committee, Mr. Chairman, to suggest as the hon. member opposite has, the word 'half-truth'. I would suggest he withdraw it and use other terms.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I do not choose to withdraw it. I was brought up to the understanding that half the truth in many cases is the equivalent to a lie. When the hon. minister stand up here and distorts what I said, it was quite a revelation to see him bring in these estimates, adding all those people and all this expense to the public purse, in view of all of his past statements that all the fat that was in government, and all I asked the hon. minister to do was to have the decency and integrity to stand up in this House and retract his statements he has made in past years, and that he made during the election campaign, in this House, following which, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. minister is prepared to deal with the question in its entirety, so far as my comment are concerned, I am quite prepared to withdraw the statement I made about half-truth. But until we hear the whole, that is where the matter rests.

ONE HON. MEMBER:

We were here a week, where were you?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I believe the question has been called and the mover of. . .

MR. HENDERSON:

On the point of order, I suggest the term 'weasel' is very unparliamentary. That is even worse than 'half-truth'. It was appropriately applied, and I call on the hon. House Leader on the other side of the House to have the decency to stand up and . .

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I will now call the motion as placed by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc. All those in favour of the motion as placed by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc stand.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, we got the information from the hon. minister we asked for . . . I quite agree we will have a standing vote on it, in fact, I think it is an excellent idea. Go ahead and put the question; I withdraw my remarks.

26-88

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

MP. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, it may well be alright for the group on the other side to laugh loudly, but I recall very distinctly that my colleague, the hon. Member for Wainwright, asked this very question of the hon. minister. I am sure, if he recalls his answer, he will remember he said, "it isn't in here" on that appropriation.

You had an opportunity, Mr. Minister, to clear it at that point, and I say we are perfectly within our rights to get it and I suggest that when they start laughing, they had better start thinking about what their hon. minister has been saying. All we are asking for is the information.

MP. STROM:

The government has determined what policy they want to follow. This is very correct, we are not going to argue it as far as their right of decision. We may disagree with them in policy but I suggest that we have a right to know where the dollars are. The hon. minister has now given it to us and therefore my hon. colleague is correct in saying there is no point in pursuing the motion that he has placed before us. And that's all that we were trying to do.

MP. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I don't think the motion can be withdrawn without unanimous consent.

MP. TAYLOR:

Well, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order, the motion was based on the request for certain information. That information was given, now surely we're not going through the unnecessary detail of voting when the information has already been given. Well, I don't know what is funny about it. The information has been given so the basis for the motion has been removed.

MP. CHAIRMAN:

Very well, as the Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, I understand you have withdrawn your motion?

MR. HENDERSON:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think according to parliamentary procedure, I didn't hear you volunteer to second it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No, I understand in committee you do not have to have a seconder.

MR. HENDERSON:

Fine, well my motion, Mr. Chairman, was that the total on income account be held in committee until the hon. minister has tabled before this House, the information pertaining to the amount of monies and the appropriations involved wherein public funds are going to be expanded in the Department of Agriculture, on members of this Assembly other than the hon. minister himself. That was the basis of my motion and if a seconder is not required, I think it would be an excellent idea to have a standing vote on it.

MP. CHAIRMAN:

Very well, then the question has been called. All those in favour of the motion, and in order to make it more exact, would the people in favour of the motion rise so the clerk can count them?

April 11th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

26-89

All those opposed please rise.

The count that has been given to me, in favour of the motion, 18; opposed, 40. I declare the motion defeated.

We will now have agreement on the total income account expenditure of \$18,403,925.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The capital account expenditure in Section 2, on page 2.

The following were agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation No. 1181</u>	Emergency Capital Account	30,000
<u>Appropriation No. 1186</u>	Farm Consolidation	1,220,000
<u>Appropriation No. 1193</u>	Land Manager	189,620
Total Capital Account Expenditure		1,439,620

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. CHAIRMAN:

It has been moved by the hon. minister that we rise and report. Has it been agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. DIACHUK:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. House Leader has moved that the House adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

26-90

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 11th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 10:37 p.m.]