

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Monday, April 17th, 1972

[The House met at 2:30 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present the petitions of:

Alfred Baum, Fred Drysdale, William Hoag, Donald Hawkes, and Brian Tink for an Act to Incorporate the Grande Prairie Racing Association;

The Historical Society of Alberta for an Act to amend an Act to Incorporate The Historical Society of Alberta;

Sister Juliette Larose, Sister Ellen Brunt, Sister Rachel Maynari, and Sister Laura Murphy for an Act to Incorporate the Sisters of Charity of Providence of Calgary;

Les Soeurs de Charite de la Providence des Territoires du Nord Ouest for an Act to amend An Ordinance to Incorporate Les Soeurs de Charite de la Providence des Territoires du Nord Ouest;

The Society of Industrial Accountants of Alberta for an Act being The Society of Industrial Accountants of Alberta Act, 1972;

Canadian Junior College for an Act to amend An Act to Incorporate Canadian Junior College;

Thelma Thompson Baxter for an Act to provide for an Extension of Time for Commencing an Action Beyond the Period Allowed by The Limitation of Actions Act;

Ralph A. Siebring, Douglas Clarke, R. J. Barrett, J. C. Givens, Isalah Melech, Peter Huising and Mrs. Greta Bennett for an Act to incorporate The Institute of Accredited Public Accountants of Alberta.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of this Assembly the President of the Scandanavian Airlines System, Mr. Knut Hagrup. Scandanavian Airlines System is one of the largest in the world and they are the ones who pioneered the Polar Route to Europe. With them is Count Otto von Rosen who is also with the Scandanavian Airlines System. I would like them now to rise and be recognized by this Assembly. They are in the Speaker's gallery.

30-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, today in the members' gallery and in the public gallery some 120 strong are enthusiastic members of the Parkview School Grade IX accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Brook, Mr. Scott, and Mrs. Hendrickson. I ask that they stand now and receive a welcome by the House.

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce a group of 57 students to you and through you to the Assembly from my constituency from the North Edmonton Christian School. They are Grade VII and VIII students accompanied by Mr. Prinsen, and I wish that they would now rise and be recognized.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to file two reports. One is that requested by the hon. Member for Little Bow, having to do with the personnel administration office and the number of people in each department; the second one, requested by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, having to do with the labour force for February.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Labour Force in Grande Cache

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce and say that over the weekend I received 150 letters from various places across the province concerning the Grande Cache operation, and paramount in this representation was the statement that instead of this creating jobs for Albertans, the companies involved are importing Japanese labourers. Is this so, Mr. Minister?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer that question to the hon. Mr. Dowling, who is the Member for Edson, and Grande Cache falls in his constituency.

MR. DOWLING:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I am very much aware of the importing of Japanese labourers. That was a policy that was established prior to the present government taking over. Since we have taken over the administration I have been in touch with the people of McIntyre Porcupine. In fact, a number of us went up to Grande Cache to discuss the entire matter with the principals of the company there. They indicated to us that they have established a training program for Albertans. They are attempting to hire as many Albertans as they can, but at the present time they can't meet all their requirements within the province. They are in Saskatchewan negotiating for some additions to the labour force. But as for the continuing of the policy of importing Japanese, that was established prior to our taking over. We are trying to avoid this as much as possible, and employ Albertans where possible.

MR. CLARK:

May I ask a supplementary question to the hon. minister commenting. That question would be, approximately what percentage of

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-3

the work force would be people from Japan brought specifically over for this project?

MR. DOWLING:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not capable of answering that question. I'd be willing to answer it if the member would table it as a Return. I would also ask him if he would table the 150 letters which he received, for my information. What I would like to say is that I make as many trips to Grande Cache as possible and I'm under the impression that the percentage of Japanese that are on the labour force in Grande Cache is not that extensive. There are some Koreans employed there, there are people from Poland, there are people from Nova Scotia and various parts of the world, but the percentage of foreign employees as opposed to Canadians is very small.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and one more supplementary question. To the minister responsible, I would be pleased to table the letters once I get the approval of each of the 150 individuals who wrote them.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, on that particular point, I wish the hon. member would, because I would like to take the time to write each one individually and explain the position that this government has taken regarding Grande Cache. We are very concerned about the employment there, and especially about employing Albertans. I have done everything I can to stimulate the course that was started up there for mining personnel. They are attempting to employ a number of the native people in the area as well, and I would like personally to answer all these letters that the member mentioned.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Labour in regard to Grande Cache. In a news article on Friday, Lac La Ronge Mine in Saskatchewan is closing down and the news flash stated that 177 miners from this mine would be hired by McIntyre Porcupine. Is this correct?

DR. JOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the facts with respect to the question are as follows: the mine in question is a copper mine. It isn't a coal mine, as the question might have inferred. The total staff at Lac La Ronge is 150. The people at Grande Cache are looking at 30. Twenty of them are hardrock miners and may be able to do underground mining at Grande Cache. Ten are mechanics and electricians -- the kind of people who are very scarce to get, so the Grande Cache operation is looking at a total of 30.

Let me take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to clarify the matter of the closing down of the mine in Saskatchewan. This will be done over a period of up to three months. I think the news release gave the impression that this was an immediate closing. This is not the case. This mine will be phased out and men will be attempted to be placed.

While I am on my feet, if I could refer to the series of previous questions. To the best of my knowledge there was a maximum number of people who would be brought in from Japan to work in the coal mine in Grande Cache. This was for reasons of the absence of the kind of help, like electricians, mechanics and people who had specific training to work with particular kinds of equipment, very

30-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

heavy equipment, which is underground. This is to the best of my knowledge.

In the trip to which the hon. Mr. Dowling refers, Mr. Murray, the manager of the mine, said to us that once this number of people come to Grande Cache, that will be the end of the agreement with respect to that particular clause, and no further people from Japan would be brought in.

The training program is moving quite well. It can't handle more than 24 students at any one time because of the nature of the enterprise having to do with coal mining. We are very close to this. It may be in the interests of the House, Mr. Speaker, to table the exact information with respect to how many miners are Canadian, how many from Alberta, how many from whatever place.

Alberta Resources Railway

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question on this subject to the hon. Minister of Industry. On Friday you mentioned re-negotiating the Alberta Resources Railway Agreement with the CNR. What reduction in freight rates do you feel is necessary? I believe you mentioned a reduction of freight rates as one of the things you would be considering.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, while we are in negotiation in regard to the freight rates, I don't think it is in the best interests of the citizenry or this House to divulge what the negotiations are at this time. But, we have -- and it is common knowledge -- dropped our rate on the Alberta Resources Railway from \$1.50 to 50 cents.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that we must pick up the operating loss on the railroad to resources, do you not consider a reduction of freight rates to be an indirect subsidy to the company?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, while the question might be out of order, I would like to correct the hon. member in the fact that we do not pick up the operating expense of the railroad. We pick up the capital charges of the railroad.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lloydminster, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, and then the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen, and the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Hog Processing and Marketing

MR. J. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I understand that members of the Hog Marketing Board and members from your department have left on a trip to Europe today. I would like to know, what is the purpose of this trip?

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-5

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, certain members of the Hog Marketing Board, along with members from my department, are making a trip to Europe to look into a number of things. Firstly, to examine how particularly the Danish and the Italian market in pork is handled, in relation to continuity of supply problems, and particularly, how the European economic community handles that supply problem for export. These people, particularly Denmark, have had some experience in this, and we think that there might be some merit in that. As well as that, Mr. Speaker, the entire group has taken samples of products in relation to some of these surplus products that we have in Alberta at this time, for which we think there may be some market in the European Economic Community, and I refer specifically to potato granules and other prepared potato products. We hope there will be an opening in Europe in the near future for the sale of these products.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Prior to the leaving of this delegation to Europe, was a brief or a study prepared of written material made by the group?

DR. HORNER:

I just don't know what the import of the member's question is. Is he saying did we involve the people that had the excess product and the Potato Commission in relation to the market we feel might be there? If that is the question, the answer is yes, Mr. Speaker, and additional to that this is a follow-up of some contacts that other members of my department made when they were in Europe over the past two or three months in relation to possible markets in this area.

MR. FAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister tell us how many members are included in the team?

DR. HORNER:

There are three members of the Hog Board, the manager of the Hog Board and the director of Product Development in the department, Mr. Omar Broughton, who was previously a secretary in the Alberta Wheat Pool.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, another supplementary question to the minister. What has happened to the amount of export of pork to Japan in the last six months?

DR. HORNER:

What has happened?

MR. CLARK:

Has it increased?

DR. HORNER:

Well, additionally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to announce that the Executive Council has approved grants to the Hog Marketing Board to set up our pilot project in relation to exporting hogs to Japan. This is a joint project between industry, the Hog Marketing Board and the government for a consistent export of hogs to the Japanese market. This totals 750 hogs a week alone in our own pilot project. Other private industry in relation to some of the other processing companies have developed and

30-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

expanded the market for pork in the Far East, and in general then, in answer to the member's question, there has been a substantial expansion on a continuing basis in relation to the hog market in the Far East. We are hopeful that with this approach, plus the approach of finding out how we can develop policies in relation to the problem of continuity of supply, we can not only get into the market in Japan, Korea and into the Far East generally, but we can stay there once we are there.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister tell us the reason why the committee is rather heavily loaded with those connected with the hog marketing?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, because the idea and the contacts for the trip were developed by the Chairman of the Hog Marketing Board. We were asked to help out and we were very pleased to do so, and at that time I asked them if we could send a member of the department with them so that we could take advantage of the information that they would receive and also expand our activities in these other areas because we were particularly concerned about trying to clear the warehouses in Southern Alberta of prepared or processed potato product.

National Air Photo Library

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Inasmuch as the Calgary branch of the National Air Photo Library contains 700,000 aerial photos used by industry and geologists, as well as foresters and agriculturists, and the federal government is planning to close the service June 1st, what steps have you taken to persuade Ottawa to continue this important service to the large geological and geophysical industry in Alberta?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I became aware of the matter today by noticing it in a daily newspaper. I have not taken any particular action at all; I certainly have not had the time to. But I think it would be wise to look into the matter and to determine if there is going to be some other method of providing this service to the people who are using it to such a great extent, and if in fact there is none, we can provide some assistance to make sure that the federal government will come up with some alternative method, and I'll certainly be happy to do that.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can we be assured then that the provincial government will do everything possible to preserve this service which is vital to the Alberta gas and oil industry?

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I just said, I am not sure whether this service is the thing that will finally be in existence; it may be that they have something even better in mind to take its place. In any event I can assure you that we will fulfill our responsibility to make sure that something will be there to do the job that this has been doing.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-7

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are you aware that the Independent Petroleum Association, the Canadian Petroleum Association, the University of Calgary Geology Department, and members of the Alberta Society of Petroleum Geologists are all concerned about losing this facility?

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, normally it would seem to me that when there is that great a concern, and that great a use of something that it would not just unilaterally be removed, since the people in Ottawa have a concern to provide a service to the people of this country just like we do in this Legislature, and therefore I think it would be only wise to make sure that we know all the facts before we take off on a course of action. However, I gave the hon. member the assurances that we would protect the interests of the people of Alberta.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals, Mr. Speaker. Is the provincial government prepared to purchase the prints from Ottawa and continue the service if the federal government is adamant about closing the Calgary Air Photo Library?

MR. SPEAKER:

This is a hypothetical question depending on whether the federal government is adequate; however it's up to the hon. minister to answer.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I might say that certainly my colleague and I will review the situation to see what can be done to explore that, with a view to making some arrangements that would be mutually satisfactory to the parties concerned.

Natural Gas Franchises

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Pending the completion of the study to make natural gas available to rural areas in Alberta, will the hon. minister advise if a moratorium has been placed on all current applications for franchises at the present time in rural Alberta?

DR. HORNER:

In fact that's true, Mr. Speaker, that any area that is interested in natural gas in the rural areas should be organizing on a county or municipal basis, but should be holding off signing any franchise agreements until such time as a policy is announced after the general feasibility study is made.

MR. FRENCH:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is it not true that franchises must be approved by the department with respect to area?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, maybe I didn't make it quite clear enough. We won't be approving any franchises for any areas until such time as the feasibility study is made.

30-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

Labour Force in Grande Cache (cont.)

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the hon. minister, Mr. Dowling. With reference to Grande Cache, are there qualified Albertans now available for the jobs held by the imported labour at Grande Cache?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, the people of the Grande Cache mine, McIntyre Porcupine, the manager, the president of the company, Mr. Richardson, and all of the officials of the mine know the policy of this government, that they are to employ Albertans so far as is possible. When the situation reaches a point where they can no longer acquire properly trained Albertans and have to go beyond the borders of our province to meet the quotas of production, then they will do this. I understand they are negotiating, as the hon. Minister of Labour has indicated, with some people in Saskatchewan to have some 30 of these people move into the Grande Cache area. We are in the process, as I indicated, or the McIntyre people are in the process along with government, of training Albertans to fill the jobs that are required of the mine. And as far as possible the jobs are filled with Albertans.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are the two policies then not very parallel in that only jobs where there are Albertans or Canadians not qualified are presently being filled by imported labour? Would that be correct?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, if I may? Looking at Grande Cache or Grand Prairie or any of these places out of context of the total policy is I think what the hon. minister is suggesting - I agree with him. But there are two sides to this; first, where Canadian competence in particular areas is unavailable then, assuredly, it has to be supplied from elsewhere. The other half is this, that when that competence becomes available through our training program, then people from other countries relinquish those positions by policy and understanding with this government and our people take over the jobs. This is with reference also to Grande Prairie as well as Grande Cache. We are looking, somewhat in retrospect, at how this began and how it works now.

Looking to new enterprises, we hope and intend to work with private industry in such a way that we have most of the newly available positions filled with trained Canadians and Albertans when the plant goes on line. In this connection, for example, working with the management of Syncrude and with the native associations of Alberta, and with this government, we are anticipating this kind of capability. It doesn't come easily; there is a great deal of work to do, but it has begun, in advance, for the major projects to which we are looking forward. The ones we are working at from prior days work in those two ways. First the jobs are filled by Albertans if they are available; secondly, when they become available they replace the executive people and management people from elsewhere.

Criminal Code - Attempted Suicide

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General. In Canada, in 1968, 337 people were convicted on

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-9

suicide attempts, 24 were sent to prison and 15 were fined. Do you favour the removal of attempted suicide from the Criminal Code?

MR. SPEAKER:

This is a matter that is within Dominion jurisdiction. Does the hon. minister wish to comment in any event?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to discuss this with the hon. member but suggest we do it outside of the House because it is a matter within federal jurisdiction and there is nothing on which this House can legislate.

Red Deer College

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Post Secondary Education. In view of the inquiry at Red Deer Junior College and the serious effect it is having on the young people in the area in making a decision, how quickly can we get a report on this inquiry?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken briefly with Dr. T. C. Byrne, the commissioner of the public inquiry, and I have reason to believe that I will have the commissioner's report in my hands no later than May 15th. I can assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that we will attempt to assess that report and any recommendations he may make, and to act upon it in the quickest manner possible so as not to prejudice the desires of students in central Alberta who may wish to go to Red Deer College and who may feel uncertain about it, given the public inquiry.

Medicare - Doctors' Incomes

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in charge of the Alberta Medicare Commission. Did the Federal Department of Revenue supply the Alberta Health Care Commission with a document giving both the gross and net incomes of doctors by specialty in Alberta?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I don't have the answer to that but I would be prepared to make it a written return. If you put it on the Order Paper I will bring in a written reply.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would certainly be prepared to do that. A supplementary though; it is my understanding that such a report was submitted to the Alberta Health Care Commission. I am wondering if the hon. minister would be prepared to table that report before the estimates for the Department of Health and Social Development are considered by this Assembly?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I will also take a look at that if you will put that along with the first question, and give you a reply.

30-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

Steel Plant - Auctioneers' Regulations

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry. Could you advise us, sir, when we could expect the tabling of the Acres Western Report on the steel plant and also the revised auctioneers' regulations?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I will table both of them this week.

Penitentiary Training Program

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. It's with regard to the return that was tabled today. In section 2 it is indicated that the correction officers will be taking a rehabilitation course. My question is, Mr. Minister, has that course been initiated?

DR. HOHOL:

Yes, it has, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to be very clear on the relationship between the increment which was provided in the agreement for the penitentiary guards as it relates to the training program. The one is contingent on the other. This places that particular section of the agreement in context. In other words we didn't sign a totally new agreement, nor was the agreement open to re-negotiation.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

As a matter of clarification, a supplementary question. The correction officers at this time have the 4.7% increase, though retroactive to January 1st, 1971?

DR. HOHOL:

Yes, that's right.

Miners' Training Program

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. Is the Department of Advanced Education continuing with the miners' training program which was started approximately a year ago in co-operation with McIntyre Porcupine and the Department of Advanced Education?

MR. FOSTER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, so far as I'm aware, we are, but I'm not 100% certain. I can check it.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'd like to be definite in the information to the House. The answer is yes -- we are continuing with the miners' training program that has been initiated priorly.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Have you been able to overcome the problems with the Federal

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-11

Manpower Department, so that, in fact, the McIntyre Porcupine company have much more flexibility in the types of people that they can bring into the program?

DR. HOHOL:

That is a sort of judgment question, Mr. Speaker. I think the most direct answer would be that we are trying and we haven't been that successful. It's a fairly rigid program, not only because of Canada Manpower, but because of the number of supervisory staff that can handle a particular number of trainees, and between the two, that makes the program fairly rigid. The program is a good one, though we could see an additional program made up of parts of other programs, and we're discussing this with McIntyre Porcupine, with NAIT, and with Canada Manpower.

Peace Counselling Centre

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Several weeks ago, sir, I asked you a question with respect to a grant to the Peace Counselling Centre. At that time, if my memory serves me correctly, you said that you were taking it under advisement and were considering it. Are you in a position today to report to the House on the application for this grant?

MR. CRAWFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not. I'll take the matter up and report to the House during the week.

Psychiatric Services in the Peace

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. During that same question period, I asked a question relating to the concern of many residents in the Peace about the possibility of the visiting psychiatric service being cancelled out. Have you been in a position to examine this question and can you report on this as well to the Legislature?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd have to say that I didn't recall the hon. member in his question indicating that a further response was expected by him, further to the response that was made at that time, but once again I'll be glad to be up to date on that matter. My present understanding of the situation is that the service is not about to be cancelled, but I'll see if that is the case and try to verify it.

Feed Grain Prices and Movement

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Since Saskatchewan has passed a bill to set a floor price on feed grains, has Alberta given consideration to a floor price for feed grains marketed within the Prairie Provinces?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, if I might just comment in this way, that the question of stabilizing off-board prices on feed grain can be handled in a number of different ways. One of the jobs that the Alberta Grain Commission will be doing will be looking at a variety of ways

30-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

in which this stability can happen. Certainly Manitoba, and now Saskatchewan have suggested that the way to do this is by legally fixing a floor price. You get into a great deal of controversy then as to who regulates farmer to farmer sales, and this has caused some concern in those provinces.

We have had some initial discussions with the ministers in both Manitoba and Saskatchewan in relation to how best this can be done. It is our view, in the Province of Alberta, that if we can get away from that kind of arbitrary fixation of price, it would be better and the relationship between farmer and farmer would be much improved. So I have asked the Grain Commission to have a look at a variety of programs in which the same end might be achieved, with an additional end, that of getting the money into the farmers' pockets prior to the time of setting the price, which would be a much better way of doing things. We would hope, Mr. Speaker, after some study of the variety of ways in which this can be done, that later on this spring we will be meeting with both the Ministers of Agriculture in Manitoba and Saskatchewan to evolve a common policy in relation to non-board grain.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I wonder if the hon. minister would indicate if we are getting any closer to the free movement of feed grains across Canada. Secondly, possibly, are there any meetings planned towards this objective?

DR. HORNER:

We are all awaiting the final outcome of the Grains Council's hearings and submissions that they requested late last year and early this year in January, in relation to the entire feed grain situation. The Grains group under Dr. Deever in Winnipeg had set up a program and were to come forward with a report, which we are expecting at any time. This is one of the things that was on the agenda of the Provincial Ministers' of Agriculture Conference in Ottawa in November, and later on in February as well. We didn't come to any decision in that regard as the ministers, because we were awaiting this report of Dr. Deever's Grains Council. It seems to me that -- and I might add for the information of the House -- that we were asked as a province to make a submission to the Grains Council in this regard which we did, and a number of other groups of course did as well. They are on the group that is evaluating the proposals that have been put forward. Our representations were from the grain trade in Alberta, and we have had some preliminary discussions with these people as well. I think though, that one of the things that will improve the availability of feed grain, or knock down the barriers of moving it across, is this question of pricing. If we can have a price and have some sort of monetary return to our farmers, whether it is on an adaptation of the commodity credit operation in the United States or otherwise, that we should be able to move forward in that area. One of the things that causes restrictions and regulations, of course, is the pile-up of grain in the west. If we can remove that, we will have taken one step towards a freer movement of grain.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister give us his views on whether there is a strong possibility of feed grains from Alberta meeting the competitive price, particularly in British Columbia through the use of trucks, and is there free movement of grain across Canada?

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-13

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, might I say first to the hon. member that the minister doesn't mind giving his views on these things at all. I don't see any problem whatsoever in meeting competition in British Columbia if the boundaries were removed. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we could meet the competition there by either rail or truck if the boundaries were removed and we had direct access to that market without the rather cumbersome method of going through the Canadian Wheat Board. We would hope also to have some discussions with the Canadian Wheat Board about trying to streamline -- continue to operate through the Wheat Board -- but streamline the operation insofar as British Columbia is concerned. I have been in touch with the Minister of Agriculture in British Columbia to initiate discussions in relation to the two provinces moving forward to initiate the barrier removals on the British Columbia market because it becomes important to their livestock industry, and it is important to our grains industry. As a matter of fact, I think it is one of the areas in which we can expand the processing in rural Alberta by processing a complete feed for the British Columbia market.

MR. TAYLOR:

One more supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister anticipate strong opposition from some sections of Ontario where they are now importing corn from the USA?

DR. HORNER:

This is one of the other sides of the problem in regard to the feed grains industry, the relationship of Ontario, Quebec, and the Maritimes, the question of the federal freight assistance that is put on there. There is a line that becomes a price line as to when you're competitive with both Ontario corn and American corn with regard to the tariff that's also imposed. That price, at the moment, I think is \$1 a bushel for corn, and in Ontario 65 cent barley meets that competition very nicely at the present time, particularly with the federal freight assistance. So the whole matter is very complicated because it involves a number of jurisdictions, including the American one insofar as exporting feed corn from the States is concerned. On the other hand I don't think that the government of Ontario particularly would be concerned if we were able to develop a program between British Columbia and ourselves in feed grains.

MR. STROMBERG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Do you foresee any great movement of feed grain from Alberta to Saskatchewan with the free movement of interprovincial grain? It seems that over the years Saskatchewan does not move the feed grain in here.

DR. HORNER:

I think that basically what's happened in the last two or three years. In any case, Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan has moved from a substantial acreage of wheat to a substantial acreage of feed grains and as a result has come to a very major surplus position, because they didn't have the livestock industry that we have in Alberta, and so we, in fact, had a dumping of feed grain at prior sale prices by the producers in Saskatchewan. We don't like to see that, not only because it interrupts the grain trade here, but because it also hurts those producers in Saskatchewan, and this is the basis of our talks with the ministers in Saskatchewan and Manitoba -- that the prior sale of feed grain doesn't help anybody. And we're trying to work very hard to eliminate that particular thing so that the farmer will get a just return.

30-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

MR. NOTLEY:

I have a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister mentioned in his initial response to the question from the hon. Member for Camrose that the Grains Commission was looking into this. In view of the decision made in Saskatchewan, can you give us any time as to when we might expect a report from the Grains Commission, and can you advise the Legislature as to what our policy might be?

DR. HORNER:

Well, I would imagine, Mr. Speaker, that it might be a number of months. As I said earlier in response to the hon. Member for Drumheller, the Grains Council under Dr. Deevers in Winnipeg had underway from last fall this very intensive look at the whole question of feed grains policy right across Canada, and the committee that was set up included representations from the Maritimes, from Quebec, Ontario, and from the producing areas in western Canada. This is a very important report that we're awaiting from the Grains' Council in Winnipeg. As soon as we get that report and our own Grain Commission has had an opportunity to study that and other matters related to it, we will hopefully come forward with a policy for Alberta. On the other hand, that doesn't preclude us from going ahead with discussions with Manitoba and Saskatchewan as soon as time is available to discuss the matter of how we would operate jointly or at least in a complementary manner amongst the three provinces.

Workmen's Compensation Board

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Labour. Has the Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board resigned or given notice that he will be resigning?

DR. HOHOL:

Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, the Chairman has not resigned.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, in that event, would the hon. minister like to take this opportunity to clarify widespread thinking as to the announcement by someone other than the government as to who was going to be the Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board?

DR. HOHOL:

I don't know.

MR. SPEAKER:

This is a fairly hypothetical field here, I would suggest to the House.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Does the hon. minister intend to bring The Workmen's Compensation Act to the Legislature at this session?

DR. HOHOL:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it will come sometime during the session, later in the period.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-15

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question to the hon. Premier on the same subject of compensation. The other day in the House, hon. Premier, you mentioned that the government was giving consideration to even raising the disability pension for those on fixed pensions to a higher rate than the one announced in the Throne Speech, and I inquire if you have arrived at any final decision on that?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is, we have not. I do think it would be an appropriate opportunity when we reach that stage in the estimates for members on both sides of the House, to express their views. I have expressed mine, and would be interested in hearing views from all the hon. members as to where the emphasis should lie, and what areas of priorities we should give in terms of improvement of the disability pensions.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, mine is not a supplementary question -- if the other hon. gentleman had a supplementary on that matter, as I believe is the case, I would be happy to sit down.

MR. CLARK:

I have a supplementary question, dealing with this matter of Workmen's Compensation. The hon. Minister of Labour said the chairman of the Compensation Board has not resigned. My question to the hon. Premier or to the hon. minister is, has the chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board, Dr. Macleod, given any indication to the government that he plans to resign in the near future?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the answer to that is that the chairman has given the indication that he would like to retire from his present position in the fairly near future, but no specific date has been set.

MR. RUSSE:

I have a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Labour. He mentioned he would bring in The Workmen's Compensation Act at this session. Does he intend to carry it through at this session and pass it, or bring it in and then leave it for the fall session?

DR. HOHOL:

My intention is, Mr. Speaker, to conclude it during this session. It has other benefits in addition to those indicated in the Throne Speech, and those will be examined when the Act is brought before the House, and when we examine the estimates.

Agricultural Task Force

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The question arises out of an article in the Calgary Albertan on April 15, 1972, wherein a certain member of the party across the way made comments with respect to the agricultural task

30-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

force, and was particularly critical of four urban members who are serving on this task force. My question to the hon. minister is, could he kindly explain for the record and for this Assembly, the reason why four urban members were appointed to the task force on agriculture?

DR. HORNER:

I'd be delighted to, Mr. Speaker, because one of the failures of the previous government in the whole field of agriculture was to be too narrow-minded and rigid and inflexible.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. minister permit the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc to state his point of order?

MR. HENDERSON:

Does this House have to have inflicted upon us a partisan political question? It relates only to the affairs of the Conservative party.

MR. SHITTER:

As one of the urban members who was mentioned and has the honour to represent a number of constituents, all of whom are consumers and are very concerned over the agricultural policies of this province, this is not a political matter; this is a matter of great concern, and I would like, for the record, the hon. Minister of Agriculture to explain why urban members are on this task force.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc is raising spurious points of order again to try and detract from what I said initially, that one of the failures of the former government in the field of agriculture, was their narrow-mindedness --

MR. SPEAKER:

I must say that the hon. minister, in answering a factual question, should answer with facts, rather than with innuendo or argument.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I was never more factual in my life. One of my concerns in taking on the challenge that this department has given to me was to have a better understanding between our urban people, our consumers, and our primary producers in the field. I was really delighted after a little bit of arm-twisting, that I could get these urban members to serve on my agricultural task force. I think it is of particular importance, and I appreciate very much their willingness to give some of their very precious time to the problems we have in agriculture, and in an attempt to improve the relationship and the understanding between rural and urban Alberta. In my view, Mr. Speaker, it is a step forward to have these people. We appreciate them very much and the contributions that they can make to agriculture in Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this a supplementary?

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-17

MR. KOZIAK:

No, I rise on the same point, Mr. Speaker. Not as a question, but as a point of privilege. I refer to the article which appeared in the April 15th issue of The Albertan under the heading "Strom Raps Lougheed." On the second page of that issue the following quotation appears, Mr. Speaker. "Secondly, Socreds maintain such members of the task force as Edmonton housewife Catherine Chichak, Calgary lawyer Ron Gitter, and Edmonton's MLAs Leslie Young and Julian Koziak have no qualifications whatsoever to serve on a task force on agriculture."

AN HON. MEMBER:

Shame!

MR. KOZIAK:

The article goes on further, "You could take the knowledge these four have about agriculture, put it together and you wouldn't have enough knowledge to put on the head of a pin, said a Socred agriculture critic" -- anonymous, of course.

Mr. Speaker, I refer you to Rule 113 of the Rules of this Assembly, under Beauchesne, page 102, and in particular where it states, "Libels upon members and aspersions upon them in relation to Parliament and interference of any kind with their official duties, are breaches of the privileges of the members."

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member stated his point of privilege?

MR. KOZIAK:

That is my point of privilege -- libel perpetrated on the members, on the four members --

MR. TAYLOR:

Which member made that statement?

MR. KOZIAK:

Who is your agriculture --

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. member completed stating his point of privilege? I am asking a question. Has the hon. member completed stating the point of privilege?

MR. KOZIAK:

I have only one question that I would ask to the Chair, or perhaps two questions. The first is perhaps, who the Socred agriculture critic was who made the statement, and secondly, by what standards does he judge the knowledge of members of this House and their ability to serve on task forces?

MR. SPEAKER:

With regard to the identity of the anonymous source of the information, I know of no rule of this Assembly which requires that such sources be identified in the House. With regard to the possibility that the statement made is a breach of the privilege of one of the members, I must repeat what was said here about two weeks ago, that anything which is said outside the House, which may be of a

30-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

defamatory nature, is a matter for the courts and not a matter for this House.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for the Question Period has just expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Petroleum and Natural Gas Royalties

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, rising on Orders of the Day, the government has been preparing and intending to table for a number of weeks an important document that the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals would like to table, entitled "Review of Royalty Provisions Applicable to Leases of Petroleum and Natural Gas Owned by the Crown in Right of Alberta." Before tabling the document I would like to make a statement of explanation.

First of all it should be made abundantly clear that this document being tabled by the Minister of Mines and Minerals is not the government's tentative position paper with regard to natural resource revenue. It is our hope that that document will be tabled in this House within a period of no more than 10 days. This document deals with a specific item only, and of course, is required background to the other position paper.

Mr. Speaker, a very serious misunderstanding apparently is developing in many parts of Alberta regarding the important question of possible increases by the Alberta government in royalty rates for oil and gas charged on current production. It appears from various statements by organizations and the general public that have come to our attention in the last few weeks, that there exists the belief that the government is in a position to set merely by regulation a higher royalty rate for the majority of the producing wells in Alberta, and hence cause substantially increased funds to flow into the general revenues of the provincial government.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this is not the situation. It would certainly simplify matters if it were possible to do so. It is not. Regrettably the former Social Credit government made, in our view, a very serious error in judgment many years ago, in 1948, when it unnecessarily agreed to insert in petroleum and natural gas leases a specific provision that the maximum royalty rate which would be payable by the producers under these leases would be limited to 16 2/3 per cent or 1/6 of gross production. The former government went even further. They enacted in 1949 sections in The Mines and Minerals Act which gave statutory confirmation to the maximum royalty provisions in the lease. Even as late as 1962 when the royalties were last reviewed, the former government failed, in our view, to recognize that it was necessary to continue with the maximum royalty provisions, and that such a policy, again in our view, was not in the public interest. The former government clearly failed to give themselves any latitude on changing market conditions, which now

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-19

exist in North America and which have resulted in substantially increased levels of Alberta production and have created a significant improvement in the profit margins of major Alberta producers. The current sellers' market conditions, in all probability, will continue during the next decade and, in fact, both production and profits are likely to increase substantially.

Mr. Speaker, these royalty restrictions were, of course, known to us on September 10, 1971. We decided to enact at our first session in 1972 an amendment to The Mines and Minerals Act, so that all future Crown leases issued by the new Alberta government will not be subject to any maximum royalty restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, the seriousness of this royalty restriction is that over 75% of Alberta's current crude oil production is now subject to, and is limited by the maximum royalty rate of 16 2/3 per cent or 1/6 under leases which contain the maximum limitation on royalties. Even by 1976 at least half of Alberta production of crude oil will still be caught under these maximum royalty limitations. It will take as long as after 1980 before the situation can be reversed and the bulk of the production of crude oil be freed from maximum royalty restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, the serious consequence of this situation is that those groups or organizations preparing submissions to the government on this issue should be aware that any proposed higher royalty rates scheduled in excess of 16 2/3 per cent would only affect no more than a quarter of the existing production of crude oil in Alberta, and hence, the extent of increase of revenues to the province under such a proposal would be substantially less than if no maximum royalty restrictions had been established by the previous government.

I well recognize, Mr. Speaker, the gravity of this situation, but due to the reports of proposed submissions which have come to our attention recently we thought we should try to set the record straight and clarify the exact situation even in advance of our tentative position paper. This will give groups and organizations in Alberta an opportunity to perhaps reassess the basic thrust of their proposals on this major issue and perhaps come up with some feasible alternatives. Thank you.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table at this time this document entitled 'Review of Royalty Provisions Applicable to Leases of Petroleum and Natural Gas Owned by the Crown in Right of Alberta.' Mr. Speaker, our department has been working on this document for some weeks and it was a week ago last Friday that we authorized it to go to the press with the coloured maps that are a part of the document. We had decided to withhold tabling that document until we had copies of it available for all members of the Legislature and members of the media. Today we have them and we have requested the Clerk to distribute copies of this document to all members.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. members will observe when they examine this review that it sets out four types of leases involving petroleum and natural gas as of December 31st. It will show that there are some 33,608 leases in existence at that time, and that only 2,609 are not subject to any maximum royalty restriction. Hon. members will also observe that 94% of the leases covering petroleum have maximum royalty restrictions, and that 55% of the leases covering natural gas have maximum royalty restrictions. It will also be observed that the review sets forth that there are 158 oil fields in Alberta and that there are 234 gas fields. In the review we have set forth coloured maps of representative areas. Those maps will show the type of leases and the expiration dates of leases on the actual maps. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

30-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few comments I want to say first of all I appreciate the point that the hon. Premier made, that this is not placing a tentative position of the government before us at this point in time. When he rose to begin speaking I rather got the impression that he was going to give us today, the government's tentative position. I have listened very, very carefully, Mr. Speaker, to try and assess the reason for making the statement at this particular time and I have to confess that, at the moment, I am having considerable difficulty of assessing the main purpose in making the statement that was made today.

I note, for example, that the hon. Premier went to considerable length to advise the House that some of these arrangements or agreements were drawn up back in 1948. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I am not debating the agreement that was drawn up. I have made a point in previous debates, and I think it is a very valid one, Mr. Speaker, and that is that any time we are judging a particular decision, or any action taken by individuals at a certain point in time, I think it is most important that we recognize what the circumstances were at that point in time. And I suggest that never once, never once, Mr. Speaker, did I see any attempt by the hon. Premier to try and assess the circumstances that prevailed at that point in time.

I suggest that if we want to go back in history let's go back a little further. I happen to know of a certain city within this province that guaranteed one of its industries gas in perpetuity for a ridiculously low price, and I think there are a lot of people in this Assembly that are aware of it. I have never once, Mr. Speaker, suggested that the city fathers of that particular city, at that point in time, were wrong because I know what their intent was. Their intent was to gain industry for that particular city and I suggest when we review the decisions of previous administrations, going back to the year 1948, that it is rather important that we also recognize that there was an objective -- a very clear objective at that point in time -- which was to try and gain for this province development in an industry that, up to that moment, had not really been doing very much. There had been considerable activity from time to time but certainly nothing to what it might have been.

I simply say that when we look at the oil and gas industry in this province that everybody recognizes that within the last two years we have a different ballgame.

We are now in the happy position of being able to be much more selective in the ways and means that we will have this mineral development and also in the manner in which we will collect revenue from it.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we should not spend too much time trying to lay blame on what has happened in the past, but let's look forward and see what changes have to be made within the context of the changing times, and let's make them according to the best judgment that we can make with the information that is available to us at this point in time. And I suggest that the government should view it in that light and bend every effort to making sure that the right decisions are made now, rather than spending time in trying to justify a particular problem that is facing them at this particular time.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think, having regard to the comments made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, a comment of clarification is surely in order.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-21

Certainly as far as the question of whether it was or was not necessary to put on the maximum royalties is a proper place for debate and I'm going to welcome that debate, but, Mr. Speaker, it was suggested as to why we made this statement at this time. I think it was clear that we made the statement because many groups, from public reports that we have, and from groups that we have already received preliminary views from, have indicated very clearly that they were under a misconception about a very important point. We wanted at the earliest possible time, concurrent with the members receiving this information, to make it clear that they should perhaps reassess some of the alternatives that they are considering, and that is the purpose for making the statement.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would ask you to make a ruling with respect to whether or not I would have the right to respond to a statement such as this. As you know there is some uncertainty. The rules say that leaders of groups have the right to respond -- it's a little difficult to suggest that I'm a group -- but I cite the example, Mr. Speaker, of the Province of Manitoba, where the Legislature in that province has extended the courtesy of being able to respond to ministerial statements, to the one Social Credit member who is also the leader of the Social Credit party in the Province of Manitoba. I would like your ruling on this as I think it's quite important that we clarify it and I have some observations that I'd like to make on this issue.

MR. SPEAKER:

I wonder if the House would agree, and the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, that I might perhaps take this matter under consideration. I thank him for having given me some notice that he might be bringing up the point. I would like to suggest for the consideration of hon. members, Citation No. 91 in Beauchesne which refers to the leaders of recognized groups. The prima facie appearance of that to me is that it must refer to recognized groups within the House since the application of the rules is not intended except inside the House. It occurs to me that if the rule were applied otherwise, there are any number of members in the House here who are leaders of recognized groups, whether they be community leagues or boards of trade, or whatever they might be, and yet it would not seem in keeping with the rule that each of them should in effect turn a privilege of this kind which is now recognized by tradition into perhaps a period of debate. And, as I say, I would like hon. members to consider this point so that we might in fairness and good faith deal with it, and also perhaps arrive at a conclusion with which we could comfortably carry on later on when the situation in the House might not be exactly as it is now, but when there might be more members who are in the unique position.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that on an announcement made of this nature there is opportunity provided for remarks to be made. I appreciate that as the Leader of the Opposition that basically I would hope that I would be speaking for my party, and I would never suggest that I was speaking for the hon. Leader of the NDP party. I take it too of course that in this manner we are only making statements, and there would be no debate, and I would certainly be happy to agree to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview having an opportunity of making a statement on behalf of his party.

MR. SPEAKER:

In view of that, I wonder if we might, as I suggested, take the matter under consideration and within the next while, perhaps we could come to a conclusion on it or possibly the House would like to

30-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

have the matter referred to the Committee which is already going to be dealing with the rules, if the motion which is on the Order Paper now results in an affirmative vote.

Educational Testing and Examinations

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on another matter, I wish to advise the House at this time that the Department of Education is developing a new testing program to monitor the quality of education across the province and provide information on the value received in education for tax dollars spent. This new testing program as it is being developed, will replace the present Grade IX achievement battery exams at the end of this school year.

The new program will measure the performance of students in certain skills on a representative sampling basis. By this means we hope to be able to tell whether education standards within the province in the years ahead are going up, down, or remaining steady. In conclusion, members might wish to note that the phasing out of the old Grade IX examinations in June of this year, will eliminate a costly duplication of services and Alberta is the last province in Canada to use Departmental exams at the Grade IX level.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, before moving the House into Committee, concerning the business of the House this evening, after completion this afternoon of Department of Environment estimates, we will move to estimates of the Department of Culture, Youth, and Recreation until 5:30. Tonight at 8:00 we will deal with government Motion No. 1, on the Order Paper, concerning matters relating to legislative procedure to go to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Following consideration of government Motion No. 1 on to second reading of bills, the notice of which, and particularly numbers of which, I gave to the other side of the House last Friday.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. House Leader a question. If a miracle happens and we finish Culture, Youth, and Recreation this afternoon, would we then continue with the next Department's estimates?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe we would, if that miracle did occur and any assistance on the other side to have the miracle occur would be looked at accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I would move that you now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the estimates.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-23

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

Department of the Environment (cont.)

Total Income Account

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Supply will now come to order. Department of the Environment. We have now to take into consideration, and get agreement on the total sum which was the \$5,014,440. Do we have agreement on that?

MR. BARTON:

No, Mr. Speaker, I have a few questions. Could the hon. Minister of the Environment clarify as to what work is being done in the Swan Valley now -- watershed? He promised me this on Friday.

MR. YURKO:

I indicated at that time that the department had under consideration at this time, or actually under action, a study of the flooding of the Swan River. When this study is completed the decision will subsequently be made as to when some work in this area may in fact be done. At this point in time, we are studying it.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Chairman, there are no funds being spent in the Swan Valley at all then?

MR. YURKO:

There are no funds I believe, Mr. Speaker, appropriated toward capital projects in the Swan River area to my knowledge at this point in time.

MR. BARTON:

Is your department working in conjunction with the monies that are being spent by the oil companies up there?

MR. YURKO:

I didn't get your question again, Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON:

Is your department working in conjunction with the oil companies that are doing some restoration up there -- in conjunction, or is it with Lands and Forests?

MR. YURKO:

Well, is it administration of land?

MR. BARTON:

In conjunction with some of the environmental problems in the hills, and I know that there are some funds; I was wondering if your department or whether it was Lands and Forests that I would ask some specific questions of.

30-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, I'd have to take that question under advisement and investigate it for the hon. member. I thought he was referring initially to water, but he's now talking about general environmental matters. I'd have to take it under advisement and dig out the information for you. I'm prepared to do this if you wish.

MR. BARTON:

Is there any work being done on the watershed at Inverness, Moosehorn or anything like that? This is water -- tributaries.

MR. YURKO:

Oh, yes. Well, we are doing a series of studies. I've indicated that as far as I can recollect, we weren't doing any capital works as a department. Now you're indicating, hon. member, that perhaps some oil companies are doing something in connection with the general environment and I indicated that I would look into this and find out and report.

MR. BARTON:

Thank you.

MR. HENDERSON:

In the course of the earlier discussion of the estimates I'd asked the minister about three or four questions. I happened to be out of the House and I came in just as he raised them and commented that he wasn't prepared to answer them unless I restated the questions and so without --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Are you ready to restate the questions?

MR. HENDERSON:

Yes, and without getting into a lengthy debate on the subject, I wondered if the minister could very briefly state what he anticipates will be, or what is the government policy on three or four points. I brought up the question of user charges for water, the second item was the question of whether the cost of engineering studies which are done for the local authorities relative to water management projects should not be included under the cost sharing arrangements instead of being 100% financed under the departmental appropriation. The third question I asked was what the government is looking to so far as the possibility of developing the hydro potential on the Peace River is concerned. Thank you.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, in connection with user charges for water, I indicated that we had a pretty major program of investigation in this area. We are examining what is being done in several other jurisdictions and we are examining and tallying the use of water for various purposes in Alberta. For example, the oil industry, the amount in connection with irrigation, the amount of industrial use in connection with the cities and the towns, and so forth. This information is all being put together in a report which I hope to be able to table in this House before too many months go by. This report will also make a recommendation to government in relation to this matter. I would like to say, as I indicated in the last several days during which time we discussed our estimates, that if we are to be successful in managing our water basins, in managing our water streams, we must devise and determine some method for raising funds

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-25

in this area. It is very difficult, in the nature of priorities, to indicate that a capital works project for managing water should have higher priority than, for example, mental health or some other area of concern to government. So I feel quite strongly in this area, if we are to be successful in managing our waters on a long term basis, in providing some of the structures that are needed on our various rivers, in providing funds for flood control in some of the areas that it is needed, in providing funds for river bank stabilization, in providing funds for lake stabilization and lake rehabilitation, that some manner of raising money must be instigated directly related to this type of endeavour.

The only method that I can see before us at this particular time, is the instigation of a water use fee program. As I indicated, we are investigating every aspect of this, and we hope to have a report on this matter before government just as early as we possibly can.

In connection with cost of engineering studies, we have debated this fairly extensively, as to whether or not this should be part of the cost-sharing formula between different levels of government. Generally, we have arrived at the conclusion that, in fact, they are costs which should be included in the formula. But, we do, however, recognize, Mr. Chairman, there can and will be some exceptions. These exceptions may be for a variety of reasons, and I don't hope to get into these exceptions at this time. I think generally, in our discussions and examination of policy thus far, we have concluded the major engineering costs of studies should, in fact, be included in the cost-sharing formula.

In connection with the hydro-potential of the Peace River, it must be recognized that in light of the policy we have established -- I have reiterated this policy on a number of occasions -- where we, in every instance, would try to lead a project by some ten years, where we would try to determine the various ramifications of any major project well in advance of the actual program or actual project, so that all the various factors can be accounted for. I have indicated in the past, and I indicate again, that in some of these major programs we have to look ahead some ten years. I recognize we have some basic work to do in the Peace River. We consider it necessary and vital to undertake first of all, some major environmental impact studies in connection with the damming of the Slave and the damming of the Peace.

We hope to have perhaps some of these studies undertaken this year. I might also say in that connection, that the task force investigating the Peace-Athabasca delta has actually, I believe, gone out for quotations regarding a study in this respect; a study regarding the environmental impact of damming the Slave River. We, of course, as I indicated earlier, expect to also study this area of concern as the number one priority. The second priority would be to extend this study to include a study of all the possible hydro sites. Several studies have been made in this area. Calgary Power has made some studies; the Division of Water Resources had examined several possible sites. But there is need in this area, for an in-depth analysis on just what the potential of the Peace and the Slave is, with respect to hydro-electric potential.

A study in this area is, of course, also necessary with respect to the Athabasca study. But this would be our second line of concern. In speaking to a resolution earlier, I indicated that there was need to study this area in a number of areas. The real question before us is whether or not, in fact, the development of the hydro-potential of our northern flowing rivers should be done on a private enterprise basis, or on a shared public-private basis, or on a public basis. The question involved here is extensive, and the need for studies in this area is required to indicate the direction the government might take in the future.

30-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

The whole area of hydro-electric potential as against fossil power production and whether or not hydro-electric potential should, in fact, be publicly or privately run is one that has to be studied, in my estimation, at this particular time, and must in fact, be resolved before we can even speak about tapping the hydro potential of the Peace River, the Slave River and the Athabasca River. It must also be recognized that in a number of instances as I have talked earlier to quite a degree, the establishment of water use priorities is an extremely important matter, and in some of our hydro installations, the day is not far off, where in fact the water will have to be managed with respect to consideration being given to other uses rather than hydro even though the initial projects were established and built for hydro-electric purposes. I think that perhaps that might be enough of a general nature at this time. Maybe the member wants some specifics --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder if Mr. Henderson could finish.

MR. HENDERSON:

I just wanted to make one comment, one supplemental question, Mr. Chairman. Well, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say that I am somewhat disappointed that the government is not placing a higher priority on the Peace hydro potential. I had hoped that with the government's decentralization policy this proposal might prove more attractive and deserve a higher priority. The earlier studies of the hydro potential on the Peace indicated it was not economical because they were talking about bringing the power from the north country to Edmonton. Of course, when you talk about using the power locally, the economics change somewhat dramatically.

The fourth point I wanted to bring up relates to the question of engineering studies. Has the minister arrived at any conclusions so far as reducing the amount of funds, just as a general policy, that are available for studies on demand by local authorities? There is a tremendous backlog that have been done now in the past, because the department is financing the full cost of it. This relates to your comments I realize, about consideration being given to some participation in these costs, but has there been any change in policy in the interim to reduce the allocation for this type of work?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Could you speak into your microphone, please?

MR. HENDERSON:

I will move over towards the microphone. I am still amazed that these astronauts are going to the moon and back and we are having trouble communicating in here. Maybe the problem has something to do with the speaker and the listener and vice - versa.

I was wondering if, in view of the fact that there is a tremendous backlog within the department of studies that have been carried out for local authorities for drainage purposes, etc., which is adequate I am sure to keep a capital works program going for 10 years -- the law of diminishing returns, it seemed to me, has set in for some of those areas and I was wondering if the minister was thinking of a bit of change of direction so far as priorities and allocation of money for such studies over the next few years is concerned -- that is, slowing up the infusion of public funds for such studies because a lot of it is going to be engineering for the sake of engineering.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

10-27

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Okay, fine, Mr. Farran. We will put his question and then you can wrap up both of them, Mr. Minister.

MR. FARRAN:

Well, mine is very similar, it is on a local authority level. And I wondered, under the various planning authorities and the recommendations of flood control consultants, water resource consultants, the exact boundaries of a flood plain have assumed urgent significance. Is the department in these many studies attempting to define flood plains for these purposes? It is particularly significant so far as the Elbow and Bow Rivers and Fish Creek in Calgary are concerned and I think the urgency is great in any developing urban area. And of course, it hitches in with the studies of the possibility of new dams higher up on the Elbow for flood control purposes, and hydro-electric purposes.

MR. YURKO:

With respect to what the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc said, I certainly agreed that we have a massive backlog of studies in connection with management of water resources in Alberta. However, first of all with respect to a policy matter I don't believe that we are necessarily going to charge this backlog of studies into the cost-sharing program in the future. We are only going to apply a cost-sharing program of what's to be done in the future. I do want to suggest, though, that there are several reasons, even though we have a large backlog of studies. First of all I would like to suggest that we felt that it was time to enter a phase of capital works construction, rather than study, at the earliest opportunity. Nevertheless we recognize that this year we had to devote ourselves basically to a study of policy direction, the formulation of policy, the Alberta management plan, development on a river basin basis, an examination of the possible integration of The Canada Water Act, also the finalization of our program in connection with irrigation rehabilitation, and again a program in connection with water supply for the various towns, and a program of sewage disposal facilities for various towns; so we felt very strongly that we had a year or so of intensive study.

Now what about the future? We do have a fairly extensive, very competent, and very capable engineering staff put together in Water Resources. There is no intention on my part or the government's part to, in any way, do away with this competence that we have. You can't say that we've studied all that there is to be studied, by any stretch of the imagination. Conditions change very radically and very rapidly as urban communities grow, as in fact the whole topography in Alberta is changed and the run-off conditions are changed very drastically. We are, of course, getting into the area of management of land surrounding water bodies as against just management of the water bodies themselves. We recognize that in northern Alberta, as northern Alberta is developing, there is going to be a major need for additional engineering studies and we hope to continue maintaining an advanced backlog of studies so that implementation can follow. However, I do want to suggest that if we are successful in the area of establishing funds for major capital works in this area that more and more of the engineering potential that the department has will be switched from studying to the area of capital works construction. And I think in this regard I just want to assure the House that there is no intention on our part to in any way diminish the engineering capacity that we have. However, I do want to suggest that perhaps its role and its function will be broadened extensively in areas that haven't been touched on to the same degree in the past as they will be in the future and this will be in connection with lake shore management, stream management and river bank stabilization and so forth.

30-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

In connection with establishing accurately a flood plain and establishing regulations with respect to a flood plain I would like to suggest to the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill that this is an area of real concern to us and an area to which we are paying very close attention and it is also an area which is related to management of, not only the water body itself, but the area beyond the water body. In connection with the Bighorn Dam, one of the first things that our department has done is declare a water reservation around this reservoir so that in fact we've really recognized an area that's influential to the adequate management of that water body. Now I recognize that, in cases where rivers flow through major urban areas, this is a real area of concern because it affects property values and all we wish to suggest is that we are studying this area. We'll offer guidance, to a large degree, to the local authorities in certain areas, and in the cost-sharing formula on projects that have to be undertaken, by Calgary for instance, the provincial contribution will be extremely important, and I simply wish to suggest at this time that we are considering a cost-sharing formula which would certainly help the local authorities in managing and overcoming some of the major problems that they encounter. But this would be based on whether or not a fund for doing these kind of projects has been established, because as I suggest again, it's very difficult to get too much priority when you come before Cabinet and indicate that you have a major project to do on a river basin here, as against somebody wanting money for mental health, and I am the first fellow to recognize this.

MR. FARRAN:

Supplementary, Mr. Chairman, and I would point out -- and I am sure the hon. Member for Calgary Bow will support the view since his area is directly affected -- the exact designation of the boundaries of a flood plain involve thousands if not millions of dollars in property value in a city. At the moment there are two schools of thought on the local authority level that there should be a total prohibition against any building in the one-in-45-year flood plain and partial prohibition in the one-in-a-100-year flood plain. This covers a large part of the city of Calgary but if either policy is to be pursued with any sense of justice, somebody has to define what is the boundary of the flood plain. Now the Department of Transport has done it on a federal level for decibel contours around the airport in such a manner that the thing can be administered -- they have drawn lines on a map -- but there is an urgent need for the drawing of a just and fair line for the limit of a flood plain in the river courses through Calgary.

MR. YURKO:

I just want to suggest that I sympathize with the hon. member's concern and certainly the hon. Member for Calgary Bow talked to me privately and indicated these major concerns also. I do want to suggest though, depending on how these flood plains are identified and the type of restrictions that are placed in connection with habitation of these flood plains and building on them, that we have, in fact, here an area where simply millions of dollars are involved and we just can't afford to make a snappy, hasty decision in some of these areas. We do have to suggest that we are very encouraged that some of the local authorities have developed sufficient muscle, or "forward think," if you want to call it that, to recognize it as a problem and, in fact, begin to take some action. I do recognize that some of the action that is being taken is not necessarily something that is attractive to all people but I do believe, on the long-term basis, the action that is being taken will be found to be action based to a large degree on projective thinking and some wisdom tossed in with it.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-29

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister, in keeping with the question that my colleague Mr. Henderson asked at the conclusion of the questions on the Department of Agriculture, where in the estimates of the Department of the Environment is money located for any member of the Legislature other than the hon. minister's use?

MR. YURKO:

There are no funds in the Department of the Environment for task forces of any sort.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, so that there is no misunderstanding then, come the Public Accounts in two year's time which will account for the expenditures for this year -- there will be no funds from the Department of the Environment which we would find having been allocated to any member of this Assembly other than those for the operation of your office?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, at this particular point in time these estimates contain no funds for members of the Legislative Assembly other than the minister.

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister while he is considering water control, if he will take into consideration the north branch of the Belly River which runs into the Oldman River. If you can do a study on that I would be happy to go there at my own expense to point out -- as I tried to explain in my talk -- that this gap, as they call it, is so narrow that I am sure a cattle trailer or a large truck couldn't go through it. It just seems like a natural for a dam and there is plenty of area of natural reservoir on the other side of the range to carry water, if a dam in taking care of the Three River study, as has been mentioned by Mr. Drain as well as Mr. Buckwell, last year, and myself is impossible at this time. Such a dam would require millions of dollars, and I'm sure it would take much less just to control each river at a time.

Mr. Bailey, as I've mentioned, is familiar with the whole setup and he said it was because of a fault they discounted the site years ago, but now because of the success in handling that type of a fault with the Bighorn Dam, he was quite sure that they could seal it off now. What we need on the Oldman River are controls to prevent flooding like happened this spring. Perhaps our Taber Provincial Park is ruined for years, we don't know yet; buildings turned over, smashed up, and the silt that is laying over the whole area, I'm sure the grass is all gone, the pumping system -- everything was lost practically in this flood that came down the river. If we had controls, I'm sure we could avoid this damage and terrific expense in the future. I'd like the hon. minister to say that he would look into it.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, we look into every water difficulty in the province and this is one of the reasons I indicated that we would maintain our engineering potential because many of these factors change. Engineering technology changes quite readily and quite rapidly and a few years ago, I'm sure, not very many engineers would have told you that the Bighorn Dam was possible. But techniques have changed and knowledge has changed, and I feel very certain that what we thought was impossible ten years ago in connection with water management will be possible in years to come. So I want to just

30-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th. 1972

indicate that it is my intention to maintain the engineering capability of the Water Resources Division. I feel very strongly that it will be needed at all times -- that there never will come a time when we won't need the potential that we now have, or these resources that we now have and if anything, we will probably be increasing them.

It's difficult for me to suggest to the hon. member that this matter might have priority X, Y, or Z. It's something that we have to fit into our priority set of scales. I said earlier that this year we considered the Paddle River as one of high priority because we had incurred, or there had incurred, a loss of something like \$700 thousand to the people in that area in connection with the last flood, so we felt this was an area of high priority. Next year the priority will be something else and depending on the amount of funds we have available, we may have a number of projects under active implementation at the same time.

MR. FAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, what I have to say is applicable largely to my own constituency, but I think, by the same token, applicable elsewhere in the province. I refer to the erosion of the banks along our rivers and creeks. Every year many property owners are losing more and more of their land, particularly where there is alluvial soil, and the water rises high, takes out a considerable amount of the land and now it's amounting to many acres from the land of some people.

The policy that had been followed for some time generally by the previous government was that where a road or a public structure was involved, that public money would be spent to arrest the erosion, either through rock fill or some other means. Consequently, as the files of the Department of Highways will show, we were able to arrest the erosion in many places in the province, because a road would be, directly or indirectly, in danger of being washed away. This is little consolation to the people who own land where there is no road who are seeing it gradually eaten away by water and the force of water.

For some time I have felt that some type of policy is required to protect this waste and loss of land. I realize it's a difficult problem, it's a widespread problem, and it's a problem that is not going to be easily solved. But because the problem is gigantic in nature, I believe, is no reason why we shouldn't try to find solutions and effect solutions where they can be effected. In many cases a small amount of rock fill, or in some cases a short diversion of the stream, is all that is necessary to save a great deal of land that is privately owned from being washed away into the rivers and into the creeks. My point in raising this is that I would hope this would secure the attention of the hon. minister and his department and that the policy would be continued of arresting this erosion where it can be done at a small amount of public cost through the erection of a dam or through raising the land slightly where there is no bank, or by rock fills where rock is available. The people are concerned about losing much of their own land and it is becoming an increasingly serious problem. I know there is no easy answer, but I would hope that the hon. minister would expend some monies this year where the work can be done that will give satisfaction, that will save land without enormous expenditures of public money. I would like to have a comment of the hon. minister on this erosion problem.

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might add another matter and perhaps the hon. minister could handle both at the same time.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-31

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well, Mr. Harle. Go ahead.

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Chairman, with regard to a matter in my constituency, and this concerns the coal fields which are being developed at Forestburg. In the light of the commission hearing which took place in December and January of this year, I wonder, is the department going to come out with some reclamation requirements which will have an influence on the reclamation of surface mining areas after they have been mined?

MR. YURKO:

In connection with the hon. member's question -- the hon. Member for Drumheller -- I would just like to say that he certainly touched on the matter that we have discussed quite frequently in the last seven months as to what type of cost-sharing formula we would use. We have been using a 50-50 cost-sharing formula. In some instances we have been using a 75-25, but we hope to get some more uniformity in this area. Again it is a case of local initiation, in most instances, where there is initiation at the local level, and secondly where there is a desire on a local level -- or the private owner in some instances -- where there is a public advantage to undertaking some work, then we recognize that if the local authority is prepared to put some funds in -- say 50% -- then we would generally work with them and add the additional funds and this is, as I said, under consideration and may change.

This, of course, is again dependent on the total budget that we, in fact, have, that the department gets for this type of work. Here again, in all sincerity, I suggest that it is my hope and my intent to increase the budget that is available for this type of work. This is preventive work, and can in fact, in the long run, save both the province and the people involved, be it the local authority, or even private owners in some cases, much larger sums of money. In this respect, I say in all honesty, that I hope to be able to increase the department's budget for this type of work, but in all cases it will be related to local initiative -- to a large degree, not in all cases -- and also the local input. In many cases the labour can be provided locally, and thus their input and our input will be associated with other costs, materials and so forth. So we recognize that we have to increase our performance in this area and will do whatever we can. I do want to suggest that we are working on a policy in connection with river basin stabilization and management and in connection with work done in this type of area, we of course have recognized that where we can declare the river in the general public interest, that in instances like this we recognize that there is a good argument for total input by the province -- where we can declare a major tributary or a major river as in the general public interest. On the basis of priority and money availability, work then will be done on a total provincial government input.

This is what we declared the Paddle River. We declared the Paddle River as in the general public interest of Alberta, because of its wide and great influence, and as a result, in that particular instance, it was a total input by the province. However, in other areas where we can't declare the creek or the stream or even a very small river, in the general public interest, then we will be attempting to establish a cost-sharing formula. And this cost-sharing formula may be 25-75, 50-50 -- this is an area under study at this particular time -- but we do expect to resolve a policy in this area before very long.

In connection with the coal field at Forestburg, we will be bringing before this House, of course, during this session the Land Surface Conservation Act, and this act will make provisions for reclamation of coal fields that haven't been reclaimed in the past.

30-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

I wouldn't want, at this time, to attempt to indicate what features of the legislation will be. The House will just have to wait until the legislation is introduced.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to remark to the minister that as he's probably no doubt aware, in many instances government departments are the biggest polluters we have in Alberta, and I refer to the Road to Resources up in Grande Cache. When that railroad was built, there were a considerable number of streams that were silted up, due to the run-off of clay from this railroad, and I can certainly verify that myself. Streams that I, in the past, have had good fishing in are completely ruined for several years.

Another party in that area is Northwest Pulp and Paper. The environment people, a year ago, were giving them a rather rough time on their roads and the run-off on their roads, and they pointed out to the Department of the Environment at the time that there was less run-off and they were taking better care of their roads than the Department of Highways, and the Department of Highways is probably one of the larger offenders we have. When a new highway is being built, there is no protection for a year. There is grass seeded on the edge, but that grass takes a year or two to become established and there's a considerable amount of just plain run-off and silt.

MR. YURKO:

If I just might make some comments to reinforce what I said the other day in connection to building roads in critical areas. I indicated at that time that whenever a road was being built in a sensitive ecological area that we would, again depending on availability of funds, undertake an environmental impact study. I certainly agree with the hon. Member for Camrose that the area of siltation, the area of grassing and the proper slopes on roads and highways is one of extreme importance and this is what I was alluding to the other day when in fact, I was talking about, I believe, secondary Highway 940, being built up into the Kananaskis. I do agree that most of these roads cross many streams and do interfere with the natural water courses, and it's incumbent upon the engineers to recognize the environmental features, and as a result, incorporate these environmental features right in the design of the road itself. I just suggest again that this is an area that we're concerned with and have almost as a policy basis today that whenever a road will be running into an ecologically sensitive area, we will call for an environmental impact study, initially. This is not always possible, because sometimes one department moves ahead of another, depending upon available funds, depending on manpower and so forth. We will simply try to do this wherever possible and we will certainly have it under consideration.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, a question to the hon. minister on that. Do I take it then, with the remarks he has made in this field, that there may be highway work delayed until these studies are made?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, I don't believe I said that. I said, sometimes we get out of phase and we may follow instead of lead. But, generally, we will try to lead in every possible instance.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

You had a question, Mr. Wilson?

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-33

MR. WILSON:

Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to ask a few short questions of the hon. minister. When you tabled the annual report of the Department of the Environment, sir, you drew our attention to the fact that it was printed on recycled paper. I would like to know the purpose of this. Was it because of economics? Was it done as an experiment? Or was it done as tokenism to environmentalists? Or was there some other reason?

I am sure there is a simple answer to the next question, but we do have quite a plethora of personnel figures that don't add up, at first blush at least. In the 1971-72 estimates, it shows a total of 219 people. Then, in your opening remarks, I believe you said that you had provided for the addition of 55 new people in your department. Those two figures don't come to the 280 that are included in the 1972-73 estimates.

To further confuse the issue -- and I would like you to explain it -- in the annual report, it shows the total of 355 in the department, as of December 31, 1971. Perhaps you could clarify the discrepancy in figures on personnel.

MR. YURKO:

With respect to your first question, hon. member, I want to suggest to you, that the report was printed on recycled paper because of all the reasons you suggested and several others.

In connection with total personnel, there have been a number of inter-departmental transfers. I indicated earlier that the Land Development Branch of the Water Resources Division is being transferred to the Department of Agriculture. Furthermore, we have transferred -- has the hon. member examined the capital account expenditures?

MR. WILSON:

Yes, I have examined them.

MR. YURKO:

We have had some transfer from one appropriation to another which is indicated, for example, on Appropriation No. 2999, we indicate that 22 positions were transferred to the Department of Agriculture. There was a transfer of 19 managerial positions to Appropriation No. 2920. I believe that if there is any confusion in the hon. member's mind, it is really because of the fact that we have had some inter-departmental, and transfers within the department from one appropriation to another.

I would certainly be prepared to reconcile this for you and get it all established on an easy to read and understand sheet. However, I do want to indicate that the total increase in connection with our department was as I have indicated before. I can go through these figures again if you wish.

MR. WILSON:

Thank you very much. There was quite a discrepancy in the annual report. It showed a total of 355 personnel. Your 1972-73 estimates total 280, plus the additions on the capital account.

Back to the business of the --

MR. YURKO:

Hon. member, those positions that are listed -- the 280 -- are not all the positions of the people in the department. We have a very substantial number of positions providing technical services in

30-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

the irrigation division in Lethbridge, for example, and this comes under the Capital Account. The technical services that we provide to the irrigation districts are under Capital Account under Appropriation No. 2984. This represents a very substantial number of people. I have the figures. There are 164 in the Lethbridge office. I am transferring a number of these to Agriculture. The land development division is being transferred in total to Agriculture out of the Lethbridge contingent. The total that we are going to transfer to the Department of Agriculture is 42 of which 22 are full-time salaried positions and the remainder are not salaried and are not shown in the Appropriations.

MR. WILSON:

So those 42 that are being transferred to the Agriculture Department are in addition to what was included in the Agricultural estimates. Is that right?

MR. YURKO:

Two are in the Agricultural estimates. The other twenty aren't.

MR. WILSON:

Okay, back to the recycled paper on which the Annual Report was printed. You say it included economics and I assume that it is an economic advantage. Can we then expect in future years to see more government Annual Reports on recycled paper?

MR. YURKO:

Well, I just wanted to suggest to the hon. member that really more and more paper is being recycled and used, and in some of our Eastern cities a tremendous amount of paper is derived from recycled paper. Besides that recycled paper that is used in such things as building products -- Building Products Ltd. uses an amazing amount of paper in the production of their goods right here in Edmonton. And as matter of fact, I think they have a difficult time getting all of their requirements now and again. But in Canada as a whole, there is a substantial amount of paper being recycled and you can buy recycled paper. We have adopted as a policy matter in the Department of the Environment the idea of reusing recycled paper as frequently as we possibly can to, in fact, highlight this area of total resource recycling. We have a project going on examining the recycling of paper within government, as we recognize the Alberta government uses an enormous amount of paper and we are really examining whether or not this is feasible. On the first look at this matter, I think my department indicated that this may not be feasible at this time, but that doesn't necessarily satisfy me. We may look at it a second time.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, is it more costly to use recycled paper than other paper?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, it depends on the quality of paper that you wish. You recognize that the quality of paper isn't as high on recycled paper because it is difficult to remove some of the inks and so forth and there is, I think, a greyish tone and as a result, some of the recycled paper has been used in certain areas only, and some people just don't want to use it because of the quality of the paper. But as far as I am concerned, it doesn't affect my eyes and the printing on it is as good as on top quality paper.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-35

MR. TAYLOR:

Is it true, hon. minister, that it is more difficult to recycle the Edmonton Journal than other newspapers?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

On that -- yes, Dr. Buck.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister a question which I have been afraid to make a comment on but I am sure he would be disappointed if I didn't. I feel that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has had a relaxing weekend and I hope he won't launch into a tirade, therefore I think that possibly I will be able to get a few words in.

Mr. Chairman, and hon. minister, I would like to say a few words on the South Cooking Lake project. I listened very intently to your discussion on setting priorities, and looking at matters related to maintaining water levels I have been very, very appalled, Mr. Chairman, at the silence that has been very, very observable from the opposite side of the House by the 'silent 16' in this matter, and I speak of the hon. MLAs from Edmonton. I should say maybe the 'fightless 15', because the Speaker can't enter into this discussion. But I would think in a project as important to the City of Edmonton as the South Cooking Lake project, we certainly should have had some response from the people on the other side of the House. I really think that they are negligent in their duties because they are not pressing the hon. minister to go ahead with this project. The former government placed a high priority on this, the Environment Conservation Authority did an extensive study on this project, and we felt that it was of a very high priority nature. I am very, very disappointed to find out that the new administration that has been going ahead and looking in new directions and looking at environmental aspects would place this in such a low priority. This is a project that concerns approximately half a million people in this area and to say that we are studying and studying will mean nothing more than the death of south Cooking Lake and with that, Hastings Lake.

I would like to read for the hon. members just a few lines from the report on the "Summary of the Public Hearings on a Proposal to Restore Water Levels in Cooking and Hasting Lakes" and to bring to the attention of the hon. members how serious this situation is in south Cooking Lake.

MR. FARRAN:

[Comment inaudible]

DR. BUCK:

If you would like to know all the details, hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, I would suggest that you read the little pamphlet from cover to cover because it would give you all the details. You know that I wouldn't want to take too much more than 40 minutes of the House's time to go into the entire report. I will just briefly read one small section that will give you an indication of the gravity of the situation and this is by Mr. Spooner, and if the hon. members are not really concerned, this is fine, they can go out and have coffee, but I hope that the 'silent 16' will at least stay in the Assembly from that side of the House, or the 'fightless 15' as I mentioned before, because I am really, really disappointed that they haven't been bringing this subject up to the hon. minister. I hope that if nothing else, I can shame them into bringing this priority up in their caucus, if they won't do it in front of the people of this

30-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

province, maybe they will do it in caucus behind closed doors. But this is a summary of the speech that Mr. Spooner, who operates the seaplane base, gave to the hearing and it will indicate the concern about the loss of water in this lake. And it goes on:

"I have operated the Cooking Lake airport for the last 30 years and the last three years we are almost out of business. In the last 20 years I have measured the water each morning, so since 1952 we have dropped 50 inches. Now I have kept a record for over 30 years and the evaporation on this lake alone is from 8 to 16 inches during a summer. It seems that over the last number of years when we get a heavy snowfall we get a rise in water, but in the last two years it goes down. We are always losing, we have never come back to our normal. The evaporation is too great because the timber has been cleared, roads have been built, small little streams have been diverted and we are sitting on a hill. We are at 2,419 feet elevation and we only have an area around Cooking Lake of five miles, at the most, that runs into Cooking Lake, all the rest of it runs in the other direction."

And a statement that was made, which might have sounded facetious, but really summarized the critical nature of the situation was that "if we don't do something about South Cooking Lake we might just as well turn it into a golf course, because that's what will come of it."

So that is all I am going to say, Mr. Minister. I know that you are concerned, I believe that you are genuinely concerned about projects such as this. I appreciate the fact that you have to set priorities. I appreciate the fact that there are 75 members that always have a pet project. But this is not particularly a pet project, this should be a project of all the people in this Legislature because the matter is that critical. So I ask the hon. members once again on that side of the House to support me in this and try to move this up to a number one priority basis. It has not been budgeted for this year, but I feel that possibly next year may not be too late, but I would say in three years that the lake will be irreversible. I know you will be saying that we must investigate how much of the shore line is Crown property -- I agree -- because it would not be a wise spending of the taxpayers' money if it was going to restore a shore line for private people only. We all know that there are certain amounts of footages around the entire lake that belong to the Crown, so it would no way affect just the people who are private property holders. So, hon. minister I appreciate your concern, but I would like to see if you could move this priority up.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Chairman, I think I would like to go on record of making some comments in this regard. I would first of all like to indicate that in the late 1800's, I believe it was 1897 or so, the lake was dry, totally dry, and it certainly revived itself. The record proves that in fact -- and this was presented at the hearings and is well documented. I also want to indicate that seven months ago when I took over the department I looked very hard to find if there was any appropriation or any money allocated or, for that matter, what priority was given to rehabilitation of this particular lake. I haven't found very much in the files, but I do want to suggest that that doesn't mean to say that the department isn't cognizant of the problems in this area. It is not only Cooking Lake, Lake Miquelon, and all the lakes in this eastern part of the city -- Gull Lake is another lake -- there is real concern with a lot of these lakes.

I do want to suggest to the hon. members that we recognize this concern, we recognize there is a need for an input in this area. This is really why we have undertaken, almost within months after we took over government, the establishment of a major policy direction

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-37

in this area. And the major policy direction as I indicated is going to be associated with cost-sharing. It isn't fair for the people of Alberta to go and rehabilitate a lake when its entire shore line is privately owned, or for that matter, when the majority of that shore line is privately owned. We are not in the business of providing benefits for a handful of people. We are in the business of providing benefits for the people of Alberta and this is why we are evolving a policy in this regard.

I do suggest that we have looked at this policy very, very carefully and we will make no end of provision to provide local communities, local municipalities with the possibility of upgrading their priority listing. If they have much of lake, for example, that is privately owned and the costs involved may be fairly high, the local communities, the local people, can upgrade the classification of that lake by purchasing property and dedicating it to the public good. By doing this they will upgrade their project -- and I am talking about the type of thinking we are doing in this area -- they will upgrade their project and provide the type of facility available to the public where then it can be classified as something in the public good instead of in the private good. So that there will be all sorts of opportunities for people who own private property and own the shoreline of a lake to upgrade that lake and bring it into the realm of contribution by the province. And I hope when we do establish this policy and put it before the people of Alberta this will give the people around Cooking Lake every opportunity to participate in upgrading their own priorities. The emphasis will be on them to upgrade their priorities and not necessarily on the government to contribute on a non-equitable basis just because somebody wants to enhance his property or his particular station in life.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, I agree with one small point the hon. minister made in that there should not be an expenditure of public funds to enhance private property. But he knows, as well as I do, that all the representations that were made in this little pamphlet -- I would say as a ball park figure that 85% of these people were not locally concerned -- they were people outside the Cooking Lake area, they were people mostly from the Edmonton city and vicinity that were concerned about the loss of this lake. They are concerned not about the property, they are concerned about the ecological loss to the people of the province and the people in this area more than the enhancement of private property in that area.

As far as the weak argument the hon. minister makes about back in 1885 the lake was dry. I think when you look at this -- I don't know what dry means, if it is absolutely totally dry or down low -- we know that because of the changes in farming techniques the diversion of water away from the little creeks and so on that go into the lake, this lake cannot come back by itself. This year and last year we had two of the highest snowfalls we have had in the last decade or decade and a half and the lake is not coming back; and the lake is not going to come back unless it has some help. This is where you, sir, and your new government are supposed to provide the leadership. You are the ones that are supposed --

MR. YURKO:

We are providing it.

DR. BUCK:

-- to say, "Ladies and gentlemen we will help you, we have the people, we have the resources, we will provide that leadership." But you're not providing that leadership. You are saying to the people at the local level: "Come in and bring a delegation in to us and

30-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

tell us what to do or how the problem should be solved. We'll be glad to help you." That's leadership? That's baloney -- that is not leadership. I beg your pardon, that's an unparliamentary word. But the term possibly indicates the type of leadership that the government is showing, because it isn't showing any. It is saying to the people in a local area: "You come in here and lobby us and you tell us the answers and then we'll help you." In the area of cost-sharing, the hon. minister well knows that the people in the area and the County of Strathcona, and possibly the City of Edmonton as represented by the 'silent 16', are more than willing to help this project, because it is of vital importance to this city right here to help restore Cooking Lake. So, hon. minister, I humbly ask you to move this priority up because it is a pretty critical matter. This lake will not be able to come back without some help from man.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

On that point can we -- yes, Mr. Ruste.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to say a word or two about Cooking Lake.

MR. YURKO:

Another part here --

MR. TAYLOR:

That is right. I believe that the consideration of raising Cooking Lake should not be based primarily on whether it's going to benefit the people who happen to own land around the sides of the lake. Frankly, from what I can recall, raising the lake is going to probably hurt some of the people rather than benefit them. I would think that any consideration for raising Cooking Lake would be based on a number of factors, but one of them being the need of a hydroplane base within the Edmonton area. I recall that the Canadian government undertook a study of airstrips and air bases including the hydroplane base at Cooking Lake last year and whether or not that study has been completed, I'm not aware. I placed a great deal of importance on that study during the last few months in office because I felt this would give us the indication of whether or not Cooking Lake would be needed in the area as a hydroplane base. If it means that hundreds of planes from the North are going to have to go elsewhere because there is no place to change over within a reasonable distance from Edmonton, there may be a very strong economic factor to raise the lake that would give this higher priority which would mean much to this part of the province. If on the other hand, there are other areas found that will provide the hydroplane setup, then of course, it would be a different matter entirely. I would suggest that one of the major items to consider in diverting water to Cooking Lake is the basis of whether or not we need a hydroplane base in this area.

The other consideration that should be considered is the recreational facility of Cooking Lake for the people in the metropolitan City of Edmonton. Certainly there is a shortage of recreational areas where there is water involved, and when the water gets too low, then certainly the difficulty of using it for recreation disappears.

There is, I think, a very excellent potential for Cooking Lake, from both the hydroplane point of view and from the recreational point of view. I would hope that these two items would have the major consideration of the government when they are considering this particular project.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-39

MR. YURKO:

Well, I just might add another few comments, Mr. Chairman, in connection . . . (not recorded) . . . for one minute that we don't recognize this as a problem, and that we're not attuned to in fact what could be done in this area.

I have had a number of discussions on the lake itself, and not only on the lake but the entire moraine, the Cooking Lake moraine, which is even in our estimation more important than just the lake itself, because around Edmonton there are a number of lakes, many lakes, that have to be carefully managed. Certainly Lake Wabamun is one lake and we have indicated now that as far as Lake Wabamun is concerned, the government will do everything necessary to maintain this lake as an area of very high quality, for recreation and so forth. I think you must recognize that there are certain step-wise procedures that we must go through in order to develop a rational lake stabilization policy and a rational method of financing some of these programs. There is no way that anybody, without too much thought, can suddenly commit \$3 or \$4 million to stabilizing Cooking Lake without examining the policy in total; without examining the program in total across the province; without examining the relationship of Cooking Lake to Gull Lake, which is in just as bad a condition, if not worse; without examining the need for Calgarians to have some area for recreation in the vicinity. Most Calgarians go up to Gull Lake from what I understand, and Gull Lake, as a result, is the primary source of recreation for Calgary, and Edmonton has got a number of lakes that are primary sources of recreation. I simply mention these matters in that we simply can't blindly go out and pick out a lake and say Cooking Lake has got a top priority or has the number one priority. It may in fact have, but I just don't know at this particular time. When we resolve some of these other matters, we will then get into the practice of establishing priorities. When we solve the policy matters, when we solve the financing matters, then we will establish priorities. Cooking Lake in fact may have a high priority. I just don't know at this time, but we will certainly consider all aspects, some of them mentioned by the hon. Member for Drumheller, some of them mentioned by the hon. Member for Clover Bar. Until that time comes I am not in any position to say what is going to have top priority, second priority, low priority, number one, or two, or three priority. I just can't tell you at this particular time.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Chairman, I am one of the 'silent 15' that the hon. Member for Clover Bar referred to, and inasmuch as I usually try to maintain my calmness, I couldn't at this point. I think he will wish I had. I look at this report --

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sock it to him!

MRS. CHICHAK:

-- as to when it was called and when public hearings were held and I notice that the date is August 1971. I came to this Province of Alberta in 1951, some 21 years ago. In the early years after my arrival here in Edmonton, I did make numerous trips to that resort of Cooking Lake to enjoy the recreation that was available at that time. I would like to say that it was very few short years after that, that I no longer travelled to Cooking Lake because it had deteriorated and deteriorated. I wonder who then was the government from 1951 to 1971 for those 20 years? And I wonder who forgot to look at the importance of Cooking Lake, and that the other lakes around should have been considered and had been a priority. And then, all of a sudden, in seven months, Cooking Lake has to be a priority number one, when we have inherited the legacy that we have from the previous

30-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

administration. I would like to remind the hon. Member for Gold Bar -- for Clover Bar -- that, in fact --

AN HON. MEMBER:

Well, it is some bar.

MRS. CHICHAK:

I would like to remind him that we have the opportunity in caucuses and in meetings to meet with our hon. minister and to perhaps express our views in order to save some time here in the House so that we would be out, so that the rural people who are representing here, are going to be able to get out for their spring work. The fact that we may be silent here does not necessarily reflect that we are silent at all times in every area. I would like to say that when we remain silent, it is probably because we are considering what is being passed in comments from other sources. So, as one of the silent 15, I would like to say that perhaps we are not so silent, and please remember the 35 years and the 20 years that I have been here in the province, there has been nothing in priorities insofar as Cooking Lake is concerned, until this year.

MR. TAYLOR:

Well, Mr. Chairman, as an 'independent member', I don't know whether this is a private fight or if anyone can get into it. I would like to say in fairness that for the last four or five years there has been a great deal of consideration given to Cooking Lake as a hydroplane base. As a matter of fact, we established a committee consisting of people from the City of Edmonton, from the airport, from the federal government, from various departments of the provincial government, etc., who made a careful study of exactly what could be done in connection with Cooking Lake, other than adding water. As a matter of fact there was a priority set last year for certain monies to be spent from the Department of Highways in building a floating dock, and had the water remained reasonably high, a floating dock I'm sure would have been followed through by the hon. Minister of Highways because it was all set and all arranged to go. But when the water gets to a point below which a floating dock is useless, of course the hon. Minister of Highways would not want to proceed any more than I would, had I happened to be there. I think the big point in question in connection with Cooking Lake is whether or not the very large expenditure of bringing water from the North Saskatchewan into Cooking Lake can be justified economically. I think that is one of the major points that the hon. minister will have to consider.

MR. BARTON:

I'd like to direct a question to the hon. minister. I think we got misled here a little bit. My question last Friday was, "Is there anything being done on the headwaters of the Swan River that your department is acknowledging?" And your answer was, "Mr. Chairman, I think I would have to take that under advisement and report back. It just skips my memory whether or not we are doing anything on the headwaters of the Swan except perhaps, studying the matter." [Interruptions from the members' gallery] If you remember that was from up above, and I said, "You missed your signal." "Well, we are." And supplementary, "Is it in the form of a holding area?" "In all honesty, I would like to get the details for the hon. member." And that's all I'd appreciate.

MR. YURKO:

I indicated that I'll get the details for you. I can give them to you privately, or table them in the House, or how do you want them?

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-41

MR. BARTON:

Privately.

MR. YURKO:

Right, I'll send a memorandum on this point.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Can we end on this point now?

DR. BUCK:

No, I have another question.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Do you want to get somebody else angry at you, Dr. Buck? Yes, Mr. Ruste?

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, there are two points that I'd like to raise. One is, could we have from the hon. minister a reconciliation of the staff transfers in the Department of the Environment as it relates to income and capital account, and tied into Agriculture, and then back to the annual report, so we have that. And secondly, in the annual --

MR. YURKO:

Do you want this tabled, or how?

MR. RUSTE:

No, you can let me have it, if you will please, and I'll let my colleague have it here. The second point is that in the annual report it refers to 51 complaints involving water pollution that were investigated during the year. My question here is, were any of these of a harmful effect to human beings who were using the water? Can you tell me this right now?

MR. YURKO:

Well, hon. member, you're taxing my memory.

MR. RUSTE:

It's in the annual report of the department.

MR. YURKO:

Yes, I recognize it's in the annual report. You asked me -- Mr. Chairman, if I might get the question clear in my mind, I was asked if any of this pollution that was investigated was harmful to humans?

MR. RUSTE:

Which resulted in, shall we say, harmful effects to the humans involved. Maybe another way would be to say --

MR. YURKO:

What could be counted as harmful effects that you're talking about?

30-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

MR. RUSTE:

I think I'd leave that part to your judgment, but the 51 complaints -- I mean, there's pollution involved, but maybe you could break it down into what percentage directly involved conditions harmful to humans, and the others could be in other areas such as for fish and lakes and so on.

MR. YURKO:

I have a great deal of difficulty resolving what "harmful to humans" is in the hon. member's mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder, in view of this that --

MR. RUSTE:

For example, I think where you get polluted water, and you drink polluted water of some types, that a person can become violently ill from it. This is what I was getting at.

MR. YURKO:

I think, Mr. Chairman, that what I have to do is take the question under advisement and get the department to review each of the cases and indicate whether this was of a concern for wildlife, siltation, or human beings. I simply couldn't answer the question off the top of my head.

MR. RUSTE:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Last question, Dr. Buck, or comments?

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, I think we can ask questions, if I have the rules in the right perspective. We can ask questions until we get the appropriation entirely passed. Is this so, or is it not so, Mr. Chairman?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, this is on the final vote of the total appropriation --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes, that's right.

DR. HORNER:

These were figures on the final vote of the total appropriation. I want to suggest very respectfully, that he has had all kinds of opportunity to ask questions on the appropriate vote. Because of a request by the hon. Leader of the Opposition that certain matters he wished to bring up could be discussed on the total appropriation, we allowed him to do so. In my view, the hon. Member for Clover Bar is making up for either his absence or his ignorance on a previous occasion. Therefore, he is not in order at the moment.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I reject categorically the suggestion that we are only at liberty to ask questions when the hon. Minister of

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-43

Agriculture, Mr. Humility as he is otherwise known, is of the opinion that we should be asking them. Surely, we have the right on this side of the House to ask questions on the appropriation as long as it is in keeping with the procedure before this House. As far as the complaints of the hon. Minister of Agriculture are concerned, the only performance I have ever seen on opposition was what I learned from him. So if he doesn't like the performance I suggest it is because we had such an excellent teacher in this regard. I think these questions are quite in order, Mr. Chairman. The appropriation should stand until we get the satisfaction --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Could we get Dr. Buck's question or comment now, because I believe this is his last one?

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, it certainly is not. And I take offence at what the hon. Minister of Agriculture said. But considering who it came from, I'll just let it pass.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you.

DR. BUCK:

I think I have the right to express the wishes of my constituents and I can do it at any time I want to, while the question is being discussed.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Take your remarks and go home.

DR. BUCK:

The question I would like to -- just in case you think I shall ignore the hon. Member for Norwood, I will not. I will get back to you. It will only take a minute to discuss --

[Interjections.]

If the hon. Member for Lac la Nonne or Lac Ste. Anne will just be patient, I will get to the point I would like to make. The longer he heckles, the longer I will stand here. As the hon. Member for Drumheller said, if they want us here until Christmas, we will be here until Christmas to check out every little bit of stuff they are trying to shove in here and there.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I am waiting for you, Dr. Buck. Carry on.

DR. BUCK:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The question I would like to ask the hon. minister, in establishing these priorities, is very simply this: in his learned opinion -- and he will be the one responsible for establishing these priorities -- will this Cooking Lake project ever, while they are the government, come into being? That gives you four years, hon. minister. Will this priority be established by that time, or will this project be looked at within two years? In quoting from this little book, when Dr. Trost asked, "How important is the time of getting the water into the lakes?", the answer to that question by Mr. Oeming, who is quite familiar with ecology -- I'm sure, very, very familiar -- said: "I would think that in this case

30-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

you haven't any choice. You have got to save Cooking Lake right away. The time is past due in which to do it."

In saying a few words to my learned friend for Edmonton Norwood, I would like to say that now I am pleased to see that we are down to the 'Fightless 14', because at least she had the intestinal fortitude to stand up in this House and give her view, unobtrusive as it was, but I would like to say to the hon. member, I enjoyed those lances at Cooking Lake at Jo Johnson's.

The problem has been with us a long time, certainly. But we are waiting for the 'now' government, because when they went around this province telling everybody that everything was going to be done right now, the people took them at face value. This is why we want to know if it is going to be done now or ten years from now, because there is a difference, because this lake is that critical.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Minister, have you an answer to that?

MR. YURKO:

I have really answered the hon. member's question. I do want to suggest, though, that the Environment Conservation Authority as part of its commission is to make recommendations to government in this regard. It had extensive hearings and these recommendations will be considered in their entire context before this matter is resolved.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you.

DR. BUCK:

Can I not get any commitment as to what the minister thinks? Well, I would like to know what the hon. minister thinks because he is the man who is going to be setting the priorities. Surely, when he looks at all his studies, he has had this report for quite some time. He has not answered the question, hon. member.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I'm one man that runs a department. These matters are decided by the government; there is no way I can answer the hon. member's question. He can sit here until Christmas and ask the same question, but I can't answer it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well. Thank you Mr. Minister. Now, on this discussion can we get approval to the total income of \$5,014,440?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Capital Account

The following were agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 2981</u>	-	Water Resources Development	\$1,089,000
<u>Appropriation 2984</u>	-	Technical Services	3,232,090
<u>Appropriation 2987</u>	-	Resources Conservation and Utilization	600,000
<u>Appropriation 2991</u>	-	Pollution Control Technical Services	472,000
<u>Appropriation 2999</u>	-	Water Resources Salary Pool	chargeable

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-45

Total Capital Account 5,393,090

Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation

Income Account

Appropriation 2801 - Minister's Office

[Two items were agreed to without debate.]

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, is the hon. minister going to give us a short review of the department?

MR. SCHMID:

I do believe in miracles but I am afraid the miracles are too short for that one. I do have some remarks and would have made them some time ago, but I am afraid the Department of the Environment wasn't flooded out as we had hoped for sooner, and I would therefore like to make remarks on 2802, and probably tomorrow I will have a few remarks to make.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well. All we will do is get agreement to the total of \$34,640 and then you can get your remarks in.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Appropriation 2802 - General Administration.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons I am not going to be here tonight is because the President of SAS is in the city, as you know. I introduced him today, and we discussed at his head office, during my visit to Scandinavia, on behalf of the Province of Alberta, a possible establishment of a stopover here in Edmonton on the way to Seattle at least once a week. It is in the paper today so I can disclose it. It is one of the reasons I feel I should at the reception that is being given on his behalf tonight.

Turning to my department, Mr. Chairman, I would like to read a couple of letters first that I received just recently to indicate what our young people of Alberta are doing.

"Dear Sir:

It was a very great pleasure last Thursday to listen to a concert in the Mayfair Nursing Home presented by the Gateway Singers. They are a wonderful group of young people from the Grace Presbyterian Church and you sponsored them. They were so enthusiastic and obviously took great joy in singing an excellent choice of modern songs and hymns. Apparently the Mayfair was their seventh concert and I regret not having heard the others; they must have been a joy to witness and hear.

One hears so much of youth that is controversial today that I felt the need to congratulate you, They are worthy of any interest which is shown them, and I trust you will continue to support this very worthwhile effort.

Sincerely,

Denise Bass"

30-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

I have another letter from the 500 Jacques Lodge, Calgary 4.

"Dear Sir:

We, the guests of Jacques Lodge 500, Senior Citizens' Home in Calgary, had the pleasure of a visit from the young choir from the Grace Presbyterian Church in Calgary, and on behalf of all the guests of this lodge, I would like to tell you how much we enjoyed their visit and their singing. We hear so much of the youth of today getting mixed up with drugs, etc., that it gives us double pleasure to hear and see young people giving up their time and energies to come and entertain the elderly. The very look on their faces while singing seemed to indicate that they were enjoying singing as much as we enjoyed listening to them. Please accept our sincere thanks and trust that we may have them back again in the future.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Valentine"

I would like to make a few remarks but the remarks are somewhat longer than 15 minutes. I could cut them if the people do not agree, but otherwise --

MR. HENDERSON:

The hon. minister will learn the brevity of our discussion is, of course, in the brevity of his comments.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

In that case maybe the hon. minister would do better in not making any comments, and speed this up, Mr. Henderson.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Perhaps it would be preferable, in the case of this particular department, that the comments of the hon. minister be made at the end, under the total appropriation; or we could proceed with consideration of the estimates from No. 1 on at this time until 5:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

OK, we'll hold it. Mr. Taylor?

MR. TAYLOR:

Did I understand the hon. minister to say that he would like to call it 5:30 now? If the hon. minister has some appointment I would think we should oblige and call it 5:30 if he has an appointment that is urgent. We've done this with other people and I can't see any reason why we shouldn't do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

OK, we'll continue on until 5:30 then. You're prepared to answer specific questions are you, Mr. Minister?

MR. SCHMID:

Yes.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-47

MR. KOZIAK:

A matter of clarification so that there is no misunderstanding later on. Does this mean that comments on the entire portfolio can be made at any one of the estimates, or are we then restricted to No. 2801 in making our own personal comments?

MR. TAYLOR:

I would suggest that we confine our remarks under this arrangement to the appropriation under discussion and keep the general remarks to the very end.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well. Any questions or comments under certain appropriations before we carry on?

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, which vote would we look at here for grants? I'm thinking of the Edmonton Youth Orchestra, in travelling to other countries, and that. Which vote would that be under?

MR. SCHMID:

This is the Cultural Development Branch and it's appropriation no. 2814.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

You keep that notated, Mr. Ruste.

Appropriation 2802 total agreed to \$ 270,060

Appropriation 2803 Recreation Branch

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make one or two comments and then ask the hon. minister for his comments.

Under the present regulations, which I had something to do in preparing, and which I was not completely happy with in operation, I would like to say that we did provide, in connection with the recreational grants to municipalities, that these would be paid on the basis of the years of technical and professional preparation. This was done to try and encourage highly qualified people in the field of recreation, and I think it has accomplished that particular purpose. The grants today, I believe, are limited to a maximum of 70% to repay the salaries of these highly qualified personnel in recreation. I'm referring to part 1, regulation 5.

During the last few months that I had the Department of Youth, for which I was responsible, in visiting many centres I found that there was a grave need that wasn't filled by this particular regulation. For instance, a recreational committee would want to have one of the local people, who was well qualified, say, in dressmaking or in painting or in volleyball, give instruction for two or three hours a week. And they had no way of, not paying that person, but reimbursing that person for out-of-pocket expenses, and consequently we found that the work wasn't done in many cases because while many a person is prepared to donate his or her time, they are not prepared to go into debt over the affair. We had considered, as a matter of fact we were in the processing of considering, some way of changing the regulations so that the recreational committee, with the approval of the Department of Youth -- and I say that with the approval of the Department of Youth to keep control of it -- might be able to pay nominal sums to persons who were carrying out leadership and providing leadership in specific programs. I am wondering if the

30-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

hon. minister has come up against this problem and if he is giving consideration to this same type of thing?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. Member for Drumheller, yes, we are giving consideration, in fact we have written to every recreation board and every municipality, town, and city in Alberta to let us know what particular preference they would have in having certain changes made to Regulations 198/68 because, as the hon. member is probably aware, we are running out next March anyway and that, of course, would be the best time to make additions or deletions or improvements where necessary and as desired by the people of Alberta.

MR. TAYLOR:

I am certainly glad to hear this, and I wonder if the hon. minister is giving any consideration to retaining the capital grant and the annual one dollar per capita grant?

MR. SCHMID:

This, of course, is also under consideration. Some municipalities or recreation boards feel they would rather like to have a loan than a capital grant. Others feel that the 70%, 20% and 10% split for leadership and administration, is not quite satisfactory, and all these items are being reviewed and, of course, when we come up with the appropriate distillation of all the letters we received -- which was a tremendous amount -- we will come up, hopefully, with the best possible regulation under the Recreation Branch.

MR. TAYLOR:

Has the hon. minister any time schedule for that study? Does he expect it to be completed this year?

MR. SCHMID:

Hopefully by fall, hon. member, because after all they are running out next March and we would like to make sure that it will be introduced as early as possible.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that I would have very much liked to have heard the philosophy behind what the new minister is going to do -- his personal philosophy and the philosophy of his department -- as the new head, because I think this is really quite important. In going through the estimates, to find out just what his philosophy is in running this department, I am a bit disappointed in this. I thought we would hear this, because it would probably help the debate that much more.

But in the field of recreation I would like to say that it's a good thing that the hon. Minister of Agriculture happened to have this windfall of \$9 million this year from federal funds -- that he very, very astutely put into the Department of Agriculture -- and he gave the funds out to the Economics Branch because this got over the problem of providing recreational funds this coming year -- the \$9 million.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It's not true.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-49

DR. BUCK:

What do you mean, it's not true?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Minister?

MR. SCHMID:

Would the hon. member repeat that again -- a little louder and clearer this time?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Does anyone want to hear what he is saying?

DR. BUCK:

OK; I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer -- the funds that came from Ottawa for this winter works incentive program, there was a fund of \$9 million. Was this \$9 million not put into the Department of Agriculture through the Economics Branch? Where were these funds obtained?

MR. MINIELY:

The \$9 million was co-ordinated through the PEP Program which was chaired by Dr. Bert Hohol, and it was allocated through various departments. As a matter of fact Dr. Hohol can clarify this but I think just a small portion of it was related to the Department of Agriculture, and I think that was totally a provincial contribution with respect to agricultural fairs, \$800,000 of which was provincial money. As far as I can recall there was practically nothing of the \$9 million that went through the Department of Agriculture, and that is why I am saying I don't understand your statement.

MR. SCHMID:

For the clarification for the hon. member across the aisle here, not a single cent, not any input whatsoever, went into the distribution -- or whatever it is being called -- of the \$9 million he mentioned from the Department of Culture and Recreation.

DR. BUCK:

Well, that is even worse news then, hon. minister, because in setting up programs -- I think, in fairness to the previous government, that the reason we have such excellent facilities in many of the rural areas of this province was because of this grant set-up that was administered by the previous government. And I say that in all fairness, and I am sure the hon. Minister of Agriculture in his moments when he is fair would have to say that it did certainly help with these projects, because when you look at an area within just 50 or 60 miles of the City of Edmonton, when you look at the excellent recreational facilities -- and just for the information of the hon. members of the House I think they should know this information because these funds went to assist in the construction of specially covered arenas and curling rinks, but especially for covered rinks -- and when you look at an area of 75 miles radius of Edmonton, when you see towns like St. Albert, Port Saskatchewan, Sherwood Park, Ardrossan, Vegreville, Wetaskiwin, Devon, Calmar, Ponoka, Red Deer, Lacombe, Barrhead, Leduc, some of these areas, they have these facilities because of the recreational grants that were available.

So I would suggest to the hon. minister, because I've been through this raising bingo tickets, pounding nails, buying shares until I think I own shares in 25% of the facilities around this area, I would suggest and I had made the suggestion before, and it was not acted on, but I think it has some merit, and this is setting up a

30-50

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

revolving fund for recreational purposes. You can set up whatever percentage you want, if you want local participation, 30 to 40%, and your recreation loan of the remainder and as the money goes out and as the payments come in then I think it will serve a useful purpose. Because the biggest problem in these small areas is obtaining sufficient capital at a long enough term at a reasonable interest, because what kills these small communities is that if you have to go to a chartered bank, and you can only get it for 10, 12 years, 15 maximum, and they just can't handle the repayment with this type of a set up and this is where I believe that the government can move into this field, so I think, for what it's worth, I certainly think it's worth investigating.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Chairman, as I had replied to the hon. Member for Drumheller, we are looking at the change in regulations and this, of course, is one of the considerations as I mentioned to the hon. Member for Drumheller.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, before we go further on. Would the hon. minister tell us which votes the Boys' Clubs of Calgary grants come under?

MR. SCHMID:

The Boys' Club of Calgary? Which program, may I ask, is the hon. member referring to?

MR. WILSON:

All of them. All of them that deal with your department.

MR. SCHMID:

I think you may be specifically referring to the Dropout Program. Is this so?

MR. WILSON:

That's one of them.

MR. SCHMID:

There is no provision in this year's estimates for a Dropout Program for the Boys' Club of Calgary, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WILSON:

Would the hon. minister tell us why?

MR. SCHMID:

As you are all aware, certain priorities had to be set and certain budget cuts had to be made. In looking at the program and in looking at the priorities that I felt my department had to take, the Boys' Club of Calgary program had to be one of the ones that had to be reconsidered, and sad to say -- it's quite an important program -- we had to cut in certain places. This was one of the programs we had to cut, feeling that they were well on their way, and that they had received from us, \$20,000 just very recently and hopefully this would carry them with the support of the City of Calgary through to the end of our next fiscal year.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-51

MR. WILSON:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm certainly disturbed to hear this because I have some first hand knowledge of the tremendous jobs that the Boys' Clubs of Calgary were doing in their High School Dropout Program to help high school dropouts from culturally and economically deprived areas gain some insight into how they can best work within the system to get jobs.

For example, one of the very, very fine instances where this program has been of benefit: one of the students who they were counselling had actually finished his Grade XII and he was interested in airplanes, and he applied to the counsellor, Mr. Jim Gallup, who was operating under this High School Dropout Program, and said, "Is there any chance that I could get a job as a janitor at the airport so I could be near airplanes." This student had no idea that he had an opportunity to be a pilot, or be an aeronautical engineer, or things of this nature in connection with the aviation industry. This was something that if this program hadn't existed, that student would never have had the opportunity, would never have known that he could have gone on to something more than being a janitor. And I would like to recommend to the hon. minister that if he wants more information on specific examples of what a tremendous job the Boys' Club of Calgary were doing in the High School Dropout program, that I can give him many, many examples, and I would ask him to reconsider and perhaps even reallocate some of the funds in this budget and I would even be prepared to make recommendations to him, where he could shift some of his estimates to further the tremendous job done by the Boys' Clubs of Calgary Dropout Program.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the hon. member for so really forcefully, and capably pleading even, my cause for the Boys' Club of Calgary. Maybe he didn't quite understand what I had said before.

We were able to allocate to the Boys' Club of Calgary \$20,000 out of last year's budget which should carry them through. I have talked to the person involved in the Boys' Club. Hopefully, with some support from the City of Calgary, to the end of our next fiscal year, this \$20,000 -- we did not expect it before because we did reallocate some money from another project to the Boys' Club because they needed the money immediately. It came out of last year's appropriations.

MR. WILSON:

Do we have then, some assurances from the hon. minister that he would look favourably on further grants to the Boys' Club of Calgary High School Dropout program as the need arises, which may not be in this year's estimate but may be down the road, but that we would have your assurance that you would look favourably on this? Then could you tell us, are there any grants in your budget anywhere to the Boys' Clubs of Calgary for any projects that they have applied for?

MR. SCHMID:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, there are definitely among our appropriations regarding the appropriations to the young people of Alberta, Youth Services Branch. There is some money in there, if necessary, to allocate to the Boys' Club of Calgary, but not in particular to the Dropout Program. This was quite well understood by the president, who came to see me down in Calgary, when I told him that I was reappropriating some money out of the last fiscal year so we would have at least some money available, which was \$20,000, for their program in Calgary and the Calgary area. Again I have to repeat, I am very sympathetic to their program, and hopefully, that Edmonton at least is going to do something similar very soon, because it is very well, of course, within our program.

30-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes, Mr. Hyndman.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the report and request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

It now being half past five, the House stands adjourned until eight o'clock this evening.

[The House rose at 5:30 p.m.]

* * * * *

* * * * *

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

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. The hon. Mr. Hyndman proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by the hon. Dr. Backus:

Be it resolved that:

A. The Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to:

1. Review the existing procedure for the introduction of Money Bills under Rule 49 of the Rules of Assembly, having regard to sections 54 and 90 of the British North America Act, 1867, and section 50 of The Legislative Assembly Act.
2. Conduct a study into matters pertaining to the scope of the Speaker's authority in relation to the officers of the Assembly, the person employed in connection with the business and affairs of the Assembly, and the offices and other facilities provided for the administration of the business and affairs of the Assembly and its members.
3. Review the procedure for the giving of notice for the introduction of Bills and in particular Rule 36 of the Rules of the Assembly, and the Resolution of the Assembly

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-53

regarding that procedure passed on February 6, 1970 and appearing at page 35 of the Journals of the Assembly for the 1970 Session.

4. Review the existing procedure providing for debate on the budget and consider procedural changes which might result in the consideration of Estimates being started prior to completion of the budget debate.
 5. Review existing procedures and assess the desirability of rule changes which would:
 - (a) enable Estimates to be considered by Standing or Select Committees, and
 - (b) enable Bills to be considered by subcommittees of the Committee of the Whole Assembly.
 6. Consider whether the Speaker should be given notice of:
 - (a) questions of privilege which Members intend to raise,
 - (b) motions to adjourn House on a matter of urgent public importance.
 7. Assess whether changes in the Rules are or may be necessary in relation to the holding of Fall Sitzings of the Legislature.
 8. Consider whether votes in Committee of the Whole Assembly should be recorded.
 9. Assess the adequacy of existing Rules regarding "Introduction of Visitors".
 10. Review the "Hansard" operation to date.
- B. In considering, reviewing and studying the matter referred to in paragraph 'A', the Committee shall determine whether there is a need to revoke, rewrite or amend any of the Rules of the Assembly relevant to those matters and shall make its report and recommendations to the Assembly on the said matters, and, where any recommendation involves an amendment to the Rules of the Assembly, the Committee's proposed amendment in draft form shall be included in the report.
- C. For purposes of this Resolution, the Speaker, the Clerk or Clerk Assistant and Law Clerk shall have the right to attend at and participate in meetings of the Committee but shall not be entitled to vote.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, in introducing this motion, may I briefly say, firstly, that the Legislative machine, like any other machine, requires a periodic overhaul to enable it to run smoothly and prevent it from seizing up. Certainly the ten points listed in paragraph B of this resolution are suggested for the purpose of having the Privileges and Elections Committee look into the general operation of the Legislature with a view to having public business proceeded with in the most efficient manner, but at the same time dealt with by full debate. There is no suggestion here of any attempt to have the committee cut off debate or full consideration by the entire House of matters which come before it.

However, I believe that, from time to time, it is necessary to have the standing legislative committee to which this motion is referred update and modernize and streamline legislative proceedings, or at least to consider doing that. I believe that, for example, with the item under paragraph A1, "Review the existing procedure for

30-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

the introduction of money bills", many who are not familiar with this procedure have reacted perhaps with mixed feelings of amazement and mystification and puzzlement when the resolution stage of the bill is proceeded with. Some would say it is almost an "Alice in Wonderland" proceeding, and indeed in jurisdictions such as Ontario, this has been abbreviated very significantly and the resolution stage has been done away with, without in any way restricting the degree of consideration and debate of money bills by hon. members of the Assembly.

I believe, therefore, that any Assembly should, from time to time, prune away the dead branches of procedure without affecting the integrity of the existing tree, but at the same time coaxing along the green buds and offshoots of reform.

Just to deal very briefly with some of the items in respect of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, the first one regarding money bills I believe is self-explanatory. Point 2 regarding the scope of the Speaker's authority, I think, could be usefully dealt with and reviewed by the committee, and especially the last clause of that dealing with the question of officers and other facilities provided for the administration of the business and affairs of the Assembly and its members.

Item 3 deals with a small point which was raised by Legislative Counsel in considering the existing rule for introduction of bills.

The question raised in item 4 regarding debate on the budget is one which relates to the possible speeding up of the procedure which is now used by this Assembly for consideration of the budget and estimates, with a view to seeing whether or not it would be useful to be able to move into the estimates more quickly than is the case at this time.

Item 5 deals with reforms which might be possible and which have been dealt with in a number of other jurisdictions, the review of estimates by a standing or select committee, especially those estimates which might be noncontentious and which would save a good deal of the House's time, leaving for the House in full Assembly, a consideration of those matters which would be contentious or possibly so. The item referred to in paragraph 6 is one which a number of Canadian jurisdictions have raised recently, and that is the possibility of members giving to the Speaker, and only to the Speaker, some notice of some time -- maybe an hour or an hour and a half's notice -- of the privilege to be raised and motions to adjourn the House on a matter of urgent public importance, so that these could be dealt with more expeditiously by the Assembly when they are reached on the order of business.

Item 7 in paragraph A relates to fall sittings, noting, Mr. Speaker, that there will be two sittings in the first session of the 17th Legislature. This is the first sitting of the first session of the 17th Legislature.

Items 9 and 10, I think are self-explanatory, regarding "Introduction of Visitors" and "Hansard", and paragraph C on page two, I believe, is of special interest, because in the past, perhaps one could say that those who have been most directly involved or who have been required to implement changes in procedure by the Legislature, that is the Speaker, the Clerk, the Clerk-Assistant and the Law Clerk, have not really had an opportunity to play a viable part in the discussions. I think we could, as a committee, gain a great deal from their knowledge and experience, and that is why it is suggested in the motion that they be members of the committee to the extent that they could attend and participate, but of course not vote.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-55

I don't believe anything further needs to be said, Mr. Speaker. I would welcome comments and positive suggestions from the other side.

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, in seconding this motion, I wish to stress that I am a strong believer in tradition. Something that has grown with the passage of time, and has proved its value over the years should not be cast aside lightly in the name of modernization. Much of the parliamentary procedure has value and I have sat through the proceedings of this House and have always been able to note the value of the things said and the privilege of the individual having the opportunity to say them.

But times do change and the work of this Legislature has become much greater and more complex as the province grows. I think it, therefore, becomes necessary to review the traditional ways of doing things and see if there are not better ways to carry out the work of this Legislature while preserving those rights of individuals to have themselves heard in the House.

The specific areas that the committee is directed to consider are the areas that would appear to require modification, but in seconding this motion -- and I am sure the mover would join me in saying that I would welcome any suggestions of other areas that are considered in need of updating. These could be in the form of amendments, but would perhaps be better put forward as a motion later in the session so that the committee would not have too indigestible a directive for its initial consideration. A cathartic might be necessary to obtain the results of their deliberation.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I realize this isn't the time to debate the various items in the proposed motion, but I would like to say that the Social Credit members, our leader and Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, insofar as the Social Credit members are concerned, approve this procedure. We think that a periodic review and overhaul is well worthwhile.

I would like to make one or two points. I would hope that the committee would not recommend change simply for change's sake. We have a wonderful history of evolution in regard to parliamentary procedure and most of the things that are contained in our rules have, therefore, some very definite reasons for being there. It has been found necessary to have them there to protect the rights of the people and the rights of the members and the rights of the government members and opposition members throughout the years. I would trust that the Privileges and Elections Committee would not make recommendations for changes without making a very careful study of the reason why the rule is there right now. On the other hand, I think we have to be practical and if the need for a rule has now disappeared then, of course, the rule should be changed. If there's a better way of protecting the rights of the people and the rights of freedom of speech than what is presently in the rules, we should not be afraid of making the change either.

The history of parliamentary procedure is a challenging one and an interesting one, and when you combine that with tradition, which we don't want to lose entirely either, because every country as it grows older glories in its traditions. It is an interesting problem. I believe that the committee will have a challenging and an exciting motion to deal with.

In summarizing what I have said, (1) let us keep tradition if it is worth keeping, and (2) let us make sure if we make a change, we don't lose the rights that have evolved through the years in

30-56

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

parliamentary procedure, and (3) if there is a better way of doing things in this day than what has evolved, then by all means let us have the courage to do that.

There is one other point I would like to mention. There may be other items that come up from time to time during this session, before the committee finishes its work. I would hope that the hon. Government House Leader, and the hon. members on the other side of the House, as well as on this side, would take quite a liberal view of referring further matters so we won't have to go through this exercise every session. If enough members feel that something has been omitted that should be dealt with by the committee, I would hope there would be agreement in including same.

The only other point I have to mention is that there is no time to report back. I would assume we would have a report back before the end of this session, and possibly the hon. House Leader would deal with that when he is closing the debate.

MR. NORLEY:

Mr. Speaker, by and large I agree with the resolution as it is proposed. I would, however, add just a word of caution about point No. 4. I think that in discussing the budget, one of the important things we have to keep in mind is that this is one of the time-honoured provisions in our parliamentary system for as thorough a discussion of general issues as possible. I would be extremely cautious in any effort to streamline, if, in the process of streamlining, we in any way reduce the opportunities of members to discuss those issues which are of a general nature or which may relate to their constituencies.

I want to raise a matter, Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this resolution which is not directly related with the Rules of the House, but which is certainly related to the privileges of members. I am referring to the transportation arrangements now enjoyed by members of this House. Frankly, I think it would be worthwhile if the committee took the time to investigate whether there might not be better transportation arrangements than we presently have. We all have passes on the railroads and bus passes, but I think in this modern day and age, as the hon. Member for Lethbridge pointed out, perhaps we had better get out of the horse and buggy approach to things. I do believe this would come under the general privileges of the House. I would propose the following amendment: that we insert a Clause 11 after Clause 10 which would read as follows: "Review MLA transportation arrangements".

MR. GRUENWALD:

Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. I believe that this proposed amendment is well worth considering, in view of the fact of the necessity of MLAs to travel to and from their constituencies, sometimes on a rather short notice basis. The business of the Greyhound Bus and the railways certainly is outdated, there are isolated areas where they're not nearly as practical as they were when this was first introduced, so I think a very worthwhile discussion could come out of this business of looking at this whole area of transportation. I think that there is some serious thought could be given to having some limited number of plane passes, for example, for members while the sessions are on in particular, maybe a very limited number in between, but in particular while the sessions are on and in areas where no public transportation is provided, but mileage should be looked after again on a very limited basis. Now I'm aware that these are the types of things that could be abused but I would hope that when the committee looks at them they would put in safeguards to get away from this. I believe this amendment is well worthwhile and I'm happy to second it.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-57

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I really hadn't intended to say anything but I would like to make a comment in regard to the proposed amendment. First of all I am not rising in my place to object to it in the Legislature, but simply to make the point that I do not believe it belongs in a discussion on the rules and proceedings. It seems to me that this would be cluttering up the discussion here and personally I think we would be well advised to separate a discussion on rules and proceedings of the House from items that relate to the payments that might otherwise be made. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to leave any impression there that I do not feel that it is an item that could be discussed. I just do not feel that this is the place that we ought to include it.

MR. SPEAKER:

There does appear some doubt as to whether the amendment should be made in this particular motion since it deals with a subject matter which is not really related to the motion, as has been pointed out by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The motion deals with the rules of procedure of the House. The amendment deals with something which perhaps comes under The Legislative Assembly Act and deals with the reimbursement of members for expenses incurred.

DR. HORNER:

There are one or two points that the House should consider in this regard. First of all I can appreciate what the hon. Leader of the Opposition has said, but on the other hand, I do think that there is an area here that isn't really covered when we are discussing changes to The Legislative Assembly Act, because it doesn't deal with the necessity of certain members, and I am speaking of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, the hon. Member for Peace River, the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, the hon. Member for Lethbridge, and the hon. Member for Medicine Hat about the kind of activity that is involved in by some of the members going to those areas, if they don't have air transportation. The time we went, we had what was supposed to be air transportation, but it kind of played out on us. In any case, I think that there is some merit in separating this question of transportation of MLAs from any consideration of compensation on the other hand, and I think it would be more fairly considered doing it this way. There is a tendency, if you lump it into the total sort of thing as it applies to all members, that you don't really consider some of the real transportation problems which certain members must have in this Legislature. Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I think that I could support and I would hope that we can support the amendment as proposed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two on the proposed amendment. The subject matter of the proposed amendment I think is well worth while. However I don't think it belongs in the consideration of the rules of procedure such as we are doing in this particular resolution. The present passes that the hon. members receive from the bus companies and the railways are through the courtesy of the bus companies and the railway. They involve no payment as far as the public funds are concerned. If the airlines would like to issue each member a similar pass or certain members similar passes then of course there is nothing to stop them from doing so now. If it is a case of the government providing the payment for certain air passes or so many per year, then of course that does become a matter of public funds and it becomes a matter of more than procedure in the house.

30-58

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

It really becomes a matter for an amendment to the Legislative Assembly Act and I would much rather see this matter discussed, as the hon. Leader of our party said, at another time. I would think that on the second reading of the Legislative Assembly Bill that the principle could be discussed with the proper amendment being made in the Committee of the Whole. This would determine the wishes and the thinking of the people and also give the government an opportunity to decide whether it wants to assume another expenditure in connection with air passes. In the meantime, possibly, representations could be made to the airlines to see if they would be prepared to issue courtesy passes, as do the bus companies and the railways on the basis that we are travelling in the interests of the public generally and not in our own particular interests. So I would strongly recommend that the amendment not be included in this particular resolution, but that it would be more appropriately dealt with when the Legislative Assembly Act is before the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is a point of order now before the House as to whether the amendment may be appropriately made to this motion and I would like to direct the attention of the hon. members to citation No. 203 of Beauchesne which says that it's an imperative rule that every amendment must be relevant to the question on which the amendment is proposed. There are, of course, qualifications and exceptions, but I supposed if there is no -- Well, it's a point of order, and if the hon. members wish to debate it before we go on with the consideration of the amendment, then perhaps we should deal with that first.

DR. HORNER:

On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, just briefly -- in my view there is a separation between what certain members have to achieve and what the general group of members have to go through. It is my view that it would be wise and prudent to separate the question of certain privileges in regard to passes on transportation to attend sessions, from what might be considered as compensation or other allowances made to members. Therefore, I feel that the amendment is in order and that it is a useful amendment and one that the Privileges and Elections Committee should, in fact, take up. I could argue, very clearly I think, that to decide otherwise is to decide against certain areas of the province, for which if they are going to be represented properly and in the same way as other areas, then transportation becomes a very important factor in the ability of their members to represent the people for whom they come here to speak. I suggest, very sincerely, to the hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. House Leader that in fact we should make this distinction, vis-a-vis the ability to represent people in outlying areas, and the whole question of compensation. If we will send this part to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, that is the place this area should be dealt with - in other words this is an area, if you like, in which you are talking about discrimination -- discrimination vis-a-vis the problems of the outlying areas. I suggest very clearly that this is where it should be considered and then the whole matter of compensation can be discussed at another time in relation to The Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I have to agree with our Leader and our House Leader in their position. I feel that the matter before us, with regard to payment for travelling expenses, particularly here we're talking about air flight, is a consideration that should go along with our indemnity. For example, the hon. Member for Drumheller hasn't an air service into his constituency. He has to travel by car or make some type of arrangement and certainly has some distance to travel to the Legislature. Possibly a consideration that we should make in a matter such as this is a type

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-59

of fund available, upon which a member could draw from, to use or to subsidize whatever type of travel that he uses. So in that line it certainly would be an extension of the indemnity. To have this amendment go along with the present resolution certainly is not in order. I feel, as my colleagues do, that this would be better placed and better discussed under The Legislative Assembly Act.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order I would like to read from sec. 203, Beauchesne:

"The law on the relevancy of amendments is that if they are on the same subject matter as the original motion they are admissible, but not when foreign thereto."

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that with reference to the items mentioned by the hon. Deputy Premier that we are not disputing these various items; we say they are foreign to this motion and therefore contrary to the rules of the House and the procedure of the House. They have nothing whatsoever to do with the rules of the House and the procedure of the House. I would therefore recommend -- I cannot see how we could do otherwise -- that the amendment be declared out of order at this time.

MR. JETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could have the amendment read again so that we are clear on what it is asking.

MR. SPEAKER:

The amendment moved by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, seconded by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West is: that the motion be amended by adding as a new clause 11, the following:

"Review MLA transportation arrangements."

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the point of order I believe that it appears that almost everyone here would like this issue discussed and there should be a practical solution. Rather than violate the rules, why don't we obtain unanimous consent that the government side of the House propose a separate motion to have this matter discussed immediately before this committee sits on this issue before us, or after, and achieve the same result. We are taking time debating a rule. I believe this amendment is not relevant to the rest of the motion. I would like to make just one comment with regard to the hon. Deputy Premier's remarks about outlying areas. I hope that when this is debated he will consider that when I am in Calgary I have to come to Edmonton to represent Calgary and I consider Edmonton an outlying area when I am in Calgary.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment it seems to me that we have to determine whether or not we are talking about referring to this resolution as dealing with just procedures of the House or whether we are talking about privileges of members. And I think if we broaden it to privileges of members that we can consider whether or not it may be a privilege of a member to receive some support in his travelling to and from his constituency to this Legislature to represent the people who elected him and if you consider the resolution is dealing with those privileges then it would seem to me that the amendment would be in order. If the resolution is being considered as just dealing with those things that go on within the Legislature itself, and it appears from looking at some of the things

30-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

which we are considering that it doesn't quite do that, then we should save the transportation amendment for another time. It looks like, in my mind, that we are really dealing with privileges of members and if they need some considerable overhaul it might be wise not to limit what the committee can look at.

Since I am talking, Mr. Speaker, on the amendment and I have some comments about the resolution itself, I will wait until we have dealt with the amendment.

MR. NOTLEY:

On a point of order, with the greatest respect to the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Member for Drumheller, I do think that comments made by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs are relevant. I believe the resolution as it reads goes beyond just the rules of the House, for example, Section or Clause 2 certainly can go beyond just the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, if we are talking about people employed in connection with the business of the House. I would respectfully suggest that the wisest course of action for this Legislature to follow would be to refer this matter to the Committee and have them assess it carefully. I don't think that tonight is really the place to take up the business of the House itself with a long discussion on the various ramifications of reviewing MLA transportation arrangements. But I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that if we look at it in a larger sense of the privileges of the House, and as I noted, some of these clauses do in fact relate to privileges of the House, then it seems to me that the amendment I've submitted would be in order, and that to refer this matter to the committee would be a prudent course for us to take.

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the point of order, I just want to point out one thing here. I think the amendment is in order from the point of view that you can refer anything to this Committee. First of all, Paragraph (A) says "refer to the Committee." However, if the amendment is made I would think there would have to be an amendment in Paragraph (B) also, where it says, "the committee shall determine whether there is a need to revoke, rewrite, or amend the rules of the Assembly", and it should say "The Legislative Assembly Act" also because you couldn't deal with the report of the committee without considering an amendment to the Act. So we should be able to include this in their report, and I think if the amendment is also made in Paragraph (B), because we're dealing with something else, then I feel that the amendment would be in order.

MR. SPEAKER:

In order to get on with the matter, it does seem, as mentioned by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, that if this amendment is adopted there should be some language added to the motion by way of perhaps an addition to the amendment or a further amendment, whereby something will result from the consideration by the committee of the question of transportation arrangements. In other words, merely to consider the transportation arrangements isn't going to get us anywhere. Presumably the purpose of the amendment is for the Committee, after having considered these arrangements, to make a proposal to the House with regard to them. And although I was first inclining to the view that the amendment was out of order, on re-reading the motion, it does include a number of somewhat related or perhaps even unrelated items. Some of them relate to procedure, some relate to the jurisdiction of the Speaker, some relate to the Hansard operation, which certainly doesn't take place entirely inside the House, and with some hesitation and doubt, and having heard the debate on the amendment, I am inclined to find that the amendment is in order provided that we may give it some effect by some further change which perhaps hon. members might wish to suggest, so that the

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-61

committee will then be able to make some recommendation in regard to the subject matter of the amendment.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on another point of order then. Is it suggested that the amendment is in order providing there is a further amendment? I can't understand that if that is the ruling because everything in this resolution deals with this booklet and Beauchesne -- everything. There isn't an item there that doesn't deal with this. [Mr. Taylor held up the Rules of the Assembly.]

Now if we're going to start considering allowances for members for travelling, there are several other things that should be considered too -- the allowance for members while they are at the session, the allowances for members for secretarial help in their own constituencies, the matter of sessional indemnity itself, and we're getting into a wide new field entirely. If the government wishes to have the matter of the payments to members considered, then I would suggest that that be a separate resolution entirely, so that it will be related to public costs and not related to this booklet, and I suggest that everything in this resolution now is related to this booklet and Beauchesne.

DR. HORNER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker --

MR. TAYLOR:

Well -- Mr. Speaker, I'm still speaking on it --

DR. HORNER:

The hon. member is now debating a ruling that you have just made, and I want to suggest to you, sir, that this is completely out of order.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not debating the ruling you just made, I'm suggesting that you said the ruling was, "that this was in order, providing something else was added." Now I don't understand that ruling because who is going to add the other part, and if that part is going to be added, then let's cover the whole subject matter of allowances. I would like to see this whole matter reconsidered carefully, because this whole resolution is on procedure. We are now introducing a foreign matter which I contend under rule 203 is completely foreign to that resolution and should be declared out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller is correct. I cannot make a ruling that the amendment is in order unless it is, as I see it, perfected in the manner in which I suggested. Certainly it is not up to the Chair to propose an amendment to the amendment.

DR. HORNER:

With respect, Mr. Speaker, surely if the amendment is considered as part of the resolution then whether or not there are specific instructions there to the Committee to report back is not of consequence. The consequence is that the amendment then enlarges the role of the committee in looking into this matter. With respect, I don't think that such a resolution has to spell out that the Committee then will report back to the House on this, that, or the other thing. They will discuss the matter and will report back their

30-62

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

thoughts in relation to it. It may well be that the committee may decide that, in fact, this is not in their purview at this time and make recommendation that the government or the Legislature should consider it in an entirely different way. I want to suggest, sir, that it isn't necessary for any additional thing to be added to the amendment at this time, but rather that that should be a consideration of the committee and that their report to the Legislature will deal with that matter at that time.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I follow that same view, and in paragraph ten "review the Hansard operation to date," you have not insisted that we should add the words "and report back to the Legislature" on any of the ramifications of the Hansard operation. I think it is just understood that they will report, that they are not just going to talk about the Hansard operation and keep it all to themselves.

MR. TAYLOR:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I would again submit that by your own ruling the amendment as it stands now is out of order. I fully agree with that interpretation. I think that if this matter of money, allowances, etc. for members is going to be considered, it should be a separate resolution and properly framed covering all such matters.

MR. FARRAN:

I think what the Speaker said, Mr. Speaker -- excuse me for trying to put words in your mouth -- but I believe that you did say you thought it was in order but you would like it clarified a little bit by something being added to it. But you said you thought it was in order.

MR. SPEAKER:

In order to get on with the matter, I think the position -- well I know the position that the Chair took was, that as it stood, the amendment was out of order and that it required some further amending before it was acceptable. Whether that is right or wrong that is what I have said, and it is beyond my authority to change it. If the House wishes to question the matter and change it, that is up to the House. On the other hand I have invited an amendment to the amendment. If someone wishes to move that, I will be glad to deal with it.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I should like to point out that in paragraph (B), the implication is that the Committee will make recommendations with regard to the items of procedure and so on that are contained in the previous part of the motion. But I cannot see this text as extending to making a recommendation with regard to transportation arrangements for MLAs, and that is the reason why I suggested an amendment could be necessary in order to make the amendment acceptable.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, would the following amendment -- the amendment to the amendment -- be acceptable where, to 'the Rules of the Assembly' we added and the Legislative Assembly Act?

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-63

MR. SPEAKER:

I don't know whether the hon. member may move an amendment to his own amendment, but with the unanimous consent of the House and of his seconder, of course, he could withdraw the amendment and substitute another and perhaps we could proceed on that basis.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY:

I certainly withdraw the amendment -- the original amendment -- then and with the consent of the House move a new amendment with clause 11, as I originally suggested included after clause 10, and in section B, the addition after 'Rules of the Assembly' of the words 'Legislative Assembly Act'.

MR. TAYLOR:

May we hear that again please?

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please repeat the additional text that he is proposing for his amendment?

MR. NOTLEY:

Well, the first part of the text, Mr. Speaker, is just a new Section 11 as it stands. "Review MLA's transportation arrangements" would remain the same and referring back to section 10. In Section B, so that we have a report for any recommendation involving amendments to Rules of the Assembly, then we add, "or amendments to The Legislative Assembly Act," so that you have a reference back to a particular act there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to go along and second that new amendment.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I again rise on a point of order, because if the other is out of order, this is even more out of order. This is completely foreign to the resolution in question. It's bringing in another act tacked on at the end of one section, completely foreign to the whole resolution and again is foreign to the motion, using the arguments from Beauchesne. If we want to amend The Legislative Assembly Act, let's put a proper resolution doing it. This is a resolution dealing with the rules of the House. Certainly, it's the rules of the House, it's Beauchesne and the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings and everything in this motion deals with that and with nothing else. And I suggest that if we're going to clutter up resolutions like this by shoving in foreign matters, we're making a very grave mistake and establishing a very grave precedent.

DR. HORNER:

Well, it's not quite as grave as the hon. Member for Drumheller would like to make out. Let me put that forth, because No. 1 in the resolution talks about The Legislative Assembly Act in relation to a number of things. I say again to the hon. member, and to hon. members opposite that there is a distinction between the ability to

30-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

represent one's constituents in the matter of transportation and the question of what compensation one might get for doing so. I think in fairness to all of Alberta, and I know that a lot of members don't have that problem, but there are some that do, and I think that this is a particular problem that relates to a few constituencies and that deserves the consideration of the Elections and Privileges Committee of this Legislature prior to any consideration of changes in The Legislative Assembly Act. I say, Mr. Speaker, with respect that the arguments that the hon. Opposition House Leader has just made just don't hold water when one reads the resolution, which refers on at least one occasion to The Legislative Assembly Act, and as a matter of fact, refers to it twice. There's just no way that that argument holds true, and I suggest in light of your previous ruling that we should now have the question in relation to the amendment.

MR. GHITTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say with the greatest respect to our Deputy House Leader, and on listening to the arguments, and as much as this was an amendment by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and recognizing full well the many problems that we have under our present Legislative Assembly Act, and feeling it very dearly as one who uses the airbus so frequently, and one whose greatest friend these days seems to be the airbus, I must say that I personally concur with the viewpoints of the hon. Member for Drumheller. I believe that there is no place for this particular amendment within this motion. I say that, not on the basis that it is unimportant, and I totally concur with the importance of the motion as set forth by the hon. member, but I do feel that we are talking in terms of the rules and procedures of this House. I do believe that the hon. Member for Drumheller has clearly set out that point of view, and I would dearly love to see The Legislative Assembly Act looked at seriously by the members of this Assembly for the many issues which have been raised this evening. But I personally cannot see that there is a position for this amendment within the context of this particular motion as proposed, and I merely wish to state that from the point of view of another member on this side of the House.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I take a contrary view. I agree with the Deputy Premier and also with the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview and the hon. Member for Lethbridge West. I believe they should be congratulated on their courage in fetching in a subject which is obviously anathema to so many members on their side of the House. However much they may have wanted to introduce it, they feel that they have been tactically outmanoeuvred. I believe that according to the rules this is in order and we should vote in favour of it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order, surely under A, No. 2, where the committee is asked to conduct a study into the facilities provided for the administration of the business and affairs of the Assembly and its members. There is absolutely scope for considering the transportation matter, as outlined already. It would seem to me that we are not bringing in any foreign matter into this discussion at all. I think if the hon. members don't want the committee to look into it, it is a different thing. But on a point of order as to whether or not it can be considered in its present form, certainly, it can be considered. If they don't want the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections to consider transportation matters, then there is a clear course of action for

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-65

them; they merely vote against this amendment. Obviously it can be considered in the scope of this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair is having some difficulty in getting the floor. Does the House agree that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview may withdraw the original amendment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It wasn't unanimous.

MR. SPEAKER:

As a matter of fact, all those in favour of the withdrawal of the amendment and the substitution of the new text, please say 'aye'.

[The motion was carried with some dissent.]

MR. SPEAKER:

This point of order, I take it, is settled, that the new amendment is now before the House. If I am required to say anything about the propriety of the new amendment, and perhaps I should in order to bring the matter to a head, I think we are in a grey area here. We are not discussing a matter, strictly speaking, of principle; we are discussing a motion to refer. The question is whether in a motion to refer a number of things you may add one more thing which may or may not be closely related to those already being referred. Under the circumstances and with great respect for, I think, the weighty arguments that have been made against the propriety both of the amendment and the substitute amendment, I would hold that the substitute amendment is in order. Unless there is some further debate on the substitute amendment, I would propose to put the question.

All those in favour of the amendment moved by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, and I take it, seconded again, by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, that the motion be amended by adding a new Clause 11, namely, 'Review MLA transportation arrangements', and be further amended in paragraph B, by inserting in the third last line after the words, "Rules of the Assembly", the expression, "Amendments to the Legislative Assembly Act". Having heard the amendment, all those in favour of the amendment, please say 'aye'.

[The motion was carried with some dissent.]

MR. SPEAKER:

I declare the amendment to be carried. Now, the motion as amended, I trust, will not be necessary to be read. If the House will agree that the motion as amended may be taken as read, all those in favour of the motion as amended, would you please say, 'aye'.

[The motion was carried with some dissent.]

30-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill No. 6, The Alberta Loan Act 1972

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. minister Mr. Leitch, that Bill No. 6, The Alberta Loan Act 1972, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker, there are just a couple of comments I would like to make with respect to Bill No. 6. I think all hon. members are aware that this is the bill that authorizes the government to borrow up to a maximum of \$200 million for the fiscal year which will be ending on March 31, 1973. Of course, the bill will be moving through the House simultaneously with the approval of the estimates.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have stated in the House earlier that the government anticipates that during the actual fiscal year, we may not, in fact, have to borrow more than \$150 million. While this may be the case, and I'm sure you can appreciate we have to consider the cash flows of the province, it is essential that while this might be our anticipation at the present time, that in view of the timing of the fiscal year and of course the sittings of this house, it is essential that the government do have authorization to borrow up to a maximum of \$200 million. Mr. Speaker, I think that those are all the matters that I would raise with respect to Bill No. 6 on second reading.

[Bill No. 6, The Alberta Loan Act 1972, was read a second time without further debate or dissent.]

Bill No. 7
The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation
Amendment Act 1972

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. minister Mr. Leitch that Bill No. 7 being The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act 1972 be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker, this act increases the total aggregate authorized borrowings under the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Act from \$1.1 billion to \$1.2 billion, I emphasize that this is the aggregate figure. The reason for the need for increase in the aggregate figure is to allow the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation to carry on during the fiscal year, ending March 1, 1973 by providing them with, in effect, \$100 million that they can loan to the municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the new members I would say that the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation, as many may be aware, but some may not be aware, is the Crown Corporation of the government which presently borrows under the Canada Pension Plan and subsequently reallocates the monies borrowed to the various municipalities to assist them in many areas if the municipalities require assistance. Mr. Speaker, I wonder I know the hon. Member for Calgary Millican asked me a question in first reading with respect to something I said on introduction. When I said that the Municipal Financing Corporation, another purpose is that it would provide a convenient means for Albertans to, in effect, invest in the debentures of the municipalities, utilities debentures in this area. The hon. member asked me how this was accomplished. I would just like to say at this time that originally, before the Canada Pension Plan was implemented, the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation was actually authorized to go to the market on its own and in turn reloan to the municipalities. Initially this was the concept of the

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-67

AMFC and there is a very small portion of the present debt that is guaranteed by the province through the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation that represents direct borrowing of Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation. Again, I emphasize, a very small portion, but this is what is meant by my reference to that fact in the future if we so desired, the Corporation is authorized to so do. Mr. Speaker, I think that those are the only comments that I have to make with respect to Bill No. 7 on second reading.

[The motion was carried without debate and Bill No. 7 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 10
The Public Service Vehicles Amendment Act, 1972

MR. HANSEN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move Bill No. 10, seconded by the hon. member Mr. Batiuk for second reading, the bill being The Public Service Vehicles Amendment Act, 1972. The things that this amendment does with this Act is to define what an ambulance is, so that a vehicle may be licensed under The Commercial Vehicle Act which will give the proper control of the vehicle with what it has to have and what it has to carry for the good of the people that have to use it. It makes it a safer vehicle because it will be a vehicle licensed to carry people to and from the places where they will be attended and I think this bill is very worthwhile when amended because it gives the right to have oxygen and things that they need that will give the people better benefits. This is why the bill is being amended. Also the second part of the bill here will be amended in section 2, clause 3 will amend this part of the bill so that it will place trailers and semi-trailers in the same place as trailers are now, as far as passengers are concerned.

The bill before covered trucks, but it didn't cover the trailers that they were pulling. With the new amendment it will also take in the trailer or the semi-trailer that the truck is pulling and place them so that they cannot carry passengers. This is to make it safer and also just to carry on with the same bill that they had but also include the trailer that they are pulling. These are the amendments that will be made to this bill and I think both amendments are for the safety of the people involved and this is why the amendments are being placed in both of these parts. So I would move that they be amended this way and we'll hope in the third reading that I will have the support of the House before this Bill is closed in the third reading.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two in connection with the principle of Bill No. 10. The effect of Bill No. 10 is to bring ambulances under the rules and regulations of commercial vehicles. At the present time ambulances have rules and regulations of their own and it would appear from this amendment that the rules and regulations peculiarly distinctive to ambulances will now be removed and ambulances will be brought under the commercial vehicle section. If that is the case I think that the principle is unsound. Possibly all of the rules for commercial vehicles, I say possibly, might be applicable to ambulances, but certainly ambulances are in a class that require other rules that would not be applicable to commercial vehicles. It would still then be necessary, if this amendment carries, to have another section for ambulances and I refer to just one or two items. For instance it says all of the provisions of the Public Service Vehicle Act which apply to commercial vehicles will apply to the owners and operators of ambulances. Today the operator of an ambulance requires an "A" operator's licence - the very highest. He must have an annual medical. You may operate a commercial vehicle with a "B" licence and you don't have to have a

30-68

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

medical every year. The age, again, may be a distinctive feature, but does this mean that we are now going to lower the requirement for operators of ambulances from the top to one step down? I think that if anybody requires the top licencing to operate a vehicle it's the person who operates an ambulance, that is carrying the ill and the sick and the crippled and those who have just been taken from serious accidents etc. I would suggest that this would be a grave error if that is the intention of this particular bill. I would urge hon. members to think very carefully about lowering the driving requirements for a person operating an ambulance.

Now the second point - an ambulance has particular authority now to break the speed limit, to go through red lights when their lights are flashing. While some medical men say this is not necessary, other medical men say it has saved a number of lives. With an ambulance sometimes time is of the essence. When you have a serious accident on the highway and an ambulance wastes five or seven minutes in getting to the hospital it may well mean that person's life. So the present legislation gives ambulances the right to exceed the speed limit. They have their flashing lights to identify them and people clear the way for them. Maybe the odd ambulance driver takes advantage of this, but the exception probably proves the rule that that is why we need the rule. When a person is really in serious condition and must be taken to a doctor the sooner he gets there the better his chances are. So again this would not be applicable at all to commercial vehicles and commercial vehicles shouldn't ever have the opportunity, because they are carrying commodities; ambulances are carrying human beings and that makes the difference. So I would suggest very seriously that the hon. member and the hon. minister review this section and make sure that we are not going to firstly, lower the operator's licence as would be indicated here and, secondly, that we are not going to take away some of the advantages or benefits we have given to ambulances in the light of the fact they are carrying sick people where time might save a life.

I am not excited at all about the ambulance section and I would hope the hon. Minister of Highways and the hon. Attorney General and the hon. member would review the matter of bringing ambulances under the same rules as commercial vehicles.

In reference to the second section I am fully in accord. I think the exceptions that are there now for a truck have been worked out through the years and are quite sound and if they are sound for a truck then certainly they should be sound for a tractor trailer, semi-trailer, etc. I think the second amendment, in principle, is very sound. But I do question the first, on ambulances.

MR. BATHURST:

Mr. Speaker, just a word or two that I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Member for Drumheller, that the taxi as well as the bus is also a commercial vehicle yet anyone holding a licence to transport people must have a Class "A" licence with a medical taken. Taxi drivers, school bus operators, or any other vehicle which is used to transport people must have a Class "A" licence. Therefore this amendment is not requiring in any way to lower the requirements of the ambulance operator.

MR. POSTER:

I think, Mr. Speaker, if I may enter this, the points raised by the hon. Member for Drumheller are points well taken. The only observation I would make with respect to his reference to the definition of ambulances is I think that his fears can be taken care of by the authority under the Public Service Vehicles Act to pass regulations that will cover those various points. I appreciate that if there were no changes in the regulations under the Public Service Vehicles Act at the present time, some of the hon. member's concerns

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-69¹

would, in fact, be well taken but I think that this amendment must anticipate certain changes to those regulations to cover the very good points he has raised.

MR. DRAIN:

I am concerned about this for this reason. This particular section one here about ambulances. In rural areas you do not have an ambulance organization as such. There has been an effort to work this in with hospitals and we have had some success in doing this so, hence, who do you have for ambulance operators? You have your hospital staff. Presumably a person has to be rushed to a hospital, do you then go out Diogenes with the lantern and say; "Are your qualifications there? You can now go forth in holiness and save this man because you are duly authorized under The Highways and Vehicle Act and you have a Class "A" licence.?" Or do you go and drive the man there? You know, I think probably -- I had better not say any more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Bonnyville asked leave leave that Bill 10, The Public Service Vehicles Act, 1972, be read a second time.

[The motion was carried, and Bill No. 10 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 14
The City of Calgary and Calgary Power Ltd.
Authorization Act, 1972

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, although this act is merely a formality, it does mark something of a milestone in the history of Calgary and I'd like to tell you about it.

In the 1930's, Calgary built a dam at Glenmore on the Elbow River in the southwest corner of the city to provide a reservoir for its water supply. With the addition of pumps and smaller water reservoirs on the high ground, it has been sufficient to supply water for a population of 420,000. Now our city has reached this optimum population. During my tenure of office as a city alderman I pressed as early as 1965 for the city to draw water from the Bow River, its largest and most certain water supply. Through financial considerations the recourse to this main river for water was postponed and postponed until the safety margin had vanished. Now work began last year on the first phase of a new water supply from the Bow River at Bearspaw at a cost of some \$13 million and it's crucial to all Calgarians that this new supply be on-stream for this summer. I'm happy to say that so far the work seems to be on schedule.

In the early 1950's the Bowness area of Calgary suffered severe winter flooding. A Royal Commission determined that the cause was frazil ice and that the remedy lay in the construction of a dam at Bearspaw which is a narrow part of the river ten miles west of the city limits. Fortunately this recommendation for flood control coincided with Calgary Power Ltd.'s desire to build a dam at that location and the structure was built at no cost to the state. Incidentally it was on the western end of the lake formed by the Bearspaw Dam, that I farmed when I first came to Canada many years ago, so this is a double honour for me to move this bill.

30-70

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

So with the Bearspaw Dam constructed by Calgary Power, the city had a ready-made reservoir. All it needed was a filtration plant and a pumping station and the pipes to convey the water into the existing water system. Under normal circumstances a municipality is saved harmless from any damage arising from its utilities, but in this case, bearing in mind that the dam and the land upon which it is situated belongs to Calgary Power, the city entered into a bilateral agreement last June to save Calgary Power harmless from any damages arising out of the city's use of its land and its facilities. And because of the haste and the necessity of getting this thing on-stream by this summer, the agreement was signed by the city last June. Now, because of the exigencies of time the necessary ramification of the agreement by the province could only take place now at this session of the Legislature. This is the reason for the Authorization Act and why I move second reading.

[The motion was carried, and Bill No. 14 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 17: The Bee Act

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker --

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be possible to hold this act until tomorrow? The hon. Member for Macleod is very interested in it and if it is possible we would certainly appreciate it.

MR. HYNDMAN:

That would be agreeable, Mr. Speaker.

MR. APPLEBY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's fine with me.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it then that the House agrees that second reading of Bill 17 be put over until tomorrow.

Bill No. 20: The Perpetuities Act

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Dr. Hohol, the second reading of Bill No. 20.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the time of the first reading of this bill, it deals with a highly technical subject of law and it was our intention to introduce it then and move it through second, and perhaps even committee stage during this current sitting of the Legislature, but then leave it sit over the summer until the fall in order to have the benefit of comment by those people who are concerned with the application of the legislation.

The principle that the bill deals with is the general common law rule that no interest is good unless it must vest, if at all, not later than 21 years after some life in being at the creation of the interest. Putting that in the simplest possible language, it means that there is a time limit on which property must vest. If it doesn't vest within that time limit, the gift or disposition is then invalid.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-71

I think everyone agrees that the principle is a sound one and one that should continue in force. But the perpetuities rule and its sub-rules operated very harshly in a number of circumstances. In particular, it tended to trap the unwary, and this bill doesn't do anything to the general principle that property must vest within a certain time. It doesn't interfere with that rule. It simply removes some of the harsher aspects of the rule.

For example, Mr. Speaker, section 3 applies to what might be called the wait-and-see principle. Generally speaking, at common law, one looked at the rule, or looked at the disposition and then at that point considered whether there was any conceivable way in which the property could vest outside the perpetuity period, and if the conclusion was that there was a conceivable way, the gift was invalid. That often operated very harshly and very unexpectedly. This section permits one to wait and see whether the rule is violated, so that if the property actually vests within the rule, the gift is good and not invalid.

The next section dealing with another important point of principle is section 6 the common law rule provided that the gift had to vest within a life in being plus 21 years. So if someone had inadvertently provided for a gift at 22 years after the life in being, the gift was invalid. For example, if one said "I leave my estate to my wife, or the income to my wife for life, and 22 years after her death it shall be divided among my children," the gift to the children was bad, because it vested more than 21 years after the life of the wife. Whereas if they made the gift in the same words but said "after 21 years after death" the gift was good. This section now permits the gift to be good and it vests within the time limit provided for by this Act.

Another section dealing with a harsh instance of operation of the rule is section seven. In the case of gifts to classes, or a group of people, if the gift to one of them fell outside the rule, the gift to all of them was bad. This section now merely provides that the gift to those that fall outside the rule is bad; the remainder of the gifts are good.

Another section dealing with a matter of principle is section 9. The operation of the common law rule is such that the gift was bad if a person who was, in accordance with all scientific knowledge, beyond the age of childbearing -- the gift might still be bad on the basis that there was a possibility of them having a child. The rule didn't allow for the physically impossible, merely the theoretical possibility. And section 9 does away with that by providing circumstances within which the rule will operate, providing circumstances within which people are deemed to be capable of having children, which might void the gift.

There are other provisions also dealing with the principles of the rule. For example, under common law rule it doesn't apply to leasehold property, but it does apply to the right to acquire an ownership interest in the property. For example, a lease for 999 years was a good lease, but if one provided for an option at the end of that period, the option was invalid because it would pass the interest in the property more than 21 years after the date the agreement was entered into. The section in the bill provides for options up to a period of 80 years being valid.

The last item of principle dealt with by the bill is what's known as the rule against accumulations. In common law there is such a rule. It's difficult to understand. Again, it often operated harshly and this bill provides that the rule against accumulations shall be the same and operate under the same circumstances and conditions as the rule against perpetuities.

30-72

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

[The motion was carried, and Bill No. 22 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 22, The Coroners Amendment Act, 1972

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Dr. Hohol, second reading of Bill No. 22. This bill, Mr. Speaker, provides for several amendments to The Coroners Act. The first deals with the time within which the medical superintendent or an administrator of a hospital shall give notice to the coroner of the death of someone within the hospital.

There's another provision in the bill, providing that if a death occurs under circumstances where an inquest might be ordered, there is to be no interference with the body by embalming, cremating, or the application of a chemical until the coroner grants his consent.

Other amendments deal with the changes in the form of the documents issued by the coroner. A further amendment removes the requirement that in the case of mine deaths, three members of the coroner's jury be miners. And the further amendments impose an obligation on persons in charge of correctional institutes and things of that nature to give notice of the death of inmates.

[The motion was carried, and Bill No. 22 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 24, The Margarine Amendment Act, 1972

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for Smoky River, Mr. Moore, that Bill No. 24, being The Margarine Amendment Act, be read a second time. The principle of this bill is that it will remove all colour restrictions with respect to margarine. The arguments in favour of passing Bill No. 24 are, of course, numerous and sound. We must consider that our government is embarking on a very diversified agricultural program -- a program to develop every aspect of agriculture, production, manufacturing and marketing.

To place or maintain restrictions on one product, to aid or protect another in the same field or category, is, in fact to discriminate one against the other. And so it is with butter and margarine. And the war carries on.

The dairy industry may feel it will be adversely affected if margarine is permitted to be coloured the same, or any other colour. I don't know why we are so presumptuous to say that margarine can only then be the colour of butter. I would like to see it, perhaps, in rainbow colours and have a pot of gold at the end of that rainbow. However, statistics indicate that in the period of 1962-1971, a ten-year period, the dairy industry did not produce sufficient quantities of butter to meet our domestic market for five of those ten years, in other words, for 50% of the time.

Butter production in Alberta and in most of Canada has been dropping extensively since 1966. This continued to 1971 and 1972, so that in 1972 there was a butter shortage in Canada of 34,500,000 pounds. Only Quebec increased its butter production since 1966. According to the Canada Statistics, Alberta alone imported from the United States in 1971, 2,193,700 pounds of butter. I might say at this time that the next highest province in Canada in 1971 to import butter, was British Columbia, with an import amount of 763,200 pounds of butter. I would also like to say that information is very interesting and staggering for 1972, wherein, in January 1972 alone,

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-73

Alberta imported from the United States some 2,302,000 pounds of butter.

To meet this shortage, Canada imported butter at lower prices in many cases. However, this price saving was not passed on to the consumer, nor did this importation increase our dairy industry income. I note from statistics that farm cash income from dairying was as follows, and here I will compare as between Alberta and British Columbia.

Alberta in 1966 had a cash income from dairying of \$40,008,000. In 1970 Alberta had a cash farm income in dairying of \$45,548,000, an increase in income of \$5,540,000, while in the same period British Columbia in 1966 had an income from dairying of \$40,973,000. In 1970 it had an increase to \$50,665,000, an increase of \$9,692,000. So that British Columbia, in farm cash income from dairying, rose during that same period of time over that of Alberta by \$4,152,000. The above figures do not reflect subsidies paid by the federal government.

I am making this comparison of this income between these two provinces as evidence that British Columbia, with no colour restrictions on margarine since 1952, has increased its dairy cash income during the period 1966 to 1970 even more rapidly than Alberta, a province with margarine colour restrictions.

Just a short time ago, as a matter of fact only within the last two weeks, British Columbia had reported that it again increased its butter sales. The Canadian Dairy Commission statistics indicate subsidies paid directly to Alberta dairy producers for the period April 1971 to January 1972, subsidies totalling \$6,007,000. There is no question that there is a vast price difference between purchasing margarine and butter, an economic fact that cannot be overlooked by those on very low incomes or welfare recipients. Numerous people, for health reasons, are restricted from using butter and therefore must use margarine. Now I'm not going to get into the argument or the validity of whether the fact that for health reasons they must use margarine, because I don't think that that is relevant at this point. The information that was given was that these are the directions by their doctors for whatever reasons they are, and so the validity I don't think should be debated. The deep colouration of margarine which presently exists is claimed by margarine users not to be very palatable and I to some degree have to agree with that.

The government is expanding programs in the area of agriculture. Every facet of agricultural production is being explored. The production of rapeseed in the province has great potential, particularly in producing rapeseed oil. The production of rapeseed oil leads again to another industry for Alberta and that, of course, is a healthier industry in the manufacture of margarine, inasmuch as the validity, the availability of rapeseed oil can be sufficient in quantity, but there is no need to use marine oils. We have a total Alberta product. Enhancing the attractiveness of margarine not only stimulates rapeseed and rapeseed oil production, but as well makes a healthier margarine manufacturing industry. All of the above aspects bear relation to increased employment and income in the overall field of agriculture.

Let me give you a brief history of margarine in Canada. In 1886 the federal government passed an act which prohibited the manufacture and sale of certain substitutes for butter. In 1948 the Supreme Court ruling cleared the way for the manufacture and sale of margarine in all provinces. However, the dairy industry being concerned with the competing product persuaded the federal government to impose a 12% sales tax on margarine and persuaded the provincial governments to impose colour restrictions.

30-74

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

The Province of Newfoundland never had colour restrictions on margarine, and so when it entered Confederation it was on the precise condition that it not be required to comply with the sales tax nor with the colour regulations regarding margarine that were in existence throughout Canada. The result was that Newfoundland neither had to pay 12% sales tax on margarine sales nor did it have to bring in colour restrictions, so that the people of Newfoundland enjoyed a freedom in the manufacture and use of margarine no other province enjoyed. I believe that it would be fair to say that neither the dairy industry nor the margarine industry suffered in that province.

British Columbia, as I have pointed out, has, or it appears to have, a healthy industry in the production of butter, even though colour restrictions have been removed as far back as 1952. The Province of Saskatchewan has now moved ahead with the removal of colour restrictions there, but they went even further, in that they have also removed the requirement of the part of restaurant owners to post notice of serving margarine to their patrons. We are not going that route. To many margarine users the deep colouration is an embarrassing visual reminder of their financial plight. The deep colouration of margarine does not lend itself to well for various uses in baking. Food in its variety is produced generally to satisfy the palates of the consumer and margarine is no exception.

I have received many, many letters, and as evidence I have them here in support of this bill. These are letters from all parts of the province. I have many letters from consumers stating that they purchase their margarine by the case, each trip they make on a visit to British Columbia and when their friends go they make the same arrangement with their friends to bring it back by the case to stock up to use during the time that they are here in between their trips. The stores in Dawson Creek, British Columbia, report that they unpack only 25% of their supplies for sale in the store by the pound and the balance is sold by the case, reportedly to Alberta shoppers.

Who is benefiting here -- Alberta or British Columbia? Are Alberta dollars remaining in this province? I think the answer is obvious insofar as margarine sales are concerned and butter sales. Rapeseed produces to the farmer \$2.47 per bushel, raw butter fat brings to the dairy people 55.2 cents per pound; and in the instance of co-operative producers, a gross of 61.2 cents per pound. These, of course, do not include subsidies paid by the federal government.

As I have indicated, the provincial government has expanded vastly on agricultural programs to enhance and to aid agriculture in every aspect. It is providing guaranteed loans to dairy people, to other people in the agricultural business. It is doing everything possible to find new markets for all of its products, including butter. There are no subsidies paid to rapeseed growers, nor to margarine producers.

I do not criticize the Alberta dairy people for the shortage in production or for the subsidies that they are paid, because I believe that they require to have some basic income. But I would like to say that their criticism which I have received, that the passing of this bill will affect the butter sale -- I can only say that if it affects the butter industry it will only be from the aspect that we will not need to import in as great a quantity as we presently do, and that, in fact, perhaps butter sales will go up. Because where you have a restriction, very often psychologically it works that you have a greater demand. Let's keep our Alberta dollars in Alberta, and I don't think that the dairy industry can show sufficient proof that the passing of this amendment will affect their business and their income. And so I again ask for your support in passing this bill.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-75

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak on this amendment that will lift all restrictions on the colour of margarine.

Mr. Speaker, today we noticed a number of students from the city in the Legislature. This has been the case over this first session. Many of them come from the heart of this city and have seldom visited a farm and know very little about agricultural practices in general. I believe that the humorous stories that we have heard concerning city youth visiting farms are not exaggerated. Last summer a number visited our farm and we were quite amazed at some of the questions they asked of us. A neighbour had a niece visiting him from Los Angeles and one day while touring the farm she asked, "Why do some cows have horns and others do not?" "Well," he said, "some cows grow horns, others do not grow horns, some lose their horns and others we snip the horns off." "Well," she said, "why does that cow not have horns?" "Well," he said, "that cow doesn't have horns because that cow is a horse."

Now as the city students filed out the last few days I felt an urge to go and speak to them and ask them what is butter and what is margarine? And I want to assure Mr. Koziak that I'm not the gentleman who you brought up today about someone not wanting the city fellows on this particular agricultural committee -- I'm not the one.

It's hardly necessary for me to explain these two products, however very briefly there is a great difference between these two products. Now man has been making butter by churning the fat of milk for thousands of years. Butter is a nourishing, tasty spread used for bread. It's used in frying food. You mix butter with flour and it's a shortening used in cakes and so on. Now butter has been used for other things besides food. It's been used for a medicine. Early Romans and Greeks used butter as a remedy for burns and scalds, etc. Ladies in ancient times used butter as a dressing for the hair and there was no need for wigs in those days, Mr. Speaker.

Today when we think of butter we think of the product that is made from the milk of a cow. Milk has long been recognized as nature's most perfect food, and no amount of competitors' advertising can change this preconception. I remember going to a country school and all we had to drink was water. A local boy had to carry it there, there was no well at the school. Now, today, our students have a choice, either water or milk or an orange juice, and I know we encourage our children to drink milk during the noon hour.

Margarine on the other hand is made by mixing water and salt with vegetable oil or perhaps marine oil, or it could be animal fats and oils. It is then churned with pasteurized skim milk and it dates back to the time of Napoleon. Napoleon enjoyed bread when he could have a spread on it, but he found that he couldn't carry the butter along with him when he went on his warring ventures because it just wouldn't keep. I can remember during the Second World War visiting stores, and there would be long tables there with different groupings of butter. The farmer would have to leave his name with that particular group of butter he was selling. There would be the Olsen's butter, the Johnsons, the Larsens, the Jacobsons, the Sorensens, and so on, and I have seen people go along the table and pick up a pound of butter, one table to the other; it wasn't that this particular butter smelt like some perfume from Paris, but butter doesn't keep, we have to admit that. Well anyway, Napoleon commissioned men to manufacture a spread that would take the place of butter and this they did. This happened in 1870 and it was introduced into the United States in 1874, and there has been a long legal battle over its use ever since. Some stores have received fines of \$5,000 a day for passing it as butter. Other states in the United States tax a pound of margarine and the money is paid into the dairy industry for research and so on.

30-76

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

Well, the lifting of restrictions on margarine will not complement rural development. It will do the opposite. It will centralize. For example, the margarine manufacturer can obtain rapeseed oil, corn oil, cotton seed oil, or assorted marine oils by tank car. He can process them and manufacture enough margarine in one plant to supply all the Dominion of Canada. Now you cannot do that with cream, of course. The creamery operator is in no such position. Assembling large quantities of milk at one time and place is costly and impossible. There are 56 creameries in Alberta at the present time and some are rather small. There is one four and a half miles from my farm. It's a small one but many people are employed and I am afraid if we pass this legislation that the number of our creameries will decline.

This proposed legislation is taken very seriously in my constituency. There is one gentleman there who has been a farmer and he is also a poet. I consider him to be Alberta's country poet. I contacted him a few days ago and told him that this amendment was coming up, so he wrote a little poem and I would like to pass it on. It is a rather serious poem and it is by Tom McCracken. It is entitled: "Barnyard Gossip"

The Holstein said to her Jersey friend,
"If you have got an ear to lend
I have some things I'd like to say
Some things I heard the other day.

It seems as though the powers that be
Are issuing a firm decree
To lift restrictions slick and clean
On colouring of margarine.

Now I declare that by this act
They are giving credence to the fact
The product they are imitating
Is worthy of a higher rating."

The Jersey said, "I am annoyed.
For we will all be unemployed.
I think it's stupid, cruel and wrong
And that's what makes my face so long.

Another problem, by the way,
Is what is father going to say?
I think that if they pass this bill
They should supply us with the pill."

Most dairy products are presently produced from Canadian raw materials with a large percentage of profits going directly to the local farmer. This is certainly true of butter but I am not so sure that it is true of margarine.

Many industries are related to the dairy industry, such as feed companies, chemical companies, veterinarians, drugstores, packing plants, and others. You can get just about anything from soup to nuts with margarine. You check your local store, you can get corn holders for so many wrappers, corn holders to hold a hot cob of corn; you can get a bow maker, and if you buy "Good Luck" today in the supermarket, you can obtain some pantyhose. They'll do anything to sell their inferior product.

DR. HOHOL:

Pantyhose! Got any samples?

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-77

MR. SORENSON:

They are determined to chisel in, to imitate, to adopt the characteristics of a much better product. Now I have read a few submissions by agricultural groups on this issue and I would like to read one or two of them into my account. Here is a letter from Strome, Alberta dated April 14, 1972.

"Mr. Ralph Sorenson, MLA,
325 Legislative Building,
Edmonton, Alberta

Dear Mr. Sorenson:

Re: Margarine Act Amendment

Further to your letter of March 24th, 1972, please be advised that a motion was passed at our regular meeting held on Monday, March 27th, 1972 to oppose the Margarine Amendment Act.

I trust that you will voice the opinion of your local when this matter is discussed.

Sincerely yours,

West Flagstaff National Farmers Union Local No. 725."

They have about 200 members strong. It's signed Marlene Smith, secretary-treasurer.

And then, the submission of the Uniform Dairy Committee to the Government of Alberta, Agricultural Committee on the impact of the removal of colouring restrictions on margarine, and I'll not read all of this, but it goes on to state:

". . . removal of the colour restrictions on margarine would be of no benefit to the consumer, and would cause serious reduction in gross income to agriculture. Removal of these restrictions would not improve the quality of the margarine, nor would it give the consumer a price advantage. However, it would make identification difficult and would be an inconvenience and danger to those on restricted diets. The most irritating aspect of margarine promoters to the dairy producer is the fact that they continually try to capitalize on the image of butter. Some processors of margarine put it in a butter wrapper, some put it in the traditional size and shaped package of butter, somehow it has even found its way into the dairy case in the market place. Now they want to use the traditional colour which is natural to butter. Dairy producers believe this to be outright deception. They don't object to margarine being sold, but let it be sold on its own merits. Spokesmen for the vegetable oil industry claim that removing the restrictions would increase the consumption of margarine, and decrease the consumption of butter. In British Columbia, where there has been no colour restriction since 1952, per capita disappearance of margarine is 11.5 pounds per capita, 2.22 pounds more than the national average. One pound of butter returns 84 cents to the dairy man as opposed to 8.8 cents returned to the rapeseed producer per pound of margarine sold. From this we see that for every pound of butter that is replaced with margarine, there is a decrease in gross agricultural income of 75 cents. Assuming Alberta consumption patterns would follow British Columbia, we can project a net loss of \$2.7 million to the total farm income. If we compare these figures on an oil versus butterfat basis, we find the returns to the producer are 5.5 cents for margarine and 84 cents for butter.

What would be the gains, assuming the entire decrease in Alberta butter consumption was replaced by rapeseed margarine? This would increase the rapeseed market by only 143,000 bushels, or

30-78

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

one half of one per cent of Alberta rapeseed production, but decrease butter consumption by 11.4%.

We would also like to remind the government that such a decision would be inconsistent with their goal to develop rural communities, replacing 3.59 million pounds of butter with margarine would be equivalent to the production of more than ten small creameries located in rural communities. On the other hand, rapeseed processing facilities, if expanded, would likely be centralized in an urban area. Replacing butter sales with margarine would be a decrease in income, not an income transfer since a percentage of rapeseed growers are also cream shippers. We have heard too much emphasis on the importation of butter into Canada. In the dairy year, 1971-72, we imported a total of 11 million pounds, five million to meet market demand, and the remaining six million to maintaining dairy stocks at a safe level.

Butter consumption in Canada is approximately one million pounds per day. On the other hand, five million pounds of butter were exported in Britain in the early part of the dairy year. We are now producing more butterfat than is required in Canada and the small deficit we have, has been created through exports, a situation that is unlikely to continue. Due to heavy buying of cheese by the United Kingdom, an increasing amount of cream has been used for the manufacture of cheese. When Britain joins the Common Market, this market will contract and much of the production will shift back into butter, possibly creating a surplus. Production of butter in Alberta for January 1972 is up 4% over 1971 production."

I feel, in closing, that the producers and consumers have become the victims of these smart processors and manufacturers. I don't see why we have to go any farther, I think we have leaned over backwards to accommodate margarine as it is. I feel the amendment should be defeated. Thank you.

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, I also have the submissions of the Uniform Dairy Committee which was just read to the House. I have a few comments to make. I might say that I am very pleased that the Uniform Dairy Committee did make the submission and did take the time to make their points of view known. In addition to the submission, I was fortunate in receiving a booklet which was prepared by, I believe, their committee, called "Dairy Facts and Figures at a Glance", pertaining to dairy farms of Canada, which contains some interesting statistics.

The statistics, of course, that are of interest to me and should be to this House, are that in 1963 -- now this is for a period of 1961 to 1970, I am choosing 1963 because in that year, the per capita disappearance of creamery butter was at its highest. In 1963, it amounted to 18.56 pounds per capita per year. In that same year, the per capita disappearance of margarine products were 9.22 pounds. In 1970 the per capita consumption or disappearance of butter had dropped to 15.32 pounds which is a drop of a little over three pounds per person, and in the same period the per capita disappearance of margarine went to 9.28 pounds which is an increase of 0.6 pounds per person. So that the 3.24 pounds of butter that were not consumed, did not find their way, Mr. Speaker, into consumption of margarine because as 3.24 pounds of butter, or as the amount of butter consumption dropped by 3.24, the corresponding increase of margarine consumption went up by only 0.06.

These figures, of course, then ring a little red light and cause me some alarm as to whether or not there is a connection between the consumption of butter and the consumption of margarine and whether

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-79

the colour restrictions have any bearing on these particular statistics.

I was interested by the quotation that appeared in the submission by Unifarm in their particular submission, in which they state that in British Columbia the per capita disappearance is 11.5 pounds, which is 2.2 pounds more than the national average. This would be correct from the statistics that I have before me. Unfortunately, I do not know what the per capita consumption of butter for the Province of British Columbia is to see if there is any comparison. However, I would place some caveat on the statistics that this relates strictly to the fact that there is no colour restriction in B.C., because in looking at the same statistics that were supplied to me by the dairy farm people, I find some very unusual statistics, on page 30 in which they -- I'm sorry, on page 32 -- in which the per capita consumption of butter for 17 countries is shown. Just taking the year 1969 as an example, Mr. Speaker, in New Zealand the per capita consumption of butter was 40.3 pounds, as compared with the Canadian per capita consumption of 15.3 pounds, and a low for the United States of 5.4 pounds. We all appreciate that the great majority of the British Columbia residents live within a stone's throw of the American boundary. Perhaps there may be some connection there.

There is another item, of course, that must be considered, that I'm aware of, and that perhaps others are aware of. A number of baking companies exist in the Province of British Columbia which then export all across Canada, and these companies may use margarine in their baking products. And of course, the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood has pointed out another phenomenon and that is that in the Cities of Dawson Creek and I believe she mentioned Fort St. John -- I may be wrong there -- only 25% of the margarine products are sold on a per pound basis and the rest are packaged for case consumption, which tends to support the fact that margarine products are exported to the Province of Alberta. So that when we take a look at the figure of 11.5 pounds per capita disappearance of margarine products in British Columbia, this can somewhat be misleading, in that some of those pounds may be finding their way into the Alberta markets.

So, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in the position where I'm not convinced that there is any relation between the per capita consumption of butter, the colour of the products, and the per capita consumption of margarine. I think that perhaps there are other matters that affect the per capita consumption of butter much more greatly than the colour of margarine. I think that one of those items was the cholesterol scare that this country became aware of in the years that butter consumption decreased quite drastically. There are factors which affect butter consumption which are a lot more devastating to the farmer than the colour of margarine.

Having come to that conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I then concern myself with the problem of 'passing off' that has been raised by the hon. gentlemen opposite, that if we permit margarine to assume the same colour as butter, are we then permitting a fraud on the consumer. Mr. Speaker, I look at, firstly, the restaurant trade. The restaurant trade uses these products in their cooking and their sandwiches, what have you. However, our act, as it presently stands, requires restaurants which use margarine to plainly disclose this on their menu; so that by removing the colour restrictions, there is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Speaker, that we wcn't be assisting the passing off of margarine as butter in restaurants. That problem does not exist.

The second place is in our supermarkets. By removing the colour restrictions on margarine, are we assisting the passing off of that product as butter? Here again, I feel that there is no problem, because we are not giving the margarine producers the right to use the word butter to describe their product. The product will still

30-80

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

remain margarine, no matter what colour it is, so they cannot pass it off as butter, in the same fashion as, I found, ice cream can be passed off. There are two brands of ice cream. There is the ice cream that's made from milk and there's the ice cream that's made from cream. You can go into your stores and pick up one without knowing that you've picked up the wrong one. So I don't think that we're having that problem here, Mr. Speaker, that margarine won't be passed off as butter, because it'll still be a different name.

So, what are we looking at. We're looking at the home -- the use of that product in the home. Now, if I in my own home wish to use a product that is margarine but looks like butter, should I be denied that right? I think this is basically the whole thing. I haven't been convinced that removing the colour restrictions will affect dairy production, but I am convinced that there is a segment of our population, there is a segment of the people in the province of Alberta, who would like to have their margarine coloured a particular colour. This is borne out by their buying habits, that they would import cases upon cases of margarine from another province.

Now we all know, Mr. Speaker, that foods become palatable because of certain colours. If a green steak were put on your plate, Mr. Speaker, you probably wouldn't eat it, no matter what the taste was. It may be far superior, but we're used to particular colours. I think this is what we're looking at -- the consumer, the person in the home. Are we doing that person in the home a service or a disservice by removing the colour restrictions on margarine? My submission, Mr. Speaker, is that we are doing that person in the home a service by removing the restriction on the colour in margarine. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I notice from a press clipping that before my remarks this evening can be taken seriously in this House, I will be obliged to set at least one of the hon. gentlemen opposite straight in terms of my background, and whether I know anything or not about agriculture.

I could, perhaps, begin by stating how little I know about the particular subject at hand, inasmuch as I have extracted milk from cows using two different methods, the ten-digit technique and the more automatic technique. I did that, Mr. Speaker, beginning as soon as I could get away from a cow before she could step on me, until I was about age 16. After that, I knocked around on a few farms, and eventually wound up as assistant herdsman in charge of a dairy farm, which, back in those days, was considered to be quite large, inasmuch as we milked over 70 cattle daily. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I held that position until I was gored at the Royal Winter Fair in Toronto, as the records of the General Hospital in that city will show, by an Ayreshire bull.

Subsequently, I moved to La Belle Province du Quebec where I, for six years, served as general secretary of a farm organization. Most of the members of that farm organization were dairy farmers. Mr. Speaker, in that capacity I had the privilege of being one of two people being responsible to organize the first Dairy Marketing Board in Quebec, around the Carnation Company plant at Sherbrooke, Quebec, which exercise involved us in getting a 75% positive vote of 2800 dairy farmers in that region of the province.

During my sojourn in that province I had the honour to edit for two years a farm magazine, published by Macdonald College, and worked in the extension service of Macdonald College, which, as you recognize, is the agricultural faculty of McGill University. Subsequently, I obtained my Master of Science degree in Agricultural Economics at the University of Massachusetts in the United States.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-81

Mr. Speaker, having established, I hope, some portion of the reason that I might have been placed on that committee, not to mention the fact that I now live in a city and am responsible to a city constituency, and hopefully, have some interests and some ability to represent the constituents in Edmonton Jasper Place who are consumers -- that, I think, would be another reason why I should be on the committee. To come to the specific question here --

AN HON. MEMBER:

Show us that pinhead now.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I think the main issue here is a matter of consumer choice. It was my experience many years ago, when I was with a farm organization, that at that time there was quite a divided feeling among dairy farmers as to whether or not margarine should be permitted to be coloured the same as butter. I suspect that that opinion is still divided today. I would submit that many farmers are free enterprisers sufficient to regard the colouration of margarine as being somewhat inevitable. I am not sure how much difference it is going to make, anyway. I would agree with other comments which have been made this evening. When we have a differential in price which is equivalent to 75%, I think that is a sufficient motivation to induce many people to eat a product which doesn't, perhaps, take on the colour they would like to have it, but it is a sufficient motivation that they would probably eat it anyhow. If they didn't like it in that colour they could buy colouring and colour it themselves. So really, Mr. Speaker, I think that this issue is being made into a mountain when really, it is not that important. I don't think that it is going to be harmful to agriculture. I do think that it may open the way for some products using combinations of oils and dairy products. This point has not been brought out, as I recollect this evening, but I think this is a potential. I think it is one that ought not be overlooked and I commend the act to the hon. members.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I trust I have set the record straight and perhaps added an additional point to the argument favouring this Bill.

MR. DRAIN:

Well, this is an interesting bill, Mr. Speaker, I must say and rather an unusual bill. I -- it is a bill that anyone can wonder about. When Napoleon II started on his program of properly developing a substitute for butter from the standpoint of economy, of course he started on lard and skim milk. As we progressed in time, we evolved to probably a more sophisticated product. So we now come to an era when customer choices are no longer determined by the customer. These are pre-programmed by the smart boys who, according to one school of economic thinking, pre-decide what the customer is going to have and then proceed by the processes of advertising to properly jam it down his throat. Now there may even be a plot in the case of margarine; however, this could have what I would classify as a very minor impact on butter as such in the colouring. It would appear to me that we have two products. We are looking at butter and we are looking at margarine. One by virtue of the legislation that is presently on the books which is actually an evolution because initially in the Province of Alberta, margarine had to be a sickly gray colour and was accompanied in its sale by the little package of yellow. I was quite interested in people who would take this product in a bowl and add the yellow and beat it until it had a beautiful yellow colour, which you could not tell from butter except in the taste. That leads me to the thought that would a rose smell differently if you called it something else, or if it was a yellow

30-82

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

rose or a pink rose; I doubt very much whether this would be the case.

Hence, I would think that margarine as such should stand on its own merits. Here again, I question my own logic because if you go a little further into this problem and delve into the type of butter that a cow produces in the summer and then look at the type of butter the same cow produces in the winter, you find that there is colouring added to it, so there even the cow, with due respect to the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation, is not consistent in the program of this particular product. Then there is, of course, the factor of health which has been mentioned. The cholesterol count in margarine could be probably a little less, but I have tried on several occasions to try and gulp down this margarine and there is no way that I could possibly do it. It has got to be butter for me or else. Maybe I am spoilt or something, but there is no way that I can possibly utilize this stuff. I suppose if you were raised on margarine that you would have the same repugnance towards using butter.

Looking at butter in 1972 and considering the fact that we had probably a 30% subsidy on it, it certainly is not price-wise competitive with margarine; however, and this may astonish some hon. members, food costs are vitally important to a lot of people and a lot of people will have to use margarine because, basically, they are becoming used to it.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, whether I -- and here again I doubt that I have contributed anything very significant to this debate --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. DRAIN:

This is a regulation peculiar to the Province of Alberta in regards to margarine. So we in the Province of Alberta say that margarine shall be a certain colour and thereby have set up butter on a certain colour pedestal. This will not basically, in my opinion, affect the agricultural efforts of the dairy people because people who are used to butter will continue to use it, and people who are forced by economic conditions to use margarine will use margarine, and I think probably once people become accustomed to margarine it would be pretty difficult to bring them back to butter.

So I think probably you could classify this bill as a bill that could be possibly irrelevant, but nevertheless which has a certain amount of sophistication. A bill, probably, that leads us a little closer to realities and away from this process of regulating and regulating and grinding out laws after the manner of these legislatures all over the Dominion of Canada where the Legislatures get together in their wisdom and they grind out law after law and the main objective is to confuse the people whom they properly represent. And certainly I would qualify that it was also in the spirit of 'do-goodism' that father shall lead his little child along the pathway. Sometimes I wonder why these children don't kick back a little harder than they do. Thank you.

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I should follow the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest or not, but I will in this instance.

I would like to compliment the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood who gave such consistent and very clear statistics and good arguments for putting through this bill with regards to colouring. I think

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-83

there are some arguments in favour of it. I believe that at the time that the law was written to define margarine with colour restrictions or keep it separate from butter, I think that it had a far greater political importance, possibly, then it has at this time. It was a new product and I think that the dairy people had considerable concern about what the impact might be on their particular product.

I was interested in what the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona who spoke about the danger of fraud. Then the thought crosses my mind why the margarine people would wish to colour their product the same as the dairy product, or why the dairy people would wish to be distinctly different from the margarine product. I don't know whether I really received an answer from the debate that has gone on in the Assembly. Possibly this should be clarified. If there is an indication that the margarine people hope to make use of the same spectrum as butter with the intent of fooling the public then I think we would have to take very careful look at the bill. I might pose this to the dairy people, if and when this bill is passed, whether they might ask the Legislature of the province for a bill similar to The Margarine Act which would restrict their colour to a specific spectrum, so that they in effect could, with great pride, identify their product before the public.

I think it was brought out in debate that butter varies and the cow has little control over this. So colouring is added to butter to give it a specific colour. It crosses my mind as to whether it is the colour that determines what a consumer buys or whether, in fact, it is the price or whether it is the taste. If it is the colour then the question crosses my mind, if margarine was permitted to be the same colour as butter and butter was reversed to be the colour of margarine, whether this would have any effect, positive or negative, on sales. Again I haven't an answer to this problem. I think probably time will tell. I suppose when the bill is passed we will have an opportunity to assess the reaction of the consumer, but I would like to state clearly that if there is any intent of masquerading one product under the guise of another, then we should seriously consider precisely what we are doing in this bill.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, just a few words. First of all to answer the hon. Member for Lacombe, I agree with him completely, that there shouldn't be any attempt to masquerade one product for another. What the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood so ably presented was a simple bill removing the colour restrictions on margarine. This doesn't affect the packaging requirements that are still in effect and still have to be approved and these packaging requirements and labelling requirements are pretty specific in relation to margarine.

It does, however, relate somewhat -- and I would just like to expand on one or two points -- I am rather surprised that the spokesman for the opposition should come from the constituency of Sedgewick-Coronation because, and without any malice towards the hon. member whatsoever, I have spent some time listening to representations from a number of communities in his constituency and a number of producers in his constituency, in the heart of the rapeseed growing area, who spent a lot of time with myself and the hon. Minister of Industry in relation to the promotion of a rapeseed crushing industry in the Alliance area, and had the support of every major town within his constituency for this rapeseed crushing plant. If he suggests, of course, that that is not of any consequence I say to him that he really doesn't have any knowledge of what is going on in agriculture in his area and that he should reassess his thinking in that regard. When he says it is some smart processors that are promoting this bill I want to reassure him also that it is nothing of the kind. I think it is a natural evolution of a practical way of resolving some of the problems within agriculture, and I might say,

30-84

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

Mr. Speaker, that this is a problem within agriculture between the two groups.

I also want to say that I have been impressed by both sides wanting to promote their own product. I haven't been impressed with either side on their ability to sit down at the table with the other side and say, "maybe we could do things better together." And I really say to both the Rapeseed Association and the dairy people in Alberta that it is about time they had another look at themselves in this regard. I say it carefully and I have said it to them directly prior to saying it here that, in my view, there are things that they should be doing together and it's about time they did it together without going back into the past and picking up old arguments that aren't relevant anymore. And I would hasten to hope that the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation would also bury his old arguments because none of them are worth a hoot. Frankly when he starts to compare the question of the dairy industry and the rapeseed industry and then he compares B.C. and Alberta it's as -- well, I am sorry if I upset the hon. member --

MR. SORENSON:

Have you ever tasted margarine?

DR. HORNER:

Well, it doesn't taste like butter you know, and I don't care how you colour it, it doesn't taste like butter. But all I am saying is that the hon. gentleman shouldn't stand up and make arguments that don't hold water such as when he starts to compare British Columbia and Alberta in relation to the question of how much butter and dairy products are produced in B.C. and how much rapeseed is produced there. There is no rapeseed produced in B.C. outside of a very small handful in the east block of the Peace River country.

I would also like to say that there is a statistics branch in my Department of Agriculture which could have given him a great deal of information. If he had cared to call he would have found out, for instance, that of all the margarine produced in Alberta up to 90 some percent is made out of Alberta rapeseed oil at the present time crushed in Alberta, and that the opportunities for expansion of the margarine producing industry in Alberta in relation to the use of rapeseed oil are pretty major, if we can come up to the same kind of standards that B.C., Saskatchewan, and Manitoba have, so that we can have access to that market as well. If he had cared to look into the matter he would have found that a substantial portion of the margarine coming into Alberta came from British Columbia, and was bought there, was manufactured out of whale oil or marine oil in British Columbia, and because it was coloured a certain way it was brought into Alberta and sold.

These are the things, Mr. Speaker, that are easily available to anybody who wanted to look them up. The situation is that we don't import any marine oil into Alberta for the manufacture of margarine. Essentially all of the margarine produced in Alberta is made out of rapeseed oil. We would hope to extend that to where it was 100%. Also if he had cared to look at the figures, he would have found out that the question of the per capita consumption of butter is directly related to the affluence of our society, and as that affluence goes up the number of pounds per capita of butter goes up. He would also have found that this year we're importing from California some 35 million pounds of butter into Alberta. Well, now he can put the blame for that anywhere he likes; I don't really like putting blame anywhere, but I just want to suggest to him that it is pretty difficult to substantiate any argument when, in fact, those kinds of imports are coming in.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-85

He would also find out the dairy product that we're talking about that goes into butter is in demand for the manufacture of cheeses, particularly specialty cheeses that were a very, very net import of cheese into Alberta, that we have all these opportunities for the dairy industry in Alberta, and that we as a government have made a pretty substantial program to the dairy industry to improve their capacity to meet the market that's there. We appreciate that this may take a year or two.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that the number of dairy cows in Alberta continue to decline; we hope that we can stop it; we hope that we can at least level it off. But surely that is no reason why we should all of a sudden say that our rapeseed people shouldn't have the right to an equal opportunity.

I'd just like to say one other thing in this area before I sit down, and this is in support of the dairy industry in regard to the very vicious campaign, which in my view, was carried on by certain people in the health field in which they promoted the idea that if you ate butter you developed a higher blood cholesterol and as such a higher degree of arteriosclerosis in your body. And of course, if you look at the Tibetans, they live for many hundreds of years on strictly a dairy diet. They have practically no arteriosclerosis in Tibet, and their people very seldom die of heart disease. But being more contemporary, the 20-year survey has just been completed in Farmington, Massachusetts, in which a very detailed analysis of diet in relation to the matter of cholesterol has been carried out over the past 20 years, and that survey in Farmington has pretty conclusively shown that, in fact, there isn't any relationship between the question of diet and the amount of cholesterol in your blood or arteriosclerosis.

I know some of the people in my profession like to get off on tangents on occasion, and I want to say very sincerely that in my view they have not isolated the reason for people to have a higher than normal cholesterol level, and it has to do probably with a multiple of factors. One of the primary ones has to do with stress and our bodies' reaction to that stress, rather than diet as such and the ability of our bodies to look after the foodstuff that we take in. And I want to put to sleep, as far as I'm concerned, that there is certainly any correlation between the ingestion of dairy products and blood cholesterol in spite of what has been written in some of the local papers. I have had some experience in this matter for a number of years, and have had some opportunity to look into the research that has been done in relation to this over this period of time. And I can say categorically that we are being sold a bill of goods that we've all of a sudden found the magic key to the solution of heart disease, that if we eat a lot of corn oil margarine that we are not going to have it. Of course, this is just so much nonsense.

Like a lot of things in life, we have to accept all of these things in a more practical way and appreciate that there are multiple factors which affect, not only us, but our bodies. To blame one and hope that you have the panacea, is hiding your head in the sand. I think also then, Mr. Speaker, if I could conclude on that note, that anybody that opposes this bill, in my view, is hiding his head in the sand. I think that I would like to call again on both the Rapeseed Association and the dairy people to get together. I think there are new products that they could develop together, that would be worthwhile and marketable. I think also -- and I say it directly to the dairy people -- we are willing to support you in a pretty major program of expansion. I would hope that you would come forth with some new ideas in the realm of packaging of your own product, with some new ideas in the realm of marketing your own product, rather than just depend on government protection to do the job for you. This bill embodies the principle that we have enunciated in this department before and that was that we wouldn't regiment against people, but that we work for people. We work for both the dairy

30-86

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

industry and the rapeseed industry and hope that we can have an expansion in both.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I was listening to most of the discussions on it, and I would certainly be amiss if I did not bring to the attention of this House some of the fears expressed in my constituency in the past few weeks. I noticed that the former speakers have indicated that we were importing butter from B.C., and I can truthfully say that in the past three or four years, some eight dairy producers in my area have left the province and have gone and settled in the Fraser Valley, in B.C., and they were also producers in this province and in my constituency. They found that the climatic conditions here being as severe as they are, they could not compete with the B.C. industry. So about two or three years ago I went into the Chilliwack area to visit some of my neighbours, since I had been in the industry myself for a number of years. I found to my surprise that a man in the industry with 22 head of cattle, situated on 14 acres of land in the Fraser Valley, was able and capable of having a very good standard of living, whereas the same farmer that was operating a 40-head dairy herd in my constituency before, could not make the same returns as he did in B.C. So I began to inquire how the difference was arrived at, and what had to be done to make a living in B.C. in a similar industry as he had been making in Alberta, and we found that in B.C., they only purchase fluid milk, in most cases in the Valley at least. He had a fair quota and he was selling milk at \$7.25 per hundred pounds. Any milk produced over the quota was sold for less.

The climatic conditions in that part of the province compared to Alberta, cattle were only confined in the two months of December and January. In other months, to a great extent, they were out on range. The amount of land held was certainly far less to support a dairy herd in B.C. The taxes were less, and they didn't have to make any forage because they could import the alfalfa from Washington, delivered in their lots for \$25 a ton, which they couldn't do in Alberta. I think there is a problem. I just can't visualize that we are really going to help the dairy industry. Maybe we will. I think time will only indicate to us whether we will or we won't. The fact that we are now importing butter from B.C. is an indication that the people are leaving the industry faster than they are getting into it, and the people that are in the industry here are going elsewhere. Some are going to Ontario, and some are going into B.C. because of the climatic conditions. I think the cost of producing 100 pounds of milk in Alberta is far greater than in the two areas I have mentioned before. I think it's only sensible that these people should be perhaps producing butter and maybe we should be buying it from them.

The only thing is that my fears are also expressed in the general direction of the number of smaller dairies that we have in our small towns, villages and hamlets throughout the province which are now employing something like 13, 15, 18, 20 men. I'm particularly concerned with the dairy at Evansburg. There are, this year, approximately a dozen more people dropping out of the industry and it means that it's a question now whether this dairy will be able to continue on the basis that it has in the past and if more drop out of it, of course, then the industry will have to close and milk and cream will have to be brought in to the City of Edmonton, in the same manner as the Warburg Palm Dairy plant was closed some years ago because they could not operate on the basis they had been in previous years.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the fears that I have to express, from the meeting that I attended just the other night. The question came up there that if butter was coloured the colour of strawberries, would then the margarine industry want to colour their margarine red instead of yellow. I think this is a question that we'll have to wrestle with and I have to agree with the Minister of Agriculture.

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-87

Perhaps we should get the two groups together -- both the dairy industry and the margarine industry -- to see whether we can meet on equal grounds to discuss our problems and perhaps come up with a solution. I am really concerned -- at least in my constituency -- what this is going to mean. I can't foresee the future, and neither can any members in this Assembly, but I would say it's a bold step but in what direction? I think only time will prove whether we were right or wrong.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, if I may just have a few words. I've certainly enjoyed the course, shall we say, in dairying, marketing and medicine. I was interested in the hon. Member for Jasper Place justifying his existence. I, too, can say that I have had experience with milking -- not the mechanical kind, but the arm kind. I would like to commend the mover, the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood for her able presentation, as with the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation. I think the two of them there was a real debate in the presentations made. Certainly over the years the production of rapeseed has come into being in Alberta as the Cinderella crop. It's been mentioned many times as an important part, and I think that when we look at that we're looking at maybe larger producers in the agricultural field in rapeseed. Whereas in dairying, it comes back to many, many smaller producers for whom this income forms a very substantial and a very important part of their operation, and one that we don't want to overlook.

Now, in the time that I had to do with agriculture, I remember the permission of the Elgin print for use of rapeseed and margarine. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that another thing that should be looked at in the field, as far as the consumer goes with margarine, is to remove the restrictions imposed by the sales tax that we have at the federal level. This would be of benefit to them. But certainly in looking at the whole field with the young person experience that I had in the prime days in dairying and so on, and the remarks made by the last member who spoke and the people leaving the dairy business, I think that if I look back to some of the work that we went through in those days, if I was a young person again, I might not look at doing that same thing over again, because the returns in relation to what we see in other professions and other fields of endeavour. Certainly my concern would be in this bill that butter will remain superior as a food product and I would say that margarine should stand on its own and not under the guise of butter.

I think one mention was made of fraud on the consumer and I think that if we protect butter in the public eating places and in the advertising of this, in this respect I think that it'll have to stand on its own as far as I'm concerned. And while I would prefer to see it remain with the colour limitations that we have because butter is superior and the only reason they're trying to get margarine that colour is to fool people. I don't go along with that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, my education has been too great tonight not to comment on it, even though most of us, presumably, have lost our franchise to speak on agricultural matters, even though we lived there most of our lives, but happen to live in the city today. I should like to comment in this way. I don't have the eloquence of the hon. Member for Pincher Creek. I haven't his turn of the phrase, the hyperbole, the capacity for extended adverbs and adjectives. All I can say is simply that this is a matter of choice. I marvel at the extent of discussion here tonight.

I would simply make my point by recalling a story from Shakespeare. You recall in *As You Like It*, when Touchstone, who

30-88

ALBERTA HANSARD

April 17th 1972

enjoyed the favours of a gal by the name of Audrey. Touchstone, himself, was pretty homely, but Audrey was exceptionally homely. The other shepherd lads gave Touchstone a hard time, and said, 'How come you keep the company of such a homely gal?' He said, 'Well, friends, it goes like this. An ill assorted thing she is, to be sure, but mine own.'

MRS. CHICHAK:

Bringing this debate to an end, I would like to make a few closing comments, and throw out a challenge. The comments on both sides of the House, I think, have a great deal of merit; however, in opposition to my amendment that I brought forward, I don't feel there has been a strong enough presentation to overbalance the facts as they are today. The fact that there is such a tremendous shortage of butter produced, the fact that provinces which don't have colour restrictions are not suffering in the dairy industry with respect to butter.

As the hon. Minister of Agriculture indicated, perhaps the two parties should get together and talk, and perhaps out of that, we can come up with a new product, "butterine". This is something we can look forward to in the future. I think times are changing; I think we are progressing; I think we have to move ahead with those times in every aspect of our life, and that includes agriculture; that includes the dairy people; that includes the margarine people.

As far as trying to imitate to fool people, those comments are not valid. After all, when we go to the store, we do read what we are buying. Certainly, it has been mentioned that the labelling and packaging has not changed. By what stretch of the imagination can we say that we are not going to be able to recognize butter and margarine? We certainly are going to be able to recognize when we put it on our table, if we do; and when we taste it. The colour is not going to change the flavour. I would like to say that I use margarine for cooking, but by no stretch of the imagination, colour or no colour, would I prefer to use margarine on my bread, because I still like butter.

We are concerned about the small dairy producer. I think the shortage of butter is indicative that there is not enough produced, and how can we say then that they will be turned out of their business, and will not have an income when we are importing so many millions of pounds by the month, let alone by the year?

Those are the things I want to say in wrapping up in respect to The Margarine Bill. But, I cannot pass up this opportunity in throwing out a challenge to the Sacred agricultural critic. That is something I would be very interested in knowing, and perhaps he will come forward when he hears my challenge. I may not have the economic background that my hon. friend for Edmonton Jasper Place has, but I would like to say that I do have a background in practicality. I, too, in my earlier days, milked the cows; I too, can distinguish the breeds of herds that there are existent in the cattle industry; I, too, can identify many breeds of horses. I, too, can tell you - I think that I could challenge the critic with respect to the candling of eggs and the care of them and preparation for market. I think that I could throw out a challenge to the Sacred critic in the buying of agricultural products. I think I could go along the counter and identify to him the good cuts of meat and the various cuts of meat. I could also, not only in the meat sector, throw out a variety of ways to prepare not only meat but all the many agricultural products. If he's concerned as to whether our knowledge could be put on a pinhead I would like to have this test to see who would be the larger pinhead. I so I ask you to support this bill.

[The motion was carried, and Bill No. 24 was read a second time.]

April 17th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

30-89

Bill No. 25 -- The Condominium Property Amendment Act 1972

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Dr. Hohol a second reading of Bill No. 25.

This, Mr. Speaker, deals with three matters - the first is an amendment to the definition of a resolution, the second provides for the building of condominiums subject to the provision of The Condominium Act on leasehold property, whereas the act as it now stands deals with only freehold property, and the latter portion of the bill deals with the method of insuring the property.

[The motion was carried, and Bill No. 25 was read a second time.]

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 o'clock. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30

[The House rose at 10:50 p.m.]

