

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, May 2nd, 1972

(The House met at 2:30 pm.)

PRAYERS

(Mr. Speaker in the Chair.)

READING AND RECEIVING PETITIONS

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the following petitions be now read and received. First the petition of the City of Calgary for an act to terminate certain agreements between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the City of Calgary; and secondly, that of Orville V. Burkinshaw for an act respecting Great Way Merchandising Limited and The Securities Act.

[The motion moved by Mr. Ashton, seconded by Mr. Stromberg, was carried without debate or dissent.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce some 120 pupils from the Stony Plain Junior High Grade IX class. They are accompanied by the assistant superintendent of the County of Parkland, Mr. Al Myers, the assistant principal of Stony Plain Junior High School, Mr. Jim Orioux, teacher Mr. Arnie Newfield, teacher Mrs. Johnson, and another teacher Mr. Oglestone. Also with them are the bus drivers, Mr. Yoist, Mr. Jamison, and Mr. Altheim. Also behind me, in the public gallery, we have 25 members of the Stony Plain Chamber of Commerce. I would ask both these groups to rise and be recognized.

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Legislature, 37 Grade IX students from the school at Mannville in the Vermilion-Viking constituency. The young people are accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Bohaichuk, and Mr. Lakusta. They are seated in the public gallery, and I would ask them to stand and be recognized.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Sessional Paper No. 113.

44-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall and the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Egg Marketing Board

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture and ask him if the Alberta government and the Alberta Egg Marketing Board have taken over the operation of the produce house Cal-Ed, so that now in fact, the marketing board is involved in distribution of eggs, in addition to its role of egg buying and having responsibility for the control of egg marketing in the province?

DR. HORNER:

That is correct, Mr. Speaker, I intended later today to speak to that particular point in some length.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, I should perhaps ask of you. Is it permissible to go on with one or two supplementary questions on this issue then? I would like to ask the hon. minister if there has been any financial commitment made by the Government of the Province of Alberta involved in this arrangement between the Alberta Government and the Egg Marketing Board?

DR. HORNER:

Only a continuation of the guarantee that the Egg Marketing Board or the Egg and Fowl Marketing Board have, in fact, had for some time.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the minister who, in fact, will be supplying the managerial services for this new organization?

DR. HORNER:

The Egg Board themselves will be. A Mr. Russ Marfleet, who was formerly with APM will be taking over as manager of the operation for the Egg Board.

MR. CLARK:

Another supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is APM involved in this arrangement in any way, shape or form?

DR. HORNER:

None whatsoever, Mr. Speaker. Just to clarify for the hon. member and I'll deal with it later as well the fixed assets of Cal-Ed Poultry Farms, Edmonton, Ltd., have been acquired by the Alberta Egg and Fowl Marketing Board. Cal-Ed, of course, is a subsidiary of Ogilvie Flour Mills of Montreal, and had provided grading, packaging and other general marketing services to egg producers in Edmonton and surrounding areas. I had early discussions with Ogilvies, Mr. Speaker, in connection with the question of integration of some of these companies into these areas; and Ogilvies were one of the first major companies to announce that they were willing and ready to get out of primary production.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-3

In addition to that, the problem that has been before us, in regard to eggs particularly, has been the lack of a marketing opportunity for the smaller producer. There have been innumerable cases where cases of eggs were not being bought by the grading stations on the grounds that they didn't want them or couldn't use them, because they were in small lots. I encouraged the Egg Board to look into this matter so that we would have a central clearing house in which we could guarantee to every registered producer in Alberta a market outlet for his eggs and where his next major requirement would, in fact, be quality, and if he produced quality eggs he would get the quality prices, rather than the situation that's been going on for the past two years in which, in fact, in certain cases, smaller producers fed their eggs to hogs, or just did away with them, because it didn't pay the freight to ship them to a grading station. There have been all kinds of instances, Mr. Speaker, where once they did ship the eggs they were refused by the grading stations. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I intend to enlarge upon the situation and our objectives and our hopes for the future in regard to returning a marketing and production opportunity to the smaller farmer, particularly in Alberta.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Do I take it from his statement, then, that he will guarantee to take the production from any small producer, providing there's a quality, of course?

DR. HORNER:

And provided that he's registered with the Egg Board.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, one more supplementary question, then, to the minister. The Egg Marketing Board will be involved in distribution as well as market control?

DR. HORNER:

That's correct, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall, followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Temporary Release of Prisoners

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I wished to direct this question to the hon. Premier, however in his absence I would like to direct the same question to the hon. Attorney General. Will the government be making representation to Ottawa regarding the temporary releasing of dangerous inmates held in federal prisons located in Alberta?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I'm at a bit of a loss to answer that question. I wonder if the hon. member has some policy or program in mind that the federal government is now following on which he's suggesting we make representations.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation to the Attorney General, we read recently of the releasing of dangerous criminals held as inmates

41-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

in federal prisons and this recently happened in the Province of Manitoba. In this particular case, the inmates had just disappeared. This, I feel, is certainly detrimental to public safety. That is the reason why I'm asking what the position of this government is. While I appreciate that it is a federal matter, I'm just wondering whether our provincial government has a stand or some feelings in this regard. Are we concerned about the possible danger to public safety because of such a program?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure from the explanation given by the hon. member whether he is talking about releases by the Parole Board, that is release by consent, or whether he is talking about an escape.

MR. HO LEM:

I am talking about temporary releases of prisoners to attend mass, or to attend meetings such as the AA, and this sort of thing, which is the policy adopted currently by federal authorities.

MR. LEITCH:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned within our own correctional institutional system about a release, either voluntarily by the system, or through an escape of any person who at that moment in time may constitute a danger to the public. I have commented on this several times. So far as the federal programs are concerned, I think the hon. member's question involved a conclusion that I am not at all sure is correct. Certainly, nothing of that nature has been brought to my attention.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. the Attorney General. Is the hon. Attorney General aware that from the federal penitentiary in the Drumheller area, scores of prisoners go out every day to work, to play for dances, to take part in various activities? Not one has escaped, and they have made quite a contribution to the community as well as quite a contribution to rehabilitation?

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the program being followed by the federal government within the federal penitentiary system.

Cattle Rustling

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Is the hon. minister aware of any increase in cattle rustling in this province?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by a variety of sources that, in fact, in certain areas there has been an increase in cattle rustling. The government has taken steps to try to prevent this by the implementation of additional regulations under The Brand Act by trying to upgrade our brand inspectors, and to work very closely with the four RCMP officers who are directly involved across the province in this business of trying to prevent rustling. I am sure all of us would like to try and stop it. I would hope our farmers themselves would continue to be ever vigilant about branding their cattle, and about making sure to keep an eye on them, because this is part of the prevention as well.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-5

MR. SPEAKER:

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

National Air Photo Library

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Further to your previous statements assuring the Legislature that some alternate program would be implemented when the federal government closes the Calgary branch of the National Air Photo Library on June 1st, can you now advise what that alternate program will be?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Inasmuch as the Independent Petroleum Association of Canada, the Canadian Petroleum Association, the Alberta Society of Petroleum Geologists, the University of Calgary Geology Department, plus agriculturalists and foresters, have all indicated this is an important, useful facility, when can we expect an announcement on the alternate method of carrying on the service, keeping in mind it is due to be closed on June 1st?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, there has been some concern expressed by the companies that the hon. member has mentioned. However, he may not be aware that there are, in fact, alternate sources presently in the province where you can obtain this kind of assistance. Our own Department of Lands and Forests, for a fee, will provide this kind of service. Nevertheless, the federal government is aware that theirs has been used fairly extensively, and they are trying to provide some other alternative method.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the Department of Lands and Forests have an equivalent file which includes 700,000 prints?

MR. GETTY:

Well, hon. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should refer to the Minister although he may not have all the facts with him today. You can get a picture of any part of Alberta, yes.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Have you considered purchasing the prints from Ottawa and making copies available through the provincial government?

MR. DICKIE:

We haven't taken any active steps in that area at the present time. I propose to have some discussions with my colleague, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I might say also that I haven't had any representations from the various organizations that the hon. member has mentioned.

41-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

Slave Lake Timber Development

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Some time ago he announced April 30th as the deadline for proposals to develop a select block of timber in the Slave Lake area. Could you report on that to me?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to report that indeed we did have a proposal come forward and it came to my office on Friday afternoon, so it was well within the deadline. We do have that proposal now, and we will be looking at it, and we have, in fact, Mr. Speaker, scheduled a public hearing on the afternoon of May 15th for Slave Lake as a follow-up to the proposal that we did receive.

MR. RUSTE:

Just a supplementary. Do I understand then there is only one proposal submitted?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there was only one proposal submitted. On preliminary examination however, Mr. Speaker, it looks like a very good proposal, both in terms of the proposal itself, but secondly also, as a proposal for a forestry operation that should assist other forestry operations in that area.

MR. RUSTE:

A further supplementary. Where will the hearing be held on this matter?

DR. WARRACK:

At Slave Lake.

Loans to Potato Growers

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Are you aware that potato growers are not able to make loans under the present regulations of the Potato Guaranteed Loan?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, they are from the ordinary chartered banks, but the Treasury Branch -- as I told the hon. member a few days ago -- we are making changes so that the Treasury Branches can be involved as well. I understand that this question deals with the use of section 88 which the chartered banks can use, and which the Treasury Branches can't use, but we are changing it to allow the Treasury Branches to use a chattel mortgage on the product which, in effect will give them the same kind of security of section 88 in The Bank Act.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-7

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. It is the chartered banks that are not making the loans at the present time with the present regulations. I think that the potato growers and the banks have got together and that any of the applications that have been made to the chartered banks to date have been refused, and they are requesting changes in the regulations.

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the regulations were primarily drawn up by representatives from the chartered banks in conjunction with people in my department, and if there is some fault in the regulation that prevents them from making loans, I'll check on it, because we are changing it with regard to the treasury branches. But this was done in full consultation with the banks.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Camrose, is this a supplementary?

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. In an earlier question you indicated that you had met with the chartered banks and other banking institutions. Have you met with any of the banks in the past week, and if not, are you prepared to meet with these groups very soon with regards to the potato growers?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. We met within the last few days, at least my officials have, and officials from Treasury have met with representatives of the banks in Calgary in the last few days on this very subject.

Chain Lakes Clean-Up

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. A group of concerned sportsmen from High River have informed me that the Chain Lakes reservoir west of Nanton has become saturated with suckers. Will your department be giving consideration to rectifying this problem?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Chain Lakes area is just west of Nanton and as a matter of fact, recently that particular provincial park was roughly doubled in size. The lake there is a man-made one that was conjunctively a PFRA and Water Resources Project at the time. As I understand the situation, it was inevitable that there would be a build-up of suckers in that particular lake, and sooner or later it would be necessary to look at some way to remove those undesirable species -- and even if done this would likely have to be repeated in about four or five years. We have looked at this. Mr. Speaker, I must say that we have not made a concrete decision as to what direction to go on it; there are several alternatives, but none of them are very desirable.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I thought that in light of past elections there would have been a shortage of this species of fish. But would you give consideration to using a fish-killing agent?

41-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

DR. WARRACK:

I was listening closely and found the first part of your supplemental so humorous I missed the second.

MR. STROMBERG:

The second part of that question was -- would you be giving consideration to using a fish-killing agent?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. This would be among alternatives that basically revolve around the different kind of agents that one could use. Some are more selective, but of course more expensive than others, and some are complete. I'm personally concerned, although I don't have the technical analysis of the long-term environmental aftermath that might be a part of using these kinds of agent. So not having assessed that, I'm not prepared to make a decision on moving in that direction now; but we are looking at that as one of the possibilities to alleviate that problem. It is a serious problem because it's in an area that's of very high recreation value otherwise -- and it's an important question -- as it is readily accessible to many people in Alberta who would like to be fishing for trout.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, since this was already done about four or five years ago, and it has filled up again, will the government continue to put in trout at the rate of three-quarters of a million a year again this year, as they have been doing in the past?

DR. WARRACK:

Well this is the problem exactly, Mr. Speaker. The lake was man-made in the initial instance and stocked, but it was inevitable from a biological point of view that there would be an increasing proportion of the fish life there that would be suckers, and therefore undesirable fish. It may well be that at some point that it would not be worthwhile to do this in terms of further stocking with trout, but I would hope that we could find a way to salvage the situation.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Northern Transportation Corridor

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. There's been some speculation that there may be a railroad built alongside the proposed Mackenzie highway. I'm wondering whether the government has had any discussions as yet on this with the federal government?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, not in specifics. In discussing the whole area of a northern pipeline corridor and transportation corridor, of course, the consideration is that one of the things is a railroad, and the other is an all-weather highway as well as the pipelines. While I've had some discussion about this with the hon. Minister without Portfolio Responsible for Northern Development, I have not had any specific discussions with the federal government on a railroad.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-9

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, either to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs or the hon. Minister of Industry. Has the government considered the possible merits of the Mackenzie railroad and the effect such a railroad could have on our own ARR?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I think it's something that obviously has to be considered by any administration. Other than that I have nothing to add. Perhaps our hon. Minister of Industry or Northern Development may wish to add something to it.

Car Dumps

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport. Last year the department, in conjunction with municipalities, arranged for specified places for dumping old car bodies, with the understanding -- at least it was my understanding -- that they would be picked up by the end of the year. Many of these car body dumps are still filled with cars. What is the department's policy with regard to this matter?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, we tendered the cars last fall. The low tender was Navajo Metals in Calgary, and they are in the process of cleaning them up all over the province on an orderly basis.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

The Planning Act

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. In response to a question of last Friday you indicated that an enquiry would be held around the middle of May into Edmonton's misuse of The Planning Act. Can you now advise what the terms of reference will be for the hearing, and where it will be held?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think we should all stop using the term 'Edmonton's misuse of The Planning Act' because that's not the subject of the enquiry at all, and I would like to correct that.

The terms of enquiry will roughly, or approximately, deal with the application of The Planning Act insofar as land contributed by developers towards roadways and circulation systems and for public reserve insofar as the requirements of The Planning Act are concerned.

When I spoke to officials of the Planning Branch some time ago they suggested that probably about the middle of May would be a good time to hold it, because at that time we thought the legislative session might be drawing to an end. It doesn't appear that it will so it's possible the enquiry will be delayed two or three weeks on

41-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

that account -- if it's found necessary. But that's the general idea -- to give interested parties a chance to present their comments with respect to that aspect of the Act.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, will the date and place of the hearings be advertised in newspapers?

MR. RUSSELL:

Certainly, Mr. Speaker. It's our intention to hear both sides of the story in this regard, because as you know we intend to bring in a completely new planning act at the spring session next year and I think this will be a very useful endeavour to carry out in the meantime.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Sewage Systems

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Could he perhaps give some indication of what help could be given through his department or the federal department for hamlets located in municipalities and counties that find it very difficult to supply a sewage system, where the water table is very high and the danger of contamination to their water supply would be very great?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated on many occasions in this House, money, of course, is provided through Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation for sewage systems to centres in Alberta. Federal monies are provided equivalent to two-thirds of the cost of any sewage system, of which 25% is a grant. However, I have also indicated to the House on several occasions that this government is working very actively on establishing an overall policy whereby the Alberta government could provide some assistance in this regard on a equitable basis to all centres in the province. That is whether they are of 100 people in size or 1,000 people in size, or 10,000 people in size, and I would like to suggest that it won't be too long before I put before this House a policy in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

New Calgary Air Terminal

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Industry. Mr. Minister are you aware of any recent development concerning the Federal Department of Transport's longstanding promise to build a new terminal at McCall Field in Calgary?

MR. PEACOCK:

Yes we are, Mr. Speaker, and we understand that it's going forward.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-11

MR. FARRAN:

Did they give any timing on starting construction, Mr. Minister?

MR. PEACOCK:

As the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill knows, they've given at least three different dates. The latest date we have now is that they are intending to go forward this year.

MR. FARRAN:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is there any hope that the federal government can be persuaded to press for early consideration of bilateral agreements on air routes? I think particularly of such applications as Ozark Airways, interested in flying to Alaska via Calgary.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that the federal government is looking very favourably on negotiating with the American government in opening the bilaterals and attempting to get them open by June of this year.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Japanese Industry in Alberta

MR. RUSTE:

I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. A recent release in the Financial Times indicates that Japanese television manufacturers are coming, as the heading says, "Into Canada". It mentions here, "Last week Matsushita Electric of Canada Limited, Toronto-based distributors of Panasonic television, said it will begin assembling TV's in Toronto in the very near future."

My question to the hon. minister is; was the minister in contact with this company to have them locate in Alberta prior to their decision to locate in Toronto?

Mr. Speaker we haven't been in contact with that particular company but we have been in contact with Japanese companies in order to persuade them to locate and consider Western Canada, and particularly Alberta.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question. Has there been any apparent success in these contacts?

MR. PEACOCK:

I couldn't inform the House that there has been any success Mr. Speaker, but I would say that there is interest.

Dr. Mowat Report

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, and ask him what progress the government has made on the report done under the chairmanship of Dr. Mowat on the

41-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

problem of articulation between post-secondary education institutions in Alberta?

MR. FOSTER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've read Dr. Mowat's report with great interest and I have forwarded a memorandum to the Colleges' Commission on this topic suggesting that perhaps any further consideration of the Mowat report be delayed until such time as we have had an opportunity of examining the Commission on Educational Planning, the Worth Commission Report.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. So that none of the recommendations included in Dr. Mowat's report would be effective as of September 1st of this year, the commencement of the academic year this fall?

MR. FOSTER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the House, the Mowat report was referring to the matter of transferability between and among institutions of advanced education. As the House may be aware there is transferability now within the advanced education community, in the non-university sector. The Mowat report, however, was specifically referring to the university sector. This is not a problem that is going to be resolved overnight. Having regard to the fact that the Worth Commission has been studying this topic for some time, I felt it only fair and reasonable that the whole matter be delayed until such time as that report came in. It is delayed, Mr. Speaker, in the sense that no final decision should be taken. However I can report to the House that discussions are going ahead between both sectors, that is the university sector and the non-university sector, on the matter of transferability.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest followed by the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake.

Protection of Agricultural Land

MR. DRAIN:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The in-thing now is the trend towards small acreages around our cities. In many cases this affects prime agricultural land. In effect this land is taken out of production in totality. Properly this type of development should be directed more towards marginal land. Basically, the wealth of a country is pre-determined by its ability to produce. Hence, therefore, I ask: Has your government a policy directed towards maintaining prime agricultural land for agricultural use?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree with the speech the hon. gentleman has made.

MR. DRAIN:

Has the hon. minister got a policy?

DR. HORNER:

I agree with the policy as enunciated by the hon. member.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-13

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Will the government be making a decision on the Agricultural Service Centres during this session?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a matter that is under negotiation on a confidential basis with the federal government. I appreciate the hon. member has a pipeline through DREE, but he'll have to await our decision in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for --

MR. BARTON:

Supplementary. Is this cost-sharing?

DR. HORNER:

As I just said, Mr. Speaker, these are confidential negotiations that are going on with the federal government. The hon. gentleman should ask his contact in Ottawa about his information.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Indian Petitions for Grants

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Several Indian bands have indicated that they are going to petition the provincial government to see if they would be eligible for municipal assistance grants as received from oil royalty, and I wondered if the hon. minister has had the representation yet? And is the government looking favourably on the requests?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member gave me notice of the question yesterday and in that time we have done what checking we can to see where these representations or petitions might be. Nobody in my department has heard anything about them yet, so to that extent the question is hypothetical.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

MLA's Fastball Game

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio responsible for Northern Development. In his invitation to all members of the Legislative Assembly to muster a team of members to play three innings of the fastball game at Renfrew Park on Monday, May 6th, I'm just wondering what year that is -- because I understand that May 6th -- this year -- is Saturday?

41-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

MR. ALAIR:

Mr. Speaker, we were just doing that to see if the fellows on the opposite side were awake. It is Monday, May 8th at 6:00 p.m.

MR. RUSTE:

I want to assure the hon. member we are awake.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc followed by the hon. Member for Camrose.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I find the information I want is contained in the Return No. 113, so thank you.

Kootenay and Elk River Railroad

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Transportation. In light of the Supreme Court of Canada's decision to give the green light to the Kootenay and Elk River Railroad -- to begin building it -- would you lend support to the movement of grain on this railroad when the Fraser Canyon is blocked?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we would certainly consider that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Senior Citizen Housing

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has the provincial government agreed to the federal government proposal of increased federal financing for senior citizen housing projects sponsored by non-profit organizations?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, we have not taken a position on that yet. Perhaps my colleague the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs may wish to add something.

Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, before he does -- on a point of clarification, I guess it would be -- would the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs help us on this side of the House by outlining the policy that we should follow in directing questions to him or to alternate ministers of the government?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the question period is the time to do it. We discussed a bill on the department last night in principle. We will have an opportunity to discuss the bill in

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-15

complete detail -- all the clauses in it. Essentially, as I have said in the House three or four times before, the department is for the co-ordination of all the activities of the various departments of our government with other governments. However, we do not get in between the various departments and their counterparts in other governments.

MR. WILSON:

Just one further point, Mr. Speaker, on that. Then in any involvement of the provincial government with the federal government we should direct the primary question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, and then he farms it out if he doesn't want to handle it? Is that the situation?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, if that appears to be a reasonable way and if he would like to do it that way, we will do it that way.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Public Utilities Construction Contracts

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. By way of explanation, it has come to my attention that Calgary Power does not open its construction contracts to open bidding, but rather selects certain construction companies. My question to you is can the hon. minister advise the House whether or not the Public Utilities Board specifically takes this matter into consideration when setting a rate structure, as the lack of competitive bidding may mean that the company's construction costs are higher than would be the case otherwise?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, with respect to The Public Utilities Act, there is nothing in the Act or the regulations pertaining to the act that states categorically that a public utility must tender all of its contracts. I would think, though, in any rate application hearing before the Public Utilities Board, that the interveners that would intervene on behalf of a municipality or a rural electrification association would question certain features of such contracts, and the onus would be on the utility company to prove, in fact, that they did get a fair and equitable contract.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister. You didn't really quite answer my question, sir, with all due respect. My question was does the board take this into consideration as a matter of policy?

MR. WERRY:

With respect, Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak for the board because the board is an autonomous body and is a quasi-judicial body and merely weighs evidence at any rate-hearing application. The onus would be on the interveners to ascertain and to question the utility that requests a rate-hearing, that they justify any contracts that are awarded. If the interveners questioned any contracts, it would be up to the company then to justify the letting of those contracts and the Public Utilities Board would have to rule on the matter.

41-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

Senior Citizens Housing (cont.) and CMHC Funds

MR. SPEAKER:

With regard to the last question asked by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, the Chair regrets having intercepted a pass from the hon. Minister for Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to the hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs, I believe it was.

MR. RUSSELL:

Could he repeat the original question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. WILSON:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, as you outlined, it was a farm-out to the Minister of Municipal Affairs from the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, and the question was, has the provincial government agreed to the federal government's proposal of increased federal financing for senior citizen housing projects sponsored by non-profit organizations?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of inferences, or I think incorrect conclusions in the question. I don't know specifically to what the hon. member is referring or if he's on another fishing trip or not. I must say, though, I've been frankly quite disappointed with the allotment of CMHC funds for Alberta for the present fiscal year. As you know these haven't been officially announced. I did manage to obtain them from the local manager here in Edmonton in time for the estimates of my department, and they're down considerably from last year. There's a dramatic drop in the non-profit funds under section 15, from \$11 million to \$5 million, so if you're referring to senior citizen housing that could be built under that section of the act, I think we're all in for some rather strong disappointments because of the dramatic decrease in federal funds available this year.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister be making representations to Ottawa as to why the reduction, and attempt to convince them of the need in Alberta for an increase rather than a reduction?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the budget of CMHC, of course, is set by the House of Commons. The matters to which the hon. member is referring will be discussed by officials of my department and CMHC and the Federal Ministry of Urban Affairs this week in Edmonton. Hopefully we intend to get some positive response out of those meetings, but those are being held across the country and are the ones that I referred to previously in the House as still being kept on a confidential nature.

MR. HENDERSON:

Supplementary on that, Mr. Speaker, regarding the question of CMHC funding of not only this type of project, but general availability of CMHC funds within the Province of Alberta. Is the Minister of Municipal Affairs or some other minister responsible for overall co-ordination of the utilization of CMHC funds within the province in total?

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-17

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the funds are utilized through the programs carried out by the Alberta Housing Corporation and except for the sewage treatment loans which come under the responsibility of the hon. Mr. Yurko. It's really late on into the federal fiscal year when we receive any sort of indication as to what those funds might be. Now I indicated a moment ago my extreme disappointment at the drop in funds for Alberta this year, because we made every effort last fall to make sure that Alberta's '71 allotment was completely used. That was \$41 million and we did just exceed that figure. The total figure has dropped to \$34.5 million this year, and they have stipulated where the drops and where the increases should be in certain specified programs within that. For instance, the allotment for student housing has gone up, but for public housing it has gone way down. It's that kind of thing that's concerning us.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, as all members are, of course, aware, the matter of foreign investment has been a subject of concern throughout the province, and as all members are also aware, the federal government today has taken a position on this matter which is of importance to Alberta. Members are cognizant of the fact that the federal government has been looking at a screening process of new foreign investment into Alberta, and some hour and a half ago, or less than that, the statement was made in the House of Commons, and concurrently the Prime Minister delivered to me a letter. The letter is confidential but the attached documents are not.

Enclosed with the letter was a statement on foreign direct investment which, because of the nature of the economy of Alberta, it is in the interest of all members to have repeated here. I am going to ask the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to do so.

I also received from the Prime Minister today the bill that was tabled in the House of Commons, and the document entitled Foreign Direct Investment in Canada. Some other copies are on the way. It is our intention to arrange to have this statement distributed during the course of the afternoon to all members, so they can have an opportunity to read it -- although it is merely a summary statement. Insofar as the bill is concerned, I think that is of considerable interest to members. We will try to make some arrangements in that regard as well.

As the hon. members are aware, there is a Select Committee of the Legislature which has been requested to assess the economic consequences of any proposed new federal restrictions upon investment within Alberta, whether by way of legislation or otherwise. The plan -- and I certainly think the proper course of action of government -- is to refer this entire matter to the legislative committee. I have a copy of a notice here that there is an attention by Mr. Koziak that the committee will be meeting tomorrow afternoon at 2:00 o'clock. It would be my hope -- and I am taking this opportunity to communicate to them -- that they might give some consideration to an interim report with regard to Item C contained within their terms of reference. That is an assessment of the plan and legislation by the federal government.

It seems to us, that as a government we certainly have a responsibility to take a look at the constitutional legal aspects involved in the document. But beyond that, I think since there has been a reference to a Select Committee of the Legislature representing members on both sides of the House, we shouldn't go

41-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

further. But I think the hon. members would be very interested because of its extreme importance to have the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs bring this statement before the House.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, this is a statement made by the hon. Herb Gray today in the House of Commons. These are his own words I will be reading.

"Mr. Speaker, I should like at this time to announce to the House of Commons, the government's decision to review foreign takeovers of Canadian businesses. I wish also to table a background document on the general subject of foreign investment. While Canada has generally welcomed foreign investment over the years, we have adopted a number of measures to foster and protect the national interest.

Foreign interest in banks and other key financial institutions has been limited by law. Our broadcasting facilities, newspapers, and magazines are subject to specific laws which effectively keep them under Canadian control.

During the past decade we established voluntary guidelines for good corporate behavior by foreign businesses operating in this country. This government has also set up the Canada Development Corporation to help develop and maintain strong Canadian control of businesses. The Tax Reform of last year contains several measures deliberately designed to encourage Canadians to invest in their own country, rather than abroad, and to encourage the growth of Canadian-controlled businesses. And the government has announced the intentions concerning the production and trade of uranium.

Parliament will now be asked to add an important new measure to these policies. Foreign companies seeking to buy out or take over an existing Canadian business above a certain size will be required to demonstrate that the purchase will result in significant benefit to Canada. The government is introducing legislation to establish a review process under the authority of the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. In general terms, the purpose will be to examine all proposals for takeovers of Canadian businesses, to approve those that on balance will be of significant benefit to Canada, to negotiate with the proposed acquirer in those cases where he can reasonably be expected to make a greater contribution to Canadian development, and to refuse to allow those takeovers that would not bring significant benefit to Canada. Foreign investment plays an important role in Canadian development, but it brings with it costs as well as benefits. While there are a variety of opinions among Canadians about the balance of benefits and costs of foreign direct investment, there is certainly no disagreement that foreign investment should work in the interests of this country.

Takeovers are the form of foreign investment least likely to add significant benefits to the Canadian economy. The extent of foreign control of a number of industries in Canada is large enough to make the acquisition of more Canadian businesses a matter of concern to the government and to Canadians generally. If takeovers created only problems it would be a simple matter to deal with them. They could all be blocked. But takeovers can be of benefit to Canada, and it was this fact that persuaded the government that as a general policy a review process is preferable to other approaches, such as a designation of additional key sectors or mandatory Canadian shareholders. This decision, of course, does not rule out entirely the possibility that other approaches might be required at some time in the future. A takeover review process is more flexible in its

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-19

ability to take into account both the benefits and costs of a foreign acquisition. Through its operation it would permit the negotiating of better benefits for Canada and increase the level of economic activity in Canada. Most other industrialized countries, even with lower levels of foreign ownership and control, have some kind of mechanism to ensure that foreign takeovers are in their national interest. Our review process will be familiar to the international business and investing community.

In order to clarify the government's intentions, I shall now describe the review process and how it will be administered. A foreign investor -- and that includes any enterprise which is foreign-controlled -- will be required to file notice of any proposed takeover of a business with assets valued at more than \$250,000, or with gross revenues exceeding \$3 million. Investors will be required to provide relevant information with the notice. The investor may also take the initiative to make specific commitments to the government concerning undertakings which would bring benefits to Canada. The government will then consider the proposed acquisition taking into consideration these five factors:

- (a) The effect of the acquisition on the level and nature of economic activity and employment in Canada
- (b) The degree and significance of participation by Canadians;
- (c) The effect of the acquisition on productivity, industrial efficiency, technological development, product innovation, and product variety in Canada;
- (d) The effect of the acquisition on competition within any industry or industries in Canada; and,
- (e) The compatibility of the acquisition with Canadian industrial and economic policies.

The assessment of the proposed transaction will be made by the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, who will then make the appropriate recommendation to the Cabinet. If the takeover is clearly of benefit to Canada, the government could then formally allow the acquisition. If, on the other hand, the Minister is unable to recommend this course, he would take steps to negotiate with the investor with a view to increasing the benefits to Canada. This negotiation might then result in additional undertakings which would permit the government to allow the acquisition. But if the government still considered that the takeover would bring no significant benefit to Canada, it would not be allowed. This decision would be taken only after a thorough examination including the opportunity to make full representations. The process is designed to ensure that the government will make its decisions with a minimum of delay. Written undertakings by the purchaser will be binding. The government will be authorized to take action in the courts to ensure that they are observed. There will be appropriate penalties for failing to file notice of a proposed transaction.

The legislation will not, of course, apply to takeovers by Canadians -- that is, acquisition of control of firms in Canada by Canadian citizens ordinarily resident in Canada -- or by landed immigrants who have lived here six years or less, or by firms which they control. Some companies have a very large number of shareholders, some Canadian, some foreign. Such companies would be able to apply for an advance ruling in order to determine their status as a Canadian-controlled company, or otherwise.

41-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

With regard to control, it is proposed that the acquisition of less than 5% of the voting shares of a corporation whose shares are publicly traded will not, by itself, be considered to constitute control; nor will the acquisition of less than 20% of the voting shares of a corporation, whose shares are not traded publicly. There will be a presumption that ownership of voting shares above those levels will constitute control. But this presumption can be rebutted. Acquisition of more than 50% of voting shares automatically will be considered acquisition of control, as will a takeover through the purchase of substantially all the property used in carrying on a business.

We shall encourage international organizations to pursue the study of multi-national enterprise and foreign direct investment with a view to co-operative international action. To this end we shall be examining whether specific Canadian initiatives might be appropriate. Our objective, as Canadians, which is to exercise greater control over our domestic environment, cannot be achieved by exclusive reliance on a takeover review process.

As part of its response to this issue the government will continue to develop positive policies to encourage Canadians to participate more fully in the development of their country and to encourage the growth of Canadian sources of capital, technology, and management. Our policy is designed to ensure that this country continues to develop as rapidly as possible in a way which is consistent with Canadian needs and aspirations, and which safeguards our vital interests."

I'll table these with the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, this has been a rather lengthy report and at this moment I don't intend to directly comment on it. I think it would be rather remiss to try and make any significant statement.

I am interested in knowing whether or not the provincial government was contacted prior to the statement being released by the federal government, whether or not there was any input. I am also interested, in knowing whether or not this completes the big book that the hon. Premier held up, if that will be available to us as members. I understood that it would be and I certainly will be looking forward to reviewing it.

I take it from the statement that has been given that a bill will be introduced to the Federal House of Commons and I would also take it that there would be opportunity for further input if, in fact, there was some input on the part of the provinces prior to the bill becoming law.

I am not sure whether I clearly understood the hon. Premier in the point that he made when he suggested that he would request the chairman of the committee to make an interim report, that would in turn possibly be made available to the federal government; or will it be only to the provincial government for our consideration?

I don't have anything further to add at this time, Mr. Speaker, but those would be some of the concerns that I would have.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have the leave of the House to respond to the hon. Leader of the Opposition by way of clarification.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-21

MR. LOUGHEED:

First of all with regard to the document 'Foreign Direct Investment in Canada,' we will do our utmost to have copies made available to all members, but in any event we will certainly have them made available to the office of the Leader of the Opposition within a matter of hours. I might say I was wrong in my comment. I was just passed a note that when we were making our statements apparently these remarks were being made in the House of Commons.

With regard to the matter of input, yes, the answer to that is clearly yes. During the First Ministers' Conference which in our view was, unfortunately, a closed meeting last November. Both during the period when other members of the delegation were with the Prime Minister and later, the matter of the question of foreign investment and a screening process was, in fact, discussed and we made certain of our views known which are very close to the views expressed by myself in the Budget Speech.

The latter question which was raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition I believe had to do with the Select Committee. My comments -- so that I can be as clear as I can -- I was suggesting rather than requesting to the chairman and to the committee when it meets tomorrow, to give some consideration to whether or not, because of the nature of the fact that it is a proposed bill, to provide an interim report with regard to that item that sets forth the Select Committee's responsibility -- being Paragraph C -- in the hope that perhaps the Legislature, but at least the government if the session is recessed, would have the benefit of the committee's views so that we might make these views known to the federal government.

If the conclusion by the Select Committee tomorrow is that they do not think that that's a practical request, then the government will have to reassess its views in terms of making an input in the matter.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to announce for the information of all members in the House today that, effective May 1st, our government has introduced a new Cash Management procedure. This procedure will allow the Alberta Government to gain in excess of \$1 million in interest per annum. As I mentioned earlier, the procedure was effective May 1, 1972 (which was yesterday), and the remittance of all major government revenues will be made directly to the Treasury Department.

In the past, cheques of major amounts were first remitted to departments for processing before being passed on to the Treasury Department. This practice resulted in a loss of interest of a major magnitude due to the time lag between receipt of the cheque and deposit in the province's bank.

The introduction of the central cash management, Mr. Speaker, will result, as I mentioned earlier, in the province either maximizing interest earnings -- and should provide in excess of \$1 million additional interest revenue -- or a reduction of interest expense of a similar amount during the current fiscal year which will be ending on March 31, 1973.

QUESTIONS

188. Mr. Barton asked the Government the following question which were answered by Dr. Horner as indicated:

- (1) Does the government support the location of a rapeseed plant in High Prairie; if not, what alternative locations are being considered?

41-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

Answer: The government takes the position that it supports the location of industrial plants in areas based on local considerations and industry consideration. Government cannot and should not indicate the precise location of industrial plants.

(2) What evidence is available to support the need for three rapeseed plants in the Peace River Bloc?

Answer: The need for additional rape seed plants will, of course, be evaluated on the question of the rape seed oil market and the meal market to economically support them.

(3) Does the government support the concept of a number of rapeseed plants in the Peace River Bloc, or one centralized rapeseed plant?

Answer: The government's support of a variety of industrial plants will depend on their economic viability.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I move that Question No. 190 be made a Motion for a Return, seconded by the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER:

Having heard the motion, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

An Order of the Assembly was therefore issued for a Return showing:

1. What industries have received offers from DREE under the Special Area Agreement Incentive Plan since the program was initiated?
2. How many industries have specified that they would rather have established elsewhere in the province than in the Special Area, but have located in the Special Area because of incentives?
3. Since the inception of the Special Areas Program, how many visits have the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and the Minister of Industry and Commerce made to the Lesser Slave Lake Special Area?
4. How many HRDA meetings has the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs held with HRDA Ministers to discuss the Special Area Program since September 10, 1971?
5. How many meetings has the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs held with the HRDA staff to discuss the Special Area Program in Lesser Slave Lake since September 10, 1971?
6.
 - (a) What was the total 1971-72 budget for the Lesser Slave Lake Special Area Program?
 - (b) How much was the provincial share?
 - (c) How much was the federal government share?
 - (d) How much was returned to the General Revenue of the province?
7.
 - (a) How many students were trained at the Grouard Vocational Training School under the Special Area Program during 1971-72?
 - (b) What was the total cost of the program?

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-23

- (c) How much was payable by the province?
(d) Who administrates the Grouard School?
(e) To what extent does the Federal Government interfere and direct the educational program?
8. (a) What is the Opportunity Corps in the Special Area?
(b) What are the details of its program?
(c) What are the results of this program to date?
9. (a) What were the findings by the Ministers, Hon. Dr. Hohol, Hon. Mr. Adair, and the Hon. Miss Hunley, from their visit and observations of the Lesser Slave Lake Special Area Program?
(b) Were any written reports made to the Minister or to Cabinet; if so, would the Government table same?
10. Does the Government know how many federal government officials are stationed in the Lesser Slave Lake Special Area to administer the Special Area program; if so, how many?
11. (a) How many provincial or local projects proposed under the Lesser Slave Lake Special Area Project have been overruled by Federal officials (i) since September 10, 1971, and (ii) since the initiation of the Special Area project?
(b) Who is responsible to design the projects in the Lesser Slave Lake Special Area?
12. (a) How much money can be claimed from the Federal Government for the third year of the Special Area Agreement?
(b) Are these expenditures covered in the 1972-73 Estimates?
13. (a) Have negotiations between the Federal and Provincial Governments taken place since September 10, 1971 to discuss the Lesser Slave Lake Special Area Program, specifically?
(b) Have any dates been set for future meetings?
14. How long did the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs meet face to face with the Hon. Mr. J. Marchand on his last trip to Ottawa?

191. Mr. Barton asked the Government the following question which was answered by Mr. Adair as indicated:

How many programs are presently proposed by the Metis Association of Alberta as to Part Three of the ARDA Agreement?

Answer: (i) There were no programs, as such, submitted by the Metis Association. (ii) The Metis Association of Alberta drafts and finalizes some of the submissions of specific projects on behalf of the Metis Sector.

MR. MINIELLY:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that Question 193 be made in the form of a Motion for a Return.

MR. SPEAKER:

It has been requested by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, seconded by the hon. Minister of Education that Question No. 193 be made an Order for a Return. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

41-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

An Order of the Assembly was therefore issued for a Return Showing:

Having regard to the answers provided to Question 170 and Question 180,

- (a) (1) With reference to Mr. Farran under January 28, 1972 what is the place, or places, of destination involving the mileage of 360 miles?
(2) What hotel or hotels were used?
- (b) (1) With reference to Mr. Moore, on what dates was the mileage compiled in Items 1, 2, 3, and 4?
(2) Please name the place, or places, of origin and destination.
- (c) (1) With reference to Dr. Paproski under January, 1972, what is the place, or places, of origin and destination involving the mileage of 1560 miles?
(2) What are the dates and the name of the places visited?
(3) What is the origin and the destination and the name of places visited involving 1625 miles?
(4) What is the origin and destination of the air travel?
(5) What places were visited in December, 1971 involving mileage of 1200 miles?
(6) What places were visited in February, 1972 involving 900 miles?
(7) What places were visited in March, 1972 involving 600 miles?

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

176. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Miller:

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

- (1) Copies of any Government of Alberta reports or studies directly financed over the past ten years by the Government of Alberta relating to the export of water to the United States from streams that do not normally flow out of Alberta into the United States.
- (2) Copies of any correspondence relating to the authorization of such studies.
- (3) The cost of such studies.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to Motion for Return No. 176.

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

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

Copies of all correspondence from municipalities or associations indicating their consent or otherwise, prior to the cancellation of the Alberta Provincial-Municipal Fiscal Commission.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

189. Mr. Taylor proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ruste:

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-25

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

(1) During 1971

- (a) How many convictions in Alberta were there under section 115 (a) of the Wildlife Act?
- (b) How many of the fines levied were in the maximum amount of \$300?
- (c) What percentage of the fines levied for the said offences were in the maximum amount?

(2) During 1971

- (a) How many convictions in Alberta were there under Section 115 (b) of the Wildlife Act?
- (b) How many of the fines levied were in the maximum amount of \$300?
- (c) What percentage of the fines levied for the said offences were in the maximum amount?

(3) During 1971

- (a) How many convictions in Alberta were there under Section 115 (c) of the Wildlife Act?
- (b) How many of the fines levied were in the maximum amount of \$500?
- (c) What percentage of the fines levied for the said offences were in the maximum amount?

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

192. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Buckwell:

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

- (1) The names and addresses of all individuals, consultants, advertising or public relations firms hired or awarded contracts with the provincial government or its departments or agencies, since September 1, 1971, showing the terms and costs of each contract, allowance, or remuneration covering same.
- (2) The names and number of public tenders submitted for provincial government advertising and public relations services indicating the amount of each bid, and the name of the successful bidder.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Moved by Mr. Henderson, seconded by Mr. Clark:

Be it resolved that a statutory obligation be placed on all provincial marketing boards to guarantee a fair share of the Alberta market for the small agricultural producer.

(Adjourned debate)

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the last time that this resolution was before us, I made some brief general remarks. This afternoon I would like to deal with the resolution in some detail; having regard to marketing boards generally, and to outline in some detail the philosophy of this government in relation to agricultural marketing; how the marketing board fits into this concept, where the question of the processing industry fits, the relationship of our general approach to the increase in the processing industry in rural Alberta. I'd like to

41-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

say something later on with regard to the government's approach to location of some of these plants, and in general make a fairly full statement this afternoon in regard to some of the problems and the policies that are involved.

As I have said before, Mr. Speaker, and just to recap very briefly; if we accept the philosophy that in agricultural marketing generally we have to accept the expansionist philosophy, then we have to be willing to get out and look for markets for our products so that agriculture can in fact expand and grow and prosper. If we accept the other side of that coin or the opposite view, that in fact, we should just try and artificially raise prices to the producers, put barriers around our boundaries whether they be federal or provincial, then surely agriculture will die and so will rural Alberta with it. So, very clearly, Mr. Speaker, our approach in this area is one that we would look for ways and means in which we could expand markets and in which we could, in fact, take the products out of the surplus position in our storage areas -- whether they be sheds or cold storage lockers -- and move them to markets of the world.

Surely one of the real things that has hurt us in the past is that we, in a very difficult selling position -- if our buyers know that we have huge surpluses of this, that and the other thing -- immediately make the price effect apparent, and it reflects in the prices that our farmers receive.

There are a number of other areas of course, that one could discuss in regard to the general philosophy of marketing. I would like to report to the House generally that I met at noon today with members of the Canada Department of Agriculture in their pilot project, known as Project 75, in which a small group of research people and others in the Canada Department of Agriculture are doing a concentrated review and pilot project in taking a commodity through the entire food system from the producer to the consumer, and getting the input of the variety of people and organizations and governments along the way to see if they could improve the marketing of our produce by this systems approach to the food systems in our country.

Both my department and that of my colleague, the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce, are involved in the meetings that are going on today as well, this afternoon -- and it might be interesting to the House generally to note that this is the first meeting that Project '75 has had with any province, and that they have chosen Alberta because of the attitude that we have exhibited, and the direction in which we have headed in regard to our marketing thrust in that area. I don't intend, Mr. Speaker, to review any further the question of the organization in the department, I think that is fairly generally known. I do want to stress, though, that any approach to marketing has to also consider the total concept of agriculture and that we have to be concerned initially, and -- from the start -- keep our objective in mind. Our objective is to improve the income position of our farmers. We shouldn't lose sight of that objective as we go into this marketing thrust.

We intend, in this marketing thrust -- as I have already stressed -- to work very closely with the Department of Industry and Commerce in relation to both the domestic and the export role. I have already announced in the House the number of grants we have made to a variety of commodity organizations. We will -- as I said in a response to a question previously -- be making additional grants as time goes along to other commodity organizations, and perhaps to the same ones that have already received some grants, if they come up with the kind of projects that are worthwhile and if the results are gratifying. In addition to the grants that we are making to these commodity organizations, we are making available the resources of our department, that of the publicity bureau and the Department of Industry and Commerce to all of these marketing groups or boards or commodity groups, in regard to their own promotions, both here and at

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-27

home, and the rest of Canada, and abroad in the general market areas. Additionally, our new section in the department of new product development will work closely with, not only the university groups who are also active in this area, but with the commodity organizations.

I might say here, Mr. Speaker, that we have already set up a food processing advisory committee composed of the university people, the industry, and our department to be available to a variety of commodity groups or commodity organizations to improve them in their product development, and to improve the processing of some of the products as we go along.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we have made available -- in a technical way -- assistance to the commodity groups for improvement in processing and all are aware that Bill No. 50 is before us in the Legislature a bill which will provide substantial help in regard to processing in rural Alberta.

I want to say here, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the question of plant location; the one thing that can hurt the entire program pretty severely, is if we get into the severe and niggling competition between towns and areas as to which town should get this plant or that plant. In my view this isn't a government decision, but should be left to the aggressiveness and ingenuity and ability of the various towns and communities in Alberta. As far as I am concerned, I am not going to get into battles between this town and that town as to where any processing thing should go. I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that if all that a larger town can do is to go and try and steal an industry that a smaller town has already got, then that town had better wrap it all up and quit trying. I feel that this has to be particularly stressed.

In addition to this kind of basic technical and promotional assistance, Mr. Speaker, we are talking, of course, about pretty substantial assistance to the commodity marketing boards in relation to domestic markets, and in relation to the export market. We intend to do this on a commodity basis as far as we can, because I think that's the way it fits in best.

I'd like to, then, Mr. Speaker, just review -- because the motion talks about a statutory obligation of marketing boards -- to review in some detail, as we see it in regard to the various commodities, and to begin that review with the question of eggs. My hon. friend for Olds-Didsbury showed interest during the question period, so I might say that the question of the Cal-Ed situation has been relatively public knowledge since the annual meeting of the Alberta Egg and Powl Marketing Board some week or ten days ago, in which it was pretty well generally known that they were in negotiation with Cal-Ed for its purchase. As I said briefly in the question period, Mr. Speaker, the reason that we have gone along with the Egg Board's acquiring this facility is simply to allow a marketing opportunity for our producers -- particularly the smaller ones.

We see Cal-Ed operation as a central facility here in Edmonton, and we are encouraging the Egg Board, along with assistance from the provincial government, to first set up receiver stations on a commission basis in a variety of communities throughout Alberta to re-establish a marketing opportunity for the smaller producers throughout Alberta. The Cal-Ed operation, of course, will be primarily centred in Edmonton, and if there is a demand, a similar or smaller facility might well be set up in southern Alberta to provide that kind of marketing opportunity.

It isn't the government's intention to get into competition with private enterprise any time that private enterprise is doing a good job. Quite frankly, the situation -- as my hon. friends across the

41-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

way I'm sure are aware -- with the egg industry just hasn't been good in the past two years. Something had to be done. I mentioned before in this House that we have asked the Egg Board for, in return for the support we are giving them in this matter, to take the lead in establishing this first receiver station, so that in fact, grading stations will reopen in a number of communities in Alberta and that they will become the first receiving station. In any case, they will funnel product into the Cal-Ed plant. The non-table quality product will be diverted by the board to the breaker plant at Two Hills.

I've also asked the Egg Board, in trying to put the entire package together with regard to the egg situation, to put a maximum quota into effect to make additional quota available to the smaller producers as soon as it's economically feasible to do so, and to be very cautious about allowing any integrated operators any increase in quota. This they've agreed to do and we hope that this will resolve the egg problem and will make available opportunities for some of our smaller farmers to increase their egg production as part of their farming operation and at the same time stop us from getting into a severe surplus situation.

Additionally, in regard to the eggs, Mr. Speaker, there will be amendments brought forward to The Marketing of Agricultural Products Act to allow the Egg Board to fully take part in the national agreement under the national Agricultural Products Marketing Act of the federal government -- or Bill C176 -- which now has restricted supply management to the eggs and poultry industry. These amendments will be necessary and will be brought forward very shortly to the House so that the Egg Board can join with the other provinces in, hopefully, sharing the domestic market. I want to make it pretty clear here, Mr. Speaker, that at no time does the government agree with the idea that we will share any export market on the basis that the domestic market is shared. We have made that very clear to the new chairman of the national Products Marketing Board, Mr. Babey, and that, in fact, our agreement is contingent upon the fact that this applies to the domestic market only.

I might just say in regard to eggs, generally, of course, there isn't any real hope that we will be exporting eggs in the shell state. Some poultry producers have taken exception to what I have said, because they say, "Well, there is no hope of exporting shell eggs, so why are you all hot and bothered about the question of sharing the export market?"

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, there are two very important factors here. One, it would be a precedent, and secondly, frankly, the poultry people haven't scratched the surface on the new product development -- the question of egg melange, the question of dried egg powder, the whole question of the provision of protein in egg form and in some manufactured form to the protein-short areas of the world. Certainly, this is an important and economical way to get protein abroad and into these areas.

Additionally, if I might, Mr. Speaker, move to the other part of the Egg and Fowl Marketing Board, we have a situation in Alberta where the poultry operator who wants to turn over his flock has a very serious problem in getting rid of the fowl at the moment, because we do not have any facility that will process them on an economical basis. We do have also some problems in that the condemned rate on these birds has been very high as far as using them for meat is concerned -- up to 40 per cent. So we have a problem in veterinary medicine as well. But we are hoping the Egg and Fowl Marketing Board will have a look at this down the road, once they get straightened around in the other operations. Hopefully, they could provide a killing facility which wouldn't have to be very large, but which would be appropriate to get a return to the producer for his fowl.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-29

In the past couple of years some of these poultry people haven't paid the freight for the birds that have been sent in. I think this is particularly a problem that we have to work on together with the Fowl Board, and we intend to do that.

I want to move to the turkey situation, Mr. Speaker. As I have announced in the House before, we have a resolution from the Turkey Board in regard to the question of vertical integration and the availability of quota to smaller producers. I have set up meetings for later on in the spring after the session is over for those integrated producers who are now involved with quota in both the broiler market and the turkey market, to initiate discussions as to how and when these people will be getting out of primary production and making available that kind of quota for our smaller producers.

In addition to that, we are willing to work with the turkey people particularly, in developing new products and helping them increase the sales of their product, both on the domestic market and on the export market. Mr. Speaker, I had one firm come around the other day with a product they are making in Calgary -- one of the products they are making -- called Turkey Jerky. I recommend it to my hon. friends -- it is excellent -- it is more than 50% protein, and is very tasty indeed. They have a new package coming out. At the moment they are using -- with the production of Turkey Jerky and Beef Jerky -- something like half a ton of meat a week. This kind of thing will expand the opportunities for our turkey growers. One firm alone in the United States is selling something like \$10 million worth of Jerky a year. These are the kinds of new things we have to do if we are going to expand our marketing and production opportunities for our people in these areas.

I might say again here, that in the broiler, turkey, and chicken area particularly, is where we need to really improve our process food situation because at the moment you can't buy a chicken pot pie made in Alberta out of Alberta chicken. You can't buy a TV dinner that is made in Alberta.

We are concerned about that, Mr. Speaker. We have a food industry research survey under way now by Acres Limited. As I mentioned earlier we have a new food industry advisory committee, which is composed of university personnel, research people, and industry, being available to the commodity groups and the formulation of this role in this area.

My department, and particularly my gals in the Home Economics Department stand ready to help any of the commodity groups to develop their product, to help them devise promotions to help entrepreneurs who would like to get into the food service business and this area to improve this situation pretty drastically, hopefully, in the near future.

I was in Medicine Hat not long ago, Mr. Speaker, and I threw the challenge to that community that they were ideally situated to do much more than they have in the past in the processed food industry, having available to them the vegetable industry on their doorstep, which is a real important adjunct particular to the TV dinners. This kind of thing certainly would seem to me to be a natural for that area. Certainly any area that shows some initiative, it seems to me, as the demand for this kind of food continues, the opportunities for secondary industry, and processing, and therefore marketing for our farmers, is very substantial.

I want to move then, Mr. Speaker, to the situation with regard to hogs. As I've said before in the House, we've taken certain steps that have improved the marketing opportunities for our smaller producers. The names on the manifest have been withdrawn, we have given the Hog Board the right to withdraw hogs without notifying the packers, we intend to have changes in the Agriculture Marketing Act

41-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

which would allow the hog board, if it sees fit, to pool on a daily basis, so that they would be completely fair to the smaller operators and the operators that live at some distance from the marketing centre.

In addition to that, we have been working very closely with the Hog Board in conjunction with industry, on pilot projects in relation to markets for pork products particularly in the Far East and we have one under way at the present time. I'm not at liberty at this time to disclose the nature of the operation. I hope too, as soon as the first shipment has arrived and is in good shape, that we will be able to make an announcement in that area.

At the same time we have been having discussions with, of course, Mr. Rickaport. That ball game is now up to DREE, and they are investigating. I understand that in that regard he made the initial application to DREE in the last two days, and that DREE is now giving it their consideration. And I would say that, in response to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and the hon. Member for Fairview-Spirit River, that one of the hog people from Alberta will be going to the Philippines in the near future with assistance from the department.

In addition to that Mr. Speaker, at the present time, three members of the Hog Board and one member of my department using funds that partly were lent from my department and other funds put up by the producers themselves are in Europe to study marketing techniques and facilities there. Certainly we have something to learn from the Danes in relation to marketing pork products, and we hope that we will be able to do just that.

In addition to that, the personnel from my department are looking at other things besides pork products, particularly the granulated potato situation and the availability of markets in certain other areas in relation to agricultural products generally.

Very briefly then, Mr. Speaker, that is the situation with regard to hogs. I'll come, later on, to some remarks with regard to some general questions about credit as it relates to marketing opportunities, and then some general remarks in regard and marketing boards to commissions, and the other commodity groups and their approach to government.

I might then move on the the question of the Sheep and Lamb Commission. As my hon. friends know, this has been set up. A provisional board of directors have met and are in the process of getting together. I've been impressed by the response of people generally throughout the province. Certainly the people in the central area around the Olds, Ponoka and Three Hills area have, on their own initiative, done a great deal of work already in regard to a lamb killing facility. We hope that they will get in touch with the Sheep and Wool Commission, and we will certainly give them all the help we can in this regard.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in this area the traditional complaint, of course, has been that we don't have a good marketing facility, and we don't have a good killing facility, and therefore we can't get our chain stores and other grocery and meat markets in Alberta to sell lamb. Frankly that's only part of the story, and part of the story is that we haven't had any continuity of supply. We haven't had enough supply to make it worthwhile for people to, in fact, go into a real marketing promotion. And so again, here is one of those times when you can't just go in one direction, but you have to take the whole with you. So we're trying in Sheep and Wool Commission to develop programs, not only in the marketing end, but also in regard to production. We hope in the very near future to change our guaranteed loan programs so that, in fact, we will have a separate program for each commodity; and in that regard, we intend to

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-31

change the sheep loan program so that a portion of that money, of the \$10,000 that's now available throughout the province for breeding stock, that a portion of that -- 40 per cent -- can be used for buildings and/or rams and equipment.

In addition to that we have made a major grant to the Sheep and Wool Commission to look at the possibility of setting up a scouring plant in Alberta for all wool. Fully 50 per cent of the weight of the wool that is shipped from Alberta to the scouring plants in eastern Canada are dirt and debris and we could cut our freight in half with just a scouring plant. We're hopeful that down the way we can do more than that, that in fact we can go the next step forward into carding and the other secondary industry that then might come with the kind of numbers that we're talking about.

Again even in the wool industry, Mr. Speaker, it depends on the whims of society and whether or not the kind of clothes we wear have some wool in them. Experts in this area tell me that wool is coming back, Mr. Speaker, because of the double knit -- don't ask me how that's hooked in there but that's what they tell me. We're also hopeful that Mr. Olsen, the federal Minister of Agriculture, will have another look at the question of dropping the deficiency payments on wool. They were dropped so suddenly last year that people, in fact, didn't get their cost of shearing back for their wool. I've made several representations to the federal minister in this regard. The Wool and Sheep Commission have passed a resolution to that effect. I'm hopeful that he will listen to a little bit of reason in this area, because we as a province are doing more to promote the sheep industry than anyone else in Canada. We have suggested to him that, in fact, rather than cutting the deficiency payment off completely as he has done, if he feels that it has to be done that it should be done over a period of years so that this would allow us time to build our industry, to improve our facilities for scouring wool, to look into the question of the lamb pelt situation, to develop facilities in which these could be usable, and tying it in with a lamb marketing promotion. We can, in fact, do a substantial amount in this area, and hopefully without any thought of surplus for a number of years to come.

It's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that in general the lamb population in Australia and New Zealand is down, and that the production of mutton and lamb there has gone away down.

One of the real problems, and we'll have to look at this, is not only do we need facilities in relation to killing of lamb, but we need facilities in which mutton can be utilized in the processed meat industry much more than has in the past, so that the older ewes and livestock can be used in this area.

We think there's a real exciting challenge here in the sheep industry for Alberta. We invite the farmers of Alberta to get to know these animals, and to develop a really thriving family farm operation using some of the newer techniques that have been developed in Alberta, at Fairview. We have some of the real knowledgeable people in Alberta about this. One of them, Mr. Jones, is away on leave of absence in England at the moment. We're hopeful that on his return he will be a real asset to us in this area.

If I could then go on, Mr. Speaker, and talk about the question of the Cattle Commission in relationship to government. About question of the Horn Tax Fund -- and the representations that have been made to me by one or two members in this regard -- I would like to say to the hon. members, initially, that the question of the removal of The Horn Tax has, of course, got supporters on both sides. I have letters on file though from major feed lots in this province who have told me, in fact, that horns didn't cause any damage to meat. I've got letters on the other side that tell me how much damage they cause. Surely though, Mr. Speaker, the marketplace

41-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

should be the taxing authority, in effect, and government has no need to be putting on nuisance taxes on this agriculture industry.

I want to suggest that if the packers or the feed lots in fact think that horns are bad that they will, through the marketplace, cause people to do a better job of dehorning than they have in the past. Certainly the figures show that there hasn't been any change in the number of cattle with horns being marketed over the past several years. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I stand by the decision to remove this nuisance tax and to allow the assessment of this situation over a two-year period.

There is at the present time something like \$1.6 million in the Horned Cattle Tax Fund. It would be our intention to have discussions with the Alberta Cattle Commission and other organizations as to the utilization of this fund. I'm going to suggest to them that, in fact, what happens is as follows; That we look into the matter of investing this fund in long-term securities which would return a reasonable rate of interest that would give us something in the neighbourhood of about \$150,000 a year to earmark for special projects within the industry. This would allow us to undertake a variety of projects for the cattle industry from the interest alone and leave the total fund intact, or as capital, that would continue to produce this kind of interest and money for projects on an annual basis.

One of the areas that we're going to have to look at in this regard is the question of the subsidy that we pay -- as a province -- to the cattle breeders to move cattle to the Royal Winter Fair in Toronto. We'd like to continue that because it is an important part of their marketing process. But I want to suggest that we could consider taking some portion of that interest from the Horned Cattle Tax Fund to allow for this kind of exhibition work.

In addition to that, of course, we'll be having some detailed discussions with the Alberta Cattle Commission in relation to their work and their promotion of cattle products. All the members are aware of the Kobe beef experiment. I think it's pretty well generally accepted that, in regard to this area, we should be shooting for the market in Japan. In fact, not only the Kobe beef market but also the ordinary or the Canadian product market is at a price level above the Australian level -- which will be acceptable to them.

There have been a number of discussions with the Japanese in regard to additional beef going into the Japanese market. These are on a continuing basis. The news report that some of the larger feedlot people in Alberta who are interested in developing killing plants along with their feedlots, have been talking to the Japanese in regard to a sustained or continuous supply to provide for that market. We are encouraging them and helping them in any way we can to enter that market on a continuing basis.

Those deal with the major products, Mr. Speaker. I could go on and talk about the vegetable situation and the honey situation -- which as my hon. friend from Athabasca pointed out the other night -- is in pretty good shape at the moment. We hope that it continues to be and that the markets remain there.

So far as the vegetable people are concerned, we are interested in helping them in any way that we can to get an ever-increasing portion of the Alberta market for the vegetables that we know we can raise, particularly in the Brooks area. I've had my people down there looking at their plant and their product is good; though some of their financing has been a little precarious. We hope that we can help that out, and that we can give them the kind of situation which will make their operation viable, by which they can give a return to

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-33

their producers so that they will continue to stay in the vegetable industry.

Then if I might just conclude, Mr. Speaker. I have a few general remarks with regard to the question of, firstly, that in relation to each of these marketing boards or commodity groups, we would hope to develop a guaranteed loan program that would have more to do with the tying in of marketing opportunities for the farmer in an operating credit way, or in a special way; and, secondly that the Agricultural Development Fund would in fact then be for longer-term credit in relation to capital land purchases and capital buildings, as opposed to shorter-term credit that the guaranteed loan program would be used for.

I'm having a little bit of static coming back from the banks who are suggesting that if we're not careful we'll plough rural Alberta under with a load of debt. I want to emphasize again, that we are very conscious of this, and that we feel that these credit programs have to be tied to a marketing opportunity. Of course, as I said when I started out, the entire area has to be dealt with -- and you can't just separate one from the other.

There are a number of areas that deal with marketing boards more particularly, and with the commissions. And the question of whether or not the people who serve on these boards, and also on the marketing council, shouldn't be a greater percentage of producers. In certain instances, I think consumers also should be on those boards. We intend to make changes in The Marketing Act that will also allow for that, so in fact we can have consumers on the Marketing Council, the central agency, and we can have additional producers on that board. I think we should give consideration also to changes in The Marketing Act allow for the members on the commissions in the various areas to be elected, so that people in all areas of the province can have some say as to who these commission board members will be.

That generally, Mr. Speaker, but not completely, deals with the whole question of marketing and marketing boards. I didn't touch on the dairy situation -- because I've done that on a previous occasion -- or -- some of the other specialty areas such as rapeseed and coarse grain.

I would like to, before I conclude with an amendment to this motion, talk just briefly about the work of the Alberta Grain Commission, and what it is working at. We have referred it, initially, a couple of primary considerations; the primary consideration, of course, of being knowledgeable about the transportation system and the blocks that can occur in regard to moving grain to our customers. We've also asked them to have a look at the coarse grain situation and to consult with our neighbouring provinces as to mechanisms by which there might be a stabilized price put into effect for coarse grains.

They are dealing with a whole variety of areas and I am very pleased with what they have been able to do so far. We're looking at the question of joint prepared feeds which I think has perhaps the greatest opportunity for expanded markets than any other area. We'll be able to encourage production of our coarse grains in the near future because of the ability to export more coarse grains as a prepared feed. I think there are markets in the northwestern United States and California that we haven't scratched before and one of the good things about those markets is that they can get there without going across the mountains and running into some of the problems that we've had in that area before. Additionally there are a number of trucks that bring other produce from those states into Alberta and are available for this. We're looking at this particular market very intensely at the moment.

41-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

The Grain Commission is also looking at the situation with regard to rapeseed, particularly from the viewpoint of the Alberta producer. We are hopeful to have some developments in that area in the very near future.

We then, Mr. Speaker, moved in a variety of areas with the primary objective being that we wanted to provide a marketing, and therefore, a production opportunity for all of the farmers of Alberta. We agree in a policy way, that vertical integration is not in the best interests of the people of Alberta and that we should negotiate with the people who are now in vertical integration -- those who have been vertically integrated from the top down -- to allow them to move out of the primary producing area and reserve it for the farmers of Alberta, and the production opportunity that that involves. We have made the initial steps in talking to some of the industry in Alberta in this regard. I can assure the House that the response that I have got so far, from these companies, has been one of complete co-operation, that they intend to move in that regard. Hopefully -- and I know this isn't one that would be solved easily -- as we solve it we may be able to make quota or production opportunities available to our smaller farmers.

So, Mr. Speaker, in regard to the outline that I made with regard to marketing boards and marketing generally of agricultural produce in Alberta, I would like to move the following amendment to the motion, seconded by my hon. friend from Banff-Cochrane, the Minister of Highways, that all of the words after "that" in the motion be struck out and be replaced by the following; "Be it resolved that the government take all steps necessary to ensure a marketing opportunity for all agricultural producers."

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part --

MR. HENDERSON:

Would the minister . . . I would like to ask the hon. minister one question before we leave his comments. I didn't want to interrupt him in the midst of his very informative presentation. Starting back at the beginning of his comments today -- on the question of the Egg Board -- would the hon. minister advise as to whether the cost of the operation of receiving stations is going to be borne wholly by the Egg Board, or is there going to be some input from his department into that expenditure?

DR. HORNER:

No, I said, Mr. Speaker, that with the primary or central operation of Cal-Ed we expect the Egg Board to, in fact, run that at a profit. The primary receiving stations that we hope will be established throughout the province -- and hopefully they will be the start, in fact, of a series of farmer's markets throughout the province for a variety of produce over the next two or three years -- will have to be supported by the government.

MR. HENDERSON:

Will have to be?

DR. HORNER:

Yes.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, could I just ask a question of the hon. minister? Would he comment on the matter of eggs from outside the province, and

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-35

what percentage of them are being used in the Alberta market today, and at what price?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, if I might just . . . the Manitoba egg situation -- and let's call a spade a spade -- that is where they are coming from. The intensity of the problem has lessened with the National Egg Marketing Plan coming into effect, it should pretty well disappear. We have had a real problem because of the price of Manitoba eggs. The prices have firmed in Manitoba and this has allowed us a little bit of breathing space. We intend to see to it that all eggs marketed in Alberta, pay at least a portion of a marketing fee towards the surplus removal program, the marketing program. But we wouldn't put a barrier at our boundary in regard to those eggs. I might say, though, that we intend to do a number of things to aggressively market Alberta eggs in Alberta, including the provision that the Alberta institutions will be buying Alberta eggs, probably from the Egg Board.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to second the amendment to this motion, firstly because I did enjoy the hon. Minister of Agriculture's speech in outlining to the House the number of small ways in which he is pointing out the opportunities that are available to agriculture and the opportunities through new directions which are being created for agriculture.

I am going to deal in a somewhat different field which was brought to the hon. members' attention in the House as being something very startling, early in the session, by those on the other side.

Mr. Speaker, when they found that there was a great emergency with the situation in grain handling, not only in this province, but at the bottle neck of the west coast. This, Mr. Speaker, I might say, has been in existence for a long time. As a matter of fact, I have been interested in this part of the field for at least 12 to 15 years and every time I have visited the west coast I have particularly taken note of how the grain handling was taking place in that area, and the progress that was being made. And each time that I looked into this particular situation, it seemed very similar. It seemed that there were ships waiting in the harbour for grain that wasn't in the port to be loaded, or there was too much of some kind of grain in the port which there was no orders for, and just a general confusion and very poor use of the facilities that we had.

Just prior to the election last July, the Premier and I took a trip out there and I will tell you of the information that we discovered on that particular trip to the west coast. There were several ships in harbour, and at one of the major elevators out there there was a million-ton capacity vessel in harbour being loaded. It was about three-quarters loaded, without any more grain in Vancouver -- not only in that particular grain handling facility, but in all Vancouver.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I'm not necessarily concerned about the minister's comments, but the resolution is specifically aimed at provincial marketing boards and I suggest when we're discussing the question of the federal grain marketing business in the port of Vancouver, it isn't pertinent to this particular resolution. I think there might be another resolution on the Order Paper where the minister could make this speech. But it's out of order so far as this particular resolution is concerned.

41-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

DR. HORNER:

On the point of order, Mr. Speaker. What the Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc says is only partly right. This amendment specifically talks about marketing opportunity for agricultural producers -- all of them. And I want to suggest to you and to the House that what the hon. Minister of Highways is talking about now is very important to that marketing opportunity for all agricultural producers.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It seems that every time I start to give the hon. members on the other side some useful information, they think that it's a point of order. Naturally, if they had been listening for the last several years, they may well have not been in that position over there, enjoying the picture on the wall that they face.

Mr. Speaker, if I might continue from where I was so -- the word has been prompted to me -- rudely interrupted, I shall continue. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we had a million-bushel capacity vessel three-quarters full with no grain in the port of Vancouver to continue filling it, and there was no assurance that there would be grain arriving shortly to fill it. Some of the ships in the bay were being charged demurrage, because they too expected to be loaded and there was no grain of the qualities that they wanted.

I'm not saying, Mr. Speaker, that there isn't a lot of grain shipped through that port, because upon our findings, with 20% of the grain handling facilities of Canada, we are shipping more than 40% of the grain that is exported from Canada through those facilities. Those facilities were operating at about 65% of their capacity, so you see, Mr. Speaker, there is lots of room for improvement in the handling of those products in that area. If we were able to take full advantage of the world markets that are available and the facilities that we have in this area, just in the Vancouver area alone, certainly all of our farmers here in Alberta would have a greater share of the market to sell their products.

However, there is definitely a bottleneck of one type or another in the handling of these grains. There is a great controversy right now about the erection of inland terminals and the cleaning of the grain inland. We hear the argument that there is a hot market at the west coast for screenings and this is justly right. But, Mr. Chairman, if this grain were cleaned inland and the screenings could be fed to an increasingly enlarging beef industry here -- because strange enough, the screenings are of a very high food quality and just as high or even higher than good grains. We could be selling good grains to those market opportunities that we have, particularly when screenings bring approximately \$30 a ton at the west coast.

There is another point, too, Mr. Chairman. If the screenings were taken out here, it was estimated by the Harbours Commission people that the efficiency of handling would be increased by as much as 30%. That is a great saving in itself, and points out the inefficiency of the systems we are now using.

It is understandable why some of the major elevator companies and grain handlers are taking exception to this suggestion, because up to this point they have received these screenings at a very nominal margin of profit to the farmers, in fact, no profit at all, and an expense of shipping it out there. It has been kind of a free-gratis gouging that the farmers have been getting because of such a policy. With the abdication of the railways' responsibility at so many points in Alberta, certainly, we have to rely more and more all the time on truck handling of grain to the terminal points. At this point it can be cleaned and graded as to the percentage of protein it

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-37

contains. The order could be sent in trainload lots to the west coast, ready to be shipped. Perhaps we could even update our shipping out there with a little imagination, such as using hopper cars, going over top of the hold of a ship and dropping their grain in. This isn't an impossibility, and would certainly have a great deal to do with reducing the cost of handling grain at that seaport base.

But the same old war goes on; there is a great deal of conflict of interest between the grain handling people and the farmers. I think until that is recognized by the federal government, the farmers are going to continue to be in a plight.

Also comes the Port of Churchill -- the hon. Member for Drumheller well knows the little organization that has fought for years to justify the stand that farmers have wanted to ship more grain through that port; but there seems to be a continual ceiling on the amount of grain that can be handled through that port. Not particularly because maybe it couldn't handle more grain -- because, as I understand the situation -- it only works on one 8-hour shift a day for the shipping period through the Port of Churchill, which is a very short time of about four months. Even that is cut short because of rules and regulations that no one seems to know why they exist, but they are there. The farmers also have to be docked one and one-half cents a bushel, as I understand it, for the grain that goes through there. This is really a difference of price between what it costs to ship it through the Great Lakes ports in that area.

So actually the farmers have been gouged over the years for the shipping of their grain, whether it is to the east coast or whether it is through the west coast, simply because we are sold a bill of goods by conflicting interests in the grain handling area. This has existed for as long as I have been looking at the situation and that goes on now for about 15 years. I don't believe that we have ever had access to the available markets that have been opened to the people of Alberta. Certainly, if we took full advantage of these markets, then we wouldn't need to really worry about whether everyone got a fair share of the market, because if you are producing 15% protein wheat, and there is only a limited amount of it, you can sell that amount, whatever the amount may be, whether it is 15 or 14 or 13 or 12 percent, or whatever was required. I think that our whole resources would have to be mustered in order to supply that type of market and we could use the terminals just to temporarily store grain for the ships as they were coming in to ship abroad. But instead of that, since I have been sitting here in this House in the last five years, there have been times when we have missed markets that were available to us because our shipping wasn't efficient, and because our shipping wasn't ready to take advantage of situations that occurred.

Mr. Speaker, it is only I think about two years ago or three years ago, when the United States grain handlers were on strike. There was an ample market for grain throughout the world that could have had access to, but we were unable to supply that market because we were tied hand and foot in our shipping facilities both at the Great Lakes and at Vancouver. So I think the amendment that the hon. minister has made is a good one, and I urge that every member support it.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, in considering the amendment, I think the only really basic question so far as the amendment, as compared to the original resolution, hinges on the question of whether the hon. minister and the government is of the opinion that they have the necessary statutory authority to carry out the commitment that they have made so far as providing the market for the products of all producers, large and small. The basic purpose of the resolution

41-38

ALPERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

initially was to try to provide the assurance that the small producer is being looked after. It appeared in a number of instances, and I think the discussion of the Egg Marketing Board today is pertinent to this point; and it has also happened to hogs that the boards themselves are dominated by the larger producers, and the small producer often finds his interest not being adequately looked after by the board.

I am pleased to say I will be able to support the hon. minister in the action that he has taken thus far in dealing with the problem of the egg situation, as well as the action they have taken to eliminate some of the obstacles and to equalize the opportunity for small producers of hogs to market their products on terms competitive with the larger producers. I therefore suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I have no reservations about supporting the amendment. The only question I think that must be gauged or judged is whether the government, the minister, has the necessary statutory authority to back up his actions in the field of dealing with the marketing boards. Apparently the hon. minister believes that he does have the necessary authority. Such being the case, Mr. Speaker, I certainly can support the amendment.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, taking part in this debate, I believe both the original resolution and also the amendment are worthy of note, but the amendment says that we will take the necessary steps to ensure a marketing opportunity for all agricultural producers. This has nothing to do, as far as I am concerned, with the original resolution.

I would have to begin by congratulating the hon. minister in the run down that he has given all the agricultural products this afternoon, and his hopes and aspirations for marketing in the future. The assistance that he has given to the commodity groups has been very necessary, and very welcome. The grants to agriculture in the forms of credit are also to be commended.

But I think most of you who have read today's Edmonton Journal, right at the bottom of the page, there's a farmer from the Peace River country who admits quite frankly that credit has been too easy to get and has been the downfall of many farmers. They are offered money, at a reasonable rate of interest, they borrowed heavily and then were unable, because of marketing conditions, to meet their financial obligations. In turn then some of them have lost everything they had.

When we talk on the amendment that we take all necessary steps to ensure a marketing opportunity for all agricultural producers, this is a worthy goal to keep in mind. When we realize that at the present time there are some 1,442 farmers in the Peace River area alone, in June 1971, who are in arrears for their PFC payments; we realize what a serious situation we face in Alberta. We are talking about the marketing of all agricultural products. I'm asking now -- what do you mean by a fair share of existing markets? We have egg boards, we have broiler boards, we have turkey producers, we have milk producers, we also have hog boards, and cattle producers.

I think, as we said before in this House, at the present time our productive capacity is about maybe 75% of what our total production could be. Our productive capacity in this province alone, with its great diversification of products, is a tremendous thing to behold. We could produce about twice what we are producing now if we had markets. But what has happened today is that the small producer is left with the gleanings. Because of the marketing boards in the present situation, and because of the type of product that most of these marketing boards cover -- they are in the main mass-produced -- they are very perishable. I'm not at the moment talking about grain, but I'm talking about eggs, poultry products, milk. These products

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-39

cannot be stored for any length of time under refrigeration, otherwise there's no return left, it's all taken up in storage.

So what of the small producer? What do we mean by a small producer? We talked early in this session about the family farm and when we actually get down to the definition of a family farm it covers 95% of all the farms in Alberta today. So we're talking then right back to our amendment. We take all necessary steps to ensure a marketing opportunity for all agricultural producers. But we also find -- and this may be rehash of what has been said before -- that in our marketing boards a very few producers, for example on the broiler board, control the production of the total broiler production of this province. Then where's the extra market for the small producer. Unless we find markets of a considerable quantity -- I'm saying a market of say 25% increase in one given year -- where are the small producers going to come? If we're going to find markets, say for example, with an increase in annual production of say, 5%, this can be absorbed by the existing producers. They must have this to stay in business, to meet the inflation and the costs of their production in this inflationary period.

So where does the small producer come in? We're concerned today that we must have a share for these small producers and these small producers are what I would say, are the marginal farmers. Their only hope left is to get a share of a market, over and above the big producer. The big producer has protected himself with the Marketing Board. I'm not knocking marketing boards per se, but I do say that those who belong to the marketing boards, particularly in these perishable products, have a high percentage of capital in return to their investment invested in their industry. Therefore, they have to be protected under certain conditions. But they are able to absorb any increase at the present time of any market that is available.

The hon. Minister of Highways spoke about the marketing of grain. And it has had its ups and downs. At the start of the session we couldn't get wheat out there; boats were waiting; the railway system, because of weather, was unable to deliver the grain; farmers, because of the winter, were unable to deliver grain to the elevator system. Today we find -- or two weeks ago we found -- that in Vancouver they had something like 840 cars of grain on two successive days which, actually, over-met the normal, in fact, it was a record amount of grain delivered at any one time to the port of Vancouver. Today we're over the winter, we're able to handle 840 cars of grain, and now we have no ships. So it seems to say it's an integrated problem: it is an integrated problem, and a very complex problem.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture talked about new products. Whether his Turkey Jerky is going to solve the problem I don't know -- it's another way of looking at things.

DR. HORNER:

I'll send you a sample.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Thanks a lot. [Interjections] It's a new product and I think we should go out for new products and find new markets. But we realize say, from 100 pounds of potatoes, I don't know how many little bags of potato chips can be manufactured. But this is one of the things for example in your new products -- and these are, in our affluent society, all dressed up -- that don't actually absorb as much of the base product as the straight old potato did. I'm concerned today that our markets -- I realize the hon. minister is in a very difficult position -- are not of his making, nor were they the making of the former government, it's the system that we're living under today in Canada.

41-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

Every province today is having a new marketing thrust. The province of Manitoba with its eggs and its surplus, they're also looking for a pork products market or a pork market in the Far East -- just the same as we are -- and it's going to be who gets there first with the highest quality product at the lowest possible price. And I don't know -- in this situation in western Canada today -- whether we're going to save our farms unless markets are available to us in such a quantity that the existing farmers, the existing high producers, can absorb this market. I see very little hope for the small marginal farmer in this resolution we're going to take -- all necessary steps for the marketing opportunities for all agricultural producers.

The hon. Minister of Agriculture has given a very complete picture, within the time limit he took this afternoon, of all the pitfalls and problems we face in all the various commodities. This is fine, but we're not getting, as far as this resolution is concerned, to the root cause of exactly what this resolution is trying to put across. And that was that we should have a fair share; a statutory obligation be placed on all marketing boards to guarantee a fair share of the Alberta market for the small agricultural producer. If we're just going to sell the products the way they are now and hope for the best, I see very little hope for the small producer.

What we are looking for today are large markets and it is all very well for the hon. minister to say, and I think he means it in all sincerity, we have the capacity, as I mentioned before, to feed half the people in this world. But we haven't got the market, and if we haven't got the market, how are we going to get that market? We are not the only ones who are looking for it. What I am concerned with is our easy credit and it's all very well to say that we're lending money here and we're lending money there. But when we actually come down to it, the producers that are already in the business are just as selfish as any other group in our society. The Cattle Growers' Association -- and while I'm not a member of the Cattle Growers' Association, I raise cattle. I am concerned that you are lending money to every farmer in the province who hasn't had cattle before. Because it is going to reflect on my market ultimately, I'm selfish as far as my cattle industry is concerned.

The dairy producer is just as concerned for his dairy business in allowing others to come into it when we have a surplus position. And I am concerned that unless we do something drastic, like making the marketing boards give a fair share to the small producers, I see very little hope for the small producer to even get into the market, let alone save his farm. The idea that we're going to turn around and suddenly just open up credit, and the hon. minister has said, unless these people are viable, unless they can prove that they need the money, or are going to make good use of it, then we're not going to lend the money. Well where does this leave the little fellow? And this is basically what we are talking about. We are talking about the small farmer who needs a shot in the arm as far as finance is concerned. Where is he going to get it if he hasn't got a viable industry? Where is he going to get it unless there is a market with which he can get a fair share to sell what he produces? He can't begin to compete with the operator who is already in existence.

One of the things that worries me -- particularly in this affluent age in which we have been living during the past several years -- when we try to sell and this is one of the sad parts, where the older farmer wants to get out, he wants all his farm is worth and a little more to spare. And if the government can lend the money to him, so much the better. But he doesn't care two hoots about the poor young fellow who buys his farm and the payments that this young fellow is going to have to make. He has his money, let somebody else worry about paying off the debt. I wonder sometimes just where we are going. We can't turn around and expect many of these young

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-41

fellows today to make a living. They can pay their bills and probably pay the interest on their loan, but they'll never reduce the principal, and this is held over their heads. You have to get 9 per cent clear on your farm to even begin to pay and there are many substantial farmers today, those who have been in the business for a great number of years, not even making 9 per cent.

I am concerned that unless we can find markets and I'll have to admit that the hon. minister, is doing everything he humanly possibly can do, and some things that are maybe not so human. He's going to try and find markets for our farmers, and for this I have to commend him. But I still feel that this amendment does not come to grips with what this resolution originally intended to be.

MR ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, may I just make a few comments? I believe that we are all sitting here saying that we are helping the small farmer, that is well and good. But it has just been drawn to my attention a few days ago, and I'm referring to the federal government's subsidy on hogs, on the \$5 per hog on the 200 hogs that are over the index of 100.

Certainly when we look at the \$5 we look at the 200 hogs and this means exactly \$1,000 to a hog operator. Well how about the small operator who is producing somewhere around 150 hogs and 80% or less are over the index of 100. Surely the \$5 was not intended to help the large operator. And I would suggest that somewhere, perhaps the hon. Minister of Agriculture could intercede for the small operators in the hog industry in the Province of Alberta.

If a hog operator ships 150 hogs, and he has only 100 that come over the index of 100, at least he should be paid on the basis of 150 hogs because it costs just as much for a small operator to feed 150 hogs as it does for a large operator to 150 hogs.

So I hope that we would at least get this over to the Federal Department of Agriculture, and if we really mean to bring about some help to the small producer, this certainly, if injected into the Alberta economy, would amount to some few millions of dollars. I don't think it was ever intended that the large producer who produces 1,000 or 2,000 hogs would be qualified to take \$1,000, whereas the person who has only 200 hogs and maybe only 100 to qualify for those hogs over 100. I hope that the hon. Minister of Agriculture would make this point to the Department of Agriculture if we want to help the small operator.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the amendment, I would like to say that I am sorry that the hon. minister, when he moved the amendment, cut it off in the way he did, because had he added these words "that we ensure marketing opportunities for all agricultural producers" to the original resolution, just as an additional phrase, I think we would have had quite an excellent resolution.

Certainly, no one can be opposed to the idea that the government take steps to ensure a fair and equitable market for all agricultural producers. But, as the hon. Member for Macleod pointed out, there really is a principle at stake here in the resolution as originally moved, in that we attempt to make sure that there is a fair share of the market for smaller producers. I recall the meeting that the MLA's had with the officials of Unifarm. I must say that I found the discussion over the marketing board situation very interesting, particularly the Broiler Board, where the officials were attempting to argue the case for the allocation of new markets. As the members who were there will recall, under the present policy of the Broiler Board, the bulk of new market as it comes available is allocated to

41-42

ALEERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

existing producers, and there are a large number of small producers who are waiting, lined up, ready to get into the business. But because of the existing policies of the board, they are going to be waiting, no doubt, a month of Sundays.

One of the reasons, it seems to me, that this motion as originally proposed has merit, is that I think it is important that we, as a Legislature, do set up some statutory obligation that marketing boards set aside a fair share of the market for the smaller agricultural producer. It is clear, again as the hon. Member for Macleod has pointed out, that the smaller operator has no hope at all unless he can nail down a share of the market. Certainly the problems that smaller producers face today are extremely serious. The price of farm machinery is going up very substantially, and while easier credit will allow farmers to modernize their operation, that is not going to solve the problems unless they have an available market.

I want to say that I agree with those who said that the minister is very hard working and very driving in his determination to expand the markets for agricultural commodities in this province. I think he is to be commended for that, and as I said during the discussion of the agricultural estimates, Mr. Speaker, I support the government in moves to open up new markets, especially those in the Pacific rim countries. But the point again that must be made is that, as we develop new markets, surely we must make certain that those markets are shared in such a way that the smaller producer can, in fact, have some reasonable expectation of a fair share in the years ahead.

Relating it right back to the motion that we are discussing at the present time, I really find it difficult to understand why we have, in fact, a substitute motion here. It could just as easily have been made as an addition and would, in fact, have given us a first-rate resolution.

No one argues that you're going to solve the problem of the smaller producer simply by putting statutory restrictions on the share of markets under the marketing boards in the province. No one argues that at all, but it is one route that I think we have to examine, along with many others, but it's an important route that we have to examine. So therefore, in my view, the amendment is, in fact, misplaced. It weakens what is a desirable resolution, rather than strengthens it.

In that sense, I find it difficult to support the strategy on the part of the hon. minister, even though nobody can take exception to the motherhood wording, that every reasonable step will be taken to ensure a fair share of the market for small producers, but I think we have to get beyond the motherhood stage and look at some of the practical steps that can be taken. Certainly one of those steps, it seems to me, is for us in the Legislature to say to the Broiler Board that we're setting certain conditions; we don't like the situation where a few producers are controlling the whole market, or a very large percentage of the market, and where they have worked out a formula that as the market increases the majority of that increase will be simply handed over to these people who have been in the business already.

Now, I know that many of us here don't like compulsory measures, but unfortunately in this cruel old world that we live in, we can't do everything on a voluntary basis. The marketing boards themselves involve a degree of compulsion which many members in this Legislature personally don't subscribe to, but, having recognized that we have marketing boards in the first place, it seems to me we must then take the next step. What can we do to make sure that those marketing boards live up to the function that they were set up to achieve in the first place? And that, as I view it, from my experience in talking to people in the farm organizations over the years, was to

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-43

make sure that not only do we have orderly marketing, but also that a reasonable share of the market be allocated to our smaller producers. And because, Mr. Speaker, the motion, as it was originally worded, attempted to nail that point down, I spoke in favour of it at the time. But because the substitute motion tends to detract from that principle and replace it instead with a vague statement that doesn't really mean anything specifically, I find myself a little disappointed, because had we, as I suggested before, simply added these words to the original resolution we could, as a Legislature, have something pretty meaningful to the smaller producers of this province and at least showed them that collectively, as a Legislature, we are concerned about taking practical steps to make sure that they have a fair share of the market.

I just want, before I sit down, to make one observation about something which the hon. Member for Macleod raised. He, of course, was quoting from the article carried in today's Edmonton Journal, which discusses the plight of Peace River farmers, who themselves admit that credit was rather easily obtained. The problem in the Peace River country, as many of the hon. members may know, is that there are a very large number of farmers who are presently behind in their payments to Federal Farm Credit. There has been considerable concern, especially in one region of the Peace River country, around the Manning area, where foreclosures are pending because of the arrears situation. Certainly, better farm credit is important if we are to modernize our agricultural operation so that the smaller producers can, in fact, survive. But it would be quite wrong were we to assume that easier credit is the panacea. The easier credit must be tied, not only to wider markets -- and I commend the government for attempting to find wider markets -- but equally important, it must be tied to a fair share of those wider markets for the smaller producers of this province.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the amendment I might mention that I was rather disappointed in a way -- I am not against the amendment as such, but I think it is evading the issue, and that is, guaranteeing a fair share to the small agricultural producer. Certainly, some of the steps that have been outlined by the hon. minister to date in what he is doing in the egg situation, and some of these others, indicate he is taking a different step from what is actually outlined in the amendment.

Certainly as far as the amendment goes, the government takes all steps to ensure a marketing opportunity for all agricultural producers. This to me means the small producer; it means the integrated operator; it means every agricultural producer, everyone who produces agricultural products in this province. I am not arguing with the steps to do this, but I submit it is evading the issue for which the original motion is brought into this Assembly.

I was interested in the hon. minister's outline prior to his moving the amendment, in the work that is being done. I submit that he mentioned the Canadian Department of Agriculture pilot project, and their first meeting in Alberta today. I submit that Alberta had the first Alberta Agricultural Marketing Commissioner. I am happy to see the minister building on this foundation that was laid by the previous administration -- [Interjections]

If it bothers the hon. minister, I am going to recite a little more.

I am interested in some of the background remarks of the minister. However, I want to outline that certainly the steps taken in marketing are something that the groundwork was laid for prior to the minister coming into his position. I am happy that he is building on it; I am happy that he is expanding on it.

41-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

DR. HORNER:

I'm happy if you're happy.

MR. RUSTE:

Certainly, as ministers and as legislators in this province, I think we have the duty to assess marketing legislation, marketing procedures, and so on, from year to year. I would like to remind the hon. members of this Assembly of The Alberta Products Marketing Act that was brought into this Legislature several years ago, that has been amended from time to time, and I submit that amendments will be needed from time to time as time goes on. Certainly this provided for the setting up of the Marketing Council, and as the ministers announced, they are going to broaden the base of that, with producers and with people who are consumers as well. I think this is all to the good; I think these are steps that are progressively going along.

He mentioned also the Cattle Commission and the work that it is doing. I might just suggest to him that it was established under the previous administration as well. I might mention also that he mentioned the work in close liaison with the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce -- who at that time, was the hon. Minister of Industry and Tourism -- and remind him of the Agricultural Industry Conference that was held in Calgary that also led, and is leading, to other steps being taken.

I think that the hon. minister has admitted in some of the statements he has made that it is not an easy process, and I agree with him. Certainly, we as agricultural producers, whether it be in grain, whether it be in livestock, whether it be in eggs, or in any other fields you might want to take -- if we were in a position to apply all the techniques that we have -- and I am talking just about grain alone -- if a person wanted to fertilize to the maximum extent, we could produce a lot more than we are doing today. But I think that those of us who are actual operators assess this, and say, "where is our market for it?" And we govern our input based on that. So in speaking to the amendment as such, this is all that I want to say, in that I think it is evading the issue of the original motion to move this amendment. I would concur with the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview in that, if he had added to it, I would have gone along with it wholeheartedly.

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Chairman, I have a few thoughts that I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. members this afternoon on this amendment, which I can give full support to, as I could to the motion. I can't see too much wrong with it. I wish to congratulate the hon. minister and his grasp of the ills and the problems Alberta has been faced with in primary

Industry marketing, one of our major industries in the province, has been all my life our major concern, and in the past we have not known how to cope with it as a province -- how far we could go -- and I appreciate the enthusiasm and the attack that the minister has made on this. However, as the senior government have been so lax in the past and has disturbed all of us -- and we have cried continually with respect to their attitude towards marketing, thinking that they were totally responsible for all of Canada -- we are encouraged with the hope that we can help ourselves. My mother used to say to me that God helps those who help themselves, but God help you if you get caught helping yourself.

If we develop markets for our agriculture -- greater than we have known in the past -- I am sure that the small producer will be taken care of better than he ever has in the past. I appreciate the

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-45

minister's enthusiasm, as I have mentioned, and hope for a solution to Alberta's agricultural problem.

Speaking of market, we have a market in Alberta, and I welcome the opportunity to bring it to your attention, perhaps it is not new. Furthermore, it is a market in Alberta being supplied by farm organizations, 2,000 or more miles away from here. I am speaking of our off-season market for fresh vegetables which cannot compare in quality with Alberta-grown produce. We pass up our own produce as soon as they appear on the shelves of the supermarkets in bins; we pass ours up to buy those, and honestly, there is no comparison, even off-season, between a carrot that is grown in Alberta and one that is grown in California. There is nothing to it; it is just like eating something without a taste.

In this great province we have an abundance of water, fertile soil, cheap fuel, fertilizer plants, as well as heat being dissipated into our waters to the point of a nuisance -- so much so that we have set up an industry here for our Minister of the Environment, and he will spend much of his time declaring values of heat in these waters. It could be reused by conducting the same heat -- which is being dissipated -- into a series of greenhouses to provide off-season needs for the province, and perhaps more than we would ever need. Perhaps in time we could supply all western Canada, and nobody, to my knowledge, is looking at this, or if they have, they are keeping it to themselves.

I was impressed in the May issue -- I can't remember whether it was in '71 or '70 -- of the Geographic Magazine which told of the Guernsey and the Jersey Islands in the English Channel, and I believe one of those islands has 1100 acres under glass. I'm sure they haven't the facilities. I imagine they have a water problem, perhaps they have a better year-around climate than we have, but they haven't the heat, that is the thing that struck me when I read this article, they don't have the heat that we are just dissipating into the air or into the water to the point where it is a nuisance. I think that here is an area that we should be doing some research on, and setting it up perhaps in various areas, especially in the areas where they're knowledgeable of row crop farming. They showed pictures in this Geographic Magazine of even growing fruit in these greenhouses. The vines were larger than your thumb, and they were trained to go right up in the air so that the caretakers could walk through the centre of the rows that were pruned so that the fruit was hanging down. It is interesting to know that early in April of every year . . . [laughter and interjections] . . . yes, it's just like a Garden of Eden -- those islands supply fresh vegetables to the British market, and I never knew that before. New potatoes are supplied in early April every year to the British market, some of them to the US market, and flowers in abundance to both the British and the US market in the early spring.

So I feel that here is a situation where we're just wasting our time spending millions of dollars -- on what was it that came out in the paper last fall; the announcement of a 5% increase. Just as soon as the first vegetables from California started to move in here the cost of living jumped several points. This is something that we should be concerned about. We talk about markets. Here is a market that is just waiting for us to shut off the border and supply ourselves. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, the amendment is very nice and I plan to support it, but it's not really pulling the wool over anybody's eyes. It simply means that the government is not prepared to put a statutory obligation in legislation guaranteeing a fair share of the Alberta market to the small producer. That's really what it means. The government is not prepared to put its legislation where its mouth is.

41-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

This is rather sad. I plan to support the amendment, but it's not fooling anybody, and I hope it does do some good.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, this is my chance to get in another dig at the meddlers. This substitute motion is really an invitation to the government to do some more meddling that won't do any good. I propose to tell you why. If it could be done, probably the hon. minister could do it. I am very happy with the thrust that he is making. But this amendment reminds me of the petition after the first World War that got 400,000 names to shorten the long road to Tipperary.

It doesn't leave any option; it simply says that the government will take all necessary steps to ensure marketing opportunities for all agricultural products. Now when you say, "shall take all necessary steps" and when you say, "opportunity" you leave the whole field open. Do you mean that the government will, if necessary, arrange trades for goods from other countries? That is one way of doing it. In the next breath we say we want to encourage secondary industry here and then we realize that the agricultural products must, in the main, be sold to those countries who have nothing to offer in return but the manufactured products which we think we ought to be manufacturing here. That's one way of doing it.

Another way of doing it -- and it's been pushed on the governments time and again -- is for the governments to buy up all the stuff. Now if they buy it up what do they do with it? I'm old enough to remember that in the United States they dyed train loads of potatoes with a purple dye, dumped them out in the fields and ran Caterpillars over them. Yet there were people looking for potatoes and there was a howl that could be heard clear to Canada about destroying food in the face of hunger. That's another way of doing it.

There are still some other ways, and they are to recognize that in agriculture we have to be competitive. Many of the products which we are asking the hon. minister and the government to take all steps to provide a market for -- our perishable products -- they can't be kept, they have to be traded or sold very quickly. Yet there is competitive production this world over. The federal government tried to reduce the wheat surplus. They spent a million dollars in Alberta just policing it to see that we did plant the hay we said we would plant. It would have been so easy to simply tell us; "we'll only buy so much wheat from each producer," and we would have made the same adjustment.

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things a government has to recognize is that if you think you can provide a market for all the agricultural products at a paying price, then truly you can shorten the long road to Tipperary. It would be just as easy. What do you do with this stuff? If you provide a market today for all the agricultural products which are offered, what will the farmer do next? On our own farm we're twisting all the time. How are we going to get rid of the barley? Shall we buy some more feeders? Shall we go in the hog business? Just when we go in so does everybody else, and we lose a few thousand dollars the first year. We might just as well have made beer out of the barley and poured it down the gopher holes. Maybe an intoxicated gopher would eat less than a sober one -- who knows?

My point is, we're in a competitive market and the wisest thing we can do in agriculture, as in anything else, is to realize that we have to produce those things which we can produce cheaper than anybody else in the competitive field. We then have to know that the prices will have to be competitive. But what happens? We can demonstrate, for instance, that in southern Alberta we can produce

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-47

alfalfa cheaper than anywhere on this continent. Our lands are right. But where do we market the stuff? Well we can market it if we can compete, and one of the ways of competing, of course, is to put in into dairy products where there is a market. These are some of the things we can do.

Now when we begin to take these steps, let's keep in mind that most of them are going to cost the taxpayer money. How long will the fellow who is not in agriculture be willing to pay subsidies year after year? I have some experience with the Fruit Marketing Board in British Columbia, and last year in one small orchard I saw 5,000 pounds of pears just dumped because they were culls. If they had been out on our market and offered at \$2.00 a box instead of \$4.60 they would have been gobbled up so fast you couldn't believe it. But they can't do that. So the old question comes back. There was a marketing opportunity at a price that would have been better than nothing; the consumption would have gone up; we would have absorbed them without affecting the other market; but we can't do it because that might affect the price.

Now these are things that this government does have to face. The other is that inflation keeps going. We do nothing about it and if we want to affect these markets, certainly we have got to do something about inflation. If our government, under the hon. minister, could, next year, provide a market opportunity for all the agricultural products in Alberta he may find that the succeeding year he would have to find another market, because the cost would have gone up to the point that our farmers could not produce.

I go back to the theory that you cannot meddle in some things. One or two of the things we could do if we have the nerve, would be to go out and arrange some strictly free-trading areas in the world, say, we will trade you this group of agricultural products on a free-trade basis for certain specified products which those people have. Then we'd find out immediately that we're out of bounds because that's a federal concern. Maybe then we could sell this resolution to the federal government. At least we'd get it off the hon. minister's back -- because I think we're overloading him as it is. It wouldn't be a bad idea.

Now let's look at a few of the suggestions that have been made. The hon. Minister of Highways told us about the screening problems -- he told us that the screenings were just as good as good grain -- I don't know where he got the information because I've tried it and they're not. I don't think they're supposed to be. But let's suppose we take some of the steps we could do. We could put these cleaning plants in local elevator centres. They're not expensive. We could clean all this grain right close to the farm. Maybe that's one of the steps we could take. But we forget there are some dangers. When you feed screenings to livestock the growability of the weed seeds is not usually affected by the digestive system of livestock. The farmer uses the manure on the land and spreads the weeds and the wind blows them around, that's the problem. But we might solve that by putting in some industries which simply process these screenings; pellet them, cook them, otherwise affect them; that might be a wise thing to do.

There are some other things we could do. We don't know yet whether we could make truck-trains profitable. I submit maybe we could. Maybe if the governments were to build highways which could carry 25 ton loads we'd find that trucks could take four trailers -- one unit -- and you do just like the CPR; when you get to the steep hills you simply hook another power unit on the front and you take them over the top. They are all brake-equipped for the downhill. Now these, perhaps, could drive right over the top of the ships and dump the grain more easily. At the same time you would solve one of your problems of getting grain from country elevators where the railroads don't want to operate.

41-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

There are things we can do. I think the most important thing we have to consider, though, is do we want the government, in taking whatever steps are necessary, to find a market? Do we want the government to tax all the people, to subsidize the agricultural industry? The original motion was certainly to my liking. It was saying that if you're going to have agricultural boards to control the market then it ought to be their duty to see that the little producer gets his share of the market.

Again I submit it will fail in the end because of the competition. You either have to put embargos on products from outside, or you're going to develop surpluses again. But, be that as it may, the original motion had a point. The amendment, which I submit is really a new motion, simply asks the government to do something that it cannot do. I submit that again it's meddling of the kind that I mentioned early in this session, and that the end of such meddling will not be to the advantage of the primary producer or the consumer. Thank you.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I move we adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

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

* * * * *

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-49

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. government House Leader moves that the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of Supply for consideration of the estimates. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair.]

Department of Health and Social Development (cont.)

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of Supply will come to order.

Appropriation 2512 Public Assistance - Basic Assistance

Transportation

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. minister would tell us if this transportation is transportation for people in the department or transportation for recipients, and what type of transportation? It seems like a very high sum of money.

MR. CRAWFORD:

I'm going to presume, Mr. Chairman, that that is transportation of workers in the department. I will just check my notes on that.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have that information available right now to answer that question. I can obtain that and provide it.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

In the public assistance area, has a directive gone out to all the unemployed employables of the department that they are to terminate their assistance, or that they are to find employment?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I missed part of the question. Directives to the recipients?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Do you want to repeat that, Mr. Speaker?

41-50

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

MR. R. SPEAKER:

What I was asking the hon. minister -- has any directive gone out to the unemployed employables at this time, that they are to go out and seek employment? That is the number one question; number two, has any directive gone from yourself, as minister, to the social workers saying that they are to place a primary emphasis on employment placement?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I have encouraged the people in the employment opportunities program in their work. No directive as such has gone out to them, and no policy exists in relation to requiring at the present time the unemployed employables to seek employment. However, I think I might forecast that depending upon the views received from members of the Legislature and from the public after the publication of a Position Paper later this year, that sort of approach is one of the options that I think would likely arise, and I would be interested in seeing what the feelings are generally in respect to that sort of thing.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Chairman, there is shown a 4.4 per cent increase in the cost of assistance. Is there some kind of scheduled increase in various kinds of assistance, or just to what is this attributable?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the cost of assistance as opposed to the volume of caseload -- I know the hon. member will have noted the volume, of course -- would just indicate that many more people. The cost of assistance relates to things like the adjustment that was made earlier this calendar year for cost-of-living adjustment for recipients, and that, of course, has to be budgeted for for the entire year in the coming fiscal year.

MR. BENOIT:

Just before we leave this vote, I wonder if the minister has the figures there with regard to the grant, as to how much of the grant is given for unemployed employables, and how much is for all the rest.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I don't have a breakdown of the amount that is paid to unemployed employables, but the percentages that have been calculated by the department are, as to the number of recipients, the unemployed employables are in the neighbourhood of 11 per cent to 15 per cent of the total.

MR. BENOIT:

The reason I raised the question, Mr. Chairman, is because very often we'd like to see this vote substantially decreased, but there's a lot of it that can't be decreased because of the type of people -- widows, orphans and this sort of thing -- that can't be diminished.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

I have one question further to my other. What programs has the government initiated over and above the employment opportunity program that we initiated in the last fiscal year, for employment of welfare recipients?

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-51

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I think I should begin by saying that I rather like the idea of the employment opportunities program itself, and thought that it was well conceived and that it holds forth quite a lot of hope for improvement in the situation. In a smaller way the sort of program that I'd like to see developed also, and has been developed in recent months, was the one in regard to employment of people over 45. I must say that, although it's only experimental at the present time, and is intended to run for approximately three months as an experiment, if that experiment is successful, we hope to expand that program perhaps on a slightly different basis than the experiment is being run. Apart from that, the sort of incentive to work that there may be, of course, to the person who is an unemployed employable, cuts across the whole area of the employment program of last winter which was instituted not through this department but by the government as a whole, and related to the advancing of educational opportunities. I suppose the programming there would be correctly viewed as an expansion of educational opportunities. I think apart from that, real adjustments to that area would wait upon reactions to the paper that I hope to publish in regard to public assistance later in the year.

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the minister if he's ever given any consideration to employment within the local government sector for these unemployed employables? It seems to me that where there's work to be done with regard to hospitals, grounds, changing storm windows, and there are numerous areas where people like this could be used, when there aren't job opportunities for gainful employment. I was just wondering if the department has ever given any thought to jobs or invited local governments to suggest jobs for these people who are employable and yet receiving social assistance.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, this is a difficult area to judge. It's certainly very tempting to conceive of a requirement that the person who is receiving aid at public expense might reimburse his fellow citizens in some way for what they are doing to help him, and in that sense to look after public areas and so on, in the manner described. At the same time, this sort of thinking has been abroad, I think, sufficiently long, in the hands of enough government planning departments in various parts of the North American continent, that the evidence so far, I'm afraid seems to me to be that when attempted, it's not all that successful. Having stated the two sides of it in that way is the reason why I say it's a very difficult matter to judge. I don't mind going beyond that, though, and saying that I think the majority of the population would understand if an attempt were made to promote work to some extent among the people who are receiving the benefit of the support by their fellow citizens.

I don't like to defer every proposal that comes forward by referring to the reactions that I hope to receive to the paper on public assistance later in the year. But once again I think I get a very much broader feeling of both sides of the question if we do wait for public reaction. I sincerely hope we do get public reaction on points such as have been mentioned when the public assistance paper is made public.

Mr. Chairman, while I am on my feet -- I have the answer to the question of the hon. Member for Drumheller, a moment ago. The answer is that that Appropriation No. 2512 is for the transportation of recipients only.

41-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

MR. HANSEN:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. minister could tell us where such a difference comes under Other Expenses. There is a \$254,000 less this year than last year.

MR. CRAWFORD:

I hope I can find that, Mr. Chairman. I don't want to speculate entirely, but it is probably just a change in classifications. The overall budget, of course, has gone up by almost 10%. Unless the entries under last year's estimates were precisely the same in all seven classifications, there would be no reason to suppose that the other expenses are not varied simply because of the changes in the other ones. But, once again, I will be glad to get that information for the hon. member.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, is it the intention of the hon. minister to continue the utilization of the citizen participation committees? Is it his intention during the coming year to expand the use of those community level citizen committees?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Is the hon. member speaking of the advisory appeal type of committee? Very much so, Mr. Chairman. I wondered at first about such a concept when I heard of it a year or so ago -- wondering if there might not be sometimes more emotional or impassioned reactions to a recipient by his neighbours than would be by the relatively detached departmental workers. But on reflection I do think the community has a part to play in that sort of thing. It is my hope that they are used to the full extent.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. minister any type of information or detail as to what has occurred in the past year since we implemented the use of those committees? How many cases have they dealt with? Have they been successful? Have they found any abusive welfare? Has the hon. minister got any recommendations from the committee as to changes in the act, or changes that should be made? Those were the primary functions of the committee.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, there hasn't been enough time to assess that sort of data yet. The answer is that there is no feedback in an organized way; no proper canvas of the findings of the citizen groups has yet been done. I think they have, in fact, been operating really in most cases, only since last summer and some have not begun to operate, so it is still an area that I think deserves a careful analysis, but it is not possible to have completed at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well. Yes Mr. Farran.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. minister to statistics which are contained in the book, "Poverty In Canada", which was a report by the special senate committee on poverty. On page 69 of the book it gives the following figures as of December, 1970 for welfare payments in various provinces in Canada.

Alberta is far and away the highest. It starts with Newfoundland \$230 a month. This is on a basis of a family of four, two parents and two children. Prince Edward Island, \$244 a month;

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-53

Nova Scotia, \$263 a month; New Brunswick, \$187.66 a month; Quebec, \$218 a month; Ontario, \$271 a month; Manitoba, \$246.10 a month; Saskatchewan, \$215.15 a month; and Alberta, \$335 a month; British Columbia, \$211 a month.

Now there's absolutely no doubt from these statistics that Alberta leads the field as the welfare state in Canada. You want to stack this up when you talk about incentives for people to work, with the present minimum wage of \$1.55 an hour, which is about \$62 a week, or perhaps multiplying that by four, \$248-\$260 per month, allowing for the occasional five-week month. So, with the minimum wage being so far behind the basic welfare level, how can anybody in his right mind talk about incentives to get people off the welfare roll? How can it be that the scale in Alberta can be as high as 33 1/3 per cent higher than British Columbia? I just draw this to the attention of the hon. minister because everybody is concerned about rising costs of welfare. There's no doubt in my mind at all that this is the number one welfare state, and that it's gone farther than anywhere you can think of in the western world -- in Alberta, right here at home.

Other Expenses

MR. LUDWIG:

Is the hon. member who just spoke making a motion that this government now reduce the whole thing?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

No, he just brought it to the attention of the hon. minister.

MR. LUDWIG:

I was asking because his criticising is being applauded. Why doesn't his government do something about it -- they did a lot of criticising. Or can't they? Are their hands tied?

Appropriation 2512, agreed to \$70,254,500

Agreed to without debate:

Appropriation 2513 Public Assistance - Municipalities \$8,107,600

Appropriation 2514 Public Assistance - Improvement
Districts and Special Areas

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder why this is 20 per cent. Don't we pay 80% of the welfare costs in I.D.'s, the same as we do in municipalities?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I don't understand the question. I know the normal share is 80-20. Where does the hon. member see 20 per cent in 2514?

MR. TAYLOR:

2514 applies to the government commitment of 20 per cent of welfare costs in unorganized areas.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the answer to that is under the province's own appropriation the 80 per cent is paid, and where there is no organized municipality, and there is, in fact, an improvement

41-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

district where the province, in the shoes of the minister of municipal affairs, is really in the same position as the municipal government would have been, then the 20 per cent is paid by the province in any event. It's gone down slightly because some of the tests of residency have been changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Notley?

MR. NOTLEY:

I just was curious about why they've gone down, and the hon. minister has answered my question.

Appropriation 2514 total agreed to \$ 71,200

Appropriation 2515 Public Assistance - Agency Grants

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Could I ask a question, and this question refers to all of the public assistance votes prior to this one, too. Is it the intention of the hon. minister and the government to decrease the gross number of payments into public assistance through various techniques this year. And is it the intention in the 1973-74 budget to have a lower amount of public assistance paid than is being paid in this particular fiscal year?

Mr. Chairman, I think that knowing that economic conditions change, knowing that we have variable programs in the federal area which sometimes have a beneficial effect on the amount of public assistance that has to be paid and perhaps sometimes otherwise, and knowing that we have the normal volume increase of a growing population and therefore perhaps a slightly higher number in each year of people who require some form of assistance, I would say that what we're looking for is rather a control of the escalation, even a control per capita. But to forecast that it's likely that we will be spending less, say in another year, I can't consider that to be very likely.

Appropriation 2515, agreed to \$ 807,500

Appropriation 2532 Preventive Social Services
Administration

MR. DOAN:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister if there is any way of measuring how successful these preventive measures are in preventing social problems? How do you measure them?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member hasn't asked me anything yet I think he was probably saving this one up because it's a real dandy.

The difficulty of evaluating a program which is intended to be preventive is, of course, very great. I think the short answer to the question is that no precise evaluation is done of these programs. No reliable way of evaluating them has been put forward that I know of. The programs are in their infancy; they are meant to be experimental, they are meant to be observed as experiments and judgments made on them to the best of the ability of the people involved, which as the hon. member should know, are both local people in the communities and of course the departmental people who work with them from time to time. I would say that the judgments that are

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-55

made are not made on the basis of hard data, but more on what the results might apparently be.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether it's proper for me always to give this gratuitous advice to the hon. minister but I just want to draw his attention to the appearance on the scene of another money-eating monster in the welfare field which is just beginning to grow in my own constituency. That is the area of day care centres. I have just drawn the attention of the minister to the fact that a family of four on welfare in Alberta gets \$335 a month compared with the same family in British Columbia getting \$211. Well perhaps one of the reasons for this very heavy welfare scale in Alberta is that we have, indeed, a very high cost of living here. Many of the essentials for a family are imported at high costs and we all know how much people in western Canada resent the fact that things we produce have to be sold on an open market, and everything we buy is tariff protected in the interests perhaps of manufacturers and so on in eastern Canada.

But this next pressure derives also in part from the very high cost of living. The theory put forward is that working mothers have to work in order to make ends meet for a family because of the high cost of living. Hand in hand with that proposition goes the argument that you must have day care centres to look after the children of deserted wives, and thus get the deserted wives off the welfare roll. If this was to be just on the basis of the privately operated day care centres getting a subsidy for needy children -- the children of needy families -- on a case-by-case basis, similar to the system presently used in nursing homes, I don't think I would have too much quarrel. But what is happening under the guise of preventive welfare is that government-operated day care centres are becoming more and more numerous. We already have three in the city of Calgary, operated 100 per cent by government, with all the normal attachments of the so-called experts who feed off the poor, the social workers, the guidance counsellors, the child education experts. The bulk of the money, of course, goes towards these sorts of people. There's a proposition that nobody should be allowed to run a day care centre anymore unless they've had a two-year course at a junior college. This proposition is now being put forward that standards will be extremely high and, of course, the costs again will be high because we are building up yet another establishment.

The comparison of costs between the privately-operated ones and the government-operated ones is absolutely alarming. And of course there won't be enough money to go around to satisfy the need if this route is taken. For the need may be great, perhaps not as great as some people think, but the need is quite widespread. If all the money goes into these empires run by the bureaucrats there can never be enough to satisfy even a modest amount. So I would urge the hon. minister to call to a halt the expansion of day care centres until he's had a chance to have a really good look at it. Because given a free rein, as they're being given at the moment, I can see in two years the Preventive Welfare budget being as big as the Social Assistance budget. Just gratuitous advice but I'm drawing your attention to it.

Appropriation 2532 total agreed to \$ 104,060

Appropriation 2533 Preventive Social Service Projects

MR. R. SPEAKER:

I would like to ask the hon. minister a question on prevention; one of the things we felt should happen, after the amalgamation of the department, was that Preventive Social Services and Preventive Health at the local level should be amalgamated and brought together

41-56

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

or co-ordinated through some means. We recognized that the two programs at the present time, or a year ago, were run as two separate entities and at times one didn't know what the other was doing and there were projects that just weren't integrated as well as they should have been.

One of the things we were looking at was integrating the Preventive Social Services with Preventive Health, not only here at the central level -- the departmental level -- but also at the regional level. And I still feel there is a lot of merit in that approach. We saw that there were certain trade-offs that would have to occur with other social development or health services and re-arrangement possibly of funding, but it was a practical and a possible thing to do.

So my question to the hon. minister is, how does he see it at this time, and has he some plans to do that in the coming year?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Minister?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Chairman, most of the Preventive Social Service programs, being largely experimental in nature in the communities where they're being tried, don't lend themselves to an establishment style of integration at the present time. I suppose it's possible in, say, doing dental checks or doing some type of assessments for early learning disabilities, or something like that, with pre-school age children that it could be merged with the program on day care. I think that's the sort of thing that is possible.

The hon. member's question related to whether or not this had been undertaken as at the present time. The answer is that it has not been and I think that, as a matter of programming, it would be something that would evolve when the preventive programs are more firmly rooted and when more experience has been had with the merging together of Health and Social Development programs.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise a question in connection with that, as to whether this is done only for people who are on social allowance, or whether this money is available for communities which are sponsoring Headstart or Homemaker groups as well?

MR. CRAWFORD:

It's available generally, Mr. Chairman. Even the day care program which was used as an example a moment ago isn't limited to people who are on some form of assistance. The normal type of application is made by a municipality, with, you might say, the seal of approval of the municipal government at that point, and then acceptance or not by the department. If the municipality chooses to move in such way that a voluntary association which is approached should carry the same application once again with the approval of the municipality, that, too, is an acceptable approach, and it need only qualify in the sense that it's an experimental preventive community type program.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Chairman, just a short question to the hon. minister regarding these day care centres. Personally I have gone on record as being opposed to them -- I just don't think we should be in them at all. Nevertheless having said that, do you know about how many

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-57

government-sponsored day care centres there are in the province? And do you feel totally committed to this program to carry on with it?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I don't have the number of government-sponsored ones in the province. If I'm not mistaken, with perhaps one exception, they are all in the cities of Calgary and Edmonton. And the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill mentioned there were three in Calgary. I believe there are two, perhaps three in Edmonton. Although admittedly it is intended that there will be more, the numbers involved would not be large. There might have to be perhaps two added in the province this year.

Now, as to whether or not we are firmly committed to this type of day care program, I think I would call it a moderate priority. Whether or not precisely the way it is being handled at the present time is the absolute end as to the way it is done is another matter. If it can be operated in some way where the quality of the work that's done there can be assured and the same time effect some cost-saving based on the contribution made by the province and by the municipality to these programs, well then that would be desirable. But I think, where they do exist, they are serving, not just the convenience of people who utilize them, but something that would at least be approaching actual need in the areas that they serve.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Do you expect that there will be more? I think you said in Calgary? Why? Are people asking for them, or are you imposing them on people? I mean, I really think you're pushing this onto the public.

MR. CRAWFORD:

No. I can explain that one very easily, Mr. Chairman. I'm afraid we're going to be turning down quite a few just because, as I called it a moderate priority, there isn't enough money to go around. If the hon. member could see the way my door is beaten down by people who want such things, well then I think he would have his answer. Although I support the concept to the extent that it exists at the present time, and I can foresee a cautious expansion of it over a period of time, I won't try to be so agreeable as to conceal that view from the hon. member because I do know his feelings on this, which he has expressed before. But it is, in fact a moderate priority, and I think we will see expansion there. The expansion will be, I would think, just what the government is able to balance out of a fairly substantial demand, and, of course, the limited resources available to fulfill demands of any sort.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Minister, with respect to this vote. Is it necessary for the municipality to have the formal agreement with respect to Preventive Social Services? I mean the elaborate set-up -- is it necessary to have that? Then I can say to the hon. minister that in many places in the smaller rural areas, they do have kindergartens and day-care centres which are being funded by local means, using various buildings and so on and so forth, providing a very excellent service. The community whose people are using the services are paying for them themselves.

MR. CRAWFORD:

I maybe shouldn't be reacting to each point, one at a time, Mr. Chairman.

41-58

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Fine, Mr. Miller.

MR. CRAWFORD:

I would like to react to that in a moment.

MR. D. MILLER:

It was on the same subject, Mr. Chairman. I must speak in favour of day care centres as far as my constituency is concerned, relative to the sugar beet growing area. The native people come in there with their families, and this certainly has provided a great help to these children, where many of the parents work, where one or two of them will attend the day care centre with officers who are there. They are nice clean quarters and children are taken care of and taught various things while they are there. I am satisfied that it has certainly been an aid these last few years to this area. It is a place where the native people can go and there is a place for adults as well. But there are separate rooms for the children where they can be taught and entertained instead of just running loose on the streets or out on the farm sometimes, where you see them. Without these day-care centres they would just be with a small covering over them, like a small tent, and just lying around there most of the day while their parents are working. I have that much to say in favour of them because I know they are surely appreciated. With this working out of the health unit in the Barron Eureka Health Centre, I must say too that the Preventive Social Services are really working well there, with respect to the director and the assistant director. They are older men, as I have explained to the hon. minister before, and they do a lot of family counselling, holding people together and discouraging people from applying for social assistance. They take a sort of fatherly attitude to it, and also with people who are unemployed employables. I could tell you stories of numerous people they've relayed to me, where young men weren't too anxious to take work. They would sooner just loaf around the town, play pool, and go in the beer parlours. One of these social workers, the director, would call a certain one in and say he would only give him so many days to take a certain job that he had lined up for him. If he didn't take it, he was recommending his assistance would be cut off. I feel that these kinds of men, these kinds of workers are a real asset to the organization and they work out of the Barron Eureka Health Centre. But the family counselling idea, I feel we should be doing more on that, because there seems to be a general attitude growing where one of the parents is on social assistance, they get the idea that they will agree to disagree and split up. These situations come to the front where a conscientious social worker will take time to talk to them separately and then bring them both in together and finally let them know that, in no way, can they split up and receive social assistance under those circumstances.

MR. BARTON:

I would like to ask a few questions on this particular appropriation. How many communities in the north have taken advantage of the Preventive Social Service project? Do you know of any isolated communities?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of communities in the north that have become part of a Preventive Social Service district, but just how many it is and how many individual communities it involves, I would have to say to the hon. member that I would be glad to go over the map with him and give him that information.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-59

MR. BARTON:

Could I follow up? I think there is a specific problem in this type of cost-sharing in northern communities, especially in Metis colonies and small towns. For instance, when this program was first initiated, our community looked into it very closely, but it meant a 20 per cent increase for hiring an administrator, \$6 on each ratepayer. So I think that actual formula, in this case, for northern communities is sort of discriminatory.

I think that in the area where it's needed, it's needed totally, 100 per cent participation, because the resource isn't there for them to pay for it. Do you follow my thinking? I can see where this is typically to the advantage of the city of Edmonton or Calgary or any larger centres, or organized area. But in our case, we have three communities that are carrying the administrator. The ID contributes a little bit, but we actually can't get the scope of the projects into the assessment of the communities because it's out of our reach. So I was wondering if your department had any revisions towards the north, to look at this on a little more community type basis and maybe have 100 per cent financing for administration -- at least for the director?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I can say that no consideration has been given to that up until the present time. It is a matter that I'll be pleased to discuss with the hon. member and with the hon. Mr. Adair, and give whatever consideration should be given to it.

Mr. Chairman, while I'm on my feet, I just wanted to say to the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen that he was the only one that I hadn't responded to directly and I take no exception at all to his remarks in regard to private day care. I want it understood that in my view the private day care operators do make an enormous contribution, and I think the vast majority of day care is still done on that basis everywhere in the province, but it's just not possible in some situations to have that particular service available to all at the cost that it is.

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the minister if there is any assessment of Preventive Social Service programs, and by whom the assessment is being done?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the hon. member was out when I answered that question for the hon. Member for Innisfail, but I did indicate that actual assessment on a hard-fact basis, I suggest, is not really possible. Therefore, not being possible, it isn't done, as such. The sort of judgment that's made, is based on the presumption that the program is experimental in nature and both the evolution of the program and the apparent results are judged to the best of the ability of the people involved in them, but they are flexible programs and to judge them and evaluate them clinically, or anything approaching that, is not possible.

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Chairman, relative to the assessment by the people working in them, don't you feel that anybody working within a program is going to have glowing reports about his program, and that it's not really an assessment of the program itself. Maybe this one is a poor one to pick on, but this reasoning can be carried right through most government programs where there should be some assessment of a program. Because when you ask the people who work on a program, you'll never get somebody coming to you and saying, "Well, you know, that program is no good." That's like cutting his own throat,

41-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

because he's going to be cut of a job probably, or he'll have to move someplace else. What I'm suggesting is that some of these programs should have some clinical assessment of some type to see whether they are giving results, or whether we're just throwing money in the old proverbial bottomless bucket. The people who are working in them are getting paid, and maybe there are no recipients in the long run, or they may not be getting any benefits. Possibly, if I may suggest it, this may be an area where somebody -- and it's probably pretty hard to get somebody that's independent and completely unbiased -- should look at these programs, but I suggest that this is one area where I feel that a task force of MLA's could certainly assess this, and maybe leave out the MLA whose area it's being done in.

MR. DRAIN:

You know, what I would like to know about Preventive Social Services is, under what criteria of instruction do these people work? What are they precisely expected to do? Referring to my own particular area, and I'm looking back at the past, and looking at the present. We have kindergarten. Now, I went to kindergarten 50 years ago. Time runs on. Nevertheless, all my kids went to kindergarten and private kindergarten, so this is general in the Crownsnest Pass. In no way was the government involved. Then we get a preventative social service arrangement with the various municipalities, so now we have kindergarten. The point I am trying to make here -- should the government be all things to all people, or should people have the opportunity of doing some things for themselves? This is one particular area.

The other area that we find Preventive Social Services involved in in our area -- and it does generate a certain amount of useful assistance -- is working with senior citizens. I suppose it basically establishes a communication medium between the senior citizens and the government services that are available to them. These are apparently all the results that I have seen thus far. These intangibles may be quite valuable. I had the impression that preventative social services meant precisely that. But this, evidently, is not what it means. If there is a social problem, you go to a social worker, who is a psychologist or a family counsellor, so then you go into a different area altogether.

I would certainly like to know exactly the format of what these people are supposed to do, if anybody knows this.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I suppose a relatively general treatment now might be given this subject, adding some detail to what I have already said. I hope that all hon. members understand that the initiative comes from the local level. To me, this is one of the important aspects of it. I think some of the figures that might be of interest to hon. members would be these. For example, the day care projects occupy about 26 per cent of the budget. This is on the figures that are calculated as being the figures as at March 31, 1972 for the last fiscal year. Just about as large a percentage -- 22.8 per cent is in family service and counselling -- a long-standing type of service in some communities, but not available in others from the private sector, particularly the smaller communities. 15.6 per cent of the cost relates to various committees. We have the homemaker's program. We have the head start program, the parent-child development programs. We have mental health consultation service. Some small percentage -- less than 1 per cent -- is made available for youth hostels and drug information. About 3 per cent for drop-in centres. Again, around 1 per cent for each of the volunteer bureaus, family planning clinics, and boys' clubs. Meals on Wheels occupy less than 1 per cent. There is a program in Calgary that is supported, and I believe there is one in Lloydminster. I may be mistaken in the name

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-61

of the community. It is in one of the communities outside of the metropolitan areas.

I think there is, therefore, perhaps a wider range to this type of program than some hon. members may have appreciated. It is so easy to fall into a discussion of something like day care, because it is there; it is a big one, and it is well known. I think we have all used a day care centre on occasion. I am unlike the hon. gentleman, not sure if I was at kindergarten, but certainly, I have used day care centres in recent years, in the sense of the privately-operated babysitting services from time to time as required. Most people I know have.

Just in concluding this general sort of semi-statistical reply, I think the really important thing is to grasp the extent of citizen involvement at the community level. Here I think I am speaking to both the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray and the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, 23,000 people have been involved to the extent of more than 5 million hours in the last fiscal year in regard to Preventive Social Service programs. Some view might therefore be had of just how far the citizens' groups are participating with some support. These things aren't paid for totally, of course, by the province, even as to the 80 per cent. What the 80 per cent is, is financing the deficit. In a day care centre, there's income, of course, from the people who use the service. It's usually scaled as to ability to pay. In the family counselling areas there is income from interviews -- once again, very often scaled as to ability to pay, with usually a \$5 basic referral fee and with enough referrals it does add up. Some groups who are involved in some way, like Meals on Wheels, all of their help is volunteer. Maybe some of these 25,000 people and some of these 5 million hours just aren't paid for by anybody except the volunteer in giving of his time and his effort.

I don't want to paint too idealistic or glowing a picture of an area where I think that we're still perhaps faltering to some extent, and perhaps will continue to, but it does seem to me that where you can bring in volunteer involvement to that extent, it's worth staying with it for a while and seeing what might be developed. In any evaluation and any appraisal of what's being achieved, I think it is not just as simple as to say that the people involved are definitely going to give it an A-OK and fool the rest of us. I don't think that happens. There are too many people using the service. They know whether they're getting good service or not. Too many volunteers that aren't getting out of it, and won't allow themselves to be fooled for ever on the value of what they're doing, and there's generally too much exposure to the community, for all gross errors in evaluation, to last for very long. So, as I say, I think the area is one where we may be feeling our way, to some extent, but that that process should continue.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, I can certainly agree with the minister, and I watched with envy for a number of years the preventative social services located partly in my constituency, the County of Leduc and the town of Leduc, and the valuable services that this group renders -- the total involvement of all the citizens in the community -- I think for the dollars that are invested in the director of this preventative social service and the counselling service that it provides -- if we can save perhaps one or two families from breaking up, and I've seen this happen, and in the community -- I've seen the director come over to the other side and involve people in my town, and he has produced remarkable results in the field of preventative social services. If we can save some of the families that are now bordering on the point of breaking up, we will have certainly saved some of the monies that are appropriated in Appropriation 1225 that I criticized yesterday. To me, this department really makes sense, because this is the department where we can salvage people before a

41-62

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

wreck occurs. If we can just bring some of the younger people who need counselling at times, professional counselling, and if we can get the total involvement of the community -- in my town we have the total church groups which are united in one group. This was made possible by the director from the preventive social group in the town of Leduc and the county of Leduc. I think this has been in effect now for three years, and if you've seen it work I think the appropriation, rather than being what it is, should be at least twice that much and we could get out of the mess that we are in right now. The \$70 million that we are spending could be partially saved if we tried to prevent something before it actually happens.

MR. NOTLEY:

I would just like to make two very quick observations to follow up on the points made by the hon. member for Drayton Valley. He has made some excellent points. The money we spend on preventive social services is very wisely spent. It's the kind of expenditure, Mr. Chairman, which can, in the long run, save us money on our total welfare expenditures. My concern too is that we perhaps aren't spending quite enough. I know that there's a 22.8% increase, but this still leaves us at only \$3.1 million and I personally feel that when you consider the various projects which would qualify under Preventive Social Service that we could spend considerably more than that. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that as the hon. minister assesses the priorities of the government in the months ahead that next year we can look forward to a substantial increase in this Preventive Social Service budget, because I think this is obviously the route we have to take and I certainly feel that our modest increase this year is worthwhile, but next year let's hope to do a little better.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I have two questions. The \$800,000 that has been added to this particular vote -- is that to go to programs that are on an ongoing basis at the present time? If not, how much of the money will go to new programs that have been initiated at the community level? Number two, with the \$800,000 increase in this appropriation, in what appropriations would one find a corresponding decrease? Perhaps I should place a third question. In light of the remarks of the members of the Assembly, what area of your responsibility in expenditure would you see decreasing so that you could place a substantial increase in this appropriation?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes, Mr. Minister.

MR. MINIELY:

There is not an \$800,000 increase. You'll notice the level of expenditures last year was \$2.6 million.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Minister.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the increase due to increased costs is \$145,000 -- that's just the increased cost of operating ongoing programs -- the estimated cost of some new municipalities that are on tap to enter would be about another \$50,000. Day care costs and counselling, day care to the extent of about \$300,000 and counselling to the extent of about \$100,000 would make up the balance of \$600,000 which is the increase. So it would be seen -- I suppose what you'd call the volume increase -- would be about \$200,000 and the new programs about \$400,000. Now as to corresponding decrease I know that the hon.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-63

Member for Little Bow isn't asking that with tongue in cheek at all. I know that he knows that although on a strict balance where you achieve a benefit, such as the benefits that some hon. members have expressed their confidence in achieving in programs like this, that if you save someone with a preventive program from going on welfare, that you should be able to take it off some other appropriation as a saving. There are, of course, two aspects to that. One is maybe over a period of time the amount by which the public assistance appropriation would have increased had it not been for the program, would have been eased in some way. The other possibility, and governments are head-over-heels into this in all areas -- by that I mean all geographical areas of the continent at the present time -- is that they are increasing and providing more and more services. So by the simple act of providing an additional service, no matter what the nature of it, you expand cost and may well find that although you're glad to be able to do something that wasn't done before, that it doesn't automatically result in being able to terminate something else.

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Chairman, I think I would be remiss without saying a few words about day care centres. I don't disagree with the concept of day care centres. What I do disagree with is the government involvement in day care centres.

I would personally like to go on record as backing the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill and let the government phase out their part in day care centres and put it back where it should be -- into private enterprise. There are particular cases, naturally, there are welfare cases where possibly with mother and father working they could use the services and we could possibly help out in that particular case.

As for preventive social services. I think as far as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is concerned, as a legislator here, he is out to see how much money he can spend. I'm here to see how much we can get for the money we're spending.

I'd like to also point out that it's pretty easy to put in these services and once you put in these services you're stuck with them and it's awful tough to get them out again.

And as for PSS directors; certainly, over the four years or the number of years they have been working in the province they have bound to have done some good. But I can assure you they're out to look for everything they can do to more or less justify their jobs. And one of the things they are out for right now is advocating government involvement in day care centres. I would like to go on record as not favouring government getting involved in day care centres but to phase out what they have done and put it back where it should be, into private enterprise.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Barton.

MR. BARTON:

I was wondering if the other part in the bottleneck of this system right now is the different year ends between the county's and the town's year end and the government's year end. Where they have to submit a partial proposal -- these are small projects -- they're not ongoing ones, and it creates quite a hardship on the director to try to put it across to some of the people because they just don't understand. I was wondering if there is any flexibility in this? Where it doesn't have to cut off, say, on March 31st? If it's approved on December of, say, 1971 for twelve months it would

41-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

continue on and not cut off and resubmit a budget at the end of March 31st to coincide with the government's budget?

MR. CRAWFORD:

At the present time, Mr. Chairman, I don't think there is any way of approving programs in excess of 12 months. However, I think as a practical matter, if a program is approved for part of a year the community which is asking for it is urged at that time to get a request for their budget in for the following year and the example given by the hon. member -- if it's looked after for the last four months of the fiscal year -- they're urged right then, the time to get their budget in for the following year is right away, and unless the department was able to give them a reasonable assurance that they could carry forward their budget without reduction within the next year and that they were, therefore, part of a program which is now being supported -- unless the government could do that, I don't think the community would go into it and we have been able to give reasonable assurances to the programs that are ongoing.

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Chairman, before we leave this appropriation I'd like to clarify whether there has been some misunderstanding or not. I'm not questioning the philosophy of Preventive Social Services. I think the philosophy is good. What I am questioning and what the hon. minister brought up about all the people being involved -- and this is all very good. These people are involved but they're leaving it to the paid directors and employees to do the assessment and this was my point. Their assessment may not be good -- I know there's a lot of good in it and I can think of lots of it myself -- but I'm just wondering. On some of these programs we should have some hard cold assessing of whether or not they are really performing what we intend them to do.

And in this case if we go by the name of the program it's preventing people from going on public assistance and are they really doing that? Sure they are developing day care centres and maybe looking after some parts there, and I know in my area they have these play schools which are successful, but are they preventing people from going on assistance?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Is that a question? I just wanted to assure the hon. member that I understand his views and certainly have them in mind.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Chairman I just have to make one comment -- it will take exactly 30 seconds. Number one, I completely support the statement that the hon. member stated just now. It is so vital that there is objective evaluation outside the department, and I don't think it's possible for them to evaluate their own work and this is true in every scientific circle and social evaluation also.

The other question I would like to ask the hon. Member for St. Albert is, does he really mean that the government should pull out of day care health completely? Because I don't support that concept in its entirety. I think there are vital needs to be met for government supported day care centres because day care centres have to reach a certain level in standard for all people. Now there are some people who cannot afford it and that is the single parent, whether it is mother or father or because the mother in fact wants to work. But all the day care centres have to be of a certain standard. Now if they can't afford to place these children in these day care centres, I submit that the government must subsidize them, otherwise these children are placed in substandard day care centres, and I

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-65

understand that in Edmonton there are some 1700 spaces needed right now urgently for mothers who have to work.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder, Dr. Paproski, if you and Mr. Jamison could make a decision and then have Dr. McCrimmon share it there.

Yes, Mr. Farran.

MR. FARRAN:

I was going to say that my proposition is just that. That they should be subsidized on a case-by-case basis in private day care centres and the standard should not be set so high that private enterprise can't operate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Before we go on to Appropriation 2535, I had a note passed to me to the good hockey fans here. The final score was Boston 2, New York 1.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

On the hockey game?

MR. WILSON:

No. I wonder if the hon. minister would briefly outline the steps to be followed in the existing adoption procedure.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Chairman, the situation in regard to adoptions has changed greatly in most of the civilized world in the last five years. It has been undergoing rapid change. The reason being, of course, the prevalence of birth control devices. The consequently smaller number of children available for adoption caused me, earlier this year, to review the position which the department wanted to adopt in regard to adoptions.

Basically, new applicants for adoptions -- and this doesn't relate to ones whose applications pre-dated the change in policy -- new applicants for adoptions, if they are able to have their own children at all, are urged not to proceed. And families who have adopted two children already are urged not to ask for more. Also families are urged to move into different age groups than they may have expressed a desire for in the first place, and indeed into different races than they may have expressed a desire for in the first place.

The guidelines that I've just described have not been in effect for very long, I would say two to three months. And all I can say is that once the restricting of the relative freedom to adopt started, that naturally there is some disappointment on the part of individuals. When I refer to the previous freedom to adopt, I think it's well to note there was a period in time when large numbers of children couldn't be placed because the available children outnumbered the willing would-be parents. The balance has swung the

41-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

other way and although the guidelines I have referred to haven't been in effect for very long, I think they are fair and workable and a little more experience with them, will I think, show us the way as to whether or not this is the right approach.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, I have a few other questions along the same line. Perhaps I should read off all the questions to the minister and then he could answer them all at once.

Would he advise roughly how long he feels it should take, or how long it actually takes for parents who want to adopt, to go through the process, until they actually end up with the child? How long it should take if they have a suitable child in mind, with parents who are willing to put the child up for adoption? How many children are awaiting adoption in Alberta at the moment, or at any recent date that is suitable? How many people are waiting for children? How many single parents adopted children in the past year? Could he tell us what is the percentage figure or the actual number of programmed adoptions that failed during the placement period?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to be in a position, since I don't take shorthand -- I got pretty close to it here -- of reading the transcript of this when it comes out. I will just react briefly by saying that I think the length of the process does indeed depend upon the availability of a child from the age group requested and the willingness of the would-be-parent to change. It clearly depends on whether or not at the time of the application and at the time that any reassessment that is done of the applicants, that their family circumstances are such -- there have been cases where the circumstances were not appropriate, perhaps at the time of the first application and then later could become appropriate. I am sure the reverse is also true that an applicant may decline in his suitability through economic reasons, family upsets, and so on, so that during that period he would be put off if things looked like they were going badly in the adoptive home, put off almost indefinitely by the worker. I think some of the difficulty that there is, is that sometimes the workers don't clearly communicate these reasons to the adoptive parents and they have the sensation of interminable delays which may, in some cases, be more justified than would appear.

Also the probationary period -- I don't remember if that is six months or one year. Is it one year? Then that, of course, is a factor in the length of time. However, the actual work being done by the government staff, I think probably in many, many cases takes longer than it should. I base that on the number of complaints I get about the length of time it takes. All we can do in that respect is -- I don't think we want to add people to the adoption workers in the public service, we are trying to avoid this type of expansion of the service -- I take cognizance of the fact of the number of children available for adoption is declining and hope that a relatively short term will adjust the situation. I think there have been times when a change in the law occurred a year ago, or now almost two years ago, that resulted in quite a number of cases coming available for adoption simultaneously -- I have forgotten just what the amendment to the law was at that time -- an enormous backlog was created.

Now I just can't answer the hon. member as to how many children are awaiting adoption or how many adoptive parents are on the roles at the present time. The number of single parent families in the last year who have taken children on for adoption would be very, very small. I'm sure that figure is available and I did miss the hon. member's last question.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-67

MR. WILSON:

I was wondering what is the percentage figure or the actual number, Mr. Minister, of programmed adoptions that failed during the placement period? And just while I'm up, I realize that you may not have all of the statistical data at hand at the moment, but would you give us your undertaking to supply the statistical data within the next few days regarding this last question, and some of the others that require looking up?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, I will be glad to give that undertaking to the hon. member to answer those questions.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I'm a little concerned about one adoption. It's an international adoption. But when I understand that a single parent may adopt a child here, and pretty well across the continent, I suppose, I find it difficult to understand some of the social workers in this particular case. It's a case where the husband is a little over 70 and the wife is about 35 or 36. They're an excellent couple. He's in excellent health and she is a tremendous person. They're loved by every kid in the town. They run a restaurant. They're held in the highest regard and esteem by the mayor and the council and the church and so on. The social worker at first told them they couldn't have a child because they didn't have a home. They were living in the back of their premises. So he went to the expense of building quite a beautiful home. Then they raised the objection that he was too old and they couldn't put a child there. We pursued the matter further with members of your department, and it's about this time that the government changed. I have been pursuing it ever since. It seems like the couple are continually being asked the same questions by the social workers. I have no objections to what's going on in the head office. It appears that these international adoptions have to go to the international office in Ottawa, and they're trying to secure a child from Hong Kong. So I frankly can't understand why this should take -- it's been going on now in the second year. This is a splendid couple. When you consider that a woman or a man of 40 may adopt a child, here we have a couple, a married couple, highly esteemed, and he's in good health. If something happened that he did pass away, at least the child would still have an excellent mother. I'm simply raising this because it seems like somewhere along the way there's some kind of a blockage that seems to be holding these things up unnecessarily. Now you can't take every one to the minister or the deputy minister. I think I've been getting pretty reasonable satisfaction from the director of Child Welfare, and I think it's now in the office of the international office in Ottawa awaiting approval because the child would have to come from Hong Kong. But here's a chance for some lonely waif of Hong Kong to have a beautiful home and wonderful parents, and I think this type of thing should be expedited and not discouraged. I would hope that the hon. minister would agree with that approach.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, just a quick reaction. I find the hon. member's remarks in regard to expediting what should be possible, to be entirely reasonable. If it is a case that he wishes to draw to my attention further, I'd be glad to look at it.

DR. MCCRIMMON:

I have one short question to the minister. It's regarding the adoption of a baby, and after the child was adopted, in a few weeks, the baby was found to be deaf I've gone to your department, and it appears there is no machinery whereby they can adopt this child -- they haven't signed the papers yet -- without becoming involved in

41-68

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

financial problems in the future as far as his deafness is concerned. They are quite prepared to sign the papers and have the baby. They don't want to give the baby up, but there appears to be no machinery in your department whereby the government would still remain responsible for treatment of deafness, the equipment and the school and so on, for a deaf child who is involved. They are a working couple and they are afraid they don't know how they can look to the future and see whether or not they will be able to cover this financial hazard that lies ahead of them.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, my presumption would have to be that the joint incomes of the people is sufficiently high so they don't fall within the area where assistance would be given under any existing program. Therefore, I would ask the hon. Member for Ponoka to perhaps discuss that particular case with me privately.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Just a comment with regard to my hon. colleague's comments a few moments ago. I certainly support the submission he has made to you. If you look on the file of that particular child there is a memo from myself to the department indicating my support for them to move on it. Certainly, anything the hon. minister can do I think would be much appreciated.

The other question, we introduced last session, a six-month period between the placement and permanent adoption. I was wondering, have there been any serious implications of that change in legislation? Has the hon. minister considered reducing that six-month period, possibly to a three-month period? I say that because I know a number of the other provinces were considering that in the last one or two years. I am not sure which province -- BC was considering it, maybe they have done it already -- moved that period to three months rather than six months. I felt it was most essential because of the delays that were happening and the worries and concerns that many parents had indicated to me at that time. I was wondering if the hon. minister could comment on that.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the answer to the latter question is no. There is no present intention of reducing it from six months to any lesser period, but I certainly don't mind giving full consideration to that.

In regard to whether or not the change from 12 months to six months has caused any difficulty, I would say that the answer is that it has not caused any difficulty in the sense of the ability to appraise the family for its suitability and the like. Six months seems to be a fully-adequate time. The only problem in regard to that was purely administrative at the time it took place. I do know there was quite a pile-up of work, which was foreseeable.

Appropriation 2535 total agreed to \$ 342,950

Appropriation 2536 Child Welfare Services

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of observations that I would like to make to the hon. minister. In the past month, sir, I have visited two group homes, one in Edmonton and one in my constituency of Calgary Bow. I would like to report, sir, that I am most impressed with the calibre of care that is being rendered and the social gains being achieved, both for the children in the group homes and for the people who are providing the sustenance and the supervision.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-69

In the group home that I visited in Edmonton, I was most impressed with the policy used. In one instance I am familiar with, one of the house mothers, a woman who is a widow, and who had quite a large family of her own, was on social assistance for years. But now she is gainfully employed in the group home and is apparently doing an outstanding job of looking after the small children in this particular centre.

I think that we have double benefit -- we harvest two crops in a situation like that, when we can take somebody off social assistance and give them gainful employment in an area they are very knowledgeable about. Although they may not have academic qualifications, formal qualifications, they certainly know the problems and how to raise children.

The one in Calgary Bow, I think, was somewhat of an experiment in that the house parents were university students. They were dealing with teenage children in this particular instance. They are just winding up their first year of operation in this particular facility, and these two university students who are acting as house parents are moving on now that they've completed their studies, to other projects. But I understand that the policy is to be continued and two more university students will be hired and interviews are being conducted at this point in time. I would just like to say that from my observations, that this policy has been a tremendous benefit. There again the practical experience that the university students, or the students taking social assistance courses, are gaining is outstanding. As well, the teenagers who are their charges, or in their care, can rap with them, and it seems to be a very happy, amicable solution to the overall situation. I just wanted to let you know, sir, that I think those are two real good points worthy of continuation and expansion.

MR. HINMAN:

I would like to tell the House a bedtime story in the hope that everybody will go to sleep but the hon. minister and you, and the estimates can be finished. The title of the story is 'Alice in Blunderland'. It was told to me by a very frustrated mother, and I think, illustrates that our system is not perfect. Alice was 15 years old, and she lived with her mother, who was a widow, in a town where her mother was professionally employed. She went to a birthday party on April 1, and did not come home. Her mother found, by enquiring the rest of the night, that she had caught a ride to a neighbouring town, and was finally able to discover that she had taken a bus for Vancouver, without anybody's consent. The police were notified and finally stopped Alice at Osoyoos, and took her off the bus. They couldn't detain her because she was a juvenile they said, but they did take her to a welfare home. At 4 o'clock in the morning she left the welfare home without anybody interfering, and went to Vancouver. After a week's frantic hunting, her mother finally got word from Vancouver that she was in a 'Cool-Aid' house. Now, if you don't know what a 'Cool-Aid' house is, I'd better tell you, because I didn't know either. A 'Cool-Aid' house is operated by the hippies themselves, with the support of the welfare people and with grants. It's objective is a very proper one. The youngsters themselves hope that they can take these runaways, give them a period to cool off, give them a little advice and perhaps get them home.

Unfortunately, however, since these are not too well supervised, all types of people get into these 'Cool-Aid' homes and drugs get in too. When the mother finally went to Vancouver to see what she could do, she found that the child was getting counselling from a child counsellor, and that the child counsellor was telling her that she was perfectly right to leave home, and that she didn't have to go back if she didn't want to. That bothered the mother. She took Alice to the welfare counsellor herself and found out something of what the child's problems were. The child said that she hated the

41-70

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

town in which she lived; her mother was a square, and the house was too small. Having seen both the house, and knowing the mother, I know this was a case of a pretty mixed-up child. At any rate, the mother got the child to go with her to the home where she was staying and tried to discover what really was the trouble. The child finally said well, she was just lonely. If she had company, she'd be alright. So, the mother went to the trouble of arranging for the child to stay with friends who had children and to go to school in a town a long way from the place where she had been living.

She went to school one day and disappeared. Now the mother tried all the known sources and a week later found that she was back in a Cool-Aid house in Vancouver. She reached the counsellor who said this was a bad place for her and they transferred her to another Cool-Aid place. The mother tried to provide psychiatric treatment for the child, but before the psychiatrist could get to her she had disappeared again. The only thing she left was a purse, and the only thing valuable in the purse was an address in Toronto of a boy whom she had met in her travels. The mother phoned Toronto to the home, found that the boy had got home, seemed to have settled down and was alright so she left word that if the girl turned up there they were to notify the mother and the police. In due course the girl did turn up and the police were notified. The police put the girl on a plane, she came back to Calgary, she was met by her mother and a nephew, but she had a compulsive urge to keep going. The mother, however, did get her to come home, got her in touch with the local doctors. They got a psychiatrist but the girl simply locked herself in the bathroom and when she finally came out she just turned up the hi-fi so loud that nobody could talk to her and the interview ended.

The next morning she was gone again, this time apprehended by the police not too many miles away and taken to the nearest one of these group welfare homes. To keep her there they took her clothes away, but at 3:00 in the morning she left with somebody's bathrobe and was gone again. After another real struggle she got back to Vancouver. She phoned her mother that she was under LSD and the mother could tell she was under something alright. She had been taking drugs, she said, for a considerable length of time. The mother phoned the drug squad to pick the child up and send her home. But she got no further word. Finally she got word to meet a plane; she met the plane, the child didn't come. She called back to the police out there and they said the child had disappeared between her Cool-Aid home and the air centre, so she didn't get home.

Well, the mother finally found where she was again and she was advised that she better put the child in Ponoka or Oliver. She tried that, but it required the evidence of a doctor and before they could get the doctor the child was away again. This time she didn't go west. When the mother finally heard from her the police called her from Toronto and they had picked the child up for shoplifting. I'm not going to continue this story very much longer. She was sent back to Edmonton, where the mother met her with the nephew that tried to do something with her. They just couldn't do anything, particularly because she had been advised by the counsellors that she didn't need to go home.

Now this is a pretty sad story, I'm happy to tell you it didn't turn out as badly as you might have expected. The girl is home now, seems to have settled down, but is considerably the worse for her experience. Now what bothered me was the fact that there seemed to be no provision whereby the police could get that child actually delivered back to her mother. What shocked me worse than that was that the welfare people, the counsellors -- at least those in Vancouver -- were giving this child the kind of advice they were giving her. I was shocked again to find that in spite of the history of the case they couldn't get some doctors out after five o'clock to examine the child and decide whether or not she really should be in an institution.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-71

Now this vote seems to provide for welfare services so I've used the excuse to tell you the story. I'm only concerned that if it is possible for a child to do this, then a parent is placed in a very, very sad position. It's easy to imagine the suffering of that mother. The fact that this child finally got on the right path, I think, is sheerly accidental. I'm very concerned that if truly this kind of thing is possible that we do what we can through the department to see that this does not happen, that there are better means than this to save children and get them back with their parents or to get them where they can be handled. One thing that I didn't mention was that the mother tried to get the child before a judge to have her made a ward of the government so she could be put in detention. The judge, instead of giving a decision, advised them to take her to a psychiatrist somewhere else. She got away again on that occasion. You can see why I call it "Alice in Blunderland" and I hope that we can overcome that difficulty in the future.

MR. DOAN:

Mr. Chairman, I notice in that group it mentions juveniles found to be delinquent. Now I was wondering if the doctor works in conjunction with the Attorney General's department?

MR. CRAWFORD:

If who works in conjunction with the Attorney General's department?

MR. DOAN:

Well, if you do, sir? How do they deal with these juveniles who become delinquent?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, primarily the question of delinquency involves a judgment on the part of the police who come across a young person in some difficulty. The making of an actual finding as a delinquent is the act of a family court judge and it is to those juveniles who have been found to be delinquent by such an adjudication after appearing in family court usually through the efforts of social workers who have had the child referred to them by the police because of the tender age. Once the judges order is made the juvenile may be placed in an institution which is offered by the department and that's why it appears in the estimates as one of the costs.

Appropriation 2536, agreed to \$9,303,760

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 2537</u>	Metis Inventories	nil
<u>Appropriation 2538</u>	Maintenance Orders and Recovery	\$ 210,940

Appropriation 2539 Metis Rehabilitation

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of questions I would like to ask here. First of all I note, Mr. Minister, that the increase here is only 1.8 per cent. Now I would guess -- I don't have any statistics here -- but I would guess that the population increase would be somewhat greater than that. I am wondering why the increase is so small?

Secondly, I don't know whether this comes under this section -- I'm sure it probably doesn't. It probably comes under human resources development in Executive Council but I am wondering whether the government has any plans to fund some of the native organizations

41-72

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

such as the Alberta Metis Association, in terms of shared programs and also in operating grants for the organization?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Minister?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe that as the hon. member has indicated, he presumes it to be the case that the actual grants don't come under this appropriation.

As to the small percentage increase, that reflects the fact that no expansion of the program is anticipated in this coming year, and is the reason why no percentage similar to either the growth in cost of the programs themselves, say 6 per cent or 7 per cent, which might be a fair estimate for present growth in the national product, or based on population increase as the hon. member suggested. An attempt is being made, because of the nature of the programs being what they are, to operate them a little bit more efficiently and yield at least equivalent results without a great increase in expenditure.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, on that. First of all, I am wondering if the hon. minister could tell the House whether or not the Metis Association is involved in a direct sense in planning these programs? Whether there is any structure for that consultation process?

Secondly I am curious about the nature of the assistance to students who want to obtain a high school education. To what extent are we prepared to go in this program to assist the Metis children who want to go on to advance their education?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the Metis Associations are not involved in the programing, or arriving at the programs. That is a suggestion which I would be willing to look into. I think the contact with these associations is to a large extent in the hands of the hon. Mr. Adair, and I think that probably we could benefit from some co-ordination in developing things here in the year to come, which are not reflected in this particular budget, being mainly programs that were brought forward from an existing basis, on a sort of a hold-the-line basis.

Now the assistance in education -- the notes that I have -- indicate that it applies to all levels of education including university. It means that in particular communities, if a facility such as, say NAIT is not in the community where the Metis child is, that he would be assisted in support and transportation to enable him to take that course.

MR. NOTLEY:

On that, to follow up. Assisted in terms of living costs or just transportation to and from the place? For example, let's say that a child in Northeastern Alberta comes in to Edmonton. Obviously the a child in Northeast Alberta comes in to Edmonton, obviously the cost of the trip in would be borne from this fund. But what about the living costs in the city? Would there be provision made for room and board and books and so on?

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-73

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman the assistance does go beyond the transportation. It includes the cost of living, how far it goes into school books and so on is a detail I don't have at the moment.

MR. BARTON:

Yes, I basically have a few questions here. 1. How many Metis colonies are there in the Province of Alberta? 2. Whether the three in the Lesser Slave Lake area under the Special Area Agreement are covered in this appropriation, or in this Special Area appropriation? 3. Would you be in a position to add to colonies, future colonies? 4. Then I really think the land tenure comes under this too. It's too bad the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests is not in because there are isolated communities that have been there for several years, and home improvements, and the actual going into a bank and trying to negotiate a loan because they haven't got anything tangible; they haven't got a lease. It was about this part that I was wondering.

I'd like a breakdown on the total program because I agree with the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that it's not enough -- it's been left aside for quite awhile -- it's one of the major problems in the North, the native Metis relations.

5. Then I was wondering if the cattle agreement where you can get \$10,000, plus another \$6,000, I think it's up to \$8,000, fits under this guaranteed loan plan. Whether they are eligible for it.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Are those all of the questions? Mr. Chairman, the answer to the first question is -- 8. The answer to the second question is yes. The answer to the third question is possibly. The answer to the fourth question in regard to land tenure is something that I would have to take under advisement before going ahead on. And the answer to the assistance that's given in farming and ranching, my notes indicate that assistance is given. And I believe that this is sometimes by way of guarantees to the co-operatives that may be set up. But it could also involve an individual Metis who wants to go into the ranching business -- who may be supported with interim financing through the government in Northeastern Alberta -- comes in to Edmonton, obviously for the purpose of acquiring some cattle. Beyond that general impression in regard to the farming and ranching, if the hon. member wanted more detail, I would have to get it for him.

MR. MINIELY:

I would just like to help a little bit. I wonder if I could add a little bit to the hon. minister's comments? He had indicated that the hon. Allen Adair, the Minister of Northern Development and Native Affairs, has some responsibilities in this area. The point that I wanted to make clear was firstly -- the Metis Association. There was a question arose with respect to the input that they put into government policy. The Metis Association has been funded by provincial government grants in the past and is still being funded by provincial government grants which are not included in this appropriation. Secondly, the Metis Association does prepare input for government policy. An example, I believe, is they have been working with the Alberta Housing Corporation on northern native housing projects, they have made submissions to the Alberta Housing Corporation in that regard. So there is actually some input from the Metis Association to various government departments with respect to the formulation of government policy.

Thirdly, I wanted to make clear again that Appropriation 2539 is by no means the total amount of money that is provided for northern native and Metis rehabilitation projects in the north.

41-74

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

MR. BARTON:

The final question I have on that is basically under the Livestock Loan guarantee. Do they qualify? They can qualify as an applicant under the Metis colony and get the full \$18,000?

MR. MINIELY:

This as I know, recently -- I can't tell you the exact details -- but I know -- as a matter of fact it is a matter of public record now -- that there was an Order in Council passed about two weeks ago, which is now a public document, wherein native and Metis people are involved in a joint venture and it is covered under -- I believe the hon. minister was out at the time you asked the question -- but it is covered under the Livestock Guarantee Program or in a different program, on a co-op activities program. But it is for livestock, I believe.

MR. BARTON:

I realize it is under co-op activities, but what I am trying to get at is, if an individual who has a few -- say 20 head of cattle -- wants to expand, is he covered under the Guaranteed Loan agreement?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes, yes they are.

DR. HORNER:

Yes, if they are responsible cattlemen and can establish their credit at a bank or a treasury branch or a credit union, they are covered by the Livestock Guaranteed Loans.

MR. HO LEM:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask this question. I see that under this vote there are 15 salaried positions. In the program aimed at raising the standards of living, are there any Metis people employed in this program, in the design of the program, in the implementation of these programs? Are there any Metis people hired by the department working in this area? I think that this is very important because there is a natural resentment by the Metis against non-Metis people when it comes to the discussion of their social problems. They feel that they have a problem that is all their very own, it is different from the problems that you or I know, and they do have a real reason, and a just reason to feel the way they do. I was wondering if there are Metis people involved, and if not, will there be consideration given to the thought of hiring such people?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, the answer is that there are Metis people involved but the exact number I am not able to give the hon. member.

MR. HO LEM:

Are they salaried people?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I understand they are. If that is not so, I will correct that information to the hon. member.

MR. NOTLEY:

I would like to follow up on something that the hon. Provincial Treasurer said. He mentioned that assistance to the Metis people in

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-75

Alberta comes under a number of appropriations. I understand that, for example, under Executive Council, under Human Resources, there is an appropriation there.

At the risk of cluttering up the appropriations, I'm wondering if perhaps we could have some summary made of just what the programs are, so that rather than discussing it piecemeal, we can look at it in some integrated sense. I really do feel, Mr. Chairman, that this is an area that we have tended to overlook for too long a time, and perhaps it is because if we look at the appropriations on an isolated basis it's all too easy to miss the forest for the trees. I was wondering if perhaps either the Treasurer or the Minister might give us a bird's-eye view of what the programs are and then flowing from that, just exactly what the framework is for the consultation between the Metis Association and the government on these specific programs.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, we have prepared that. I believe the hon. Member for Slave Lake requested that, and we summarized all the appropriations related to native people and Metis people for your purposes and --

MR. BARTON:

Just for the special areas and not for this total programming. I think he's talking about the one on this. Maybe you should do that one too.

MR. MINIELY:

In any event, that covers most of the appropriations -- the one that I summarized -- it does cover native people, Metis people, and northern development. I think, with due respect, the proper place -- the hon. Mr. Adair has this summarized because he is co-ordinating programs regardless of which department they are involved in -- and we could release that to you at the time that the Northern Development and Native Affairs appropriations come up under the hon. Allen Adair.

MR. BARTON:

I have one more question. I'm just wondering if this appropriation should continue to stay under Health and Social Development. It would probably be better appropriated under Native Affairs.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I think I can respond to that. The answer is that we are giving consideration to this particular adjustment at the present time.

Appropriation 2539 total agreed to \$1,018,530

Agreed to without debate:

Appropriation 2560 Mental Health Services \$ 145,020

Appropriation 2561 Community Psychiatric Services

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate some information with respect to this vote. When I examine this vote I see that the salaried positions just vary by one from last year and I see the salaries are up, something in the neighbourhood of \$70,000. I presume this is just the ordinary increment -- but what disturbs me is that the

41-76

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

travelling expenses are reduced from \$29,280 to \$20,080, or a reduction of \$9,200. This is the vote, I presume, for the guidance clinics that travel around the province, and I should say that this is a very valuable service to the rural areas. I think we must appreciate the fact that before a child can be admitted to any of the institutions for emotionally disturbed in the province that this particular child must be assessed by the guidance clinic. These clinics come out on a monthly basis or every two months with groups from varicus centres, with the psychiatrists and social workers and so on and so forth. I know in the health units in the rural areas the nurses are driving around and they run into these various cases of emotionally disturbed children who are certainly a problem to their parents; and so when the guidance clinic comes in every month or every two months or whatever the program is, the health unit arranges for the interviews. They come out with teams. I believe the psychiatrist sees the child or the family at a certain time and other people in the team rotate around on a daily basis. I've noticed over the period of years that their work has increased as time goes on.

I would say that in my particular area they are doing double the assessments they did a couple of years ago. I am quite concerned that the travel expenses would be cut by \$9,000. There is no indication that staff would be cut. My concern is, instead of making 12 trips a year, if it is cut back by about one-third, maybe they would cut back three or four trips during the year.

I would like to have some assurance from the hon. minister that this work will not be cut back. I think it is a very valuable service. I think it is the key to our various institutions for mentally disturbed children. I think it is a very valuable service, especially in rural areas. And I would like to have some assurance that my arithmetic is not the way it really is.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I can give the hon. member the necessary assurance, firstly, that there is nothing wrong with his arithmetic, but that the supplementary information that I have before me answers his question in this way. What you have before you is, that last year it was estimated to cost \$29,000, that being the amount voted in the estimates. This year it is \$20,000 and a few odd dollars.

The experience last year was that \$29,000 was not spent. That appropriation was spent only to the extent of \$17,900. The previous year it was \$18,000. Therefore, the accustomed amount of travel can be accommodated within a \$20,000 budget.

Appropriation 2561 total agreed to \$1,280,690

Appropriation 2562 New Mental Health Program Development

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, in order to save time in the discussion of mental health, what I would like to request of the hon. minister at this time is this type of information; I would like it possibly within the next two weeks -- not tonight -- I don't think I would want you to go through a discussion at this time: 1. I would like to have a summary as to which of the recommendations in Chapters 23 and 24 of the Blair Report the government will be acting on in this coming fiscal year 1972-73. 2. What specific recommendations will be implemented under Appropriation 2562? 3. What recommendations do you feel you will implement or accomplish within the next three year period? I think if we can get that type of information as condensed as possible, relating to the recommendations here, I think that will be satisfactory information for us at this point.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-77

Appropriation 2562 agreed to

\$1,237,800

Appropriation 2563 Alberta Hospital, Ponoka

DR. MCCRIMMON:

I have several questions here. I can list them one, two, three, so perhaps you could give short answers to them. 1. Is there any further decrease in staff contemplated for this year at the provincial mental hospital at Ponoka? 2. Will there be travelling clinics operating from the Alberta Hospital, Ponoka, servicing central Alberta? 3. There was some discussion between the hon. Attorney General's department and your department re updating facilities for the criminally insane, and remands from the courts in conjunction with the two departments. Has any consideration been given to placing this facility at the Alberta Hospital, Ponoka? If not, would you give it your serious consideration that trained staff and full treatment facilities are available at the Alberta Hospital, Ponoka? 4. Are there any research programs to be initiated from Ponoka Mental Hospital in conjunction with the mental health thrust? 5. Are any of Appropriation No. 2562 and 2561 earmarked for Ponoka?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Are you going to reply to them, Mr. Minister?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I can reply to most of them right now, Mr. Chairman. The staff positions are shown in the estimates, showing not a great change -- a change of 22 positions out of a last year's establishment of over 800. It does forecast a decrease to that extent.

The second question is whether or not travelling and services are expected to serve central Alberta. I think that the mobile type of service that will be planned in the expansion of mental health services is not finally planned at this stage in order to enable me to answer that question specifically.

The third question, in regard to discussions with the Attorney-General about the forensic facilities at Ponoka, the likelihood is that a maximum security holding facility for criminal psychopaths would be located at either Calgary or Edmonton in due course. It's known that the present forensic facility is located at Ponoka, but the facilities there are not adequate and options are under consideration at the present time as to the possibility of including a new forensic facility in the new remand centre in Calgary and that is regarded not as a certainty, but as one possible option. In other words, there is no commitment to Ponoka for the new facility of that type, and the likelihood is that it would better serve the remand function and the holding function if it was in one of the other cities.

As to research, I have no answer for that in the detail that I have before me, right now, and would look forward to discussing that sort of question with the hon. member with whom I have discussed the Ponoka Alberta Hospital on a number of occasions.

And, as to whether or not any items under Appropriations 2562 and 2561 related specifically to Ponoka, I would be sure that under 2561 the answer is 'yes.' I can go into the extent to which that applies with the hon. member because I know that the interest in this particular case is a very direct one for this constituency. With regard to Appropriation 2562, I would have to agree to provide him the information in due course.

Appropriation 2563 total agreed to

\$5,485,030

41-78

ALEERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 2565</u>	Alberta Hospital, Edmonton	\$7,035,310
<u>Appropriation 2568</u>	Emotionally Disturbed Children	203,500
<u>Appropriation 2548</u>	Preventive Health Administration	

MR. BAETON:

I'd like to ask, is this appropriation under where the health units are administrated from?

Is the department planning any closures of any, or expanding of any health units, specially the Smith area? There is some concern whether the district health nurse at Smith is being recalled and I was wondering if you could fill me in on this?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of any special arrangements in regard to Smith. On the whole, the health units are operated by the municipal authorities with the support of the province, and if there is some arrangement at Smith that I wouldn't know about that would involve the province in a decision such as that, the hon. member might care to bring it to my attention; I can specially look into that.

MR. FARRAN:

Is there any hope that the health unit services in the city could be co-ordinated with the active hospitals in any way? The provincial contribution to the medical officer of health's department in the City of Calgary is a very small percentage of the total budget and the local council has been concerned with the expansion of this department, which is largely financed by property tax. It began, of course, with attention to communicable diseases, and giving vaccination shots and that sort of the thing, for the people going abroad, to inspecting restaurants and smelling the sewers and this sort of thing. It's grown from that into a concept of community clinics largely concerned with prenatal advice and what is called Well Baby Clinics and even free dental service for some people. The thought has been expressed that perhaps some of these services being provided by the state could be provided under Medicare and some of them could be provided through the out-patient departments of the hospitals at a considerable saving of cost at local level. Is it possible that somebody could have a look at whether this could be done, whether there are any duplications in the field? I don't know if this applies in rural areas, but it applies in the city.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I think that this is part of an overview that has to be taken in regard to two things that are being advocated at present time. One is the merger of services of the department as between health and social development, but more particularly the discussions and the ideas that are being advocated in regard to community health centres. If, in the hopefully anticipated community orientation of some health services, the local health units and some general hospital services could be rationalized in some way, at least in some communities, well we would certainly want to examine that.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Chairman, just one short question. In the past number of years the request has been made by both the urban and the rural organizations for health units to own their own buildings eventually instead of paying continual rent. I wonder if any consideration has been given in this respect so that, although a municipality builds

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-79

the health unit centre, it will be able to apply the rents to the point where the health units will eventually own their own building so they are not continually paying rent on a building that they will never own. I know of some cases where the monthly rent runs somewhere around \$300.00 to \$400.00 and upwards. I was just wondering if there was any consideration given to this?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I would have to say that that matter hadn't occurred to me. In deference to the hon. member's probable concern from experience based on his past service in the municipal area, my first reaction is that I don't really see what purpose would be served by such a thing.

The rental, it's true, is a part of the budget of the health unit, but that is contributed to by the province. The monies that are normally paid are often paid to the municipality as the space occupied may belong to the municipality. Therefore the advantage of it escapes me other than just for the purposes of the budgeting of the health unit itself.

It seems to me that the answer to the difficulties that health units are having in regard to budgeting is probably related to two things. One is the cost break-down as between the province and the municipality for the support of health units. The long-range answer undoubtedly lies in the fiscal arrangements between the province and the municipalities across the board in the areas that, after the municipal-provincial fiscal task force recommendations have been received, will be made by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. ZANDER:

I believe you did not understand my question, hon. minister. The point that I bring out is a health unit that has been established and that I was the chairman of for 14 years. We paid a yearly rent of almost \$5,000. This was made up of a number of municipalities, towns and villages within the organization and this money -- I believe in total they have paid almost \$120,000 towards the rent of the building, and they have actually never owned it. I think actually all they want, and this is the request that has been made over the years and it was always turned down by the former government, is that eventually the local authority will be able to let the health unit own that building for the rent they have paid in previous years. This is all they request.

MR. BARTON:

I have a question. Under what vote does air ambulance come?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure what vote the air ambulances traditionally come under in the Department of Health. The answer at the present time is related to the fact that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests and I have been discussing the possibility of the transfer of the responsibility for air ambulance to that department. At present it's in one of the votes in health but in a general vote. It doesn't appear as a special separate item.

MR. BARTON:

Could I just elaborate a little bit on this because I can see where the government's revenue for the King Air is coming in.

First of all I was wondering if they are looking at changing the structure of the air ambulance in the point of administration? For instance a typical example -- a patient has a dysentery problem and

41-80

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

needs to be flown to the hospital. As it exists now they have to phone the air ambulance number and the doctor decides whether it should be an air ambulance or whether he should go in on packboard or skidoo or dog train, or whatever, in the isolated communities. The problem is this; in most areas there are district health nurses, and can these district health nurses authorize the flight?

Secondly, if you're anticipating using the King Air for northern communities, I really question that because I think I took 14 months to change the policy while I was on the Northern Development Council -- as far as the Department of Lands and Forests running the planes out of Edmonton and spending two or three hours and then finding out they can't get into the airstrip because of the shortness of 3,000 feet. I really think in this particular case that your charter operators in the north have the knowledge of the airstrip; have the knowledge of the weather; the conditions of the airstrips as far as compaction; and I really think you would be running a risk. I think this is their role. They do many hours of flying in the north; they actually do free fire patrol. I think this is their baby and I can't see where King Air can be charging around the province on air ambulance trips, especially based on evidence.

MR. CRAWFORD:

First of all, Mr. Chairman, there is no intention of having the King Air or any other aircraft based in Edmonton carry on the air ambulance service. I know the hon. member will be interested in knowing that I have had representations from operators of private airlines in the North. I think we are really speaking mainly of the dispatching of aircraft in regard to the responsibility between myself and the other minister that I referred to.

I have found what I believe to be the appropriation for the payment of the air ambulances and it's under the appropriation that we began with this evening. It would be under 2512, Fees and Commissions, a general vote of \$550,000, and I understand that the air ambulance would come out of that.

MR. BARTON:

To follow up. Are you anticipating changing the structure of authorization of flights at all in any way, or have you looked into this area? As far as the local nurse, the particular authority for ordering these flights?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I apologize for forgetting to answer the earlier question about the local nurse. I think the answer would be no. I think the dispatching authority would still have to be a medical doctor. My concern in some cases that have come to my attention has been an unnecessary rigidity in the Department of Health about approving a request from a doctor who is at the site of, say, an accident. I hope that the dispatching of help when it's needed and that particular difficulty in respect to it is cleared up. I think a reasonable compromise would be that we would normally accept the indication from a doctor at the scene rather than the doctor at the other end of the phone in Edmonton being the principal party authorizing it.

MR. BARTON:

The next problem is the air ambulance. I think it's probably solved with the amalgamation of Health and Social Development. If the accident has occurred in a northern community and a particular patient is flown out by air ambulance, the patient sits and after being cured can't get back into the community. Will this be covered

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-81

under social development? Or under a one-way type of ticket there and back? It's quite a problem in my area with isolated communities.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I think what the hon. member is talking about now is temporary assistance in cases of need. Hopefully, after the good doctors in the City of Edmonton or whatever other city they may have been flown to, got through with the patient, he wouldn't need an ambulance ride back. I know the hon. member indicated that he has to get back some other way and often doesn't have the funds, but I think what we're talking about isn't really part of the ambulance program, it's part of temporary assistance, and of course, in cases of need an application is made and assistance is normally given.

MR. BARTON:

This causes a problem, because, for instance -- I'll use the typical community of Fort Chipewyan which is out of our welfare area where services are provided. The services are provided either in High Prairie or Lesser Slave Lake for medical needs. A man is flown in by air ambulance; how does he get back? There are 200 miles of wilderness. How does he get back from that point other than by going down and making an application? In this case it's usually out of the area's jurisdiction and they have to go and check it with the file at High Level, or in this particular case it might be Fort McMurray. I'm worried about getting him back to his family on the same two-way affair -- in and out.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the question has been answered. What is involved is the possibility that some temporary financial assistance is required, and in the normal course that would be forthcoming. But relating the answer to the question, still speaking of the relatively rare case where the incident involves an air ambulance, I think they are sufficiently few in number so that if a situation such as the one that came to the hon. member's attention arises, we will make some arrangement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Appropriation 2549 total agreed to \$ 384,290

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 2551</u>	Vital Statistics	\$ 211,670
<u>Appropriation 2554</u>	Social Hygiene	285,030

Appropriation 2555 Industrial Health Services

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, on this particular appropriation, I'm wondering whether the government is giving any consideration to expanding this in the future. It seems to me that as we place more emphasis on pollution control that perhaps equally important we must also look at the total question of industrial health. I see here we have again a very modest 3.5% increase. I am wondering, however, whether the government has any long-term plans to increase the work of this particular department and eventually this appropriation?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an area where the involvement of government is direct to some extent, but need not be direct in every

41-82

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

sense. The industries themselves can be motivated to take certain steps which relate to industrial good health, and the job of the department really is by and large in that area. It is an inspection and educational and urging type of role that it fulfills.

Now as to whether or not an overall program should be anticipated that would give expansion in this area, I suppose so. I suppose that the sort of counselling and urging role of the branch and its inspection and regulatory roles won't always be adequate to the job. Naturally we are not really looking for areas to increase costs. I don't feel a bit sorry in these cases where we can look at only a modest increase, because of the enormous sums of money that are spent by this department. I want to assure the hon. member that I have had a very concerned liaison with the department over this particular section in order to try to stabilize its work and give it a good basis -- and I might say that under Dr. May it has been very expertly and professionally run -- and to try to stabilize its programming and its objectives in the short term, and then on the basis of that and the further exposure that I have to the success of their programs to date, to decide whether or not we should be expanding it in some general way.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes, Mr. Notley.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary on that point. I notice that the Alberta Federation of Labour, Mr. Minister, has in the last several years shown a great deal of interest in this whole field of industrial health. I am wondering if this particular department has any consultative process by which there is an input from the organized trade union movement through the federation? I think it would be valuable in monitoring the work of the service and perhaps considering programs for the future.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I think the answer to that is we would certainly welcome any input that the organized labour groups may want to make in any briefs or expressions of opinion. I suppose the typical example might be in specific cases where an abuse is apparent and then a report to the department would result in some action being taken. As far as the sort of programming is concerned, if general recommendations and policy directions and so on were recommended in that area by the labour groups, we would certainly be pleased to have them.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, some of my thoughts on this appropriation went along entirely different lines from those of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. Without knowing any of the details about what sort of service this little section of the department provides, it did occur to me that the proper place for this function is the Workmen's Compensation Board, which is one of the wealthiest autonomous bodies of provincial hierarchy. It had cash funds greater than the entire province at the end of October. It is financed by mandatory levies on industrialists and employers and I just wonder why this department exists at all.

It occurred to me that it might be a little bit of deadwood that had been inherited over the years and never been dropped off.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-83

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I'd be glad to discuss that privately with the hon. member in order that I won't take the House's time.

Appropriation 2555 agreed to \$ 196,700

Appropriation 2557 Tuberculosis control

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Chairman, a question to the minister. I'd like to ask why there is a decrease in this appropriation.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, it's a change in the way in which salary appropriations are handled; a change in regard to the Baker Sanatorium staff is reducing the salary requirement under this particular appropriation by \$77,000. I think I can assure the hon. member that the reduction under this particular vote is not in any way going to hamper the service that's provided.

Appropriation 2557 agreed to \$ 456,060

Appropriation 2558 Tuberculosis Treatment Service

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, just before we leave this, I'd like to ask the minister if he would enlarge on his intentions regarding the tuberculosis treatment at Baker Sanatorium whether or not he plans to expand the treatment of the mentally handicapped and how is it he is able to reduce the staff by 43.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I indicated that a change in the appropriation under which the sanatorium staff was being handled was the cause of the particular reduction, and I believe that the premises at the Baker Sanatorium at the present time are generally known to be available for certain of the other types of programs that the hon. member mentioned in regard to handicapped children. My belief is that tuberculosis, other than in the northern part of the province, where the incidence remains unfortunately high, is not a disease which requires a lot of hospital space in Calgary and Edmonton. Now, as to the handicapped programs that might be developed at that particular site, we have had discussions with the groups in Calgary that are interested in developments at that particular location, and all I can say is that discussions have been had and it's under consideration.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

This means that there has been no decision at the present time on the cottage-type facilities they were going to place there?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I think that's the answer -- that no firm commitment has been made to the groups that expressed an interest there. It's at a very current stage at the present time.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to clarify this one point - you have no intentions of closing down the tuberculosis centre at the Baker Sanatorium in the foreseeable future. Is that right?

41-84

ALEERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

MR. CRAWFORD:

I know of no such intention, Mr. Chairman.

MR. BARTON:

I agree with you that the problems of tuberculosis in the North are actually getting worse. Are there any new directions that you have planned in your department to tackle this problem?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I suppose every once in a while in the estimates I can be allowed to idealize, in a few words. This is a problem which I think for anyone who becomes acquainted -- and the hon. member will understand that there are so many members of the House that have not a great knowledge of the North and have to go through the process of becoming acquainted with that problem -- but anyone who has must feel very deeply for the human suffering that takes place as a result of that.

It is my hope following the session, through discussions that I will be able to have with the hon. Mr. Adair and with the hon. Mr. Getty, who is interested in the northern development programs also, that we will be able to resolve some of the anomalies in basic health care in the northern part of the province. I don't say this, imagining for a moment that the task hasn't been attempted previously and that it is an easy one at all, because I'm sure it is not.

The hon. member asked about new directions. It is my deeply sincere hope that some progress can be made that will have results in the short term as well as the long term.

MR. BARTON:

Bringing actual TB clinics right into the communities would be a real example, because I think currently they just come to Slave Lake. They take a sampling, and they never actually get out into the rural areas of my constituency. Maybe the emphasis could be shifted a little bit.

Appropriation 2558 total agreed to \$1,784,350

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 2540</u>	Public Health Services Administration	\$ 38,740
<u>Appropriation 2541</u>	Medical Treatment Services Administration	
		1,584,000
<u>Appropriation 2542</u>	Medical Treatment Services	165,910
<u>Appropriation 2543</u>	Nursing Aide Schools	575,060
<u>Appropriation 2544</u>	Laboratory and X-Ray School	

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Chairman, on this particular subject, I have to talk for my area, and probably it happens all through the North -- we have quite a problem of getting the actual enrolment into these programs, especially in nursing. They are usually booked up -- and I think in cases right now -- they are booked up almost 18 months to two years ahead. We can't get people into the program. I was wondering if there could be a two-pronged approach with Canada Manpower and your department, to maybe allot a certain number to the North.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Member for Little Bow would recall that last year the number of enrolments was doubled from 16 to

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-85

32. Hopefully, this will have a good effect starting very soon, because this change only took place last year. The benefit from it won't be felt yet.

The demand for this type of trained person does seem to come primarily, of course, from rural places. I think the hon. member is making a reasonable suggestion when he suggests that the North might have a special look in placements.

Appropriation 2544 total agreed to \$ 84,400

Agreed to without debate:

<u>Appropriation 2545</u>	Cerebral Palsy Clinic	\$ 15,000
<u>Appropriation 2569</u>	Group Homes for Handicapped	120,000
<u>Appropriation 2571</u>	Centre for Care for Mentally Handicapped	762,000
<u>Appropriation 2572</u>	Developmentally Handicapped	1,000,000
<u>Appropriation 2574</u>	Alberta School Hospital, Edmonton	300,000
<u>Appropriation 2575</u>	Alberta School Hospital, Red Deer	5,561,570

Appropriation 2577 Deerhome, Red Deer

MR. BENOIT:

Just one final word, if I may, to support what was said by a number of the others here tonight, with regard to the social allowances. If the hon. minister looks back in his files he will find one or two letters there suggesting the possibility of a formula urging that we not provide any more for people who receive social allowance than possibly the lowest paid people in the community, the amount they would receive if they were receiving unemployment insurance, or if they never receive any more than what they would not be paying income tax on if it was received in wages. It has to be some kind of a formula because it can't apply in all circumstances in one way or the other. This I think, is pretty necessary, and I want to substantiate what some of the others have said with regard to this.

MR. DRAIN:

One particular thing here, and it was mentioned by Mr. Farran, the difference in cost in Alberta -- Alberta insofar as welfare is concerned. Alberta is a growth area. Hence, accommodation and housing is a big cost. I don't think there is that basic difference in food and the other things that are provided under social assistance. At least from my knowledge of what welfare recipients receive, they certainly don't live very high on the hog. So, I think probably if these figures were analyzed, the reason for the big differential in Alberta is simply the difference in accommodation costs, in housing.

MR. FARRAN:

I'm afraid the situation is worse than I described it earlier on tonight, unless the Senators are wrong in their figures. The figures I gave have a little footnote, and it said this: 'Actual allowances granted may be subject to ceilings and do not necessarily correspond to the budget standards.' The basic needs are defined as food, clothing, and shelter, and this is included for all the provinces, except for Alberta, which is the highest on that basis.

Alberta has three little daggers against it, and a footnote, and these daggers say this (this is a special footnote for Alberta): 'Amounts for provincial allowances are specified for food and clothing only.' So, in addition to that figure I gave you, they paid rent.

41-86

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

Appropriation 2577 total agreed to \$5,511,120

Appropriation 2580 Opportunity Corps

MR. BARTON:

I would like to ask the Provincial Treasurer to clarify; you've added a couple votes here, haven't you? Or made two new votes? 3074 and 3075? On your footnote on this -- [Interjections] -- because last year there were funds for the . . . Right?

Could I continue on? I have several other questions.

This Opportunity Corps, is this specific appropriation of \$782,330 directly totalling within the Special Area program of Lesser Slave Lake? Or is this an expanded program?

MR. CRAWFORD:

This relates to Lesser Slave Lake.

MR. BARTON:

All right now, I have several questions. How many dollars was in appropriation last year towards this total expenditure?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, perhaps I can answer quite a lot in a very short comment upon that. I know that the hon. member and the Provincial Treasurer are in the process of matching up, if possible, the equivalent appropriation to the last estimates, but my information from the department is that that particular exercise -- and I find this darn book pretty difficult to match up all the old and new appropriations -- isn't all that important because the program doesn't involve any greater commitment of funds than before, other than allowing for a slight anticipated increase in price and volume in the usual way. Therefore it's really a carry forward of an existing program.

MR. MINIELY:

Supplementary to that, I have located it here now. The 1971-72 forecast in estimate figures and the 1970-71 actual for Appropriation 2580 this year are included in last year's Appropriation 1464, Lesser Slave Lake Project. The reason for not breaking it down here is -- the note that I have is that the historical information, that is with respect to previous years, was available only on a project basis and it would have been difficult to arrive at a realistic breakdown of expenditures of previous years by departments. Because as you know it was one total project vote. The vote that blended the whole Lesser Slave Lake project last year was 1464; that applies to the Health and Social Development 2580.

MR. BARTON:

This is a cost-sharing program, right?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Yes.

MR. BARTON:

How many cases were handled on this particular program?

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-87

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I don't know the answer to that. I don't want to have myself treat this as the Oral Question Period anymore than the hon. member, but maybe questions like that if put on the Order Paper could be answered in a relatively reasonable length of time.

MR. MINIELLY:

Mr. Chairman, there's been a misconception of the Lesser Slave Lake project, which I've noticed about three or four times in the Question Period and in various times in the House. One thing that I would like to make clear about the Lesser Slave Lake project when we refer to it as a cost-sharing program is that, unlike other cost-sharing programs, the Lesser Slave project is funded half through grants, and half through loans. The loan portions are fully repayable. It's a loan from the federal government to the provincial government, and the grants are on a 50-50 basis. Whereas most cost-sharing programs are 50 per cent cost to the provincial government, the Lesser Slave Lake project is actually only a net 25 per cent contribution by the federal government. There's a very distinct -- if I might -- distinct distinction between that and other cost-sharing programs.

MR. BARTON:

Second question, have you evaluated this particular program and come up with any -- whether it's met its objectives?

MR. CRAWFORD:

No, Mr. Chairman, this is one of those programs that is in a fairly complicated area related to HRDA which was of course, cutting across many different departments and largely setting its own priorities and running its own programs. Whatever dispute I might have with that concept of doing the work is not relevant to my remarks on this appropriation. Having it in this appropriation is an attempt to bring it into a line department, where the work that can be done by the department to assist in any way with the difficulties of the people there can be merged with what was in this part of the HRDA program. In those circumstances I don't think that hon. members would expect that more has been done since last fall than to segregate this particular program and bring it forward for inclusion in a departmental program. The evaluation and our views of the achievements of its objectives will have to be made during the coming fiscal year.

MR. BARTON:

Second question, would your department still use a management unit as projects are for proposal in the local area, or do they have to come to this particular department?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, my presumption would be that the closest branch of the department would be the one involved.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Ludwig.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I was out of the House just for a little while. Could we revert back to 2574 just for a brief statement?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No!

41-88

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

DR. HOFNER:

You should have been here.

MR. LUDWIG:

No? Then I'll do it on total income account.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Moore.

MR. MOORE:

I would just like to give some comments with regard to Appropriation 2580, and also to some of the other appropriations in the Department of Health and Social Development as well as appropriations in other departments, in regard to the Lesser Slave Lake region.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we're putting a considerable number of dollars, millions of dollars, into the Lesser Slave Lake area. And while I perhaps agree that many of those programs are useful, those of us who represent other constituencies in northern Alberta where we have like problems are just getting somewhat amazed at the number of dollars that are flowing into the Lesser Slave Lake region, when there are other native and Metis communities in much of the northern part that do need similar assistance.

I would suggest, Mr. Minister, for your consideration that this vote not be increased another year but the dollars that are provided here be allotted to other regions in Alberta as well for some assistance in the operation of opportunity corps and that kind of thing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. BARTON:

I have to take that challenge up because the hon. Member for Smoky River doesn't know what he's talking about.

First of all, have you ever gone back and studied the history of how long we've taken to get this blinking program going? Four and a half years. And your Deputy Premier said it was hard work and it has taken hard work.

I want to tell you another thing. That any member in the North that's envious of this program -- get out and hustle and get it expanded -- it's your government -- you do it. Don't criticize something somebody else has got -- expand it; build it up. It's one of the better programs in Canada; it's proven it's objectives; now build around it.

MR. MOORE:

I didn't have a government in power that would spend something like \$25 million or \$30 million in my constituency to get me elected. It's very nice that the hon. member Mr. Barton did, and that's why he's here.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Appleby.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-89

MR. APPLEBY:

I, like the hon. Member for Smoky River, apparently am one of the members here who doesn't know what I'm talking about. However, I would like to say it anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. APPLEBY:

This appropriation is certainly one that creates a lot of thought among members like myself because we have exactly the same or similar circumstances as Lesser Slave Lake have in the constituency of Athabasca. Yet we do not qualify for these kinds of grants, these kinds of handouts, these kinds of appropriations. If you travel in the Lesser Slave Lake constituency -- and I have done so many times in recent months -- it's not very apparent what the productive results of these kinds of grants are. I think very much like the hon. Member for Smoky River that it's time they were spread around a little bit. They're certainly not being put to very good use in Lesser Slave Lake.

MR. BARTON:

Well, I'll take --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Notley.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Notley.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Chairman, I want to come to the rescue in part of the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake.

However, I think that one of the problems we've got into with the federal government's approach to these special areas is the fact that it does create a good deal of disharmony in the adjacent areas. We have the hon. Member for Smoky River getting up and saying, "We should have some funds in our area." We have the hon. Member for Athabasca saying, "We should have some funds funnelled into our area." I could perhaps say the same thing as far as Spirit River-Fairview is concerned. But the point that must be made with respect to the Lesser Slave Lake area is that here is one part of the province that really is a desperately deprived portion of Alberta. There really is no comparison with the other regions in total. The Athabasca constituency may have certain portions of the riding that need programs similar to the programs in Lesser Slave Lake. That's obviously true in parts of the riding of Smoky River.

I don't think there is any place in Alberta where you find a uniformity of desperation of the kind of poverty that really requires some form of special program. The hon. minister in his general comments several appropriations ago, when he ventured to be idealistic, was talking about the problems of the North and that people can't help but be moved by the problems of the North. I've travelled along highway No. 2 and been in all the communities along Lesser Slave Lake, and one cannot spend any time in these places and not be moved by the desperation of the situation. And as a consequence I believe that the formal program launched by the past

44-90

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

government was well-meaning, but we at the same time have to recognize that these programs do create problems. Perhaps we haven't been capable of explaining just why we are proceeding with programs in special areas, because it's certainly a fact that the Special Areas Program in the Peace River district has caused a great deal of disharmony throughout the whole locality. But that doesn't, in my view, mean that we should just throw out the thing completely.

Nor does it mean, just because some of the programs have not been as successful as we would like, that we should throw them out either. I believe that these programs take time to develop. I don't think that we can expect to get to Heaven in a single bound, or create a new Jerusalem overnight, or create a great prosperous area out of Lesser Slave Lake within a few short years with this kind of program. But this doesn't mean that the program as launched is without merit. It seems to me that what we should be tackling is finding ways and means of improving the delivery of services and incentives programs to districts like Lesser Slave Lake, and also singling out those other portions of Alberta where there are problems. Frankly one of my objections to the budget was that there wasn't sufficient money singled out for this program of combating the problem of poverty wherever you find it in Alberta. You find it in our two major cities too, as the Human Resources Research Council report last December quite clearly pointed out.

But it seems to me that rather than trying to reduce the expenditures, the proper route for us to take is for us to consider the social responsibilities which are clearly incumbent upon all of us, and see if we can scratch up the additional funds so that programs like this can be expanded to provide hope to all the have-not areas of Alberta.

MR. MINIELY:

I haven't said much about cost-sharing programs, and just to review some of the things that have been said, I sympathize with the desires of the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake. However, I have to say as Provincial Treasurer of the Province of Alberta that the whole area of cost-shared programs is one which is of great concern to us and of great concern to me in trying to balance the provincial budget.

The great habit that existed in the box that we've been forced into is -- I know my hon. colleague, Mr. Getty has said, the Premier has stated, and everyone else has said, that we're faced with a situation because of the development of cost-sharing programs in this area, where unfortunately there are many areas in the province which require economic development, and we're forced into the development because we're chasing 25 cent federal dollars with 75 cents of provincial money into developing areas that are supposedly approved by the federal government.

The special designated areas of the federal government are ones that our government is not satisfied with. There are many other areas in the province that require economic stimulation. The central-south requires economic stimulation. This is the area, that looking at the picture in total, we have to be concerned with in cost-sharing programs.

The thing that I object to is that hon. members of this House seeming to think for some reason that just because there is a 50 cent federal dollar over there that we should automatically be chasing it. Frankly, I have to balance the provincial budget and frankly it scares me, the implications of doing this. And that's the thing that I would like to make very, very clear when we're looking at expanding the cost-sharing program, we have to be concerned that it is exactly what it is. It has to be matched with provincial money, and the implications in the future are pretty serious unless we're able to

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-91

develop our own priorities within the borders of the Province of Alberta.

MR. BARTON:

I sympathize with the Provincial Treasurer and I realize his problems. But the attack on the program by the two members is unjust because I am sure if either one of them went out and talked to my constituents, not just along the highway where probably they are used to driving on paved roads, let them get out and talk to the people of the constituency. I'll reflect their views. Let them get out into the area where the roads aren't there.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to make a remark or two on this appropriation. First of all, I concur with what the hon. Provincial Treasurer has said in that certainly we have to establish priorities. I think that is the responsibility government has in office. I would like to certainly agree with what the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has said because I think that is a fair view at this time too, if I can say that.

I would like to go back to about 1967 and just talk about where this particular program started in Slave Lake. At that time, the small community of Faust, through their own initiative, were concerned about some of the social problems and some of the economic problems that they had. They came in to see us -- and I can still recall today the number of their young people, they were 14, 15, and 16 -- and they sat in Mr. Strom's office when he was Minister of Agriculture and at that time Chairman of the Human Resources Development Authority. They said, 'What really is the future for us? What have we really got to do? In a couple of years, two or three years, our most likely path will be marriage, raising a family with more welfare. Is that really what life is all about for us?' I think at that point in time the community or those young people plus the parents made some decisions to do something.

They went back into their community and through a community organization and with the help of, I must say, a CYC member, some other community development officers, and people around the Slave Lake area, initiated a thrust and later on made a presentation to Cabinet. In that presentation they didn't ask for more of this, more of that, more of this, but the integration and the co-ordination of some of the government programs in the area -- that's A and B -- some type of development through which these people could help themselves. That initiated the Slave Lake project. Following that we, as a provincial government, certainly concurred with their initiative. At that time we were willing to put some provincial funds into the program.

I believe, practically concurrent with that, the federal government decided that they wanted to put in some special area projects. We weren't sure whether they wanted to put one in Alberta or not. We made a presentation to them and the first question we asked the minister at that time in Ottawa was, are you going to put one in Alberta? Because, as I think you well recognize, as some of the ministers recognize, Alberta was always the province that had it and wasn't always included in some of the federal intentions. At that time the minister said yes, we are prepared to move in with a pilot project, one pilot project, then we will look at others following that.

I think the requests of the other two members here, indicating that their areas should have equal treatment and equal observation is a good point because if there was success in this Slave Lake project, and something has worked to rehabilitate the people, certainly the idea should be transferred on a broader base. But we did move ahead

44-92

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

in co-operation with the federal government on this project and some good things have happened. I think the Opportunity Corps has changed the lives of many people, given them a new opportunity and the money that is being expended here for those people, I think, certainly is going to bear some good results now and in the future.

So in making those remarks, I just wanted to give the evaluation of what happened and sort of support just about the words of everyone here because that is really diplomacy, I'll tell you -- but (a) I think there is a present situation and (b) the responsibility of government is to examine whether they can expand to the hon. members' areas and bring about the same type of development.

But the real key thing for the other hon. members to look at is the initiative that must come from the local community. If it doesn't arise from that area, if local people do not start it themselves and the government tries to bring it in and impose it, well that is when you are going to blow a lot more dollars than you may feel were blown in this particular program.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Chairman, if I could just respond to that again, because I know that one thing the opposition has tried to make a little bit of fun of is the creation of the role of the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Department. I agree with the fact that we must have regional development. But I would also like to say that one of the first things that we became aware of was the fact that we do not want people dashing off to Ottawa, making deals with the federal government which are not totally co-ordinated within the Cabinet and the Executive Council, and which we are not fully aware of the budgetary implications to the province in total, and this is the kind of thing we were concerned about, as it was not a matter of the project itself, it's a matter of ensuring that there is co-ordination of all these things. The only way they can be co-ordinated, in our view, is at the Cabinet level, and that's the reason for the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. BARTON:

I'd just like to clear --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I believe Mr. Clark was next.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, if I could just follow up the comments made by Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the defence of the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs, but the minister recognizes, I'm sure, that the position that the present government takes on cost-shared programs is absolutely no different than the previous government took on this particular matter.

It's very much similar to the approach the Government of Ontario has taken for many years. That point should be made first. Secondly, at this time when the 'now' government is talking the way the Provincial Treasurer is here this evening about getting out of cost-shared programs -- as I say, that's the exact position the former government took for a number of years -- we found out that you've agreed to a two-year extension of the post-secondary education agreement. Now you agreed to it because you had no darn choice, I'm sure, but the fact remains the same, that the position you've taken is the same position that the former government had; it's the same position the Government of Ontario has had for a number of years. Despite that, the various provinces haven't been able to date to prevail upon the federal government.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-93

Secondly, might I say to the Provincial Treasurer that I'm surprised to hear you say that the province has budget problems and that those problems are caused, to a very great extent, by the federal cost-shared programs. I appreciate that the problems of budgeting aren't easy, but if you're going to wait to come to grips with budget problems until such time as the federal government gets out of cost-shared programs, especially if you hold your breath during that period of time, your face is going to be bluer than Tory blue. Because with all due respect, despite the best efforts, for a number of years, by a number of sincere people, regardless of their political point of view, Ottawa hasn't budged on this darn cost-sharing thing.

With all due respect to the Treasurer, I think that his defence of the Department of Intergovernmental Affairs is so-so, but the fact remains the same that we're stuck with these cost-shared programs, and it won't be very long before there will be some more of these kinds of programs coming along and the province will say, "No, we're not going to get involved."

It isn't very far down the road then, before Alberta tax dollars are going to Ottawa and unless the Alberta government is prepared to agree to the program in one form or another, you won't be getting any of the tax dollars back to the province. You can call it rape by the federal government, or whatever term you want, but that's the problem the Province of Alberta has faced for years. We'll certainly help you in trying to make headway there, but just please do not hold your breath until that time, because in light of budgetary problems, I don't think the province can afford a by-election.

MR. MINIELY:

That requires some response, too, Mr. Chairman. Firstly, I am not saying that all our budgetary problems are tied in and I didn't say that they are tied into cost-shared programs. I am saying that they have major implications. It is something that, as the Provincial Treasurer, I would be foolish not to be concerned about.

Secondly, I am not so naive as to think that we are going to eliminate cost-shared programs quickly. However, one thing all hon. members should be aware of, and I don't think the Assembly is aware of at the present time, is that at the Finance Ministers' Meeting and First Ministers' Conference last fall, the post secondary education agreement was agreed to for a two-year period. It was also agreed that the Continuing Committee of Officials of Finance Ministers' meetings would pursue the concept of tax points in exchange for the post-secondary education agreement. So, for the first time, we actually have at least some work being done at the official level in preparation of the concept of tax points in the future in exchange with the post-secondary education agreement.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make just two or three points. Number one: I think that we have to remember that this is a pilot project. And the second point I'd like to make is that while we may be opposed to cost-sharing programs on a 75-25% basis, we're getting one dollar's worth of value in the province by spending 25 cents -- if it's on a 75-25. If it's on a 50-50, we're getting a dollar's worth by spending 50 cents, and I don't think we can cast that off too easily.

The third point that I'd like to make is that the program in this particular area should be very carefully evaluated. If it isn't carefully evaluated, then I think much of the value might not be evident. In my area, I too have poverty, and I have people who are unemployed, and I have a reserve where help is needed. There are hard times, the same as there are in the reserves in the north. But

41-94

ALEERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

I don't think we can ever make the province worse by improving one section of the province. In other words, the whole is bound to be better if one part is made better. It is my hope that by an evaluation of the program in this particular area, that if these programs do work, if they provide the economic stimulation, if they help people to help themselves, these same programs will then become available to others in the province. This is a pilot project, and I think we have to look upon it as that. I don't think we should be envious of the particular area that is getting the work done. If the people there can be helped -- they are human beings -- because we can't help everybody immediately, let us not refuse to help anybody. If we can find the ways and means to help people to help themselves in this particular area, then carry it through to other areas in the province, then the program is going to be well worthwhile.

My only final comment is that I think every program has to be carefully evaluated, and if that evaluation is not done accurately and carefully, we may well lose much of the value that might accrue from a program of this nature.

MR. MINIELY:

Just so the record is straight -- because the Lesser Slave Lake project -- the effect of it is 75 cents provincial and 25 cents federal.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer? For the dollars that are spent in the Lesser Slave Lake area, has the project met its objectives?

AN HON. MEMBER:

It never will.

MR. MCORE:

Mr. Chairman, I think some of the hon. members may have interpreted me a little bit wrong -- I didn't mean that the program in Lesser Slave Lake should be completely abandoned. However, I do and I have, contrary to the opinions of the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake, met with at least eight of the Indian chiefs from his constituency, together with their band councils. They have expressed their opinion to me also that they question whether we get a dollar's worth of value for a dollar spent in many of these programs.

Their contention is, that while the program may have been designed to assist the Indian and Metis people in that area -- and I would agree with you that they need assistance in many forms, just as the Indian people in perhaps Sturgeon Lake or Horse Lake or a lot of other reserves in the northern part of the province need assistance -- they expressed the concern to me that those dollars were being largely spent in some cases in paying salaries for employees of both federal government, and perhaps in some cases the provincial government, and that the actual dollar that was needed by the Indian and Metis people was not getting where it should be.

I would suggest, in reply to your question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, is that program a valuable one? It needs, without question, some evaluation to determine, in fact, whether we are getting a dollar's worth of return for a dollar spent.

In the whole area of cost-sharing, certainly, Mr. Chairman, we know that we are into that kind of situation in many things in this province.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-95

All I can say in reply to the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury is that with new leadership in this province, and with the kind of co-operation we have been getting in working with other provinces and with the federal government, there is, perhaps, a chance in 1972 or 1973 for a breakthrough in many of these areas of cost-shared programs with the federal government, where in fact, we may be able to get, as the hon. Provincial Treasurer says, income tax points added instead of the other way around. It is all very well to shake your head, but the effort should be made. I would say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the effort is being made much better at this time than it has ever been made before.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I wonder if one of the hon. ministers would like to reply to Mr. Barton's question on that evaluation.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I think I dealt with that earlier when I said that the manner in which the program was pulled together for the department from a previous omnibus program operated by HRDA, was such that it was brought forward with the intent of carrying it on, because it does provide approximately half a million dollars of wages poured into the area that are actually received by people who would otherwise not be employed. I think the dollar value in the communities, if there is a generator effect to wages paid, is clearly there.

Whether or not it's worth committing that type of money for make-work projects, which is basically what's involved, is the thing that has to be evaluated. If you have a person who is skilled in some way as a result of a job experience, and then doesn't fall back later on -- although I think that he would -- well then that by itself is a judgment that you're able to make that you've achieved something. So you've had a benefit. But coming back to the expression I used before, to be able to say there's a clinical evaluation in the sense of laboratory tests, or something like that, which you can tabulate and say this is the result, that's not possible in the circumstances today.

MR. BARTON:

I'd like to reply to the hon. Member for Smoky River. How many Indian chiefs have we in our area? Could you name them all? And secondly, the program with Indian Affairs and the special area --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Mr. Barton, I would ask that you direct any further comments and inquiries to the hon. minister please, because you and the hon. Member for Smoky River can have your own debate sometime else.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one comment. If the money is being squandered, as the hon. Member for Smoky River is suggesting, or being wasted, then it's his responsibility to bring that to the attention of the hon. minister. It's the government that's responsible for this. No use looking over here. We have no authority to deal with it, and I'm sure every minister and the hon. minister will be anxious to get one hundred cents value out of every dollar. So, if he has evidence that the money is not being spent properly, let's go to the proper place and get it corrected.

41-96

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

MR. MOORE:

The hon. member, if he had been in his seat, and I presume he was a while ago, should know that my initial remarks tonight were directed towards the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development with regard to the appropriation we had before us, with the concern expressed by me of whether or not we were getting a dollar value for that. Is that quite clear? Thank you.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one quick second's remark. As one who is keenly interested in health and social development, I think there has been broad misconception that has come up from the opposition regarding a number of items in health and social development, and it is apparent that this province is a welfare province in Canada as stated by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill. And now they the opposition tell us, and cry, that they want welfare incentives -- these are chameleon cries -- well I suggest to them and just for the record, I suggest that they should be patient for a while, and allow this government to review this present welfare administration state and change it into a new welfare incentive province. We'll guide them.

Appropriation 2850 total agreed to \$ 782,330

Total Income Account

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I have a couple of questions for the hon. minister. It concerns the Alberta School Hospital in Edmonton, and the Alberta School Hospital in Calgary. I understand that these projects were commenced, that architects were engaged, and sites were purchased or acquired, and that they certainly rated a fairly high priority because of the need of this accommodation in the province. I doubt whether anybody would contradict me that there is a dire need for these facilities, and I believe that this program rated a high priority and also that it is a people-oriented program. Now I understand that the government scrubbed both these programs and, be that as it may, I wonder what the alternates are and what happened. Why did it rate such a low priority to not only scrub this program, withdraw it entirely after some money had been spent, but that nothing has been done since on these programs. I believe that the hon. minister should explain what the intentions are and why the delay.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the word delay is exactly right, I think the word cancellation is probably more in order. If this type of institution rears its head again in the future it will be as a result of a change in circumstances that might make that type of institution appropriate.

As the hon. member knows, it was information abroad in this province as of last year that there were 600 severely handicapped children and they had been for years on the waiting list to get into the Alberta School Hospital in Red Deer. It was, I think, believed by many that the only reason why the list was not longer was because people had been waiting for so many years to get children admitted to the facility at Red Deer that in many cases they had despaired of doing so and made no application.

Now I think, like a lot of things, there are two sides to the story. One is that the approach that was recommended to the recent government, of which the hon. member was a member, was that this was the type of institution that filled the need. We have not adopted that view.

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-97

For one thing, I considered firstly the Alberta School Hospital as proposed for Edmonton. Although it's a very fine-looking thing on the drawing board, and I acknowledge that, and surely there was a site available unless the site at Oliver which was proposed would have been considered to be overcrowding -- which in the view of some I think, was the case.

But as fine looking as it was, it would be two years before the doors could be opened. We immediately moved to a program on several fronts, which I think the whole House is fully aware of by now. It involved the relatively short term conversion of the one wing of the Misericordia Hospital in Edmonton, which took the 100 off the waiting list -- they are not all admitted yet, they will be by the 18th or 20th of May -- a third of them are already admitted to the new premises. By doing so it shaved the waiting list substantially.

The principle involved here is that it was not necessary to create another Red Deer School Hospital. By transfers and adjustments and re-assessments of the patients that were there it was possible to bring a particular type of patient out of Red Deer that didn't need the highly specialized care, needed mainly custodial care, and to bring them to a place like the converted Misericordia which did not have to be re-built from the ground up as a highly specialized testing and treatment and rehabilitation centre.

The vacancies created in Red Deer allowed the people with the needs that were acute in that area to be moved in there. Our overall program in regard to this, which involves also the conversion of a residence at Deerhome and the proposal to construct, I hope by mid-summer, some community residence type of homes, where once again by selecting the appropriate type of patient a space can be created at Red Deer.

On short term -- not two years -- low cost conversion rather than construction programs we managed to reduce the list in a relatively short period by 200. Now the amount of easing that has taken place as a result of that is already being felt and I predict that the end result will be that it's going to be enormous.

The remainder of the patients at the Red Deer School Hospital are being assessed, lists are being checked. Some of the children on the waiting list, it was found, had died in the meantime and the waiting list was not accurate as to what it was thought to be. The long and short of it is, that by such a reappraisal we feel that the program for handicapped -- and this refers particularly to the mentally handicapped children in the province -- has been vigorously served by the policies pursued by the government and that the real need and the fulfillment of it has not been delayed in any way.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, the hon. minister explains the situation as far as Red Deer is concerned and the fact that they took up a lot of the waiting list. But do I gather from his explanation that there is no need now to move in the direction that we were moving because the facilities are no longer necessary? I am of the opinion that in Calgary they need these facilities rather desperately and merely taking up some of the waiting list does not answer the question. This is a problem that is ongoing and it keeps continually getting worse, and you may level any criticism you wish with regard to what happened in the past. We're dealing with the situation now and we have actually launched two very well-supported programs.

There are many ways to this thing. The main thing is to get something done. I'm of the opinion that the Retarded Children's Associations were very much in favour of the programs that we implemented and if the hon. minister is saying that this is now not a serious matter, that we can stall now, that's fine.

41-98

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

But I'm taking the stand that the Retarded Children's Association in Alberta and Calgary is very unhappy about the developments and the delay and I don't think that it was explained to them. I want to have the hon. minister tell us whether he, in fact, discussed this issue with them, with the parents, with the association of the parents concerned, to see if they are happy with the development because, I agree, we didn't do enough.

But we certainly were moving in the right direction and now to say that the whole thing has been cancelled and we have moved into the Misericordia Hospital -- well, that 200 have been taken up but that isn't all. There are still several hundred children waiting to be admitted with various degrees of incapacity in this regard.

I would also like to have the hon. minister advise us whether that Misericordia Hospital is really a safe place for children of this type. Whether having that many there in that kind of a building -- and I'm not saying that it isn't -- I'd just like to be assured that it is because we are dealing with particularly incapable children. In the event of a fire it could be a serious disaster in this province.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, as to whether or not I met with the associations -- I certainly have.

I have met with the associations both in Calgary and Edmonton and also attended the meeting of the provincial association not long ago. I don't think I'm overstating the case when I say that the reaction has been, I'm sure, genuine and sincere that the vigorous steps that we have taken are really appreciated. People have told us that it's an entirely new picture and they are grateful indeed. And I'm not just saying that for the purpose of making a political speech and making this side of the House look good at the expense of the hon. gentleman opposite. I am fully satisfied in my own mind that the people I have met with are deeply appreciative of what's been done in such a short length of time.

Now, I think maybe there is a misapprehension here. I am not committed to the specific projects the hon. gentleman began by asking about. Those projects, I believe, will not be built. But we're continuing a rapid evaluation of what facilities will be required continuing the orientation so far as possible to community and less institutionalized type of care, which is our objective.

We're working on our problems in this way and because of that we will probably not build these other types of buildings ever again in Alberta. We know that the present stock of buildings of government throughout the province is an institution-oriented type of stock. There are buildings here and buildings there, and empty ones and half empty ones, and in those circumstances surely it's in the interests of both speed and economy to assure ourselves, as we did in the case of the conversion of the residence at Deerhome and the conversion of the Misericordia, that before we embark on a new program of new construction all over again full utilization is made of what is available.

This does relate to the question of when you're converting a facility rather than building a new one whether or not it's safe as the hon. gentleman asked. I give my assurance that the facilities at the Misericordia are indeed sound and indeed safe, and that there need be no worry in that respect.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the hon. minister. I gather from him that the project in Calgary was cancelled and that he

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-99

is telling us now that there is no immediate need for any facilities in Calgary, or in the southern part of the province for that matter. What he is also telling me, unless I missed what he said, is that there are no alternatives in mind at the present time.

Now, I'm not concerned whether that specific project is going on because it doesn't matter too much whether you build this particular project. The question is what are you going to do, because I'm not going along with the fact that the problem is solved. You mentioned 600 on a waiting list; you accommodated 200 and the list is growing. Now it's enough to say that we cancelled it out because if you have better plans, let's have them -- what are they? You have cancelled out a program that was needed, that we were pressured to build. The demand was established, and now you are saying, "We cancelled them and we're not going to do anything else. The problem is solved." I don't think it's solved, and I think you should explain what the alternatives are to replace what you cancelled out.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Chairman, just for the hon. member's benefit. He probably has no way of knowing this because it's so recent, but he made specific reference to the Calgary Retarded Children's Association. Now, last Friday the Alberta Housing Corporation approved the tendering of four community residences specifically for that association as phase one on the Lincoln Park Village site. A few weeks ago a similar tender was let for the community residence just outside of Lethbridge.

Each of these residences holds somewhere in the neighbourhood of at least 20. They are group residences, built on a large residential house scale, and when you made specific reference to that particular association I thought you should be aware that Alberta Housing Corporation has been in pretty constant communication with Mr. Cunningham and the officials of his association, and phase one was kicked off last Friday. You should see announcements of the sod-turning ceremony within the next few days.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this announcement, but if the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development did not know of the alternative plan, then I really wasn't expected to know, because nobody let this thing out. But I appreciate the fact that there is an alternative. It backs the point I made that we certainly need facilities of some type. I'm not being sticky about the fact that this particular project wasn't going along, but it is something. I'm advised now there is something going and I am very glad to hear that.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, I suppose we can all tentatively hope in regard to that, that I did make reference to the fact that there were community residences involved in our plan to take up the 200, and that this was part of our orientation toward a community type of treatment.

I must say that it had not come to my attention in detail where they were to be located in what city, because they are to be located in at least three cities. So that's why I wasn't able to give the hon. gentleman a more definitive answer in respect specifically to Calgary.

But in conclusion as far as I'm concerned, then, Mr. Chairman, all I would say is that I hope it is clear that it is not the cancellation of the previous conception of this without alternatives. What it is, is simply this: that because there are alternatives, the cancellations I spoke of took place.

41-100

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 2nd 1972

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Just before closing, two questions. One -- in what vote would we find the monies for the caucus committees, for the task forces? You can take a try at that.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Item 12.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Can you give the amount, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CRAWFORD:

\$4,000.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

The second question is: in what vote do we find any payments for the airplane, the King Air or the Queen Air that is in Lands and Forests -- whichever it is? And how much money is available for that expenditure?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Chairman, there is no appropriation as such that relates directly to the airplane. I'm presuming that as the cost of operating the minister's office transfer offset charges will be made between the Lands and Forests Department and the allowance of the minister's office and the departments, if its officials might use it, would have for travel. And this would be recorded in that way.

Total Income Account agreed to \$153,734,340

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. CHAIRMAN:

It has been moved by the hon. minister, is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Diachuk left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 11:37.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has had under consideration certain estimates, reports considerable progress and begs leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

May 2nd 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

41-101

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 11:40 p.m.]

