

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Monday, May 8th, 1972

(The House met at 2:30 pm.)

PRAYERS

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 70 The Health Insurance Premiums Amendment Act, 1972

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being The Health Insurance Premiums Amendment Act, 1972. The purposes of this bill are partly economic -- to improve the collections systems now in use and also clarify the exemption from premium of those over 65. This amendment will be of special interest to some of the hon. members. Another purpose of the bill is to improve the business procedures of the commission with regard to inspection of records. Another purpose of this bill is humanitarian. It writes into the act the exemption from premium of those over 65. It also makes a provision for waiver of premium in cases of extreme hardship, but only on special recommendation from the Department of Health and Social Development.

Mr. Speaker, I would advise all hon. members that there is an error in printing in this bill which is readily seen on page 1 and it will be corrected in the committee stage.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 70 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 68 The Statutes Amendment Act, 1972

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being The Statutes Amendment Act, 1972. The purpose of this bill is to correct certain craft references, typographical errors and matters of that nature in a number of the Alberta statutes.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 68 was introduced and read a first time.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in the privilege of introducing to you and to the House some 40 Grade IX students from St. Patrick's School which is in my constituency. The students are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Carr, and by their intern teacher Mr. McLeod. They are in the public gallery and I would ask them to rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

45-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

DR. PAPROSKI:

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of this Assembly, 80 to 100 good-looking students from Northern Alberta Institute of Technology in my constituency accompanied by two of the staff members, also good-looking Mrs. McPherson and Miss Berozowsky. I would like to congratulate them for taking an interest in the democratic process and the legislative proceedings and wish them well, I am sure from all here, in completing their course, and also in their lives ahead. They have assured me they will continue their interest in government action and I would ask them to rise now and be recognized.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of the Assembly 50 beautiful young ladies and handsome young men from the Archbishop O'Leary High School in Edmonton. They are accompanied by Jim di Pinto, the organizer, and Mrs. Moon, one of the teachers. This school is in the constituency of the hon. Minister of Labour, the hon. Dr. Mohol, and possibly he'd like to extend a word of welcome too. The pupils come from several constituencies. I'm very happy to welcome them to the Legislature this afternoon.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the reply to question 172, requested by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Agricultural Development Fund

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. I noted in Saturday's Calgary Albertan, the headline "\$50 million for Farmers Introduced". Recognizing the hon. Minister of Agriculture's interest in accuracy, I was wondering if he would tell me whether or not this \$50 million includes the \$21 million that was formerly in The Farm Purchase Credit Act.

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it does include the \$21 million that is presently revolving in The Farm Purchase Credit Act, to which nothing has been added in the last four years. On the other hand, it does not include the guaranteed loans that have been made up to \$6 million under the livestock program and substantial amounts under other guaranteed programs under the Department of Agriculture.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister saying today then that the sums that will be available to farmers will be the amount of money that comes in by way of payment under The Farm Purchase Credit Agreement, plus the difference between that amount of money that is outstanding for the \$21 million and the \$50 million for this coming year?

DR. HORNER:

I'm quite sure, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Leader of the Opposition is aware of the budget implications and that the budget

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-3

allocation in regard to the agricultural development fund has been set at \$5 million. In addition to that, we are going to be able to use the returns on the revolving portion of the \$21 million. I want to stress that in addition to that, the guaranteed loan programs are outside The Agricultural Development Fund Act.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. minister that I certainly am aware of the implications and I want the farmers of Alberta to be aware of the implications, as well. I'm sure that the hon. minister doesn't want to mislead them. I am taking it from the answer that he has now given to me that there is a limitation of \$5 million within the amount of money that will be made available over a long-term period, and that we are, in fact, not looking at a total additional amount up to \$50 million for the coming current year.

DR. HORNER:

I don't know just what the hon. Leader of the Opposition is trying to prove, Mr. Speaker, but let me make it quite clear as we have made it clear in this House before -- I've already announced, as the Premier has in his speech in the Budget Debate -- that this \$50 million will be used over the next three or four years. That is the initial commitment that we were putting \$5 million worth of new money into the Agricultural Development Fund, and in addition to that would have the repayments that are coming in under the \$21 million that are now in the Farm Purchase Board. Again, I stress there are other ways that I've been trying to spell out to this Legislature over a period of time of the credit policies of this government, and if anyone is trying to mislead or confuse the farmers of Alberta, I'd like to suggest it's the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who failed to put any money into that fund in the four years that he was leading the government.

MR. STROM:

Again, let me just say that I am trying to get clarification on the headline here which I say was misleading.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister of Agriculture give us an estimate again, of how much is expected to be available through the revolving fund?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that they have a little trouble over there gathering facts together, but if I can I will repeat it again for them. There will be approximately \$2 million available through the revolving fund. There will be an addition \$5 million that we were fortunate enough to be able to get from the hon. Provincial Treasurer in this year's budget. We have a commitment from the hon. Premier that the \$50 million in total would be available over the next three or four years for capital investment in agriculture. In addition to that, I have told the hon. member on numerous occasions about the guaranteed programs that we were instituting, and I have already made announcements in this House -- and if the House would like I will rhyme them off again -- but the last time I started to do this, the Chair suggested that I not do it on this occasion.

45-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary. I wonder if the hon. minister would tell us if there will still be quite a large number of applications that can't be handled this year through the monies that are available through new money and the revolving fund?

DR. HORNER:

One of our real problems, Mr. Speaker, is the failure of the previous government to put any money into the fund. This has meant that there has been a buildup of applications for this capital money. What I am hoping to be able to do, as I have already told this House before on numerous occasions, is to sit down with each applicant and see where he could get his credit best. It may well be that rather than getting mortgage money in the traditional sense that we have thought about in the past, that the guaranteed provisions of the dairy program for instance, might be to his advantage, rather than going through the Agricultural Development Fund.

At the same time we are hopeful that with negotiation we can have co-ordination and co-operation with the Farm Credit Corporation in Alberta, in the allocation of their monies into the capital side of agriculture. So I simply say to the hon. member, we hope to be able to look after all farmers' credit needs to the maximum amount possible. That doesn't mean that just because there is only going to be so much allocated to the old Farm Purchase Board -- and we hope to change the method of operation there as well -- we can sit down with these people and find out where they can be best served by credit. It may well be that instead of what happened in the past when somebody went to the Farm Credit offices, for instance, and wanted to borrow \$10,000 or \$15,000 they were encouraged to borrow \$30,000 and \$35,000 and \$40,000 much to their chagrin today. We want to try to avoid that, Mr. Speaker, so that the issuance of farm credit will, in fact, be -- as I have said before -- a discussion across the kitchen table with the intended borrower and a complete review of his operations so that he has the income to meet his debts and to improve his income as well. That is our objective; how well we succeed will depend, not only on the amount of capital monies that are available, but on our ability to have this kind of liaison and extension with the individual farmers in the various areas.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the objective -- [Interjections] Yes, the question is coming; be patient -- don't be in a hurry. Is it true that the hon. minister has asked the M.D. of Kneehill to do the picking and choosing from a large number of applications that it has received?

DR. HORNER:

I don't know who the M.P. for Kneehill is, Mr. Speaker. I don't know of a constituency called Kneehill, so I wouldn't know whether that was . . .

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Municipal District of Kneehill.

DR. HORNER:

Is it the M.P. or the MLA? Is the hon. member aware of or --

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, did the hon. minister not receive a letter, of which I received a copy, in which the M.D. of Kneehill objects to picking and choosing?

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-5

DR. HORNER:

Now that we have the proper explanation from the hon. member for Drumheller -- as I have said earlier we intended to evolve a system of local and direct consultation with the farmers involved. In fact, while the municipalities or the counties would have some input into this local advisory committee, it wouldn't be left just to them to pick and choose who should get loans. There would be considerably more input from my department field people than there ever has been in the past. There would be input from the local business community. There would be input on a local level on an advisory nature with cross-references to particularly my field people outside the area, as sort of an overview to make sure that, in fact, we are doing the right thing. This will take some time and it means a lot of involvement on the local level, but we are not asking the local counties or municipalities to pick and choose as to who might receive a loan, because I don't think that is the objective at all.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister; is this in fact, \$50 million on top of the \$21 million that was in the Farm Purchase Credit Act, or is it, in fact, a \$29 million fund rather than \$50 million?

DR. HORNER:

Well, as I have said before, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman had the honour of being the Minister of Agriculture when they didn't put a nickel into the fund. The \$21 million is part of the total \$50 million. The important part about it is that \$21 million continues to revolve and continues to be available to the farmers of Alberta, in addition to the additional \$29 million. A pretty massive step forward, Mr. Speaker, when you think that they were asked each year in the last four years that I was in this Legislature, to put some additional money into the fund and they refused point blank every time.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is that a supplementary?

MR. R. SPEAKER:

I would like to direct a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Prior to application to the Farm Purchase Credit provincial body, would an applicant be required to make application to the Farm Credit Corporation, that is under the federal government's jurisdiction?

DR. HORNER:

Not necessarily at all, Mr. Speaker. That was a letter that was sent out by our people, because of the pressure from the counties and municipalities due to the very large back-log of lists of names that they had in regard to people requiring credit. I have since informed the counties and the municipalities that, in fact, we are going to try and meet the needs of all the farmers in the areas, but that it would have to be done on this individual basis, having regard to the kind of credit that is required, the length of term that is required, the marketing opportunities that are available, and the objective of increasing the income of the farmers in Alberta, without laying them down with a debt load that they couldn't manage.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vegreville had a supplementary?

45-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

MR. EATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether this is not right, that the county -- regardless of whether it is the County of Kneehill or any other -- processes the application for the Farm Purchase Board, and if the recommendation is made, then it goes to the Alberta Farm Purchase Board?

DR. HORNER:

That is the way it has been operating, Mr. Speaker. It is not necessarily the way it is going to operate in the future.

MR. HENDERSON:

Well, Mr. Speaker, my question relates to that just asked by the hon. member as to whether the minister has had any understanding with the federal government that they simply aren't going to reduce the funding for their Farm Credit Corporation in proportion with what we put into provincial sources?

DR. HORNER:

My negotiations and discussions with the federal government in this area have disclosed, in fact, that this is not the case. The Farm Credit people are anxious and willing to expand their programs in Alberta, but I would hope, having regard to what has happened in the past, that we could have better co-ordination and co-operation, and that we, as a provincial government, could have some input into the policies of the federal Farm Credit Corporation, because frankly, Mr. Speaker, unless we do have some input into the policies of the federal Farm Credit Corporation it lessens our control of the agricultural policy we'd like to see in effect in our province.

MR. HENDERSON:

Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I just want to be clear on this point of the minister. I can understand he "hopes", but do I gather he doesn't have really any type of an understanding with the federal government at this point in time?

DR. HORNER:

Well, the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc may have operated that way as a minister, I don't know, but I know this, Mr. Speaker, that we do have a good understanding with the head of the Farm Credit Corporation in Ottawa; that we are negotiating additionally in regard to the Small Farms Plan that Mr. Olson would like to implement, and that part of the leverage we have is that Small Farms Plan, and the other federal programs that they would like to implement in Alberta. We don't intend to give up that leverage as easily as the hon. gentleman did when he sat over here.

MR. HENDERSON:

One final supplemental, Mr. Speaker; in that regard I wonder if the minister would be prepared to table the correspondence on the subject?

DR. HORNER:

I would be delighted if the hon. gentleman would go to the exercise of putting the motion on the Order Paper as he ought to in any case.

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-7

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister be able to tell us if the interest rates under both acts are going to be the same this coming summer?

DR. HORNER:

I would expect that they are both going to be relatively in the same ring Mr. Speaker. If the hon. gentleman has bothered to read the act he will notice that the question of the interest rate isn't in the act. This was done to allow that kind of flexibility that can be tied to the question of the cost of money which, of course, is where the Farm Credit Corporation is right now, adjusted on a quarterly basis, and therefore the interest rates should be relatively within the same category because of that fact.

DR. HORNER:

I might point out again, Mr. Speaker, that it was the former government that raised the interest rate to 7% and forgot to lower it when the rates went below that. So our farmers have paid that additional penalty in the last year or two.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I wonder if the hon. members who have got into a debate here -- [Interjections] -- I appreciate that, but I wonder if we would have the hon. Member for Camrose and the hon. Member for Calgary Bow and the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place, and then I'll put on the hon. member for Wainwright.

Road to Campsite

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Highways. Are you aware of the condition of the new road leading into the campsite at the junction of 21 and 14? Last Friday I drove into this campsite and counted 13 trailers, including three from Saskatchewan. The road was in such a condition that I had to drive with extreme care due to the ruts. There was evidence of trailers being stuck. With the forecast for rain tomorrow, will you see that this example of how to discourage camping tourists in Alberta is graded and gravelled this afternoon?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that question, and I am aware of the situation there. We are going to take care of it. However, I am afraid that it won't be this afternoon, but it might be this week.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the minister on the same site; is he contemplating increasing the area of that particular campsite, in view of the fact that the highway took part of it away?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, no, I have not yet looked into increasing it at this time.

Swamp Fever

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Will the Lougheed

45-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

government be making representations to the federal government on that government's current consideration of reimbursing owners of horses which must be destroyed because they have, or are carriers of, equine infectious anaemia?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of concern for horses, however, I would like to have our Minister of Agriculture answer that for the hon. gentleman.

DR. HORNER:

Well, I don't know how much the hon. gentleman knows about the equine encephalitis outbreaks and the nature of the Coggin's test which was used to determine whether or not animals have been in contact, or have had the disease.

It's been a major problem, particularly in northern Alberta, and other areas of Alberta, and we made representations earlier in the year to the federal Health of Animals department and to our veterinarian section, to have horses covered under the health of animals diseases so that compensation might be paid to the owners of these horses if they had to be destroyed in an attempt to eradicate this particular disease, also known as swamp fever, from Alberta.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is it the Lougheed government policy to encourage compulsory testing of all the horses in Alberta, or just selected breeds, for swamp fever?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, when you're talking about eradicating a disease from an area, it is a question then of testing all horses, otherwise you're not going to eradicate the disease.

I remind the hon. gentleman of what's happened to brucellosis and how it was conquered in the cattle populations. This is the basis, as a matter of fact, of the Health of Animals Act -- that and Johne's disease also in cattle, and certain other diseases. In recent conversation, as a matter of fact, just a few days ago, with the head veterinarians of the Canada Department of Agriculture, they were moving forward in the area of getting compensation for horse owners, when they had to have them removed.

One of the problems is that with horses, particularly in northern Alberta, it's almost an endemic disease. It is going to cause some pretty serious problems to horse owners, in the north particularly, if there's a massive program of eradication. If there are any horse associations that would like to make representations to us in regard to the application of the Coggin's tests, and this matter of further representations to the federal people, the veterinarian section of my department would be only too delighted to discuss with them the entire ramifications. That's where it should be done, rather than in the House, because it is a technical matter that relates to whether or not you can effectively eradicate the disease from horses in Alberta.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is there currently sufficient facilities and personnel in Alberta to Coggin's test every horse in the province in one year?

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-9

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, do you know if the federal government reimbursement program is planned on a cost-shared basis with the provinces?

DR. HORNER:

Not usually, Mr. Speaker. The other federal programs of reimbursements under The Health of Animals Act are, in fact, a direct payout by the federal government in the cattle area, tied to market value. And I think there is going to have to be some discussions with the horse owner groups in regard to that question of market value in relation to the payout that might be paid for the slaughter of these horses.

I might also say -- and I asked this question specifically the other day of the head veterinarian for the Canada Department of Agriculture -- that if a horse is a positive reactor it doesn't mean that it can't be sent to the plant here for slaughter for the various uses for which they use horsemeat. So that they do, in fact, have some market value at the present time for slaughter for meat.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, --

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

One moment please.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, we've already had one cross-examination this afternoon. Are we going to proceed through another one?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall I believe had a supplementary question so we will accept his.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What type of a preventive program has the Alberta government adopted in the way of immunization and --

MRS. CHICHAK:

If I may please state a point of order. I think the line of questioning that has carried on this afternoon would probably be better served if it was made a Return on the Order Paper as the questions are taking some detail and they keep going -- [Interjections] Well I will stand up and I will express my point of order whether you like it or not!

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I appreciate that. We will have the hon. minister answer the hon. member's question now.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood and that's why I made my initial suggestion that, in fact, if the horse owners are really interested in this I can't see any political

45-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

kudos to be gained by the cross-examination here. But my people would be only too pleased to sit down with horse owners' groups to discuss this entire matter, which is pretty important.

In reply to the hon. Member for Calgary McCall, the idea of the eradication program as suggested is the prevention that's involved. The only way we're going to prevent or to wipe out this particular form of encephalitis is by the program as outlined. I think the people that are dealing with this matter in both my department and in the Canada Department of Agriculture are probably the most knowledgeable on the continent in regard to equine encephalitis.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright and then the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury please.

Purpose of Question Period

MR. WILSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Surely the Question Period is an opportunity for the members of the opposition and the government backbenchers to ask the hon. ministers questions and to gain information. And during my series of questions to the hon. Minister of Agriculture I was getting information from him. He obviously knew the answers to the questions and he was imparting the information. It wasn't an attempt to embarrass him or anything of that nature. If the Question Period isn't to solicit information from the ministers then I wonder what it is for, and I would like you to advise, sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

My only concern is that to a certain extent you have entered into a debate here today and I will give you another opportunity to raise a question, as I did to the hon. Member for Wainwright.

MR. TAYLOR:

On the point of order, -- [interjections] Mr. Speaker, surely we don't have to get approval for our questions from the government side? The questions are properly in order.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, if I might, because the hon. gentleman isn't quite right in my view. In my view the Oral Question Period is to ask questions of the ministry in relation to at least relatively urgent matters, and if anybody would like to consult Beauchesne they'll find I think that I'm correct that for routine questions of information, many of which were asked this afternoon, in fact these more properly belong on the Order Paper under either written Questions or Motions for a Return. It isn't a question of trying to refuse information or anything of the kind, but, as a matter of fact, the objective of the Oral Question Period should be for those questions of some urgency to be handled in an oral way and the balance to be put on the Order Paper and answered in that route.

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

Is that from Beauchesne or is that a 'Hornerism'?

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-11

DR. HORNER:

That's a 'Hornerism'.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I appreciate the discussion, however the hon. gentlemen are cutting into the Question Period and I would hope that you bear with me with my direction, and I'll give everyone of you an opportunity during the question period to raise your questions. The hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright please.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. We listen to the hon. minister rise from his seat time after time to go through this political exercise. The last thing this...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

What is your point of order, sir?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Unless you raise your point of order please, we'll follow with the question from the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place.

All-Terrain Vehicles

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, my question concerns, I believe, the hon. Minister of the Environment, although it may concern the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. It arises out of some advertising for all-terrain vehicles which I have observed. The ad shows the vehicle going up-stream or down-stream on certain streams and it suggests that this is a good way to go fishing, a good way to get access to a number of remote areas. I raise the question of whether the minister has observed this, and considered the erosion effects which this might have, both on the banks of streams, and also the effect which it might have in terms of destruction of fish breeding locations?

DR. WARRACK:

Thanks a lot. I haven't seen the ad myself, but I have seen the kind of ad that would be appealing at first to someone who was observing it and who might be considering the purchase of such an item. I suspect however that it really wouldn't be a very good vehicle for fishing and I think a person would find this out when they tried it, because they'd find that the fish would be scared away by the item in question. But I think it does emphasize the serious matter that was asked earlier, by I believe the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, regarding the control of motor-powered boats on waters in Alberta and the fact that we are trying very hard to get some action from the federal government so that we will have under the Canada Shipping Act and Small Vessels Regulations, the authority to establish ground rules for the use of boats on the waters of our lakes in Alberta.

MR. YOUNG:

A further question for clarification then, and a comment; this is not what I would regard as a boat, inasmuch as it comes with six or eight wheels, all of them moving at once, and I'm just wondering

45-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

whether there is any need for concern here or whether, in fact, these could become a menace to certain types of streams.

DR. WARRACK:

I would respond, Mr. Speaker, that indeed it is, if anything, more necessary to have a regulatory function within which the all-terrain vehicles would be used than the boats which I was mentioning, and I think it is a rather serious problem.

Farmer's Life Insurance Coverage

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, is he going to continue the life insurance coverage that has been available to those who borrowed money under the Farm Purchase Credit Act?

DR. HORNER:

That's one of the facilities that we are looking at, Mr. Speaker, and in all likelihood it will be continued as an additional benefit to the borrower under the act.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary to this, does not the hon. minister feel that in the preservation of the family farm, it is pretty important that this coverage be available?

DR. HORNER:

Of course it's important that it should be available, Mr. Speaker, but like a lot of other things, it's a question of whether or not the government should be involved in that area, or whether or not it is something that might better be undertaken in a group way, by the farm organizations or the commodity groups.

Red Deer College Inquiry

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Education, and I trust he will consider it to be an urgent matter. When can we expect from the Minister of Education a report on the inquiry at the Red Deer College? When will the minister make this public? And thirdly, when can we expect some action by the minister at the Red Deer College?

MR. FOSTER:

That is a very excellent question, Mr. Speaker, and a very timely one. Dr. Tim Byrne, in discussions with me about ten days ago, indicated to me that he was taking all of last week off -- I hope the Athabasca authorities are listening -- and that it was his intention to use this past week, Mr. Speaker, to draft a report. I anticipate I will be having some discussions with him, hopefully, before Thursday or Friday of this week. I would then want to review the report once it is received. I assume I will have it in ten days, although I don't feel I can press the gentleman. I am aware of the urgency, Mr. Speaker. I am also aware of the fact that there are hundreds of students in high schools throughout central Alberta who are, I think, anxiously awaiting some advice and comment from the commissioner and possibly from myself, and I wish to assure the House, and for that matter, Mr. Speaker, the students of central Alberta, that it will be my intention to deal with the recommendations of the commissioner on a priority basis.

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-13

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Having had some experience, a very delightful experience with the commissioner, might I ask the minister to reconsider his decision not to push the commissioner?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, the advice is noted.

MR. CLARK:

Another supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, at what status is the Moir report?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker -- [laughter]

MR. CLARK:

I didn't mean for you to laugh --

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, it really isn't a laugh. I'm afraid it is a comment that I enjoy. I have been expecting the Moir report, Mr. Speaker, every Friday for the last several weeks, and I suppose I will continue to expect it this Friday. I really think that I will have it in the course of the next ten days, Mr. Speaker, but I can't guarantee it. I am making representations through my office to get that report into my hands. I am very anxious to receive it and so far, Mr. Speaker, I haven't seen it.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary, I am not as familiar with the gentleman who is heading up this particular report, but nevertheless, I would urge the minister to push his colleague of the legal profession to get it finished.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, one passing comment. It was Mr. Clark's appointment, not mine.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Member -- [laughter] The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow and then the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation and then the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Calgary Hospital Bed Shortage

MR. GHITTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. It rises out of a letter I have received from a constituent setting out his concern over the shortage of hospital facilities for urgent operations in the City of Calgary. Apparently there is an example of a 27-year-old girl who requires a cancer operation. She has been placed on the urgency list and has been waiting for some three weeks to have the operation. I am wondering, Mr. Minister, whether or not we are in a critical situation in the hospital operation facilities in the City of Calgary, and whether you can make comment, or if you don't have the

45-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

information available to you at this time, whether you would look into this matter and report back to the House?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo that I, too, have received representations today in regard to this particular case. I think it does highlight how the existence of an individual situation -- where much concern is felt by all of those who are associated with the hon. member's constituent in this case -- can often reflect upon overall matters which relate to a policy level of government. Therefore, I have asked for certain inquiries to be made into the situation, which are already in progress, and would hope to be able to report to the hon. member in a few days in regard to that.

I might add that one of the suggestions made in the letter I received was that the hospitals might be encouraged to work on a round-the-clock type of shift in order that situations like this might not arise and that the operating rooms be worked on a 24-hour basis. That is one of the things that some of the hospitals in the province have slowly worked toward in the last few years in the sense that some of them now work one and a half shifts per day in the operating room instead of one shift. But this is about the only information that I was able to have for the hon. member with regard to attempts being made by the hospital system to meet cases such as this one.

Swamp Fever (cont.)

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. In your presentation to the federal government on the proposed control of swamp fever, did you take into consideration the fact that at least one group have voluntarily been destroying infected horses, and will the affected owners be reimbursed if the program is adopted?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the one group that, in fact, has been doing this, and I want to commend that group for its foresight. The question of reimbursement is one of the federal government, and while we can make recommendations to them, it will be the federal government that decides who gets the compensation. As a matter of fact, we haven't made any formal presentation to the federal government, but rather have worked together with the officials of my department and the officials of the federal government in working out the problem that's involved with swamp fever. Again, I'd like to hear representations from the horse people who are involved.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker; would the hon. Minister of Agriculture be willing to table copies of his correspondence on this issue so that the large Alberta horse industry, particularly those involved in registered breeds, would know exactly where the provincial government stands on this subject?

DR. HORNER:

Again, Mr. Speaker, I suggest he put the question on the Order Paper, and if the correspondence is available I will certainly table it. I would say to him that a lot of it is interdepartment memos from myself to my officials, because the initial representations were made to me by the hon. Member for Peace River, the Minister Without Portfolio in charge of Northern Development, several months ago and

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-15

it was through his instigation that, in fact, the original negotiations took place with the federal government. I think that we owe some appreciation to the hon. Member for Peace River for bringing the entire matter to our attention and initiating the programs that have gone thus far.

U.K. Army Exercises

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. My question concerns a brief news item in the current issue of the Free Press Weekly. The headline states, "United Kingdom Army to Exercise in Alberta."

"The advance party for a six-week training exercise, involving 800 British troops, arrived at Canadian Forces Base here this week. Most of the training of the Second Battalion, Royal Regiment of Fusiliers is to take place at Camp Wainwright..."

MR. APPLEBY:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker, regarding the hon. member's question. I would refer you to 173 of Beauchesne, subsection 4: "Questions asked orally on the Orders of the Day being called must not be prefaced by the reading of telegrams, letters, newspaper extracts or preambles of any kind."

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, we are not asking questions under Orders of the Day. We're asking questions under the question period, which is entirely different.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It is not different. It is not.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I wonder if the hon. member would now rephrase his question? I'm sure everybody knows the content.

MR. SORENSON:

Evidently the British troops, 800 strong, will be holding training and survival and adventure training at Kananaskis, Hinton, and in the Bow Lake areas of the province between May 7th and 12th. Are you aware of this visit, and will forest officials be present to see that all precautions are taken regarding fires and other damages?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I just became aware of it. This is the type of thing that's a continuing inter-relationship particularly with the British, and I believe to some extent American armed forces, from time to time at Suffield, Alberta. I would have to check, but you can be sure that we're taking all possible precautions in co-ordinating with these people so that there's not an additional forest fire danger. As a matter of fact, I appreciate your bringing the matter to my attention.

MR. FARRAN:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister; is it not true that a battalion of British soldiers has trained at Hinton and Canmore every year for the last five years?

45-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

DR. WARRACK:

I don't know, Mr. Speaker, but I suspect it is.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister; will he require a permit for fires from these people when they are in these areas?

DR. WARRACK:

I don't know, Mr. Speaker.

Tax Reform Legislation

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. In light of the statement by the Minister of State, Mr. Pat Mahoney, that says the federal government is now willing to accept submissions suggesting changes in tax reform legislation dealing with agriculture, my question to the hon. minister -- will the hon. minister be making representations in this regard -- recommending changes?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, certainly the government will be. It will be as a result of discussions between my department and all departments of government and the hon. Provincial Treasurer. We will be passing our feelings on to the federal government.

MR. RUSTE:

I take it that representations have been made in this regard prior to this?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, there have been -- before the legislation came into effect -- the hon. member might realize it is pretty difficult to know exactly the results when the legislation has only been in effect a very short period of time; and that to get the most valuable representations would be to see how, in fact, it works. The hon. Provincial Treasurer may wish to add something to this, and should he, I would ask him to pass the information on to the hon. member.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has put it well. I spoke with the previous finance minister, Mr. Benson, and Mr. Turner as well at the Finance Ministers' meeting at the end of January. We expressed specific concerns we had with respect to the tax reform legislation at that time. In particular, their feeling was that they wanted to pass it through the House. They particularly had a target date. They felt that they would want the act to be implemented and passed in the House of Commons, and that we should make representations to them some time this year; that their mind was open with respect to changes they would make as a result of experience under the act which would show inequities.

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-17

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege; I would like to acknowledge receipt from the hon. Minister of Industry, the answers to all the questions I raised during his department's estimate debates.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of information, the Legislative Assembly on standing committee of Law Amendments and regulations is seeking opinions and ideas from Alberta citizens in relation to a government bill. Progressive Conservative MLA, Committee Chairman, the hon. member for Drayton Valley, is asking those interested to submit briefs relating to Bill No. 64, The Surface Rights Act. These briefs must be in the hands of the committee chairman, Room 513, Legislative Building, no later than May 18, 1972. Additional copies of Bill No. 64 The Surface Rights Act, may be obtained from the office of the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly Room 313, Legislative Buildings, Edmonton, Alberta.

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the House of a change in the policy of the Department of Education regarding new school building requests in the province of Alberta. As of now, all new school building requests received from throughout the province will be placed on a holding pattern by the department. This is necessary as a result of three factors. Firstly, a recent survey by the department indicates there are presently 800 vacant classrooms in the Province of Alberta. This does not include portable units not receiving full use, of which there are approximately 600 scattered throughout the province.

The second reason for the holding pattern relates to the recent release by Statistics Canada of the birthrate which in Alberta, has been dropping very substantially and has done so this year, over last year, and over previous years.

The third reason is the decreasing number of students entering Grade I. The number of students entering Grade I in September 1969 was some 39,500. In 1970 that dropped by 400. Last year it dropped by 4,000. With all indications being that the school population entering Grade I will be dropping continuously to 1975, these three reasons together have brought the decision that only critical requests for new buildings will be entertained in future, until such time as there is a better indication of some kind of stabilization of the birthrates and the number of pupils entering school for the first time.

Also the department and I want more assurance that present facilities are being used to capacity. For the present I might mention that all new school buildings being considered, on which contracts have not yet been let, will be reviewed under the new holding pattern. Some recognitions of need will be confirmed, others will be scaled down, and some will be rescinded or refused entirely.

I might mention in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that this move will not affect the school life extension program which was recently introduced, and renovations to upgrade older schools will continue as approved.

45-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. HYNDMAN:

I move that you do now leave the Chair and that the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider a Resolution for a bill for an act being The Ombudsman Amendment Act, 1972.

His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor has been advised of the contents of the bill and recommends the same for consideration of the Assembly.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair.]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The Committee of the Whole will now come to order for consideration of the resolution, that it is expedient to introduce a bill for an act being The Ombudsman Amendment Act, 1972.

[The resolution was agreed to without debate.]

MR. LEITCH:

I move that the resolution be reported.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

I move that the Committee rise and report the resolution.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Appleby left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.]

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has had under consideration the following resolution, that it is expedient to introduce a bill for an act, being The Ombudsman Amendment Act, 1972, and beg leave to report the same.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

[The motion was carried without debate.]

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-19

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 75: The Ombudsman Amendment Act, 1972

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being The Ombudsman Amendment Act, 1972.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is a very important one, because not only does it touch the most important office of the Ombudsman, but it also brings about some important changes in The Ombudsman Act. The first purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to provide an increase in the salary of the Ombudsman, effective as of January 1, 1971. The salary will be \$28,000 for a period of one year, and then effective January 1st, 1972, his salary will be \$30,000 per year.

The second purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to amend the provisions dealing with the Ombudsman's right to obtain documents. There had been some uncertainty over whether he was entitled to take possession of a document within the various government departments and return with them to his office, and because of that uncertainty, an amendment was introduced to make it clear that he could do so.

The third purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to provide that no report of the Ombudsman can be made the subject of an inquiry, under either the Public Inquiries Act or the subject of an investigation or review by any person or body pursuant to any other act. It does, however, provide the exception that a report of the Ombudsman may be the subject of an inquiry, investigation, hearing or review, conducted by the Legislative Assembly, or a committee or commissioner appointed by the Legislative Assembly.

Another purpose, Mr. Speaker, of this bill, is to provide that on such an inquiry -- that is, one being conducted by the Legislature, or by a person or group authorized by the Legislature -- the Ombudsman may be required to give evidence. Again, Mr. Speaker, the members may be able to recall a situation which had developed in the past where there was some uncertainty and dispute about that. This amendment provides the Ombudsman is a compellable witness. However, Mr. Speaker, it then goes on to provide that if, in the Ombudsman's opinion -- and the discretion is solely his -- an answer to any questions may disclose matters of secret or confidential matters, he is free to refuse to answer the question. There are further provisions in that amendment, Mr. Speaker, which enable other persons employed by the Ombudsman to appear as witnesses on such an inquiry under the same circumstances and conditions as the Ombudsman.

But again, Mr. Speaker, there is a provision whereby the Ombudsman can take, on behalf of that witness, the objection that the answer to any question may disclose materials of a secret or confidential nature.

The last purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to provide that the Ombudsman shall not, in any report which is made public, express any opinion, or make any adverse comment with respect to any department or officer of a department, any agency or member or employee of an agency, or any other person or group of persons unless prior to making a report, the Ombudsman gives to that department, agency, or person the opportunity of knowing what the adverse opinion or comment will be, and to make an answer to it to the Ombudsman.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 75 was introduced and read a first time.]

45-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

[The motion was passed without debate or dissent.]

[Mr. Deputy Speaker left the Chair.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Appleby took the Chair.]

Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs (cont.)

Appropriation 3102 General Administration (cont.)

MR. STROM:

The other day, we were discussing the operation of the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. We were expressing some concern in regard to the method in which the department was operating.

I'm wondering if the hon. minister could tell me how a project would be handled by his department -- a project that may or may not be initiated by the provincial government, but that concerns the provincial government. Would the minister be able to tell us the approach that he would use in taking this to the federal government?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder whether the hon. member would elaborate on what he meant by 'project'?

MR. STROM:

Yes, Mr. Chairman, let me take for an example the Small Farms Development Program. Would the hon. minister tell me how he would take that discussion up with the federal government?

MR. GETTY:

An item like that -- the way we are attempting to handle it, Mr. Chairman -- would be as long as it was able to fit within the overall policy of the Province of Alberta's Department of Agriculture, the Department of Agriculture would, in fact, negotiate, meet and discuss the various matters under consideration. An official from my department would be present and the negotiations and discussions would proceed -- unless there was some point at which time there appeared to be a policy matter that needed to be discussed -- at which time the Minister of Agriculture and myself would discuss the policy matter. Then it would go further, it might go to another Cabinet committee and then back to the table to be discussed with the federal government.

MR. STROM:

Taking the example that I have used, I wonder if the hon. minister could indicate to me how you would determine at what point the policy matter would be discussed. Would it be discussed prior to the Minister of Agriculture discussing it with agricultural officials at the federal level?

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-21

MR. GETTY:

Yes, the whole matter would be discussed at the Cabinet level between the hon. Minister of Agriculture and myself and other interested members of Cabinet.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I'm not just clear as to the determining factor, as to who you will discuss it with. You have said you will discuss it with colleagues and, possibly, with the cabinet. Who would initiate the discussion at the cabinet level?

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, it would depend on what the matter was. It would be referred either by the Cabinet committee method, which we have in existence, and if it was necessary to go past one of the Cabinet committees which was dealing with it, perhaps the finance priorities and co-ordinating committee then it would be referred by that committee to Cabinet.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, if I might backtrack just a little bit, because I would like to keep the project I mentioned as an example so that we can understand it just a little better. We'll assume that the federal government have initiated it, because I take it that this was their program. It may have come out as a result of the meetings that were held with the Federal Minister of Agriculture and the ten ministers of agriculture. I'm not sure at which point it did develop, but do I take it then that the Minister of Agriculture, after consultation with his counterparts across Canada, would take it back and discuss it with a Cabinet committee?

MR. GETTY:

That's quite possible, Mr. Chairman. It might happen in this case; it might not. They might discuss it with just one member of Cabinet. He might discuss it with the Cabinet Committee. It depends, I'm not sure.

There are certain guidelines established that the minister is recommending that he would like to see in the agreements reached, and certain objectives he would like to see the agreement meet. As long as it continues along those lines then he would not need any further reference perhaps. But then there are times when he might feel that it would be timely to have a report or briefing before a committee or before Cabinet itself and just bring them up to date on how it's progressing.

Are you the chairman of that committee? And would you be in charge, then, of the discussions that were carried on relative to the example that I used again? And would you then be making the final decision on behalf of Cabinet? Let me put it this way, because I want to be clear on it. Let us suppose that you are the chairman of it, and I don't know, but just for the sake of discussion, we'll say that you are the chairman, the subject is discussed there. Do you make a decision on it as the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs? And if you are unable to make a decision, do you then take it to Cabinet?

MR. GETTY:

Well, it depends again on the committee. The committee I specifically mentioned, the Finance, Priorities and Co-ordination, the Premier is the chairman of that, should it go to that. I'd have input there as would the hon. Minister of Agriculture or any other

45-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

members of that committee. And it might be that it would not go any further because we would resolve the problem, if it was a judgment factor, as to whether or not it was required to go before the Cabinet itself, then it would, on either a briefing basis or a decision basis.

MR. STROM:

When these decisions are made, and I have to confess, Mr. Minister that I haven't been able to get clarification as to how it operates and I have some appreciation for it. Can I pursue it then from this point of view? Are you really saying to me then, that the negotiations between the provincial government and the federal government will be carried on by the hon. Minister of Agriculture; using the example that I have just raised earlier?

And so I don't have to rise again on this -- you suggested earlier that in any discussions, and I may be just a little too broad in my interpretation of your remarks, but in the discussions between the two levels of government, if you are not there personally, there will then be a member of your staff that will sit in on the discussions between the provincial government and the federal government?

MR. GETTY:

There will be, and there would be, and there have been. Now there has been some period of time while we are filling all of the positions in the department, and there are some cases where we just can't have someone at a particular meeting which would be at the official's level. But normally there would be a member of my department -- Yes.

MR. STROM:

If there isn't a -- and this is the last question, I don't want to monopolize the time, just to follow through -- if you do not have a member of your staff or yourself at the meeting, what is the method of reporting to you on the negotiations that are going on between the departments? And let's take this one again, I want to stay with this example between, we will say, the deputy Premier and the provincial government. At what stage and in what method are you brought up-to-date on the discussions?

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, if we assume it's a meeting of officials -- the officials representing the Department of Agriculture, in a meeting that my department was not at because of staff problems -- the official in the Department of Agriculture would report back to his minister. In this case, it would be the Minister of Agriculture who would discuss the matter and keep me up to date on it and the progress that they had made.

MR. STROM:

Would notes be made?

MR. GETTY:

Well there could be a memorandum, and as a matter of fact, there quite often is, and sometimes in some detail. They can be both written and verbal, our offices are side by side, and we have many discussions over these matters.

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-23

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, just on the follow-up of the same line of questioning. One of the things that I have wanted to know about your responsibility is just what authority you have in the role of co-ordination. There are different kinds of authority. There is formal and informal authority, possibly you could cover both of those aspects. I think the formal authority is the one I have the biggest question about because I think we can see some situation where it may be necessary.

MR. GETTY:

Well I'm not sure quite how to answer the hon. member, Mr. Chairman. He's talking about Cabinet authority. If I could draw a comparison, the Minister of the Environment has complete authority in areas of environment. Nevertheless, quite often there may be a situation where he does not necessarily control the final decision; however, he may have made his point to the Cabinet.

Now in matters of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, you could liken to that example. As you can see by the act, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs must agree to agreements before they are entered into and that would mean considering all matters pertinent to a decision. Should it be that we decide to enter into an agreement, having taken into account my thoughts, the ministers involved, and other members of the cabinet, then the agreement would either be signed or changed -- altered in some way -- and finally, I assume, brought to a conclusion. I am not sure if I am getting exactly what you want but is that a start?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. minister could advise whether he has the authority in such case to override the Minister of the Environment or doesn't he?

MR. GETTY:

As you know, I am sure, from past experience, Cabinet authority is something that is on a collective basis. Our system is a Cabinet system, which is a collective decision of all members of Cabinet. It might be that, until an agreement finally fits the policies of the government, we would withhold approval. If a policy was unreasonable I think any member of Cabinet could take it to Cabinet and say this is unreasonable and therefore it shouldn't be signed. Naturally, of course, I am sure as you have had lots of experience in this area, that is the way Cabinets operate.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I must say I never had any experience with another Cabinet minister looking over my shoulder to see if what I was doing was in keeping with some sort of directive, so that is the reason for asking the question. I gather the hon. minister doesn't have the authority to tell the Minister of the Environment, "no, you can or cannot do this". I can only say if he doesn't have that authority, what role does he serve in this operation if it is a Cabinet decision and Cabinet collectively that makes the decision? This is where we have some difficulty in grasping exactly what role the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs does provide in this whole thing.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Read the act.

MR. HENDERSON:

Oh the act, as the Provincial Treasurer --

45-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

MR. MINIELY:

Read Clause C --

MR. HENDERSON:

. . . just keeps saying gives the Premier the authority to have certain agreements with Ottawa signed both by the Minister of the Environment or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and another Cabinet minister, or maybe just the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. What we are trying to find out is exactly what role the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs plays in the decision making.

I started out about half-convinced he had the authority to over-rule the Minister of the Environment subject to some sort of directive, presumably from the Premier. But now I find that is not the case, that the whole decision -- if the Minister of the Environment does something that isn't agreed with is, that any minister can bring it in, have the matter discussed in Cabinet, and Cabinet collectively can over-rule it or change it. Certainly I am familiar with the procedure of having a decision made collectively in Cabinet, but the question that is still hanging up in the air is exactly what role does the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs play in this operation or in this exercise or in this decision-making? This is what we are trying to find out.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, I don't think I can make it any plainer than I have for the hon. member. Any matters relating to intergovernmental agreements, they -- you know, we don't, Mr. Chairman, suddenly hear about them -- they are developed amongst the members of our government all the way from the start to the finish. They don't come in as something new -- will you agree to this or won't you agree with this -- obviously we are consulting.

We believe in and operate under a team approach in these matters and so we are constantly aware of how something is developing. There may be a situation where something appears not to fit the broad policies that the government believes in, and yet any minister may feel that he would like to do this in his department or sign an agreement, in that case, it might be withheld. But I would suggest that any minister's strength -- and it is strictly a philosophical thing as far as I am concerned -- lies within the Cabinet itself.

MR. HENDERSON:

My supplementary, Mr. Chairman, is that, other than the authority to sign agreements with the federal government, which I presume sooner or later will be defined in regulation - at least we assume it will, because if that doesn't happen, this is even a bigger fiasco - but other than this as yet undefined authority that the Premier is sooner or later going to get around to delegating to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, what authority and responsibility does the minister have then under this arrangement at the Cabinet level that previously wasn't defined as responsibility under the secretariat system that the previous administration had?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, I have no idea of the secretariat system of the previous administration, and what authority they gave it. Obviously, in going through my estimates, I would not attempt to guess at the weird and wonderful ways that those may have been exercised. I think the member has been concerned about something in the act -- and we'll get to it in the act -- and that is the regulations which indicate those agreements which will or will not come under the signing

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-25

authority. That is meant to exclude those agreements that are necessary as advised by the Legislative Council, of a more or less minor nature -- for instance, the CMHC agreements. If you read the act, the act is involved in all intergovernmental agreements, therefore, as you can imagine, it gets to be quite a broad number. Some of these it would just be administratively impossible to be involved in, and those can be designated by regulations so that, in fact, the minister must not necessarily sign them.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, on the very same topic, just so I have clear understanding, what authority then is unique to yourself in your role as Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, where you can initiate action on some project or something that happens in government? The other ministers have certainly that authority. What authority have you in that area?

MR. GETTY:

On intergovernmental relations of any kind, for instance, if we were establishing something in the area of foreign investment -- there are many things that just don't fall along program lines, in the general making sure that we have a good understanding and a working relationship on energy matters -- that type of thing we would initiate by talking to the ministers involved in the federal government and then co-ordinating with the minister involved in our government.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Just to follow this question up --

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:

I think we'll listen to Mr. French, and then you can ask your question afterwards if you wish.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Chairman, I have a question for the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. What is the status of the negotiations between you and the federal government with respect to legal aid?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, the legal aid discussions have been between the Attorney General and the Minister of Justice in the federal government. Having really discussed the matter generally with the Attorney General, I have not been involved with any further negotiations. I think what is necessary -- to throw some light on it for the hon. members who are not as familiar with our ideas on this matter -- is to give you some idea of the way the department is being set up.

Under the minister's office, there is an executive director who is responsible for four directors of the department. These directors are split up as follows: the director of legal and constitutional affairs; the director of finance and services; the director of social and cultural affairs; and a director of resource and development. I should carry that on a little further. Then there is a research co-ordinator and three research people.

At any stage of negotiations, one of the directors who is responsible for the item that is being discussed at the officials level, will be at the meeting when, hopefully, we have our staff completely selected. He would then keep me advised, and I would

45-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

effect liaison in this case with the hon. Attorney General to make sure there are no problems.

If you will recall when we were initially talking about the department, it is not the intention of the department to get between the ministers of our government and the ministers of other governments, but in fact, as long as things are going smoothly with them, we would not get involved. We encourage, as much as possible, our ministers to meet with ministers of other governments.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, just to follow the questions I had before. In the examples you cited for me -- let us say foreign investment, for example -- that area is still under the actual jurisdiction of the Provincial Treasurer. Dealing with Mines and Minerals, that was the other one for that area, that minister still has the legislative authority to make any kind of agreements in the final analysis of it. However, you could act as sort of a facilitator or mediator, but really, there is no unique legislative authority that you have in that area. Is that correct?

MR. GETTY:

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, there is in the bill -- it is unfortunate that we haven't gone through it yet -- but obviously there is authority there; it is authority to not allow the agreement to be signed.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, but certainly it indicates in the bill, I believe, that the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, along with another minister, can make signatures to agreements such as that. However, the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs would be the last to sign it, and in that sense, can either be in a veto or an OK position.

MR. GETTY:

The reason for the signature in addition to the other minister is to take the case where an act actually calls for -- and there are such acts -- the signature of a certain minister. Obviously then, rather than to change all the acts, he would still sign as a minister, inasmuch as there was not a department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs in existence when that act was drawn up. But now, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has the signing authority. It is something the Legislative Counsel has advised me is necessary.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Using the area of foreign investment, there wouldn't be any way that you on your own could initiate a foreign-provincial type of agreement and totally ignore the signature of the Provincial Treasurer. That is what I was meaning by legislative authority that is uniquely yours, to initiate agreement and to take the agreement to the Cabinet and then move from that point.

MR. GETTY:

I am not sure when you said 'foreign' -- did you mean with another government outside of Canada?

MR. R. SPEAKER:

The one area where you could initiate . . .

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-27

MR. GETTY:

You were asking about carrying on negotiations with Ottawa in a matter that was not lying within another minister's department, then I mentioned the problem of foreign investment in Canada. I could deal with Ottawa on that matter, for instance, with the hon. Herb Gray. I was trying to pick one that did not lie directly within program department lines, that's all.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

One other question, Mr. Chairman. Could the other respective ministers in all of these different items we are talking about, bring the matters we have discussed into committee or into Cabinet, to have a decision made, and co-ordinate the matter themselves? And after that, proceed to negotiate with Ottawa in a normal fashion, and do the same thing you are doing at the present time without yourself acting as an intermediate step? Could that not be done?

MR. GETTY:

Not in our government, no.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, dealing again with your authority; if upon receiving an agreement under the powers of the act, can you refuse the agreement?

MR. GETTY:

You mean that if the agreement came to me for signature, that I could refuse to sign because of something in the agreement that I did not think was advantageous to the people of Alberta? Yes.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

What are the conditions, Mr. Chairman, if there was a deadlock between yourself, and say, the Minister of Environment; the person to settle that type of agreement is the Premier. He has the final authority in that area. Whose legislation would the Premier take into consideration as being a priority legislation? Which minister has first precedence?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, they have to ask questions like that of the Premier. Certainly not of me, although if you will notice that the Act in fact, supercedes any other act in terms of intergovernmental agreements.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, while we are on that subject, I am just trying to find the appropriate wording in the bill and possibly we could pursue it when the bill comes in. I gather from what the minister has said that all agreements that are described in Alberta legislation at present time regarding the participation of another minister of the government in some other department will continue to require the signature of the minister of the department. And I gather from that, the only legislation the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs will have jurisdiction over solely are agreements as yet unnamed and undetermined, and that I presume don't exist, that will be negotiated in the future and that don't specifically relate to another department of government.

45-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

MR. GETTY:

Well, what I was saying was that the Legislative Counsel has advised that some agreements, by acts, must have on it -- I think the Act says can be entered into between the Minister of Regional and Economic Expansion and another minister, and it is actually spelled out. In that case, rather than going and changing all those acts, we have said that that minister can sign, but in Alberta, in addition, there will be the signature of the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Now if the act does not spell out that there must be a signature by another minister, then there will not be one. It will be by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs only. It is only to take the care of these situations which would save the rewriting of a great number of situations.

MR. HENDERSON:

There is a final question on the matter. I gather then that the authority that is in the Act is not intended to be used to override legislation regarding ministerial responsibilities relative to federal agreements.

MR. GETTY:

Well, I don't know what exactly you mean by that. If it says in the Act that the Minister of Agriculture may enter into an agreement with the Government of Canada to do something, that should he sign with the Government of Canada, that agreement would not be binding, unless it had either just the signature of the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs; or, should it be necessary for some legal reason, because it is spelled out somewhere that it must be the Minister of Agriculture; there would have to be both his signature and mine.

MR. HENDERSON:

In fact, the Minister is saying that the Executive Council will have the authority, by means of regulation, to override existing legislation regarding the definition in statute of a given minister's responsibility for the negotiation and signature of agreement with the federal government. This is the way I interpret it.

MR. GETTY:

No, not the Executive Council, Mr. Chairman. This Legislative Assembly.

MR. HENDERSON:

. . . Executive Council, because it says, by regulation.

MR. GETTY:

Well, this Legislative Assembly will be deciding whether or not to approve the act for my department, Mr. Chairman, and as I told the hon. member, that there are some detailed agreements that would not enter in any way into policy matters. As I understand it, under the Intergovernmental Agreement definition, there would be any document signed under a mortgage, under CMHC, Alberta Housing Corporation, -- those kinds of things -- we will designate by regulations, so that in fact, we're not signing all of those.

MR. HENDERSON:

To be specific, let's use an example, Mr. Chairman. For an example, let's use the hospitalization plan. I think the Medicare agreement also requires this -- well there is no agreement with Medicare, basically, it's just the hospitalization plan. As I recall the legislation, the agreement requires the signature by the Minister of Health, or now the Minister of Social Development.

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-29

The question I'm trying to find out, is it the intent of the government that the manner in which this office will operate, that, under the powers of Section 5 of The Departmental Act, that the government, not the Legislature, but the government, by regulation -- which is by Order in Council -- will have the authority, in effect, to say -- and I'm just using this as an example -- that no, that from here on in, the Minister of Health and Social Development isn't going to be the man that signs this paper? The hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs is going to sign it.

MR. GETTY:

I don't quite follow your thinking. This Legislative Assembly, if it approve the act -- and you're talking about The Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Act -- will be saying that there are no agreements going to be entered into with another government and this government, unless they are signed by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. BENOIT:

A few moments ago, you made a passing reference to the Department of the Provincial Secretary that previously existed. He was the keeper of the Great Seal of the Province and very often --

MR. GETTY:

I didn't mention this but go ahead.

MR. BENOIT:

Well, I thought you had -- is there in fact a comparison between your department and that of the Provincial Secretary as it previously existed?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Chairman. I had not brought up the Provincial Secretary department or that responsibility. I am aware of the Great Seal. That's now within the responsibility of our Attorney General.

MR. BENOIT:

In connection with the previous Department of the Provincial Secretary -- there were a number of things under that department, like Culture and Recreation, then there was the Fire Commissioner, and the Company's Office, and a number of offices like this. Now they've all been distributed. In your responsibilities you have four categories that you named a few moments ago. Some of them sounded like duplications of departments already in existence. How does that work?

MR. GETTY:

Yes. I see the point you're making. In other words, a Director of Resource and Development, would in fact have responsibility to be aware of those things that are going on of an intergovernmental nature for Agriculture, Energy, Environment, Industry, Lands and Forests, and Rural Development. So there would be one person who was monitoring those things happening. He would not have the program responsibility though. That would be the difference. In other words, I think I said a Director of Social and Cultural Affairs. We were picking a broad title there to try and cover the numerous thing. That that director would have responsibility for which would be in the areas of education, advanced education, health and social development, culture, youth, and recreation, Department of Labour.

45-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, would the minister outline the method of representation he used for requesting Alberta representation on the National Farm Products Marketing Council?

MR. GETTY:

I did not make that representation at all.

MR. RUSTE:

Who made the representation for that?

MR. GETTY:

The Minister of Agriculture.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, during the discussion of the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, I understood from the Minister of Agriculture that they weren't consulted at the time the appointments were made to that council, am I right in that thinking?

DR. HORNER:

I said we weren't consulted. I didn't say we didn't make representations.

MR. STROM:

I believe the hon. minister has made a statement, at least it was reported in the press that you had, that the Alberta government was going to take a very hard look at the acceptance -- and I'm not using the exact wording -- the acceptance of federal dollars. No longer are we going to be in a position of trying to buy 50 cent federal dollars.

Now my question is, is this a policy position that the government has made that you are now enforcing in all future dealings with the federal government or were you wrongly quoted on that particular occasion?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate, as I recall, when I was discussing this matter in the House during the Throne Speech debate, the hon. member who just asked the question was not able to be in the House. What I was saying is that if provincial governments sell their responsibilities and their constitutional rights for 50% federal dollars, then in losing those rights and responsibilities they would become, in effect, a regional administrative office of the federal government. I was drawing that up as the problem that provincial governments face. In fact they have their programs and their priorities established by the federal government because the federal government is providing funds.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I wasn't referring to that particular one, but if you want to take that one as an example to follow through it will certainly also bear out the point that I'm wanting to make. The article I was referring to was the very fine write-up on yourself in the Journal some time ago regard to the policies that you were going to pursue as a Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. But even in the quotation that you are making you are leaving the inference that you're not about to enter into those kinds of agreements. And I am also keeping in mind the reply the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development gave to a question while we

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-31

were going through his estimates, where he made it, I thought, rather clear that the provincial government could not afford to pass up the money that is available to them from the federal government.

My question then, is, now this is the kind of policy I would take if we are discussing today, that fall directly under your jurisdiction and that you will follow through very closely to ensure that the policy of the government of Alberta is being followed. And the inference, again I say even from the statement you just read, is that your government does not intend to follow-up accepting these kinds of cost-sharing agreements.

MR. GETTY:

Well, I think again you have hit on what is our policy and the dilemma and the challenge that we face. One is that we are in agreements and we surely must take full advantage of existing agreements and, hope in the future, that we can change these agreements. But no, if we are in agreements and there are provisions in those agreements to obtain dollars -- 50 cent dollars -- then we should, absolutely.

The real problem is, as I see it, to continue to meet our responsibilities in a decent way, the responsibilities we have, with the limited resources that we have. Obviously Ottawa has more money than is necessary for their responsibilities and, therefore, they would like to spend some of it in the responsibilities of the provincial governments and they do that by a cost-shared program. Then you are into the problem and, certainly I don't for a moment say, we will never enter into a cost-shared program. I'm not saying that at all. I was talking about the dilemma that you can face and, therefore, we are aiming our policy towards. At the same time we have a responsibility to obtain all the dollars we can for the people of Alberta, but we are trying to do that working towards the policy that I have mentioned.

MR. STROM:

Well, Mr. Chairman, let me say in all sincerity, that I appreciate what the hon. minister has said. And I think it is a good course to pursue. I'm not really talking about the past agreements, I have some knowledge of the dilemma that we were in; I have some knowledge of the problems we faced with other provinces, for example, who refused to continue to take a tough stand. And really, what I am anxious to know, and I think it is important at this point in time -- particularly in view of the statements that the hon. minister has made -- where he suggests that there will be a knew, tough, decision taken. I have no objection to that either; I'll go along with it.

But I gather from the remarks that you are making this afternoon, that you're only tough up to a point. That if the dollars are not going to be forthcoming through some other means, that you will still have to continue to enter in agreements on the same basis as previously, to take the dollars that are available to us. I don't interpret it any other way -- and really, what I am saying to you, Mr. Minister, is that the statements being made are simply to the effect that you are going to attempt to change, over a period of time. With that I have no quarrel, but let's not have any misunderstanding. The government then, at this point in time, will continue to make those agreements if necessary, if there is no way of changing them. That's really what you're saying.

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Chairman, that is slightly hypothetical, because you will admit, if there was no change, we would have to make a judgment decision. As I said, right now, this year and next year we are faced with meeting our responsibilities, they are ours, constitutionally

45-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

ours, without taxing dollars to meet them in the manner that the people desire. And therefore we must obtain those additional funds in some manner, and I'm not sure why you landed on the word 'tough', in the write-up -- which I'm not aware of, by the way. It's just going to be a determination that we can work in this direction.

MR. STROM:

Well, Mr. Chairman, the other day I questioned the hon. minister on the number of provinces that were going to support you in the stand that you were going to take. And I, if I might just make a point here -- because I think it's rather important in the problem that we are presently facing with the federal government -- when we are arguing about Medicare, for example, and suggesting to the Prime Minister that we would like to have a change, his reply to me in regard to my question that I had raised was this, "if you can get unanimous consent from the provinces to agree to follow your proposal, we will make a change."

I made a tremendous impact on him, didn't I, Mr. Chairman? I got him to admit that if I could do that, they would change. Now it goes without saying that that kind of a proposal to the provinces wouldn't be worth the paper it was written on, it wasn't worth the time it took to make that kind of statement. And yet that was the problem that we faced.

And in regard to the other, in the matter of the privilege of opting out; there again we have had proposals made to us that permitted an opting out with a reduction in the number of dollars that would be available to us, which really meant that we were then paying a pretty high price for an independent position.

And here again, I want to make one other point that I made previously, Mr. Chairman, that I think bears very directly on the problem that we are facing and again no direct reflection on personality, but simply recognizing the position that we are in. The kind of argument that we are in with the federal government is an argument that can only be resolved at the Premier's level or at the heads-of-government level, and I suggest really falls into the category of federal-provincial conferences --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. STROM:

-- and as I take it from the answers that you have given to us right now during the questioning today, Mr. Chairman, I have not heard any indication by way of direct answer or inference that suggests that you are going to have the authority to speak on behalf of the government. You will be in a position of where you are merely an information-gathering department that keeps track of everything that is being done.

But the decisions must be made within Cabinet, the final decision in case of a dispute will rest...in answer to my colleague here when he asked who would make the decision, you suggested that he would have to ask the Premier that question, and in fact, I would take it that it is the kind of decision that can only be made by the Premier himself.

So we have gone full circle, Mr. Chairman, in our discussions here where there is nothing that has come out of the answers, nothing by way of what we find in the bill that leads me to believe that any authority that we have been talking about rests with the minister at the present time. It is not with you, and I have heard nothing that

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-33

demonstrates to me that you have the authority for making final decisions.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. minister a question, but I would preface it to be sure that I have the facts straight that the indication has been given -- I don't remember whether it was the minister himself or whether it was the Provincial Treasurer -- that the federal government are now prepared to examine something they refused to do for some time, tax point transfers as an alternative cost-sharing.

The reason I asked this, because as I recall, better than a year or two years ago at the Health Ministers Conference, directly informed the Federal Minister of Health, that we wanted the same consideration that the Province of Quebec had on hospital cost-shared programs for example, and I was flatly told by the federal minister that those options are no longer open. The door is closed, you take what you get and that is it. I gather the federal government has changed their tune in that regard when they say now they are prepared to examine tax point transfers, and I believe the hon. Provincial Treasurer said, on an equalized basis. Is that correct?

Leading from that and the question of the principle involved, let me first say, Mr. Chairman, I very sincerely wish the minister success and the government success in trying to get out of these cost-shared programs. It isn't the cost-sharing it is the strings which are attached to them, this is the problem. As I say, I wish the provincial government every success in that regard.

But what we are really trying to get at today is the role that the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs plays in this exercise. I notice, for example, that as a matter of principle the government is in the position that they say, "well under existing agreements we should take advantage of every dollar we can get out of existing agreements", and then on the other hand, on the same principle, they say that they don't want to get into any more agreements in the future. I find it extremely difficult to find the logic in the argument that says there is any difference between the tax dollars on existing agreements and tax dollars in future agreements. The principle is the same and I can't quite follow the argument "well let's take advantage of what exists for tax-sharing, but we won't do it any more in future" because obviously the principle isn't being applied.

I use, for example, the question of nursing home cost-sharing. It is in the specific hospitalization agreement today with Ottawa, but the federal government has indicated -- I won't say they have stated directly but I think there are some signs -- that they would be prepared to entertain some consideration of cost-sharing in this regard. This, very clearly, would be regardless of the fact that it is an existing agreement, the hospitalization program was a negotiated agreement; it wasn't a dictated one by federal statute, like Medicare.

I have some difficulty in trying to follow what the government's policy is when they say they would be prepared to accept cost-sharing on the addition of nursing homes programs under the hospitalization agreement, but then on the other hand the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs said that "we certainly don't want to get into any more cost-shared programs." If the principle is what we are talking about I would like to get some idea how on earth we are talking principles when we hear these two different statements of approach made within the government?

45-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Chairman, it is exactly what we have gone through already with the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

We have a set of existing circumstances; we have programs that could be shared under an existing agreement and are not now being shared. We feel we have a responsibility then to have them shared and get as much money for the citizens of Alberta as possible, but not in a new direction to enter into new agreements which would have strong federal strings attached. So I think it is very easy to say that one is a long-range policy and a principle and the other is something that realistically we have to live by. I find no problem in that.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make one final remark. If one looks at the agreements that now stand with Ottawa - the Canada Assistance Plan, the Hospitalization Agreement, the Medicare Agreement, the Post-Secondary Agreement, I don't know what we could get into in future, that one couldn't bring in under the umbrella and say well it's already covered under these agreements.

For example if the federal government come along and agree to amend the Hospitalization Program or Medicare and say they are prepared to include drugs in the cost-sharing program under Medicare, does the minister consider that a new program or an existing program? Because in what I've listened to so far, everything sounds to me like you consider it to be an extension of an existing program so far as it relates to health, welfare and education.

The federal government have their nose immersed so deeply in all these areas of business you can consider almost anything within those broadened related areas we're talking about. That, I think, is where all the problems lie, and so are these going to be addenda to existing agreements so that you may say, we'll forget the principle and we'll accept the money, or are you going to examine them as new agreements?

Let's talk drugs, for example. If the federal government stepped in today and offered 50 per cent cost-sharing, what's the government's policy - what the Minister of Health and Social Development says or what the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs says?

MR. GETTY:

It's a hypothetical question, Mr. Chairman, and we would have to deal with it at the time.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, the whole department is hypothetical, if one wants to use that argument, because there's nothing in the book here yet, except an act giving the Premier power to set up certain regulations to define authority. So I have to suggest the question is quite in order because the whole department is hypothetical and the merits of this appropriation, I think, have to depend on examining the hypothetical propositions that we've been hearing from the minister, because I haven't heard anything that's of a factual nature to this moment. Everything is hypothetical. So to stand up and say it's a hypothetical question, I suggest if that's the case, we'd better just skip this whole appropriation nonsense, forget about it and go on to other estimates, because the whole exercise is hypothetical. That's what the whole problem is. We're trying to find out what on earth this department is doing and what its responsibilities are.

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-35

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, again, maybe the minister would just like to give a fuller word of explanation as to what he means. Let me put it this way, would he define what would be considered as a new program under which the policy of the non-acceptance of cost-sharing agreements would be applied? Admittedly it's hypothetical, I'll say that before you do.

MR. GETTY:

It's very difficult, because you're going to make a judgment decision. Really, that's what governments are for -- to govern. You reach a judgment decision where you decide, can we obtain the funds to carry out programs that are necessary within our province under the best possible arrangements? Having got to where you feel that these are the best possible arrangements that you are able to obtain and the program is necessary, then you're going to enter into an agreement.

If you finally make the judgment that no, this is unacceptable, we do not feel that we will spend 50 cent dollars in any particular area, but in fact, we will do it ourselves because they are preventing us in some manner from living up to our responsibilities in a decent way -- the way they should be in the province -- then we will say no, we will turn down your 50 cent dollars. That's what it's all about.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I can't help but get a smile on my face when I hear this explanation given. We had the commitment from the Prime Minister as long ago as maybe two or three years - I'd have to go back and check it - wherein we started to discuss at the federal-provincial conferences, a new method of arriving at a decision of whether or not a program would be acceptable to the provinces. On top of that, there was also consideration given -- and we were very near arriving at a method -- whereby those provinces that did not enter into it did not have to. So I have to say to you that any suggestion that a new approach is going to be taken is fallacy. There is no new approach. This has already been discussed. We have a commitment from the federal government that it was not going to be forced on provinces anymore, and I suggest that I used to sit and smile when the Prime Minister made that statement, because I had to ask myself, at this point in time, what other areas are there that a government can be looking at to enter into a total new area of cost-sharing that does not tie us up already?

I don't intend to pursue it any further, Mr. Minister. I would be interested in knowing, and getting some breakdown on the personnel within this particular vote. I note there are 15 staff, and could you give us the qualifications of these 15 people, or some breakdown for it.

MR. GETTY:

When you mention 15 you are talking about Appropriation 3102 only?

Yes, well, there is one person under the minister, the executive director. His responsibility is the overall administration of the department. If you want to make notes I will go slower.

MR. CLARK:

Could you tell us his qualifications?

45-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

MR. GETTY:

His qualifications? Oh, I believe he has the qualifications to administer the affairs of the department. There are four directors. I might say that only one of the directors is now appointed. There are four research people, one of whom is a research co-ordinator. And there are six girls.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, just one question; how are you going about filling them? Are you filling them all by competition?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, we are filling them all by competition. We have, unfortunately, only one filled, and that is the director of social and cultural affairs. We hope, shortly, to be able to fill the director of legal and constitutional affairs. The competition has just closed on the director of resource and development, and has been closed for some time on director of finance and services. We are having discussions with three of the top candidates.

MR. CLARK:

So all the positions to date have been filled by competition?

MR. GETTY:

All of the positions to date have been filled by competition except that of the executive director. I should say, though, that some we inherited through the agency that was in existence.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, just as an example, I wonder if the hon. minister could outline what the director of resource and development will be doing that isn't now being done by staff within the Department of Lands and Forests, or by staff within the Department of Mines and Minerals, and I guess if we use the term broadly enough -- staff within the Department of Agriculture. Just what will this director be doing that isn't already being done by people within the various departments, so far as liaison with federal government and so forth. Did I hear the word 'research' mentioned? What type of work will this director be doing in relationship to this matter?

MR. GETTY:

For instance, you picked the director of resource and development. It would be his responsibility to monitor the various intergovernmental activities of the Government of Alberta with any other government at the official level. He would attend meetings; he would participate in negotiations at a certain level, and keep the minister advised and aware of constitutional implications of agreements. In other words, be constantly aware of intergovernmental activities in the Government of Alberta within his responsibilities as I outlined it.

MR. TAYLOR:

What are the other directors of, Mr. Chairman?

MR. GETTY:

I went through them. Director of legal and constitutional affairs, director of finance and services, director of social and cultural affairs. In the area of director of social and cultural affairs I think I pointed out to the hon. Member for Highwood it

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-37

would be the Department of Labour, Education, Advanced Education,
Health and Social Development, Culture, Youth and Recreation.

MR. STROM:

I am not interested in people, but how many positions were transferred from the Executive Council to the Intergovernmental Affairs vote? I take it that there were some positions that were transferred here, or at least that were under the Premier's office and Executive Council.

MR. GETTY:

You are referring to the agency that was in existence?

MR. STROM:

I am only interested in positions that you were able to actually transfer from that appropriation to this appropriation, because I would take it -- if I can give a word of explanation -- that there is a reduction in the Premier's office, I think in the staff of Executive Council in two or three appropriations, and it was my view that there were positions transferred from some of those appropriations to Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. GETTY:

I'm not completely sure how many. There was, of course, the director of the agency. The four research people came over, and I'm not sure about the secretarial staff -- two or three.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, on the four positions mentioned with the directors, I take it then that Lands and Forests and Agriculture matters would be mainly under Resources and Development? Would they --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Appropriation 3102 total agreed to \$ 206,510

Appropriation 3103 Ottawa Office

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, on the Ottawa office, there was a legal man down there. Is it your intention now to keep a legal man in that office, or what qualifications are you looking for in personnel?

MR. GETTY:

It is very difficult to say. We have not come to the decision because we are now operating with the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. We have been trying to assess the type of individuals that would best suit us in the Ottawa office. Whether it would be a legal person, whether it would be a person with any particular legislative bent, I frankly cannot say. We have not made a decision. There are certainly arguments on both sides, and what we really are saying, I guess, is that we want to operate for a while under the present department and then determine how we would best serve the people of Alberta with the Ottawa office.

45-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, will the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs be in charge of all Alberta offices regardless of where they are in Canada and abroad and reducing abroad -- abroad being across the line -- and of course, in any other country in the world?

MR. GETTY:

At this time, Mr. Chairman, yes. We have decided that the establishment of, and making the offices available anywhere outside of the Province of Alberta will fall within the responsibilities of the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. That is not to say though, that the individuals will be working for or under the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. For instance, I would draw you to the example of the province presently having an office in Los Angeles. We would not handle that, other than dealing with the Government of the United States, or the State of California, in setting up the office. It appears to me that the individuals who would be actually carrying out activity and functions in that office would be working for the Department of Industry and Commerce, perhaps the Department of Agriculture, and perhaps the Minister of Tourism, but not any direct or intergovernmental --

MR. STROM:

The offices that are established under the Department of Industry will handle this so that this department then is separate from the office that you are talking about.

MR. GETTY:

The people will be separate. We have not broken them out in this budget. However, we did not have the act of the department in effect, but in the future, one of the clauses in the departmental act, and while I'm not sure of the exact wording but I'm sure I could find it here, is that the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs will, in fact, be responsible for establishing the offices. However, as I pointed out, if there did not appear to be a function necessary for an intergovernmental officer, but rather an agricultural marketing person, an industrial development person, or a tourism person, well then they would be the staff in the office, not an intergovernmental person. In that case, the department would merely be serving as a co-ordinating feature again, presumably to balance the efforts of those three people, or those three responsibilities in that office.

MR. STROM:

When the office is established by the Department of Industry, for example, then do they clear all the decisions that they make in regard to officers through you to determine whether or not that is something that falls within their department? How is it screened and what are the processes carried out?

MR. GETTY:

Well, on a broad basis, yes, it would be cleared through our department. Obviously, though, an individual who's carrying out industrial development duties would do that under the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

Appropriation 3103 agreed to

\$ 41,140

MR. HENDERSON:

I see now that the hon. Premier has graced us with his presence. I'd like to suggest we've listened at length and questioned at length the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs with

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-39

comments from one or two other ministers on occasions, as to the basic purpose of this department. As far as listening to the whole exercise, the best I can conclude is it's a "watchdog" or "policeman" set up by the government at the executive level in order to be sure that all ministers of all departments of government conform to basic government policy. Since I assume these same ministers were a party to formulating the policies in the first place, it's somewhat difficult to understand why you need another department under a separate minister to act as a watchdog to make sure everybody honours the policy agreements that the government has made.

I certainly appreciate some of the difficulties of dealing with the federal government, but I certainly would appreciate hearing from the Premier an outline that would possibly be a little more illuminating than the contributions that were heard thus far, so far as answers to the questions we've placed to the hon. minister. Because as I see the whole thing, the exercise boils down to, at the present time, a great deal of uncertainties until we know what's going to be forthcoming in the regulations. I don't see how the department is really operational in doing anything until the regulations are proclaimed.

So I was wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the Premier would possibly try to justify to the members of this House why a sum of money close to \$300,000 of the taxpayers' money has to be spent by a staff of 21 people who are basically doing nothing other than making sure that various ministers and departments are conforming to government policy.

I bring this up specifically in view of the fact that the present government added five more ministers to the cabinet. This may one of the reasons why they have to have the watchdog. The cabinet's getting so big that it's difficult to keep everybody going in the same direction. I think only the Premier himself can provide the answers. I can say that I think the minister has done a pretty good job in trying to justify his department, but as yet he hasn't come up with any answers that really justify the expenditure of this amount of money. I feel that it's only fair to the minister himself that the Premier try to clarify just exactly what this whole exercise is about.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to make this comment, and I think the public of Alberta were very well acquainted with that during the course of the campaign, because I know how many times I repeated it. I am sure, also, that the hon. minister has adequately explained it to the committee.

MR. HENDERSON:

I don't know how the hon. Premier would know. He hasn't been in the House.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Well, Mr. Chairman, in light of those comments of the hon. Premier, and really there was no substance to those remarks in the sense of explanation of actually what the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs is going to do for the people of Alberta in that, supposedly, role of co-ordination.

I think we have dealt with questions in a logical, rational and positive manner to try and understand that particular role so that we could present to the people in our constituencies and other parts of Alberta the meaning of federal and intergovernmental affairs. And I would have to say, personally, that we have not received any kind of an answer. The only kind of answer we've received -- and I've heard

45-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

this from the hon. Premier before and some of the ministers -- is an answer that comes from a position of power, in saying that we want to do it, we're going to do it, irrespective of whether it's meaningful or whether it has direction or whether it has some substance to it. Sure, that's the kind of power that the people of Alberta gave them -- gave these people sitting on that side of the Floor.

But power should never be abused. Power and decision should go in a manner that is rational and has meaning to the people of Alberta. We can all say that along the line the people of Alberta will judge just that, and our role as opposition is to find out the details of policy decisions, of decisions that are made by government, and in turn be able to interpret those decisions responsibly to the people of Alberta. And the only way we can do that, Mr. Chairman, is to have good information, and I'm very, very disappointed at the attitude of the hon. Premier in this particular item. I must say there are some others that have happened along the line.

I would like to indicate that there are a number of reasons why we want to move the amendment that the hon. member is so anxious to receive. I would like to move the amendment -- I could do it a little later to keep them in suspense, but I'll do it now, and 'now' is now, and I won't use that again in this session.

I would like to move, Mr. Chairman, seconded by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, that the estimates of the Department of -- the proposed --

DR. HORNER:

You really don't know what it is?

MR. R. SPEAKER:

I certainly didn't want to put it in the terms of being a department at this time, but the 'proposed' Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs be reduced by a sum of \$246,780 to leave a sum of \$45,140 in the vote for the Ottawa office.

We do this for some very significant reasons, and I think my colleagues have raised some questions to illustrate these particular points.

Number one; the hon. minister in his questions has not indicated anything that he is going to do with present ongoing programs that he has responsibility for. In the special area, for example, what is he going to do with those things? What can he do? Irrigation rehabilitation? We haven't heard anything -- ARDA? What is he really going to do?

One of the rumours that I picked up the other day that is very interesting. I don't know whether this is true or not, but the rumour came to me from Ottawa was this, that supposedly the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs was not acting on these things for political reasons. He had hoped there was going to be a federal election in June.

For some reason or other the provincial and federal Conservatives have a very close connection. Now whether that's for the future plans of our Premier I'm not sure, but that's one of the rumours that you pick up as being one of the things the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Department is doing.

Secondly, there hasn't been any real progress indicated to us up to this point, and I'm sure my colleagues can mention other examples, but since the House has been initiated this session I asked in March, April and May, what progress has been made with the hon. Mr. Marchand

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-41

in some of these departments? Since the beginning of this session the answer has been, "Well, we've been talking, perhaps ...", and there are some other words, but there has been nothing accomplished to this point -- no report of progress of any kind. I'm sure there can be other illustrations made here very easily by my colleagues.

The third thing -- the legislative responsibilities. We have questioned this at length today as to whether the proposed minister will have any authority or not, or will be able to really do anything. We see that there isn't anything. The minister talks about co-ordination. I ask the question, what does he do in a case where a deadlock is reached, where the hon. Minister of the Environment and he are in a deadlock? The Premier will have to decide just what has to be done. I ask him, well how do you do that? He says, well the Premier will have to decide that, he knows how he is going to do that. How would the Premier do it? Personality? Does he say one minister has a nicer personality than the other one? Is it on the subject matter? Is there an authority for it? Has the Premier got some legal type of authority? Is the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs really a senior minister, or is he just a flunkey at the present time? A senior minister is one that has some authority to do something. But we really haven't seen any indication that, that minister, or that role proposed for him, has any authority at the present time.

As I conclude it, I certainly see that the proposed Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs can't do anything unless other ministers do something so that he can co-ordinate it. And certainly a well-paid clerk or someone that is able to co-ordinate, who has a little management ability, doesn't have to be sitting as a senior minister to do that kind of thing. And I think that we should question proposing things like this when there really isn't any meaningful function.

The other thing I raise as a point is, what direction can that role give to federal-provincial relations at the time. Our leader questioned cost-shared programs, as to whether the hon. minister could really do anything. And from the discussion as I listened to it, I felt there were generalizations, no real direction. Sure there was an indication that we were going to do something about these 50 cent dollars, but what are they going to do? And how can they do it? It's nice to do a lot of talking, but the real thing that is meaningful to the people of Alberta, is some meaningful action. And I would have to say that even the legislation, the bit I heard about it, and the bit I've studied it, is that there is nothing there that is going to give that role the meaning that is necessary.

I think that the role and the department is a bit of an insult to the other ministers that are sitting on that front bench. Because what it really says to any one of you is that you cannot take the responsibility to co-ordinate yourself, and that you will run an empire, and build an empire independently of everybody else. You're also saying, Mr. Premier, that the Cabinet hasn't the capability of co-ordinating and you need a minister to run around and co-ordinate and watch everybody -- act as the watchdog as my hon. colleague has indicated. Now that certainly isn't any kind of a role that you need, in a Cabinet where people have to have confidence in each other, understanding with each other, and willingness to work as a team. That role of the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, the way it's constituted at the present time, is no indication that it is going to bring teamwork in any manner. It's going to bring a bit of misunderstanding between members, and I'm certain along the line there is going to be some conflict that the government isn't going to benefit by, but we on this side of the House will benefit by. Maybe on that side of the House, if I wanted to be a little negative, I'd have to support it on that basis. But on the positive side of it I couldn't really do that.

45-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

MR. HYNDMAN:

You're going to need all the help you can get!

MR. R. SPEAKER:

But, Mr. Chairman, I move that resolution on that basis.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, speaking to the motion, I can only say that I am certainly very much disappointed in the brief contribution that the Premier has made on this subject. The only thing I can say is that at least he did make a contribution this time. The last time we asked him for one, all we got was a stony silence and the back of his neck. And I can only say also that when the Premier of the province stands up in this House and says that the Conservative election propaganda is the basis for the expenditure of \$300,000 in this department -- I am almost flabbergasted. This government has repudiated one after the other of its election promises, and the one they now honour is the one that I think they should rapidly forget about. They were going to take education off property taxes. What's happened to that? That's gone to one of their backbencher committees. They were going to lift the ceiling off oil royalty sharing. What's happened to that? They threw another \$4 million into the pot instead of \$20 million, the way it should have been according to their campaign.

They made other promises which the hon. members seated opposite are a lot better aware of than I am because they can't help but be embarrassed about them, their actions as opposed to their promises. To now hear the Premier stand up and give as his sole justification for the expenditure of this money and this department, the fact that they included it in their election propaganda, leaves me, as I say, almost speechless -- not quite, but almost.

Certainly, Mr. Chairman, there hasn't been a positive demonstration of the practical purposes and functions this department is going to serve. The only thing it is supposed to do is act as a policeman and a watchdog to see that when the Cabinet gets together and determines a policy, that they are going to live up to it after the fact. I can see with the size of the Cabinet they have, they are going to need a co-ordinator and by the time they finish up having all their backbenchers on government boards and tribunals I can see they are probably going to have to double this appropriation in another year. How anyone can suggest that the explanations we've heard thus far justify the expenditure of \$291,920, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, isn't too concerned about the use to which the taxpayers' money is put.

MR. BENOIT:

Just a word, Mr. Chairman, if I may. I don't think that there is anything wrong with the proliferation of departments and ministers when there are things to be done in a new department that can't be done in an already existing department, or that there is a need for another minister. But if the things that are being done have already been done or can be done without an additional department or minister, then I don't think that there is any justification for establishing a new department with a minister.

In this instance in what we have heard today and the preceding days in regard to this, and in reading of the bill, there appears to be to me, at least, nothing that can be done through this department that has not already been done before through the Premier and through the Executive Council as a whole. I would think that to go ahead and agree that such a department needed to be established in the light of

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-43

all the circumstances that we see, would be wrong. So I want to support the motion that has been made.

I don't think that anything new will be done, certainly it hasn't been done, or will be done and it looks to me, from what we heard this afternoon, that there will be some duplication of areas that already exist within the department. I am afraid it is going to be another area where bureaucracy can stand. If we are going to cut down on this type of thing, I feel very strongly that we need to cut down somewhere and this is one place that we can cut down.

The hon. minister has made reference on several occasions this afternoon to the fact that a number of bills that exist do not permit the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to sign an agreement without the minister of the particular department also signing the agreement. But I have noticed a number of the amending bills which are going to be before us in a few days, I hope, that indicate that ministers who didn't have such authority before are now being given that authority through these bills. Ministers are being given more authority than they ever had.

I am rather disappointed in this, Mr. Chairman, because for three or four years we had been strongly criticized when we were on that side of the House for doing so many things through Order in Council and not doing it through the Legislature. Now, in some instances, there need not even be an Order in Council by the Executive Council. It can be done by the minister according to these bills. It looks to me as if the ministers are getting more power and therefore making it less necessary to have a Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs or a minister for such a department. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this is really, under the present circumstances, unless there can be some justification made for its existence, a superfluous department with an extra minister that I don't think ought to be in existence.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Chairman, it is rather interesting in assessing the discussion that has taken place and realizing that the bill we have before us in setting up the department hasn't gone through the Assembly, that in fact, we are dealing with estimates for a department that isn't in existence.

I suppose to those on the other side, it's a blank cheque, but certainly I've been disappointed with the performance of the minister in answer to several questions during this session. One today was when I asked him outright what representation he had made for Albertans to be represented on the National Farm Products' Marketing Council, and he said none. Going back to an earlier question that arose when I asked the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs what representation had been made to the federal government or any meeting that was held on the matter of the federal government support to migratory waterfowl damage in the western provinces, and the minister turned it over to the Minister of Agriculture for an answer, and he admitted that no ministerial level meetings had been held. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that these are two prime examples of the reason why we shouldn't be supporting the vote in the estimates for the operation of this department.

Certainly, I was amazed at the hon. Premier in his contribution to this particular one, when he was asked to outline, and certainly, I think the election platform that he mentioned - this was part of it. I submit also that the \$50 million fund for agricultural development was another part of it that turned out to be nothing more than a \$29 million one. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that maybe we'd better throw this vote out. Let's not add extra waterboys, people to co-ordinate the telephone calls, call the taxis and so on.

45-44

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Chairman, just three or four quick comments, or five or six or seven. Let me say this, I was rather surprised at the Premier's defence of the provincial IGA manager. Really, for the Premier to say that he mentioned the possibility of a Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs something like 25 times across the province -- [Interjection] -- was it 75? I thought it was 25. That's even worse...25 times across the province, and if this is the justification of the formulation of the department, at the very least, it leaves a great deal to be desired and a great deal to one's imagination.

I'd like to reiterate the point that I made earlier, Mr. Chairman, and that is that it seems to me the reasonable place for this co-ordination to be done is in the office of the Premier, because the minister here this afternoon indicated, when he and another minister can't make up their mind as to what must be done on a matter and they haven't got any agreement, they end up going to the Premier and the Premier in the end has to make a decision. Frankly, I had hoped that in the Premier's comments this afternoon he would give us some indication as to how he'd make that kind of a decision. That's the second point I'd like to make Mr. Chairman.

The third point is that quite frankly if the government feel that we have to spend this money, then might I suggest to the Treasurer or the Premier or whoever is chairman of this Priorities Committee that very frankly, I'd like to see you make the Minister of Tourism a full-time minister and funnel these funds, if they have to be spent - if that's the government's feeling - into the area of tourism. The minister isn't here today, and I really don't have any plans before this department for my constituency, but I just want to make that point before anyone would think I was being a little facetious in my comments. I may be, but on the rarest of occasions, the Minister of Agriculture has even bordered on being facetious.

DR. HORNER:

No!

MR. CLARK:

Well, just once - today. Could I get back to the Minister of Tourism and say that it does seem to me that this money could be much better spent in the operation of the tourism work in the province - if the government feels that they have to spend it.

In conclusion, let me say that it's a strange way to cut the fat out. I recall in the past three or four years we've heard a great deal about cutting the fat out, and now we find out that some of these people have transferred from the Premier's office - there are a number of new positions here - and to date we haven't really found out what they are doing. I maintain that the people in the Treasury Department are much more knowledgeable than anybody that's going to be in Intergovernmental Affairs, about federal-provincial fiscal relations. Certainly in the field of social services, if the people in the department of the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, and in the two departments of education, along with the people in Treasury aren't more knowledgeable and better prepared to deal with the problems of the federal government than the people in Intergovernmental Affairs, then we've got more problems than I thought we had. I think it is a mistake, once again. The IGA manager is a nice fellow, but this isn't the place for him.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a comment before we take a vote on the resolution. I too, was very disappointed that the hon.

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-45

Premier did not see fit to give us some more information when giving his defence of setting up the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I listened very carefully, and it seems to me that the only defence that was made was that he made this as an election promise, and it was one of the promises he felt he would have to fulfill.

I have also been listening very carefully to the hon. minister as he has been replying to questions that have been placed to him from time to time in the House. There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. Chairman, that he has been one of the more uncomfortable ministers on the front row. I would have thought that some of the new ministers may have felt a little uncomfortable, being new to their position, but I would have to say that there is little question in my mind that the most uncomfortable seat in the House has been the seat of the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. And rightly so, because there is no way, under the present circumstances, that he has been able to define to his satisfaction -- let alone to ours -- what his responsibilities are. He can tell us that he hopes he will be able to follow through on some matters; we are reviewing certain matters that are presently before us; we are giving consideration to it; and so on and so on.

We have said repeatedly that we recognize that there is a need for co-ordination, and I want to make it very clear at this point in time, that under no conditions are we denying that some effort at co-ordination be attempted. There is a need for it. We recognized it, certainly I am not suggesting that our method of getting it was the necessary one, but I am saying that at no time in the past have I heard any clear definition as to how the hon. minister is going to carry out his responsibilities.

I don't know why the hon. Premier should be so concerned about following through on this commitment. I have noted, for example, that he had no hesitation in backing away from the suggestion that an election be held every four years, which is one I believe he was very strong on, prior to his taking office. I can understand some of his reasons for wanting to back away from it, although I cannot see where it is going to cost a single dollar more to have followed through on that stand, whereas, in this one, it can and will lead to a large expenditure of money.

I have to make it very clear again, Mr. Chairman, that we are opposed to following through with the setting up of a minister for the reasons that have been outlined by my hon. colleagues. I would certainly have hoped that the hon. Premier could have given us a much greater detailed explanation of what he hopes to achieve by establishing a minister in this particular portfolio. We would have hoped that at least we would have had some suggestion from him that he intended to bring the regulations in to come along with the bill that is before us, that may give us some greater indication of what he intends to do. However, we do not have that, either, at this point in time, and we are having to approve an estimate prior to having a full explanation of what is intended.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Chairman, I would like to close the debate, if possible.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Very well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

It doesn't matter -- I want to speak anyhow. Mr. Chairman, there are some remarks that I would like to make at this time with regard to this. No. 1, I certainly think that if this position that

45-46

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

the government has placed before us, an expenditure of a sum of money, is legitimate, then one of the things the people of Alberta rightly deserve is an explanation, and that explanation must come from the Premier because he is the man held responsible for this particular role. I think that it is an insult, I think that it is a neglect of responsibility, and total arrogance on the part of the Premier and his Deputy Premier. I said "Deputy Premier" because he is the man who gives the signals to all of those people sitting in the backbenches who have no comment or ignore the situation. They are all controlled by this one middle duo situation that sits in the middle. They kind of chuckle but it isn't very loud because they know that is where they get their orders from.

And here today, we are witnessing the type of situation that can occur when people are asked to come to the Legislature, to represent their people, to speak their mind, and speak responsibly. Here is a situation where a leader of a government, and a deputy leader have suppressed them into sitting there in quiet terms. I think that is one of the worst things we have ever witnessed for a long, long time in this House.

Mr. Speaker -- [interjections]

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

. . . that is the first thing.

There is a second thing, Mr. Chairman, the Premier's comments with regards to the number of times he said that he made the statement across the province that, "this is what I am going to do." Well, I think he knows as well as I know, that stating anything more than once, 25, 35, 75 times, does not make it right. Some man way back in history said that if you tell a lie often enough, soon it becomes true. If that is what we are witnessing, I am very disappointed in that type of display.

Mr. Chairman, there are other things that I think this particular estimate, and the bill that we will be talking about a little later, indicates, and I mentioned this in some earlier comments. With regard to the purpose of these estimates, and the purpose of the legislation, there is no doubt in my mind at this time that it has one purpose. The purpose it forms is to build the kingmaker or the man who is going to take over the helm of the provincial party that sits on the other side of the House. We know that along the line there will be a federal election. We know that there is discontent with regard to the present federal leadership. We know that the present Premier of this province, has aspirations for the federal House, we know that in order to do that, that there has to be preparation, and I think one of the best places that that can occur is in a department with a man who is only a figurehead.

And I indicate that that is all this is, nothing but a figurehead. There is no authority, no way that he can over-ride any of the other ministers. He feels that he can, he feels that he has got an important position, but it is nothing else, just a thought in his mind. And I don't think he wants to bank on it all the time when he runs to the Premier and says, "Premier I am right, and I am the senior minister and you have got to take my word." I don't think he'd better bank on the fact that he is going to get the answer 'yes' all the time. Maybe the Minister of Mines and Minerals over here, is going to have to go home with his tail between his legs and lost, because that isn't the way it will be.

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-47

But, Mr. Chairman, that I think is the thing that we are considering at this time, and certainly I think, if members over on that side of the House look at it responsibly and in all good conscience, understand the decision they are making at the present time, they will support the resolution we have before the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:

The amendment moved by Mr. Speaker, seconded by Mr. Henderson, that, in respect to the Appropriations for the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, the sum of \$291,920 be reduced by \$246,780. Will all those in favour of the amendment please stand? Will all those opposed please stand?

I declare the amendment is lost.

We will go back to the original Appropriation of \$291,920.

MR. WILSON:

Before we vote on the final appropriation, would the hon. minister advise us which vote carries task force payments and payments for airplane rentals to the Department of Lands and Forests?

MR. GETTY:

There are no dollars for task force, if you are talking about the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Department.

MR. WILSON:

Is there anything in your estimates, sir, for payment to the Department of Lands and Forests for the airplanes?

MR. GETTY:

No, that would be in Lands and Forests.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, when we were talking about the use of the airplanes in an earlier discussion, the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests said that the costs of all the airplanes were carried in his department and that there were cross-entries made to the various departments that used them. That's why I was asking if the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs intends to ever use the airplanes that are leased or owned by the provincial government.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Final appropriation --

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Chairman, I still didn't get an answer. The hon. minister is --

MR. CHAIRMAN:

I think the question was answered, Mr. Wilson.

45-48

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

MR. WILSON:

. . . sort of nodding his head. Would you tell me what the answer was, please?

AN HON. MEMBER:

You should have been listening.

MR. WILSON:

I was.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Do you want it repeated?

MR. GETTY:

There are travelling expenses in here for the department when we are travelling outside the city, but unless I'm mistaken, the costs are in Lands and Forests.

Department of Lands and Forests

Appropriation 1801 Ministers Office \$ 25,110

Appropriation 1802 General Administration

DR. WARRACK:

I would understand, Mr. Chairman, that this is my opportunity; and as well as my opportunity, the opportunity also for the hon. members in the House to make general comments respecting the Department of Lands and Forests.

I would commend that all members note that the annual report of the Department of Lands and Forests was recently tabled and I think it helpful. They've likely all read it already, but I would suggest that they'd likely find it helpful to have it on hand to refresh some of the details that we will be looking at as we go through the estimates of the Department of Lands and Forests.

I would also take this opportunity to mention that the MLA sessions in the Department of Lands and Forests are still ongoing, and we've now met with the Land Division, Forestry Division, and this morning, the Fish and Wildlife Division. To advertise it, a week from this morning will be the Parks Division, and Technical Division, descriptions, discussions, and opportunities for MLA's to avail themselves of information they might wish to have in more detail from the Department of Lands and Forests.

While I'm plugging things, I'd also like to make a plug for people to put on their personal calendars what I hope will be, and I'm sure you will agree after it has happened, the most important opportunity for a number of us to get around the province on the forestry tour, which is scheduled for Monday through Thursday of the week of June 19th. I'd like to urge all hon. members to consider putting that on their schedule, and if they're borderline in their consideration of it, I'd like to talk them into it.

Finally, at the outset, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make three relatively minor corrections of a typographical nature in the appropriation estimates so that we might, as we proceed further, make sure that we're understanding each other as fully as possible.

In the one case the correction is a kind of re-ordering of a vector of numbers, and so I've prepared a correction memo that I'll now ask to be distributed around to all members' desks for you, and I'll point out that particular correction now as the first of three

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-49

minor corrections. That correction has to do with Appropriation 1846 on Operating Account, or I guess you call it Income Account. The re-ordering of numbers refers to the 1971-1972 estimates. The 1972-1973 estimates are correct as they stand but the 1971-1972 estimates, that is the ones from the past fiscal year, ought to be corrected with the vector of new information that is on the memo being circulated to you at this time.

The second correction is a typographical correction and it has to do with Appropriation 1825 where the entire appropriation is aircraft operations, but the first entry in the detail under Aircraft Operations should not read 'Aircraft Operations' but, instead, read 'Trucks and Mobile Equipment'. Let me repeat that, that's on the first line of the detail under Appropriation 1825. Instead of reading 'Aircraft Operations', which is the name of the entire appropriation, it should instead read 'Trucks and Mobile Equipment'.

The third and final minor correction is, again a typographical correction, to do with Appropriation 1823 and it should read 'Forest and Prairie Fires Suppression', rather than only 'Prairie Fires Suppression'. So insert 'Forest and' in front of 'Prairie' and I think that is all of the typographical errors that exist and everything else is entirely in order.

I would speak very briefly, and I think a general outline of remarks I might wish to make on the Department of Lands and Forests might be an appropriate place to close this afternoon. I really had not intended, initially, to make as detailed and substantial remarks on the Department of Lands and Forests as I find that really must make. I do that with some apology to some of the hon. members who have been so extremely faithful in attending the MLA's sessions we've been conducting on Monday mornings. And again I express appreciation to those people for their attendance, but I think that I cannot let that substitute for remarks here and that I should go into some considerable detail on the Department of Lands and Forests.

The second reason why I should do so is a more personal reason, and that was that in the Throne Speech debate I wanted to exercise the prerogative of emphasizing my constituency needs and I did this on the Throne Speech rather than try to take a two-pronged and, in both subjects, inadequate approach to talking about the constituency and, at the same time, some of the responsibilities and problems within the Department of Lands and Forests.

So those are my general introductory remarks, Mr. Chairman, and I'd like to proceed to describe to hon. members who have not had an opportunity for an acquaintance with the Department of Lands and Forests, the general departmental organization that is the function of the Department of Lands and Forests.

We can group the operations of the department basically into two types of operation. One being what I, at least in my own mind, call the operating divisions, and the operating divisions being the Lands Division, the Forestry Division, the Technical Division, Fish and Wildlife Division, and the Parks Division. Those are in no particular order, just as they occur to me. So these are the five basic operating divisions within the Department of Lands and Forests and four of these -- all of them except Technical -- are regionalized throughout the province, and they have regional offices and a regional structure throughout the province. So that's on the operating division side.

On the support side we have some other people around the department. One of them is the minister -- he's around there sometimes -- the minister, the deputy minister, the departmental solicitor -- we have a lot of legal involvement, not only in the enforcement area -- we're involved in enforcement in most of the divisions in one way or another -- and the registrar who takes care

45-50

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

of the filings and the very quick, and I might say in a complimentary way -- the very quick retrieval that we are able to achieve on information in the Department of Lands and Forests from our thousands and thousands of files, and the registrar is in charge of that. We, of course, have a personnel officer, and we have a very excellent administrative accountant that keeps us all both honest and up to date, and that's an extremely important function here. And incidentally there was special applause due to that particular function of the Department of Lands and Forests for handling so capably, quickly, and accurately, the accounts of the Ecology Corps last year, and that's one of the reasons, of course, why the Ecology Corps basically was handled out of the Department of Lands and Forests last year, it being established on the usual non-planned basis.

One more support function that's a very important one is the support function of resource information and publicity. And I mention that within this as those members who had the good fortune to attend the MLA's session will know, is where the Hunter Training Program is handled.

So then, these are the operating divisions. The supporting groups for these operating divisions are distributed regionally around the Province of Alberta and it involves roughly 1,400 people on the provincial public service staff in the Department of Lands and Forests.

I would talk only briefly on a division by division basis and proceed then I think to start out and make a few introductory remarks, starting first of all with the Lands Division in the Department of Lands and Forests.

First of all the public lands of Alberta are very extensive and I think it's fair to say, it's a dimension of the Province of Alberta that is increasingly important. It's increasingly important because people do seem to be becoming increasingly aware of the resources that are a part of what the public owns and particularly when this has an environmental and ecological impact as very clearly does the public land of Alberta, in fact, does all the land in Alberta.

I would like to make some remarks in some detail respecting the co-ordination of land policies and land use entities within the government, and I expect to have the opportunity to do that on a bill that will be given for second reading shortly in this House. So I'll stick largely to numbers here in terms of making all members of the Legislative Assembly aware that we have in the Province of Alberta around half of the land surface of Alberta that is provincial public land. And the total area of Alberta, as a matter of fact, only 2.5 per cent of the total area of Alberta is water and the remaining 97.5 per cent then is land. And then of that land, about 35 per cent is patented or, if you like, freehold land, and in more commonly used terminology, the private land of Alberta.

We have a number of specific kinds of dispositions of public land, including public land dispositions for various kinds of things such as for the oil and gas natural resource industries, the other resource industries and so forth, that takes up a relatively small amount of the total land of Alberta -- 3.8 per cent. Provincial Parks, historic sites, including the Willmore Wilderness Park, and I emphasize again that the Willmore Wilderness Park is neither a wilderness, nor is it a park, but in essence all of that area together is 0.9 per cent of Alberta's land, and 10.5 per cent of the land of Alberta is under the control of the federal government with the five national parks that are in Alberta, mainly, plus a number of other areas such as the Suffield station and so forth that are under federal control for specific reasons.

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-51

The special areas of Alberta are another 3.2 per cent so when you add that all up together with 47 per cent vacant public land, you come out with the total land in Alberta. Of interest, moreover, is that the green zone in Alberta is most of that public land and in fact comprises about 59 per cent of the total land area of Alberta. The green zone is the zone of land in Alberta that has the primary emphasis on forestry use, as distinct from the white and yellow zones which are the settlement areas in Alberta, that is the remaining 41% of Alberta. The difference between the white and yellow settlement zones has become less and less and is not worth emphasis unless there's some reason someone wants to pursue it.

As my final remark on this statistical package that is our benchmark to look at public lands in Alberta, I would mention that the three provisional wilderness areas would be a part of the vacant land in Alberta, the vacant public land in Alberta, and would be a part of the 47 per cent that I referred to a moment ago.

These, then, are the statistical packages of information that I think are useful to us in our discussions of the Lands Division and the public lands of Alberta. I think, Mr. Chairman, rather than go on to how we organize the functions of the Lands Division within the Department of Lands and Forests, that I would yield to your prerogative as Chairman, it being 5:30 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Minister.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Minister of Education moves that the committee rise and report progress and beg leave to sit again. Do you agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Mr. Chairman left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.]

MR. APPLEBY:

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I would then declare the House adjourned until 8:00 tonight.

45-52

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

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

* * * * *

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

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill No. 15
An Act Respecting the Minister of Industry and Commerce

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to move second reading of Bill No. 15, seconded by the hon. Bill Dickie this being an Act respecting the Minister of Industry and Commerce. The reason for this bill, of course, is a name change to more readily identify the department and its function, "Commerce", which has a world connotation of trade. To delete "Tourism" because it is a secondary industry and to identify it in its proper perspective because of its importance, to be placed into the office of the Minister without Portfolio, Mr. Dowling. Also to include within the department that there shall be a branch called the Transport Research and Development Division to include all those functions of rate and trade and movement with respect to the economics of transportation within the Province of Alberta and the borders of Canada and even beyond Canada covering international areas.

[The motion being carried, Bill No. 15 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 28 The Apprenticeship Amendment Act, 1972

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member Mr. Jamison, second reading of The Apprenticeship Amendment Act, 1972. During the past year, in a number of applications for certification received by the Board of Industrial Relations, it became apparent that the rights of apprentices to collective bargaining under The Alberta Labour Act were restricted by provisions of Section 21 of The Apprenticeship Act. To remove these conflicts and ensure that apprentices are entitled to the same basic rights as other employees, it is necessary to amend The Apprenticeship Act. With these amendments, an apprentice will have a right to join a trade union and bargaining agents can negotiate on his behalf with his employer for the terms and conditions of his employment. The negotiations will be subject to any specified wage and working conditions for apprentices generally, as may be prescribed by the regulations established under The Apprenticeship Act.

[The motion being carried, Bill No. 28 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 29 The Department of Manpower and Labour Act

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I move, and the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce seconds, that Bill No. 29 being The Manpower and Labour Act, be read for the second time. In addition to the change in the name of the act, there are three or four underlying principles of definition, of concept, and of function that I should wish to comment upon, Mr. Speaker.

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-53

The underlying principle of this act is a provision of the manpower function at the provincial level in Alberta. The need is for several reasons, and I should like to illustrate one. It is to deal with problems closest to home in our own province. The example that suits this is the federal initiative taken in the matter of inflation which caused a great deal of unemployment across the nation and certainly in Alberta.

Our provincial economy generally, and certainly unemployment specifically, was affected by things throughout the province. We know that we can gear up and tune up, plan and execute policy much faster at the local level than at the federal. Today, Mr. Speaker, there are many rapid changes in technology and of a social kind, that affect the working people. Again, we feel that working with provincial initiatives, we can more readily and more easily manage these changes to the benefits of the people, the employees, rather than hurt them. A major principle, therefore, is that all Albertans should have an opportunity for work, and that every effort of government should be directed toward this kind of objective. This is embodied in The Manpower and Labour Act. This applies, Mr. Speaker, to all Albertans: the skilled, the unskilled, and the so-called unemployables.

To this end we have set up two funds already - the Alberta Opportunity Fund and also the Agricultural Development Fund, Mr. Speaker. The current reliance on resource development must be balanced with secondary industry because in the construction phase of resource industry you have the boom period nearly always followed by a slackening of employment during the period of operation. So while our resource development must continue and even increase, we feel very strongly that this must be balanced with secondary industry and again to this end the objectives of the department will be geared. This means that there is need for co-operation, Mr. Speaker, within the government, amongst all the departments -- because most of them have to do with employment and with manpower -- and also in the agencies of the municipalities and the federal government. We are looking to the particular job specification of co-operation and co-ordination of employment programs and services within and without the government.

Let me conclude by commenting on the three or four functions which Canada Manpower carries out throughout the country. The first one is the matter of placement, and federal emphasis is on finding workers for specific jobs. We in Alberta feel that the emphasis at the local level needs to be finding jobs for workers. Another function of Canada Manpower is that of training, but we haven't in Alberta, as we haven't across the nation, the knowledge of the number of jobs that will be open over the next three years, and the kinds of skills and competence these jobs will require. One of the first and fundamental objectives of this department will be to develop the capability to do on a long-range and short-range basis, this kind of forecasting.

A third function that Canada Manpower carries, Mr. Speaker, is that of career planning. This is related federally to placement and training, and falls short at the local level in the total counselling concept with respect to careers. We feel that counselling in a career way goes into long-term planning of what a person will do with his life from that point on. This is a capability we hope to develop.

A fourth function of Canada Manpower is that of mobility. This means in an over-simplified way of moving the workers to where the jobs are. We believe that, at the provincial level, we have to train the people for the jobs that happen to be in the area in which there are unemployed. In saying these things, Mr. Speaker, let no one misunderstand that I'm particularly critical of Canada Manpower. The federal objectives are simply different than those of the provincial

45-54

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

level. Our intention is to share the function with Ottawa, to review it, to renegotiate some of the agreements, and to encourage them to do more and better in certain areas, and to relinquish certain functions and certain competence and the resources that go with them to the Province of Alberta.

So in summary, there is no intent to take over the operation of Canada Manpower - quite the contrary. Again, to illustrate, the western Canadian, and certainly therefore, the Alberta Manpower liaison, co-operation and co-ordination is conducted from the regional office at Winnipeg. This is simply too far away in distance and in time. Mr. Getty and I have already had discussions with Ottawa to the end that we might have a Canada Manpower office to service Alberta. We are hopeful that we might negotiate this one particular thing.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, in summarizing my remarks, there is a matter of exceptional employment variations in particular areas and particular industry from time to time. In working with Mr. Peacock and other ministers, and the private sector, we will attempt to even this out as much as possible.

Thirdly, we hope, in fact we must develop an information base on labour demand and supply so that in the foreseeable future we can match up labour and demand supplies, because while we do have a lot of unemployment, at the same time certain jobs in certain places can't be filled.

Fourthly, a research emphasis to forecast employment levels and occupational trends will be a high priority of this government through the Department of Manpower and Labour.

Lastly, the act recognizes that while most Albertans enjoy what may be called 'the good life', a sizeable and unacceptable portion of our population lives in circumstances which are not acceptable to us. This returns us then to the over-riding principle of The Manpower and Labour Act. That, sir, is job opportunities for all Albertans.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, briefly this evening, I want to make a report to the Legislature. I want to report on one of the five task forces that our government has initiated. I am speaking of the task force which I am chairing, and that is, Manpower Training and Retraining. I have chosen this particular time to make this report because most of those activities which we are investigating, and will make a final report on, are related to the new Department of Manpower and Labour.

The development of new policy and new legislation as comprehensive as the new Manpower and Labour Act, by its very comprehensive nature, often raises a multiplicity of questions which have to be answered as a supplementary to the development of the program itself. Dr. Hohol has described -- and he is developing -- new exciting incentives for individual Albertans within his department and the framework of this act. But the task force on Manpower Training and Retraining will aid in the establishment of new policy related to the components of this department, and will also straddle a number of other departments. These would more specifically be Advanced Education, the Attorney General's Department, Health and Social Development and Agriculture.

I want to tell you a little bit about the activities of our task force tonight, and our role in this whole development of manpower policy. But first, let me identify the members of our task force. We have Mrs. Chichak from Edmonton Norwood, Mr. Julian Koziak from Edmonton Strathcona, and Mr. Bill Purdy from Stony Plain. At this time I want to applaud the contribution that this lady and gentleman

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-55

have made to the task force which was appointed last September by the hon. Premier.

Since the task force was formed last September we have identified four areas of task force strategy and development. The first of these was the establishment of our terms of reference and our long-term goals. Secondly, we have advanced to the gathering of related information; thirdly, we have the formation of policy; our fourth step has been, and will be, the policy on legislative change.

I want to mention briefly the things we have done within each one of these four stages, but first in establishing terms of reference, we will endeavour to examine all the areas of manpower training and retraining right from the trade through to the university level. In order to achieve these terms of reference we are looking at about these 12 areas. I mentioned these in my maiden speech but I will repeat again. (1) The best administrative structures for training and retraining. (2) Financial assistance and sponsorship programs. (3) Winter programs for training and retraining. (4) Vocational rehabilitation of the disabled and disadvantaged. (5) Manpower research and the best method by which to achieve it. (6) Cost-shared programs with the Government of Canada. (7) Continuing education at all levels. (8) Individual training areas such as agriculture, training for the over-40 group, women, and so on. (9) Apprenticeship and tradesman qualifications. (10) Training in industry. (11) Information dispersal and vocational counselling, and finally (12) training for leisure time.

In order to examine in more detail each of these areas, we have advanced now to the second stage of strategy for the task force, that of obtaining information. So in the last few months we have been interviewing personnel within the Government of Alberta and other jurisdictions, conducting background reading associated with each of these areas, and holding meetings to discuss this information.

In order to more effectively deal with these topics, we have broken our task force down into four different areas for a more in-depth study of those 12 areas that I just mentioned.

Now another area of initiative which we have undertaken in the information stage, is the invitation to the public for written submissions. Early in February we advertised in newspapers throughout Alberta, inviting submissions from individuals and groups on these different topics. In addition, and following from this, we have interviewed and talked with a number of these people as they gathered information for our particular task force. Also, we have visited two areas here in the province. The task force first visited the Grande Cache development, and a couple of weeks ago I visited the Lesser Slave Lake special area. We hope to make a visit to Fort McMurray to take a first-hand look at the training situation there.

In addition, it was announced in this same advertisement that I mentioned, that open hearings would be conducted at various points throughout the province. We have indicated now, or we have invited those people to submit their names that do wish to appear before our task force at points throughout the province.

Now the third area of strategy is that of policy formation, and that's the preparation of our final report. An interim report was presented to the cabinet prior to the spring session this year, recommending a number of changes that would require, in our opinion, some background work, or perhaps immediate initiation at that point. In addition to this, we have communicated on a regular basis some of our recommendations to the Minister of Manpower. Our final report is due next November, and to this end we will be preparing our final policy statements following the conducting of our open hearings.

45-56

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

The fourth stage and the final one is that of policy and legislative implementation of our recommendations. Some initiatives have already been taken, in fact, but this stage will occur mainly between next fall's sitting and the spring session of the Legislature, and depending on what the Executive Council feels would be priorities from that particular recommendation.

So these are the deadlines and strategy which our task force is developing in what we hope will be a very comprehensive report for policy and legislative change in the area of manpower training and retraining.

Now just briefly before I sit down I'd like to deal a little more specifically because I do hope that a lot of people here in the Legislature will give us some of the ideas that they might have on training and retraining. I want to go into just some of the questions that we have to answer in the areas that I have previously mentioned to you.

1. In examining administrative structures for training and retraining, the following questions have to be answered. Where within government can we most effectively provide those structures for training and retraining? In one department, or in a variety of departments? Where should the decision-making and the planning take place? Where must the delivery of these training programs occur? How will the co-ordination be facilitated from department to department?

Well last September, upon forming the new government, we found that most training and retraining occurred in a variety of provincial jurisdictions and the first of these was The Apprenticeship and Trade Qualifications Act under the Department of Labour. Secondly we had a number of institutional programs under the Department of Education, within two branches there, the Department of Vocational Education, and within various technical institutions, junior colleges and so on throughout the province. In addition to this, we found programs being offered in Agriculture, Health and Social Development, dealing with a number of programs for the disadvantaged, and also the beginnings of some programs in the Attorney General's office within the provincial jails.

So we must examine where these various programs can best be conducted. Is the way I have just described it the best way to do it? Or perhaps should we consolidate our efforts a little bit more under two or more departments?

2. The financial assistance and sponsorship has become a thorny problem, especially in light of some of the winter programs we did this year. We found, for instance, in presenting our priority employment training program, that there were people in the institutions who were on complete allowance, with tuition and books paid for. Sitting right next to them would be a person who, just because he happened to start school in September, was not on allowance and was going through it the tough way by getting loans. And this is presented as a bit of a problem for perhaps next year's situation and one that, I am sure, our evaluation committee on the program is looking at.

3. The third area of concern is that of seasonal training programs. This year we did the Priority Employment Training programs. This year we did the priority employment training philosophy. Do we want to give a seasonal program when unemployment is at its peak? And, if so, how can we best iron out those difficulties that we did see in our first year? This year, for instance, we had something like 3,300 unemployed Albertans enrolled in about 160 courses throughout Alberta. This in itself was a positive step. But we cannot just stop there with one program. Fortunately we have now an evaluation study, as I said, going on on this program. Perhaps one thing we

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-57

should do is conduct a placement service as a supplement to a winter program like this. My personal feeling is that this year we devoted most of our energies just to getting the program off the ground, to the detriment, perhaps, of an actual placement service for those people who were taking the course to really become employed.

4. In looking at the area of the vocational rehabilitation of the disabled and the disadvantaged-- incidentally, this is one of the areas that Mrs. Chichak is undertaking and will perhaps give some comments on a little later. Basically, when we look at vocational rehabilitation, most activities now are centred within the Department of Health and Social Development, although the funding and cost-sharing is channelled through the Department of Advanced Education and the Vocational Education Division -- Mr. Foster's department.

When we are talking about disabled people, we mean physically, mentally, emotionally and socially handicapped. We are talking about people who are imprisoned in our provincial and federal jails, and we are looking at a large group of people who may be disadvantaged because they live in a particular part of the province. This is probably why the special areas were identified as special areas. In many cases our native and Metis populations have extreme difficulty in getting onto the work force, also the aged, the young, the over-40, and many of our rural communities.

5. A fifth area we are examining is that of manpower research and this is one that I am glad to see is already getting off the ground, and that is a manpower research capacity within the Department of Manpower and Labour itself. But it is not just enough to produce manpower research, as far as supply and demand. This is one of our concerns -- this whole area of how do we get the information to the people who really need it. We are looking at things like information retrieval. It is not enough just to gather a whole bunch of information and pile it on the shelves where people cannot reach it. We have got to find ways to get it into the schools, into the colleges, and into the communities. That is information retrieval.

But beyond information retrieval, I think we have got to help those individuals who still cannot make the decision, even after they have that information, by tape or reading, in their hands. What I am talking about here is a process of career counselling. This is something that Dr. Hohol mentioned. If we are going to switch from this idea of finding people for jobs, to finding jobs for people, then we have to help them at a very personal level. This is career and vocational counselling. It is an area that, I feel, has been very sadly neglected through our institutions, through our schools, and through the process of Canada Manpower.

6. The sixth area is that of cost-shared programs. I am delighted to see the incentives that our Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs is taking in this area. Many of the problems that we have discovered with our task force have originated directly from cost-shared programs -- the ones that we run into very often are those that are under Canada Manpower, under Indian Affairs, under DREE. Although these were established for very positive reasons, it has become a very thorny problem between the provincial and federal jurisdiction in initiating and getting the best out of there.

Now concurrent with the training and retraining problem -- and we're looking at the federal-provincial combination -- is the problem of employment. It is one that we are not looking at in depth as a task force although we are looking mainly at training and retraining. I personally believe that Canada Manpower at the federal level should remain as the employment agency for Alberta. But the fact remains that difficulties have arisen within our province with the service that is given by Canada Manpower and if, in fact, the service, in my opinion, does not improve, we may be forced as a province to move

45-58

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

more and more into what is, at this point in time, a federal jurisdiction.

7. In looking at continuing education, and I'm talking about adult education here, I see this particular area as the real future for training and retraining in the future. I think it will be one of our main incentives within advanced education too. The idea that a person just doesn't have to go for two, three, or four years, take a course and then he's finished for all time. I think we're going to be seeing new incentives through our colleges, technical schools, vocational schools, in the whole idea of seminars, conferences, short courses, summer courses, where people, instead of completing their training, will just be starting out at the point where they finish a particular course. More and more, in fact, we realize that in order to keep up with technology this is just about the way we've got to do it.

8. I mentioned just a few individual training areas but just in our initial look at this whole area we've identified some that do have difficulty. And we're talking about the over-40 group. I'm looking forward, in fact, to meeting with the group that the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development has mentioned which is giving an employment capacity here in Edmonton, and I'm sure they will have some very good ideas.

But we're looking at the whole idea of para-professionalism which will also, I imagine, be studied by our Professions and Occupations Legislative Committee. We're looking at the difficulties in the areas of agriculture and training in that area -- and then we'll come up with a number more, I'm sure, through our hearings and when submissions have come in which we will report on.

9. The apprenticeship system in Alberta -- this is the one that Mr. Purdy has taken a good look at -- has generally been recognized as one of the forerunners in Alberta. However, a number of problems have arisen in that a lot of individuals in coming to Alberta have found that they can't gain credit for what they have felt to be a very valuable training experience somewhere else in the world or in Canada. And since it isn't covered by the apprenticeship system then it's very often not evaluated at all. Although we have had a good system I think it's one that we've got to take a very good look at. Many of the regulations that do occur are definitely outmoded and perhaps the whole system of apprenticeship has to be revamped to a great extent.

10. Finally, we're studying the area of training in industry. It's my personal feeling, and I'm sure many of my colleagues share this idea, that industry must take a more active part within training, retraining and education of those people who are going to be working within industry, within commerce and business.

What I have given you just now is kind of a short report on what one of our five task forces is doing. I'd certainly invite any suggestions that anyone in the House here would have. Perhaps I have given you a few ideas you hadn't thought we were covering. I'm confident our task force will, as will the other four, come up with some very positive and significant contributions in these next few months in our area and, hopefully, in this whole area of manpower training and retraining.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the debate on the principle of The Manpower and Labour Act Bill, there are three areas I wish to comment on -- the manpower research availability and need, the vocational rehabilitation of the handicapped, and health and social development involvement. These are the three areas, mainly, that I will be commenting on.

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-59

Reverting back to point one, that is the manpower research. Some of the labour research statistics are: Canada Statistics, which provides a monthly labour force summary on unemployment rates; number of unemployed; labour force size; male-female rates; participation rates. The Federal Department of Manpower and Immigration puts out a publication every two months called Prairie Manpower Review which summarizes employment conditions and is basically a subjective treatment of information.

The Federal Department of Manpower and Immigration also carries out special sectoral occupational studies generally linked to industry with growth, such as the construction industry. It also makes some assessment of occupations with best growth potential.

The Government of Alberta through, the Department of Industry, carries out special industrial sector studies which generally include employment information. The labour department has done special sector studies with emphasis on areas where skilled shortages are expected. The Department of Industry also provides information on general economic conditions. What is required on the labour force research, to give complete meaning and effect to the Manpower and Labour Department, is the type of research ability that can provide the following types of information:

1. Identifications and projections of labour supply and labour demand.
2. Econometric models which can estimate impact on industries and occupations of specific public and private actions.
3. Improved projection techniques to be used in identifying occupational requirements so that training and apprenticeship programs can be improved.
4. Development of a comprehensive review to co-ordinate labour supply and labour demand with such areas as training and retraining programs, development of cities and towns, career planning programs, and placement programs.

One of the main requirements is that microeconomic research must be made available to the Cabinet so that policy issues dealing with a number of departments can be viewed based on a common information base. Alberta requires the type of research capability which will provide information as to the needs for certain types of employment, and the capability of our people to meet these needs as they are identified on a long and short-term basis.

The second aspect of Manpower, on which I wish to comment, is the vocational rehabilitation of the handicapped. A person may be considered rehabilitated when enabled to be engaged in a gainful occupation or function successfully as a homemaker. Responsibility for such educational programs should be within the scope of and be shared by, both the federal and provincial governments, so long as cost-sharing programs exist. It is necessary to provide medical diagnosis and treatment, vocational training, counselling, and other needed services on a highly individualized basis. To be eligible an applicant for services must have a physical or mental disability which constitutes a substantial handicap to employment, but will respond to rehabilitation services.

I think probably the handicapped fall into two categories, if I may categorize them. One are those falling under the special disability groups, such as the blind, mentally ill and retarded, drug addicts and persons with certain severe physical handicaps. The second category, I would say, might fall under the poverty population, the Indian, welfare recipients, criminal offenders, and perhaps other poor in the rural and urban sectors.

45-60

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

In order to properly and adequately deliver rehabilitation services to these less fortunate, we must provide rehabilitation manpower. Manpower that can cope with such special needs as are being experienced by the handicapped. This means such educational programs as will provide the training mandatory for rehabilitation manpower.

It is apparent that we are far behind in instituting vocational rehabilitation programs and, of course, the shortage of trained manpower to deliver such programs is a factor. It is necessary to set the criteria for applicants qualifying under vocational rehabilitation programs, and obtain data as to their numbers, types of training programs needed, facilities presently available for institution of such planned programs, trained instructional manpower available, and what shortages exist therein. Consideration must be made of on-the-job training, at what stage of the program such on-the-job training should take place. It should be kept in mind that at some point and in some areas the applicants themselves may become eligible as staff personnel. It is also important to realize the need in such a program for job placement personnel who will not only assist in locating jobs for applicants, but will follow up the success of such placement.

In my maiden speech, I drew attention to two facilities here in the City of Edmonton, namely W. P. Wagner High School and L. Y. Cairns Vocational High School, which were specially designed to provide students with special disabilities such vocational training as may be necessary to enable them to become employable. It is extremely important that the public have a proper understanding as to the purpose and need for such facilities. The public, as citizens, and more important the corporations, small companies, and any and all employers should be well informed of such training programs in order that they may consider graduates from these programs -- as potential employees, for perhaps less skillful jobs, but not necessarily so. It is unfortunate that my previous message which I feel was of some importance did not penetrate through to our reporting media in order that the public might have been somewhat enlightened on the matter.

Although there are rehabilitation programs for the handicapped on the federal-provincial cost-sharing basis, such programs are limited to those adults 18 years of age and over. However, the references that I have been making on the vocational rehabilitation of handicapped to this point have been mainly concerned with the young students who may not have reached the age of 18 years and who, unless they receive special training, will be dropouts and will fall upon the responsibility of the state.

Leading up to my third point of consideration with respect to the Department of Health and Social Development as it is involved with the rehabilitation programs of the handicapped with the federal government, I am somewhat concerned with the fact that inasmuch as the federal government pays for 50 percent of actual costs of programs in this area, the total program cost in the province for 1970-71 was only \$662,158. This would mean the cost to the provincial government would have been one-half of that figure -- which would not seem to indicate too extensive a rehabilitation program for those citizens in Alberta requiring such service. Costs incurred under such programs are not for facilities, but only for programs, and include fees and commissions, maintenance of trainees, tuition and other miscellaneous expenses. Such services fall under The Vocational Rehabilitation of the Disabled Persons Act and the agreements are with both the Department of Health and Social Development shared with Advanced Education. There are also allowances paid to disabled persons through a federal-provincial agreement under The Disabled Persons Act.

However, both these acts that I have just named have a minimum age requirement of 18 years and I feel that some consideration should

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-61

be given to either lowering that age minimum or making some provision for those young people who are in the schools and require special opportunity training, or more extensive training of the handicapped. I note that in the general functions and duties, the minister listed the concern for the development of programs for the unskilled and handicapped as being expressed. I feel quite confident that both this government and the minister will give this area its proper priority. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make three points and make them very briefly. Number one, I think the act will have to prove itself. It is the performance that will actually count. All of the pretty words and so on will mean little unless the unemployment rate is kept down and there are jobs available for people who want to work.

The second point that I would like to make is that industry is important -- unless there are jobs people will be unemployed, and unless we have some industrial development there is bound to be more and more unemployment. Industry normally trains its own men and I think to the greatest possible degree, industry should be expected to train its own men rather than have the training done at public expense. I think the big point there is that we do need industry, industrial development, and secondly, as long as welfare payments are going to be greater than that for which people have to work, we're going to have a percentage of people who will not work. I think that's something that's very essential and very important -- if there are unemployed employables who are on welfare they will remain on welfare, at least a very large percentage of them, unless they can make more by working than they can on welfare. I think this is something that we have to realize in this day and age.

The third point that I would like to make in connection with the act is there appears to be some conflict that possibly the hon. minister will deal with when he closes the debate, and that is the principle of the department and the minister dealing and negotiating directly with the federal government, which appears to be in some ways a conflict with the Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs bill. Those are the only three points I wanted to mention, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, if I might add just two points. One would be that in the area of research work that the department is going to do, the minister talked of doing manpower projections and manpower needs and so on, and I appreciate that those need to be done. But let me caution the minister somewhat and say that if my understanding is correct, the federal government has been down this road not too many years ago. They took a large number of people on staff - I'm not sure which department it was, in fact, I believe it was the Economic Council of Canada if I'm not mistaken - and they didn't have a very good experience in this particular field. There may have been extenuating circumstances, but what I'm saying is that I support what you're trying to do in this area of projections for the future, but don't put all your stock in those projections because I think they're only as good as educated guesses and not a great deal more. The art of manpower projection, as I understand it at this time, is relatively new and subject to a heck of a lot of mistakes.

The second point I want to make is to ask the minister at what stage are the studies that are being done by the various provinces across Canada in trying to get the whole manpower scheme reorganized? I know, for example, the Council of Education Ministers are involved in a very detailed study and the director of vocational education in Alberta was on the rather guiding task force of that. If I recall correctly, someone from the provincial government was heading it up and this was being funded by the various provinces. We supported the

45-62

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

idea strongly at that time, because we felt that if the provinces were putting some money into it, there was likely a much greater possibility of the provinces coming out with some unanimity. I recall several meetings with the various Ministers of Education and the federal government in this area, and so often the federal government would say -- well if the provinces can agree. The provinces couldn't come anywhere near agreeing.

The third point that I would touch on is the question of job trainings. It seems to me there is a possibility in this department, for the government to become more and more involved itself in manpower programs. I'm not overly enthusiastic about that, because I think if one takes the time to check some of the recent studies in manpower across Canada, the federal manpower people, anyway, will say that the most successful programs, as far as they are concerned, for money spent and people on the job after the program is over, have been in the area of on the job training. It would seem to me that this is where we should invest our money. We have a fair example, I think, that we will be able to, in the McIntyre Porcupine operation at Grande Cache, because I recall the negotiations with Ottawa, and it was harder than pulling hens teeth to get the office in Winnipeg to even consider it, and finally we had to go along on our own and say, well, maybe you'll come along later, and I guess they did. My comment to the minister would be that I think our first priority in the area of manpower training should be in the area of on the job training. I'm not unaware that some business people would abuse this, but by and large, I think research indicates and commonsense certainly points out that the area where the money should be spent is in on the job training with first priority.

MR. DRAIN:

My remarks are going to be in relation to questions, more than anything else. I don't propose to debate this. I want to seek out information. It is mentioned that we have presently enrolled in training 3,300 Albertans. Presumably you now have 3,300 Albertans who are training for specific jobs. This would be the logical reason I would think for training them. Certainly, to train people and then say afterwards there is no job for them, then basically looking at jobs as such the demand creates the supply. In other words, if you need 25 catskinners over there tomorrow and you go to Canada Manpower and you can't get 25, if you are an employer, you had better believe me, by tomorrow night you are going to have 25, because you will develop them. I think this is basically the fundamental thing.

There is certainly an earnest desire on the right to channel people into nice little concise groups, to lay out a program whereby we fit everybody into little niches. Possibly this would be a desirable situation if it were not for the human element. People have the right and privilege in this country to work or not to work as they see fit. There is unemployment in Alberta in areas where people like to be. Many people, for some strange reason, which I have never been able to fathom, prefer the environment and area of a big city. They are prepared to stay in a city, and accept social assistance sooner than go out into what could be considered a lack of culture environment. So this is one particular factor that you do have. If, in launching this program, the government as such had the power to say to John Smith, Billy Jones and Mary Somebody else, that "now I have trained you for a specific job, and up there in the muskeg country there is a job for you, will you go to this job?" And the answer is "no, we do not have the social environment we like; it is too far away from home; we miss the long weekends" -- these are the problems that you run into.

I think if you went across Alberta today and checked in many various areas, in small manufacturing plants, you would find the biggest problem is the personnel problem. I certainly do not blame the working people for the viewpoint they do have. If they are

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-63

motivated to work more, they are permitted, by the virtues of our welfare state, to pay more. Certainly an employer can expound on the benefits of paying taxes, but the working man is not prepared to see it this way. He sees -- and I see it in my own area -- if you work the tenth day on a 10-shift period, the amount of money that accrues is so infinitesimal because it puts you in another tax bracket, that it is no longer worthwhile to work. So, we have, on one hand, the employee's right to withhold the employer's right to choose whatever job he so wishes.

We have a program -- and I am not familiar with what this program is -- in training for 3,300 people. So now you have trained 3,300 people in a certain area. Are you going to say to them, "Now you are trained to do so and so", whether it is to dust money, or to weld or any of these exotic occupations that you could possibly have, and afterwards you are going to tell them, "no, you are going to shovel snow some place", because it snowed too much. There is no way that a person who has been fundamentally educated to wear a tie is going to think about picking up a lunch bucket and putting on a pair of logging boots, for instance. I know this from my own experience. Of course, I never did learn enough to possibly relate the tie to the environment that I lived in.

However, in relation to the people that are rejected by the employers, and there are many, because the employer under our system reserves the right to reject the services or to accept the services of the applicant, what is our answer? Possibly make the product more attractive; possibly realize that the potential of one man isn't as good as another. Maybe there is an area for the state to say, "well, we will subsidize". Possibly a person with a certain I.Q., in order to fit him into a labour force where his talents are such that he is not a very effective part of the equipment, should be subsidized by the state. Maybe this is a better viewpoint than saying; "well, this person should be totally rejected."

There again, where is your position if you accept a policy like this in relation to organized labour? Would employers in such a case take advantage of the situation? Here we have in Grande Cache a situation where we're short of miners. You know I can't fathom anybody being short of miners. Anybody with reasonable ability, who is psychologically conditioned to go underground can go to work in a mine. He doesn't need a vast program of training. I believe that's applesauce. He certainly needs an extensive program of safety training, but insofar as going there, you are not going into a very vast technical operation. You don't have to cut diamonds or anything like this; you cut black diamonds. You work with your hands; the operation is simple. And you know it's a strange thing, a lot of people can't seem to understand that the more ability and the more intelligence a working man has, the better he can function.

So at this present time our thinking in our society has been geared to take people of the better types out of the work force and put them into training areas and train them for something else on the premise that with this sudden vast switch, vast piles of wealth are going to fall on their shoulders. This is one of the biggest fallacies I believe that we can possibly arrive at. The result is basically a great deterioration in certain areas, where you do require the ability to compete in the future.

MR. FARRAN:

I only rise to say a few words on this bill because it was part of my personal election platform, and I feel that I should add one or two words of wisdom to those of my friend for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest -- my ideas on this subject.

I believe that the principle of training on the job, as opposed to full academic training is a right one, and the government should

45-64

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

be moving towards 50 percent pay for working on the job, 50 percent pay for being at a vocational institution such as a Tech. In Europe this is a common approach to apprenticeship; where the apprentice will work mornings in a factory and at least two or three afternoons a week in a vocational institution.

I believe the skills that should be taught in these vocational institutions such as a Tech, should be everything from selling shoes in a department store to working on an industrial camera. They shouldn't be confined to the well established trades of which everybody thinks, because our own economy is now so diversified through the various service industries that the job opportunities can't be easily categorized.

If you have an apprentice system you've got to appreciate in the beginning that there must be a bond between the employer and the government who does the subsidizing, and a bond between the employee and the government and the employer. In other words there must be a three-way contract. I know that modern educational thought looks down its nose at the apprenticeship system, but it's not possible for an industrialized nation to function without such a system. The classes which will be taught in the vocational institution if they are motivated by the employer relationship to which I've referred, would be much more in tune with the job opportunities in the economy. At the moment they are not wholly in tune with the job opportunities. Last year they trained quite a large number of students in electronics in the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology, and less than 20 percent of them were able to find employment. Now about three years before that, when they were training a similar number of electronics students they were able to find employment. But there has been a shift in the requirements of industry in the province, or close to the province, which has not been appreciated by the educational establishments. And I believe if these classes are directly linked with businesses and employers, such a mistake will not be made.

I think you would also have to put a condition on such a system of saying that not more than, say, 10 percent of the labour force should be employed under such a system, and on no account could an apprentice displace an existing journeyman.

But the idea is good; in fact, a federal plan has moved a little way towards this. They are paying 75 percent of the wages for two years for on-the-job training. But it does not wholly accord with the apprenticeship system to which I am referring.

I think you have to remember that there is some resistance to vocational training by the unions themselves. Their closed shops are just as tight as those of the professions. They are very ready to, perhaps, think of preserving high wages by restricting the number of entries into the trade, or by making the conditions of entry so onerous that they restrict numbers. I think that anybody in this field should be warned against being too ready to yield to pressure by guilds or unions to impose a mandatory union card on people practicing a trade, mandatory tests of a high standard, and high license fees. Pressure for this will always come from the people who have a vested interest, the guilds and the trades. We notice that already on a local government level.

I think that anything which is a deterrent to flexibility and diversity in labour should be avoided if you are aiming for full employment. It is too facile to say, you know, that because trade unions are in the business of labour work, that they are necessarily interested in full employment. Actually, what happens is that as wage demands get more and more extravagant, the wages get higher and higher for fewer and fewer people. Management usually makes the obvious reaction of trying to get by with a smaller labour force, because costs have gone so high, and to introduce even at an early

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-65

stage, methods of mechanization and automation. So the two things are not absolutely synonymous, and there are very few trade unions in North America that really believe in full employment. They might give it lip service, but there are very few that follow this thing in practice. However, if the relationship, as I say, begins early between the employer and the employee, there is a great chance of providing more jobs.

What we really need in this province is people in small industry, not people who are necessarily trained for the big jobs, although even here there are a lot of opportunities -- if they put that pipeline down the Mackenzie River there will be more work for welders than the whole of Canada can supply. There will be welders coming in from Germany, Italy, all over the world. The same applies to plumbers on a domestic scale. We all know there is a great shortage of plumbers, and do not think that the journeymen plumbers are not partly responsible for this.

What we need is people in small industry, like piano repairers, diesel pump mechanics, and if there is such a system that relates to the employer, I think you will get a demand for courses in these trades at the Tech.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say only a word or two. The principle of the bill, of course, is establishing another department and a minister for the department. I do not want to be negative and critical. That is one aspect of being relegated to this side that I do not particularly appreciate but I guess it is part of my responsibility. If I have to be critical, I hope it will be positively critical.

First of all, I would like to begin by saying that I have come to like the new Minister of Manpower and Labour so much that I hate to even say anything against his department or the work that is set up. I think, if I may be permitted to say so, with all due respect to other frontbenchers, that he is among the more efficient administrators on that bench. But if I have a fear that here again, we are going into what will be a duplication of the federal Department of Manpower and Labour. I would hate to take away any responsibilities in this regard that we could leave with the federal government, I feel, very much, that we might be able to do what we'd like to do through this department that is proposed to be set up here, through the federal department, if we could put some input into the federal department and work with them on a co-operative basis, rather than establishing another department which I feel confident would duplicate and probably even run across some of the other.

Here's another department that lends itself, very nicely, to another bureaucracy if we're not careful. There's no end to what could be done by way of new jobs for people employed by the department trying to prepare other people to work for other things. If I heard the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood rightly it almost appears to me that we might be taking away from the private sector some of the things they are already doing. As has been mentioned by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill and the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, there is a place in the private sector for training on the job and this sort of thing which I don't think that we should ever interfere with as a government in any way, shape, or form. And where the private sector will do the job, for goodness sake let not the government interfere, for the more we can do in the private sector without either government assistance or interference the better off we will be, and the better chance there will be of us remaining a free-enterprise society in Canada.

Now the bill also gives the minister some rather wide sweeping powers, as has already been noted by one of my colleagues on this

45-66

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

side of the House. Now we used to put in bills that gave the ministers this kind of power and we were very severely criticized for it. I'm not saying the minister doesn't have to have powers; if he's going to have a department it's his responsibility to run it. But if he can do things without Orders in Council and without permission or co-operation, or in conjunction with the Executive Council, then it may be that he has more power than he should have.

So I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, I would rather that this department wasn't going in. For all that I have such a high regard for the hon. minister, he is like a lot of us, here today and gone tomorrow and who knows who follows and what the circumstances in the future will be. And if for some reason he should be unemployed and someone should fill his boots, then maybe we would have a department that would be running across the jurisdictions of its counterpart at the federal level. I'm not too much in favour of this, Mr. Speaker.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, in my very brief remarks I shall try to forge a link between the manpower concept and macroeconomic policy -- the kinds of policies mentioned by the hon. Member for Edmonton-Norwood in her well-informed address. The Economic Council of Canada was charged some time ago, in the mid-1960's, with the responsibility -- as their responsibility in their first full year of existence -- of determining the goals for this country. Those goals would be not only for the nation, but valid goals for each individual region -- for example province as well as nation.

The first of those goals is the goal of full employment. There are four other goals, one of which is to curb inflation, and that too is a topic I would like to talk on very briefly, partly because it is inter-related with the concept of manpower and partly, moreover, because the hon. Leader of the Opposition emphasized its importance in devoting the majority of his Throne Speech debate to that topic. And it was mentioned a very short time ago in another important way by the hon. Member for Drumheller. So indeed it has a relationship with inflation and it is a very, very important tool to fight inflation.

There are a couple of realities that are clearly upon us. One is that in the technological era subsequent to World War II, we're now in a position for the first time where the average man is almost dictated to have more than one career in his lifetime. That is, it has become near normal that a person must adapt to one occupation and then another and, sometimes, a third, in one working lifetime. Whereas in most of the history of man it has indeed been the case that one trade was a trade which would last and not become obsolete in vastly more than one lifetime. So that's the first major reality upon us as we look at the manpower matter, that one can normally expect now in this modern era to have his career interrupted by obsolescence and find the necessity to re-gear his skills so that he may continue to contribute and add productivity to the society of which he is a part.

The second reality is almost a political reality and certainly a sense of public need. I think it's fair to say labour and the progressive parts at least of the business community, have been demanding this kind of manpower action on the part not only of government -- and I think the hon. gentleman from Highwood makes a good point -- I think everyone here in this room today would applaud that suggestion. But that is part of the manpower policy and the kind of thing that takes a facilitative skill and the design and plan of programs to make it work, so that you don't find yourself doing it by government out of default. So those are two realities upon us. One that, in fact, one's normal career will not match with one's working lifetime, and secondly that there has been a demand for some considerable period of time, and I think it is reflected in the

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-67

debate here, with very little negative suggestion, on the concept of manpower and labour, instead of only the Department of Labour.

To look more specifically at employment, you can divide up the concept of unemployment in as many categories as you like, but the normal way to do it in the classification of anything is to pick the classification bounds that lessen the variation within each class, and that is, of course, how you do it.

One class of unemployment, of course, is the unemployables, and you will find that normally in the statistics, and those are very difficult to compile and to analyze -- you do much better when you try than if you don't try. The unemployables would not normally be included in that work force. There are those that for physical or mental or whatever reasons find themselves among the unemployable unemployed. There is the frictional unemployed, the people that are basically between jobs. Now that adults are classed at 18 years of age or older, the adult populations that are students, so they are between school and jobs, and in some occasions, particularly since it does apply to unemployment insurance, sometimes the women are between pregnancy and jobs. That's all frictional unemployment, the second classification.

Another is, of course, the employable unemployed. And this is a very difficult kind of situation, but not the most difficult of the unemployed. The employables are the 'seek and ye shall not find' jobseekers, and they are the people who can be employed if we stimulate the level of economic activity that we have in our country or in our individual region, such as the Province of Alberta.

That's what Keynesian economics is all about, monetary policy, fiscal policy, and all of that, but that's pretty old stuff now. The thing that we're really engaged in, in the manpower discussions here is the fourth classification and that's called structural unemployment.

Structural unemployment is where you have some of the people that are in the labour force who are fully employed and yet you have jobs that cannot be filled. And other people who don't have jobs, you have that strange situation where you have in fact a mismatch of job opportunities with the skills of the people that are available. No amount of additional activity will create any additional jobs, because the people available don't know how to do the jobs that are available.

Additional economic activity generates inflation -- and that's all that happens. So with structural unemployment, where we have the mismatch of skills and the availability of people, there is that essential necessity to help people by governments and private sector action, to move from the unskilled to the skilled. You have fewer people unemployed when you remove some of them by giving the opportunity for them to become skilled with a manpower policy. That's one thing, and the other thing is that the amount of employment available to the unskilled depends on the amount of output by the skilled. So now that we're talking about using a manpower policy to convert some of the unskilled to the skilled, these skilled people will produce output that will in turn employ more of the unskilled people that are left. And so in two ways this manpower effort to reach past the mismatch of skilled and available people can help us.

When I think of these things it reminds me, going back to where I started in terms of trying to match up the working lifetime of a man with what he can expect in his career ability, there is an eminent writer named Kenneth Boulding that other economists here will know about. He has an essay in a book called "Economics as a Science" and one essay is called "Economics in the Future of Man". He contends that since the very essence of man's civilized beginning,

45-68

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

there has been about 800 generations, and that in the last two there has been as much technological change as there was in the previous 798. So he, being a man in his late 60's, says that he, in terms of the technological world, has lived half of the world. Surely that is the kind of example of what we have when we have this creation of mismatch of the person's skills that become obsolete while he is still of the working age. It might incidentally also be an excellent argument for lowering the retirement age.

That is what manpower policy is all about, to relieve that mismatch. Finally to link back to inflation again because it has been emphasized, and also to forge the link that it is truly a manpower policy and a manpower challenge to lessen the danger of inflation; otherwise you can be in a position, through fiscal or monetary policy to increase the economic activity in a country, region, or province of doing nothing but generating future inflation. Every increment of additional inflation manifests with a lag time period, in unemployment in the future -- every time.

So, I want to emphasize that the manpower policy that has been so long needed and so long demanded by progressives in our society is needed, not only for the human opportunity to work through a man's working lifetime, but it is also essential in the inflation battle that must be conquered on an on-going basis if we are to preclude serious unemployment problems in the future.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister close the debate?

DR. HOHOL:

In doing this, Mr. Speaker, I will be most brief, but I would be less than honest if I were not to state openly and clearly that I am pleased and encouraged by the discussions from both sides of the House on a very serious matter -- that of manpower which has to do, in particular, with employment and unemployment.

I took the message of the hon. member for Drumheller to mean that this is a complex and difficult problem and I agree with him. The proof of the pudding is surely in the eating and I want to place that in perspective that no act, no bill, no new part of the department by itself is going to result in a new order, in a new scheme of things that will reduce unemployment and bring in the millennium. If the sober messages of both sides reflected that kind of proposition I would want to place it in perspective. So new ways must be found, Mr. Speaker, because the last few decades are evidence that -- I don't like the phrase but -- in a land of plenty, many people go without. The complexity of the problem of having the resources and not having the capacity and the competence as a state and as a nation to see that all people are looked after in a human and dignified way, is a challenge for the whole province and for both sides of the House. So the appeal tonight is for information, for assistance, for support, for criticism, that assist us in a very difficult type of challenge.

In the comments of the comments of the hon. member for Olds-Didsbury -- one was a question -- the matter of restructuring manpower is being moved, not rapidly, but seriously in exchanges of correspondence and some meetings. But I will attempt to rather specifically answer your question in terms of how this is moving at the provincial rather than at the federal level. It's difficult not to agree that the government can become more involved in programs,

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-69

especially those of on-the-job training, as the Members for Olds-Didsbury and Calgary North Hill pointed out.

I think the comments of the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest were very effectively and fully discussed by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests in his topic of structural unemployment. So I will leave it at that except to say I cannot in all conscience agree that we're at the stage where it's a privilege in Canada, certainly in Alberta, to work or not to work. There are circumstances in which people simply cannot work, and that we recognize. But the luxury of working or not working is one that we can ill afford and I take the position that it's in the individual's and in the province's, and in the nation's interest to work and to therefore participate in the returns which make the kind of life that we should wish for all our people.

The kind words of the hon. Member for Highwood alone would bring me to my feet to close the debate, and I thank you kindly. I assure you that the matter of power I take in a rather humble way. If you recall, Mr. Speaker, this side of the House has not, to my knowledge, used the word power. We assumed responsibility for government on September 10, 1971. Words in the act might reflect power, but this is a rather different thing, in fact. It's a sharing of responsibility to government, and that is how I should like to put it. I agree entirely with those who say that what the private sector can do, let them do. Not only that, encourage the private sector to do. We have an extremely competent minister and I think the private sector is becoming responsive to him and to this government, so that the manpower competence of this government will be geared to work with private industry in a very close way.

I agree, too, that the federal government should keep those manpower programs which it can best perform, but let me emphasize this if I may, that because the parameters of the manpower programs are those of the nation, while they may be consistent for a nation, they fall short at the provincial level.

The Member for Olds-Didsbury very accurately described the dismal failure of the Ottawa people in the matter of projections. This I'm sure neither he nor I am critical of. I think the projections can be best done in a more manageable unit of geography, of numbers of people, of distance, and so while it is only a matter of degree in which the difficulty is lessened at the provincial level, I think it is more manageable, and while it's a complex business, we will attempt to assist in this whole complex business of keeping people employed. What really is difficult to accept is that very often by definition we exclude people from the capacity to be trained or to be employed, and we define them as unemployable. I personally and this department, and this government, must do everything we can to undefine people from the rolls of the unemployable and to give them a chance to be employable and therefore to be employed.

[The motion was carried, and Bill No. 29 was read for a second time]

Bill No. 27 The Fuel Oil Tax Amendment Act, 1972

MR. MINIFLY:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Attorney General, that Bill No. 27, The Fuel Oil Tax Amendment Act, 1972, be now read a second time.

[The motion was carried, and Bill No. 27 was read a second time]

45-70

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

Bill No. 30: The Agricultural Chemicals Amendment Act, 1972

MR. YURKO:

I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, second reading of Bill No. 30, being The Agricultural Chemicals Amendment Act.

This bill transfers the responsibility for administration of this act from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Environment. One of the principal changes increases the regulation of pesticide application in and around or within bodies of water. The principle of suspending or cancelling any permit or licence or renewal of same is introduced in this bill.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this bill. I'd have been far happier if the hon. member had got the hon. Minister of Agriculture to second his bill.

Agricultural chemicals, of course, are used primarily by the farm population, and fall possibly into herbicides, insecticides, and this one dealing particularly with pesticides, but most of these chemicals are used through the Agricultural Service Boards, the MD's and the farmers in question. And while I have no objection to the regulations to be drawn up by the hon. Minister of the Environment, and while I have nothing personal against the Minister of the Environment and his department, I do feel that this bill ties in very closely with Bill No. 40, The Noxious Weed Act, because most of these chemicals are used either for weeds, or in the case of pesticides -- particularly with grasshoppers and the Bertha army worm -- these are primarily used by the farm population. We are quite conscious, and I think the Department of Agriculture and its officials are quite conscious, what the misuse of these chemicals can cause. I am a little concerned that it is taken out of agriculture, because I feel the minister and his department are quite capable of taking care of the regulations and the act itself. I would ask that the hon. Minister of Agriculture -- he has made such a plea in many other cases -- why he couldn't make a plea on this one.

[The motion was carried, and Bill No. 30 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 42: The Environment Conservation Amendment Act

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, second reading of Bill No. 42, being The Environment Conservation Amendment Act.

Mr. Speaker, there are several matters involved in this bill. One of course, is that the membership has increased to four members. We envision that a substantial load will be carried by this authority in the future, and as a result we consider it may be necessary to conduct two hearings at any one time. So, we felt it would be necessary to split the authority into two halves.

It also clarifies the relationship with respect to the Department of the Environment, and it transfers the responsibility of the authority from the Executive Council to the Minister of the Environment, as we are going to be working very closely in connection with the authority on many matters.

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-71

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, looking at Bill No. 42 I am quite surprised, frankly, that this bill was brought before this Legislature. Certainly to me, it is astonishing the amount of power that is going to be invested in the Minister of the Environment as such. Certainly, I find no personal quarrel with the hon. minister or his abilities, but nevertheless, what this bill does in essence, it emasculates the power of the Environment Conservation Authority. Now, what were the objectives of the Environment Conservation Authority when it was set up? My understanding, and the understanding inherent in the legislation is that this is the concept of an ombudsman -- in effect, a body above and beyond political considerations, charged with the responsibility of taking care of the many things involved in the environment of our rapidly moving world.

So when this particular concept is accepted, that the theory of ombudsman insofar as environment is concerned, I am certainly at a loss to understand the government's position on this, for this reason. Certainly on both sides of the Legislature if the implication was brought out that the Attorney General as such should direct the deliberations of the Ombudsman, there would be a tremendous outcry. And here we have a situation, in this government which is devoted basically to open government coming out with this extraordinary bill, which in effect destroys what has been brought forward in the original bill.

On one hand we support the Ombudsman who seeks to correct bureaucratic injustice against an individual or groups of individuals and then we adopt a course of action with regard to environment conservation authority which has responsibility to seek out and correct environmental injustices which effect all of the present day society, and generations yet unborn in the decades and even the centuries to come; support freedom of action where an individual is involved, but refuses such freedom of action where the offense may be against all of present day and future societies.

Leaving a matter which should be invested by the conservation authority to the judgment of the minister completely, is unacceptable. Certainly the minister and I am not questioning his integrity or I am not questioning his motives, but certainly there are other considerations. A politician that is out on grass is like a steer in the wrong pasture. And this is what could happen to politicians when they place them over and above the purview of what is properly right and what is wrong. So this is why I cannot understand the approach that has been taken in the matter of Bill No. 42. This to me is another step towards the elimination of open government in this province, the elimination of any possible source of criticism of any sort, within or closely associated with government.

So we have this as a chain and a long cycle of things that have occurred, that makes it rather alarming to me and I wonder what direction this government is taking. Certainly, when the final outcome of the last election was brought forth, I did not feel badly, very badly, I figured the wrong people won but I said here now we have a government with a new look dedicated to open government, and then my disillusionment began, Mr. Speaker, with the elimination of the Human Resources Research Council. Here was a body that spoke for the individual, that looked as all concepts of government, and certainly in some of the reports you cannot say that they were very flattering to the former government, and rightly so, this is what this particular board was set up for, to think and to spread the light. What happens to this board? It's eliminated, completely destroyed by this government, Mr. Speaker. Now we have another one, the elimination of the independent inquiry into the provincial-municipal tax sharing in favour of caucus committees. I'm not going into that tonight, because it has been gone into and certainly the hon. members must be, I hope, reassessing the rather sorry position that they have taken in this particular subject.

45-72

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

Now we have, in this Bill No. 42, another step down the road to making a mockery of open government. I certainly ask the hon. members to think carefully, to assess this. This amendment that will assure that the conservation authority is completely under the direction of the minister is wrong. They can only investigate what he approves of and make recommendations to which he can only approve.

Certainly the price of progress and the preservation of our democratic freedom is the right to criticize the status quo. This is certainly what I intend to do, because the entire concept of this particular amendment is certainly wrong.

I do not think the hon. minister should resent what I say. This is one of the occupational hazards of being elected to the Legislative Assembly. It has been said that constructive criticism is good for a person. I think that this should be something that these cabinet ministers should be able to accept in large quantities.

But if they just accept the criticism and do nothing, this is the problem that I see. There is no use in sitting on those benches and moving back and forth and making noises because this is not what you are expected to do in this Legislature. You are supposed to think big -- you are supposed to think for the people of the Province of Alberta, Mr. Speaker. This is what we were sent up here for. We were not sent here to sit back and say nothing and do nothing. I'll have a drink on that. [Drinks from his water glass] So then, the minister's judgment is completely unacceptable as the basis for the terminating of the scope of the Conservation Authority's activities. This is an example of a negative and divisive position on criticism, if it is the minister's position that he should refuse to go along with the basis of the Conservation Authority.

The amendment basically makes a complete farce of the Environment Conservation Authority and the concept of which it is based. The minister could, at least, have the integrity, if he is going to carry on with this loathsome piece of legislation, to completely disband the Authority entirely because we have a board set up and it has no functional benefits any longer. So why have the board? Get rid of it. Save some money.

We have the precedents. This is what was done with the Human Resources Research Council and the Tax Study Commission. Here at least, in the caucus committees, they will eventually have to take the responsibility for their actions, because somewhere down the road, all of us are going to have to answer to the people of Alberta for what we do and what we say and what we think here.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in concluding these brief remarks, I am not suggesting that the hon. Minister of Environment is seeking out the crown of Caesar, although he is acting as though he is seeking out the laurel wreaths. I am suggesting that Bill No. 42 should be amended, that the Environment Conservation Act should remain as it was, for the benefit of all concerned. Certainly this amendment puts the hon. minister in a very precarious position insofar as the decision-making is funnelled into the hands of one man. Granted this is a very capable man, Mr. Speaker, but Adolf Hitler in his time was also a very capable man and we are not going to have any Adolf Hitlers in the Alberta Legislature!

HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add one or two points to the contributions that were already made by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. I am particularly concerned about this amendment,

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-73

Mr. Speaker, having been the minister who introduced the original bill into the House. Certainly I must echo the sentiments just expressed by my colleague, in pointing out to the members that the amendment that is now before us making the Authority responsible to the hon. Minister of Environment, in effect integrates the authority into the Department of the Environment. It removes any question of any autonomy that the authority might have.

One of the other amendments is that the authority may only carry out investigations after consultation with the minister. As a consequence, the authority has been stripped of any basic autonomy that it had in the original legislation, to, on its own initiative, examine matters of environmental interest and concern to the public. And certainly when we witness the actions of some politicians in this category, I think this is a very serious step.

I suggest if the amendments are proceeded with that we might as well save the taxpayers of the province the money and scrap the authority completely, because it is simply going to be something, a tool, that the minister will have where he can focus some political heat on the authority, and avoid responsibility in some matters. In my mind it follows that if the hon. minister is going to have the authority to decide what the conservation authority itself can look into, it's obvious that the recommendations forthcoming from the conservation authority are also going to have to be in keeping with what the minister thinks they should be. And certainly this is entirely contrary to the basic concept under which this particular body was established.

I notice, for example, that they're adding another member to the authority. I suggest this is just a sop to try to gloss over the fact that they're making a mockery out of the basic concept for which this body was originally established. It has no further practical purpose so far as its original intention was concerned.

One may say, "Oh, well, the hon. minister and his colleagues opposite, now that they're in the government we don't need to worry. The minister knows best." I've heard a lot of 'the minister knows best' or 'the Premier knows best' in this particular session, where there's been refusal to make statements on questions of public policy, as if this government isn't even to be questioned on them. To suggest that some independent check or investigating body isn't necessary in this particular matter I suggest is simply not in keeping with the facts.

So far as the present administration is concerned one only has to remember the statements that the 'now' Minister of the Environment himself was making before the election. Shut down coal mining in the Canmore corridor; ruining Rundle Mountain; issue a stop order; and on and on and on -- press conferences, and so forth. Then after August 30th, and after September 10th, after the ministers were sworn in, what do we hear within a very short time? We hear that the hon. Minister of the Environment and the hon. Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has visited Canmore and we then hear glowing press reports about what a tremendous job the company is doing. So obviously, Mr. Speaker, when we witness political exercises such as that, it gets a little bit difficult to accept suggestions that the government is going to objectively examine environmental responsibilities. They're obviously setting up a system under which they will not broach any criticism, constructive or otherwise, from anybody who is anywhere near associated with the administration.

I am at a complete loss to understand a completely negative attitude such as this on the part of any government that is supposed to be concerned about the environment. I think the best example of this that I can cite is the fact that I understand the hon. Minister of the Environment now has in his hands the report of the Environment Conservation Authority relative to the restoration of water levels in

45-74

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

Cooking Lake. This is a report that was initiated during the time of the previous administration and if any criticisms are to be levied against government in the report, surely they would have to be criticism of the previous administration. But, yet we ask for a Return on the report earlier in the session and this was refused. I think at that time the hon. minister didn't have the report but now, at this time, the hon. minister does have the report. I think the failure to table the report before this House can only be taken as evidence of what I have been saying, that this government is about to close the doors so that there are not going to be any reports forthcoming from any quarter which may be at all embarrassing to them. And I think the fact that they scrapped a couple of public committees that were set up and transferred them to internal caucus committees within the Conservative Party is further evidence of this.

Certainly there can be no excuse for the hon. minister refusing to table the report of the Environment Conservation Authority. He had nothing to do with the circumstances which led up to the study being initiated by the authority. He certainly can't be expected to accept any criticism for past practices.

MR. YURKO:

Point of order. The hon. member doesn't know what he's talking about. I haven't refused to table that report at all. When he asked for it before, it simply wasn't available and that matter hasn't come up on the order paper yet. So perhaps the hon. member might take off his crown or his halo and recognize what the facts are.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right. Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'm going by the previous action of the hon. minister. When the Return was before the House last time, the hon. minister didn't bother standing up and saying, we haven't got the report. We got a long dissertation from him about it being an internal report within the government -- it was up to him to decide, and only him after he had a look at it, whether it should be tabled. And quite frankly I can only judge by past performance, and I know now that he has the report and I'm hoping that he is going to follow through to provide some positive evidence to the fact that he's not just a politician whose main exercise is to get into office and stay in office that he has some legitimate concern about this matter.

MR. POSTER:

Don't judge everybody by yourself.

MR. HENDERSON:

I realized that the amendment before us completely emasculates the authority, makes it subject to the sole direction of the minister, makes it in effect part of the Department of the Environment, completely destroys the original concept. We have already witnessed the hon. minister refusing to table reports from the authority -- I don't have too much grounds for optimism. I'm hoping that he will provide the report for the members of this House. Because, Mr. Speaker, it's about the only evidence we're going to have from here on of any objective appraisal on the part of the Environment Conservation Authority without receiving political instructions.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-75

MR. HENDERSON:

I am sorely disappointed that the hon. minister hasn't the intestinal fortitude to stand up and say that we are going to scrap it, rescind it, like they did the Human Resources Research Council -- I wouldn't agree with it, but at least I could accept that he'd acted in a direct and forthright manner on it. But to do it in this manner, I say again, completely destroys the basic principle which underlay the establishment of the Environment Conservation Authority and from here on out, in my opinion, the body will be subject to the political direction of the minister. They are no longer free to act on their own initiative -- we might as well save the taxpayers money and scrap the whole principle.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could just add two or three comments to those made by Mr. Henderson. First of all -- well, I'm going to anyway. I wonder if I could refer to the publication, Provincial and Municipal Finances, dated 1971, page 226, where it talks about a summary of Pollution Control Legislation across Canada in the year 1971. I'd like to read this into the record. "In 1970," and this is with regard to pollution legislation in the Province of Alberta as compared to the rest of the provinces in Canada, and I quote from page 226. "In 1970, the government established the Environment Conservation Authority the first in Canada, consisting of three full-time members. The authority reports directly to the Executive Council of the Government and the Environment Conservation Authority Act emphasizes that the authority will act as an ombudsman on environmental matters and will advise the government on the significance of environmental management problems." And that's the end of the quotation.

I just emphasize the sentence, "the authority reports directly to the Executive Council of the Government and the Environment Conservation Authority Act emphasizes that the authority will act as an ombudsman on environmental matters."

So the real acid test to put the legislation that is before us right now is: would the government be prepared to have the strings that are being hoisted upon the Environment Conservation Authority, would the government be prepared to have those strings hoisted upon the Ombudsman?

I recall a year ago when there was a great deal of difference in this House as far as power and authority and latitude of action that the Ombudsman had. And the Attorney General today introduced legislation, which in the governments opinion, would deal with this problem. And it's very odd, that on the very same day, Mr. Speaker, the evening of the day, that the government would introduce legislation, that really for all intents and purposes as I read it, ties the hands of the Environment Conservation Authority, and doesn't allow it to be an ombudsman in the field of pollution and environmental control in this province. We were in the situation of having the first environmental ombudsman in Canada and on the very day the government is giving the Ombudsman additional powers, it is strapping in, almost destroying, the Environment Conservation Authority as we know it. And it's a disgusting and really an amazing situation.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister close the debate?

45-76

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, after listening to the dissertations on the other side, three of them, I am convinced that they just haven't read the amendments and fitted them into the act.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I suppose you're sure?

MR. YURKO:

Absolutely! I would like to suggest, because it is a matter of policy that we are discussing, 71-A reads as follows: "the authority shall conduct a continuing review of policies and programs of the government and government agencies on matters pertaining to the environment conservation and shall report thereon to the Lieutenant Governor in Council." And we have said now "shall report thereon" to the minister. The reason for this is that the minister has far more time to bring before Cabinet and argue very strongly before Cabinet the viewpoint of the authority. As a matter of fact, if any minister is qualified to argue before Cabinet, before the Executive Council, the recommendations of the authority in a very forceful and forthright manner, it is the man that has the responsibility for the environment in total in the province. This is the reason the minister is replacing the Lieutenant Governor in Council in that particular aspect -- because he is the most knowledgeable man, the most powerful man to argue the authorities case through Cabinet.

MR. HENDERSON:

It is a matter of consultation.

MR. YURKO:

Well, I am talking about the areas. . . sir, I am going to speak about several of these areas and I will indicate why after consultation. If you permit me to go through them one by one, I will certainly give you an opportunity and a reason as to why this was done in certain areas. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if those gentlemen would put on their thinking caps, then they would recognize what the value is of what we have done. Because in 71-A we have given the most qualified member of that Cabinet to argue the case of the authority before Cabinet. And who could do that better than the Minister of the Environment? Who knows what programs are going on across the --

MR. HENDERSON:

The authority itself --

MR. YURKO:

Well the authority was never given the opportunity to come before Cabinet in this bill.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I shall talk about this term ombudsman later on, because the gentleman on the other side has created a myth and I have to get up publicly and indicate the authority was never given ombudsman's powers in this silly act that they passed.

MR. HENDERSON:

Scrap it then!

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-77

MR. YURKO:

Well I am strengthening it to make it meaningful.

MR. HENDERSON:

Strengthening it, ho, ho --

MR. YURKO:

Let me take a look at the second instance, 71-E, Mr. Speaker, says again: "a matter of policy may and when required to do so by an order of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, shall hold public hearings for the purpose of receiving briefs and submissions on any matter pertaining to environmental conservation and shall report thereon to the Lieutenant Governor in Council." Now what did we do with these? We have added --

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think the hon. minister has got the message across about this silly legislation, would he just drop the matter at that and vote. . .

MR. YURKO:

I'm talking about policy matters that the hon. gentleman. . .

MR. HENDERSON:

. . .not be debated any further.

MR. YURKO:

. . .and he frothed and he roared over nothing and now he won't give me a chance to answer him without interruptions. All we have done to ease, after the Lieutenant Governor in Council or the minister, for the simple reason that the minister is holding a number of hearings in connection with bills that he introduces before the Legislature, the Water Resources Bill, Surface Rights Conservation Bills, and other bills and as a result he knows more than anyone else the total spectrum of hearings that have been carried on in the Department of the Environment as well as in the authority, as well as across government in total. So as a result, it simply was put in there for a matter of co-ordination across the department in total, in matters related to the environment. Nothing has been subtracted from the power of the authority at all, if in fact it had any power. Because this bill doesn't really give the authority any power as thou shalt say later in connection with comments about the ombudsman. In connection with 71-H where we have indicated that "may engage the services of persons having special technical or other knowledge," we have indicated there that he must check with the minister first because the minister employs all sorts of consultants. The minister does all sorts of studies and there is no point in the authority going off to the left in one direction, spending good public money, and the minister going off in the other direction and both of us doing the same study. In fact we were getting very close where, in fact, we were doing that very thing. The authority was off on its own in one direction conducting a study, and the minister was off on his own in another direction conducting the same study.

You had your turn, Jim. Nevertheless, it is necessary to integrate the functions of the authority with the rest of government. The only way it can be integrated with the rest of government is so that the authority has a seat at the cabinet meeting every Tuesday. That's the only way you can integrate the authority functions with the government in total, because the environment is not a narrow department. The environment as defined in The Department of the Environment Act is an umbrella type of act that covers all the physical aspects of the province. So there is need for co-ordination

45-78

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

in every sense of the word in connection with the authority and with the department.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest made some totally false statements, and how he could have made those statements and have read the act, I don't understand. He said the authority was given the power to seek out and correct something. Well I would like him to show me in this act where the authority has any power whatsoever to correct anything. The authority has the power to study, to recommend, to examine, to debate, to hold hearings, but I would like to see the hon. member find for me one specific spot where that government of the past gave the authority some power to do anything or to correct any situation. This was, in fact, what was occurring. That government created in the minds of the people, in the minds of the authority, that the authority was an ombudsman, that the authority could, in fact if it was an ombudsman, report it to the Legislature, rather than to the government, which it doesn't, it reports to the government. Secondly --

MR. HENDERSON:

A point of order. Is the minister saying that the Ombudsman also has authority to make changes?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

No. I don't believe the minister said that.

MR. YURKO:

The Ombudsman has the authority to correct situations.

MR. HENDERSON:

What did it recommend? The Ombudsman can correct things. Read the act.

MR. YURKO:

He makes an awful lot of corrections, Mr. Speaker, to various cases. The authority has no such powers whatsoever. All the authority can do is look at a situation and recommend to government a specific action. The Ombudsman reports to the Legislature and the authority reports to government in every sense of the word. Now what they have done, Mr. Speaker, by their loose language is to create the idea outside that the authority was an ombudsman so that complaints were coming to the authority, and there was a feeling amongst the people that the authority would go out there and take action and correct the situation. And then I was getting requests that the authority wasn't doing this very thing because they didn't have the power in the first place to do such things. The only man in this area besides the government, in total, that can take any action to correct the matter is the minister. As a result the minister had to co-ordinate his activities with the authority and the people had to be straightened out. I made at least two speeches in this regard to indicate to the public that the authority didn't have the function to correct pollution in the lake, or some very thick smoke somewhere which was affecting somebody's breathing apparatus. These matters had to be subsequently referred back to the department. It created an intolerable situation and it had to be straightened out. And in fact, it was. It was left up to this government to straighten it out and that government simply suspended something on a stick out here and felt that it would create all sorts of miracles. It wasn't about to create miracles. Furthermore, somebody has to bring the budget of the authority through the Legislature, and it turned out that the Minister of the Environment must bring this budget to the Legislature and in fact, argue for a budget for the authority in that cabinet meeting. I say again that there is no one better qualified in that

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-79

cabinet meeting to argue more strongly for the authority than the Minister of the Environment, because he knows what they're doing and he knows what they are talking about.

So, for the life of me, I can't understand what the criticisms are all about. Obviously it's again a case of political nonsense, if you want to call it that, Mr. Speaker, and I wasn't surprised at the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc going through the harangue he did. But I was surprised at the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, because I was always under the impression that he could read and understand and contemplate and decipher better than he had indicated when he read this amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It has been moved by the hon. Minister of the Environment that Bill No. 42, The Environment Conservation Amendment Act 1972 be now read a second time.

[A recorded vote being called for, the House divided as follows:

For the motion: Messrs.

Adair	Ghitter	Miniely
Ashton	Hansen	Moore
Backus	Harle	Paproski
Batiuk	Hohol	Peacock
Chambers	Horner	Purdy
Chichak, Mrs.	Hunley, Miss	Russell
Cookson	Hyndman	Schmid
Copithorne	Jamison	Stromberg
Dickie	King	Topolnisky
Doan	Lee	Trynchy
Farran	Leitch	Warrack
Fluker	Lougheed	Young
Poster	McCrimmon	Yurko
Getty	Miller, J.	Zander

Against the motion: Messrs.

Anderson	Drain	Ruste
Barton	French	Sorenson
Benoit	Gruenwald	Speaker, R.
Buck	Henderson	Strom
Buckwell	Hinman	Taylor
Clark	Ho Lem	Wilson
Cooper	Ludwig	Wyse
Dixon	Miller, D.	

Totals: Ayes - 42 Noes - 23]

MR. SPEAKER:

I declare the motion carried.

[Bill No. 42 read a second time.]

Bill No. 41 An Act to Amend The Clean Air Act

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Lloydminster, second reading of Bill No. 41, an Act to Amend the Clean Air Act. The act defines with regard to air pollution the role of the director of standards, and approvals and the director of pollution controls. It contains procedures with regard to obtaining

45-80

ALEERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

a permit to construct a plant and the subsequent obtaining of a license to operate that plant. This separation is important since the environment department will be farming out some pollution control functions to other departments or boards as, for example, the Energy Resources Board. The setting of standards and the licensing of construction and of operating will not be farmed out but will give functions performed only within the department of the environment. Also, from a philosophical standpoint it can be considered good practice to separate the judiciary so to speak from the enforcement body.

Another important amendment expands the authority of the minister to make regulations to more effectively control air pollution at the source, while the original act provided for basically ambient control, the amendments will alter regulations, setting the maximum concentration and weight of contaminants which might be emitted. Further the amendments provide for the establishment of source standards for all industries in Alberta. These amendments provide for the certification of visible emission readers, that is smoke readers. It is important, not only from the standpoint of insuring that the department can accurately measure visible emissions, but that the department can legally support its findings. In other words the certification will make smoke pollution regulations enforceable. Another important change requires that within 30 days of the minister issuing the stop order, the environment conservation authority must hold a public hearing into all matters leading to the making of that stop order.

Mr. Speaker, I believe in giving credit where credit is due, and I feel that the past administration does deserve credit for setting up the environment department, and for the associated legislation including The Clean Air Act. However, it is often the case with new legislation it soon became obvious that several changes were required in The Clean Air Act in order to make it really workable legislation, and the most significant of these are the ones that I just reviewed. Further, I am sure that as technology advances and as the department continues to work with legislation, future amendments will be forthcoming from time to time as the need arises.

I would also like to commend industry for their continued advancement of pollution control technology. The fact of the matter is that the reason the government can regulate continually higher pollution control standards, is because industry is conscientiously and continually improving the equipment and the processes which make clean air possible. While government must set the standards and give leadership in achieving objectives, nevertheless, industry is, by and large, doing its part to improving environment also.

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, the people who operate Alberta industry, including the management, and the engineers, and all other employees, are people who live in our communities, who enjoy the outdoors, and indeed, want to have clean water and to breathe clean air, as do we all. These people also want to leave a good environment for their children, as do we all. So then industry, because it is really people that make up an industry, and the government, and the general public, have a common objective, and that is a clean environment for Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would say that clean air is the responsibility of us all, not just of government and industry. As a general public, we are quite willing to set ever higher standards for industry, and so we should. However, we probably try to avoid thinking about a source of pollution that is much greater in urban centres than that emitted from our industrial plants, and that is pollution from the automobile. Now I think we all recognize that we are going to continue to drive our automobiles, and that,

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-81

furthermore, the US government is forcing the auto industry to innovate improvements as soon as they can be developed. In fact, in this regard, I notice today that General Motors alone has now some 3,500 engineers working on this specific pollution problem.

However, I think we all have a personal responsibility to ensure that our car motors are kept tuned up, and that the emission control devices are actually connected and are in good working order.

On the subject of personal responsibility, one of my children the other day asked me if I wasn't being a little bit hypocritical in introducing The Clean Air Amendment Act, while continuing to puff on the occasional cigar. After reprimanding the lad for his irreverence, I did reflect on this paradox to some extent, and have been contemplating either stopping the cigars or perhaps taking the advice of the hon. Member for Bonnyville and the hon. Member for Camrose regarding the chewing, or whatever it is that one does with Copenhagen snus. Seriously, though, air pollution is the responsibility of us all. Governments must set the standards and enforce the rules. However, it is incumbent on every Alberta citizen, corporate and private, to strive for clean air.

[The motion was carried, and Bill No. 41 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 46: The Public Lands Amendment Act

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. J. A. Adair, Minister without Portfolio responsible for Northern Development and Liaison with Native People in Alberta, second reading of Bill No. 46. The bill, though important, is straightforward and, as I described on first reading, is simply the repeal of Bill No. 66 from last year's Legislative Assembly, and in that way leaves those portions of The Public Lands Act in precisely the place that they stood and exactly the same language as was the case prior to Bill No. 66 of last year's Legislative Assembly.

[The motion was carried, and Bill No. 46 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 51: The Litter Act

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, second reading of Bill No. 51, being The Litter Act.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will give government an opportunity to provide a method of control of litter in general. There are three main parts to the bill associated with the policies required for controlling litter on land, litter on water, and unsightly premises along highways.

The act itself, basically, is an umbrella act and brings together sections from existing acts which deal with this problem which are mainly The Highway Traffic Act and The Public Highways Development Act, as well as The Public Lands Act. The pertinent sections, of course, are removed from the above acts and are included in The Litter Act, and then administration of each of these sections is being transferred back, or will be transferred back to the appropriate department to utilize the existing forces for litter control that are presently set up within government.

There are some matters affecting some measure of persuasion with respect to municipalities and their control over litter. And the act does provide for the issuing of a cleanup order to the municipality

45-82

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

where an offense is taking place and the municipality isn't taking any reasonable action.

I think at this time that is all I would like to say on this act. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a comment and ask the hon. minister this may not quite apply here but I think the hon. minister can give me an answer. My concerns is in municipalities where they have taken gravel out -- and the hon. minister brought this up last year -- because in the Clover Bar area along the refinery rcw and along the river there are many such areas, and throughout the whole province. I was just wondering if the hon. minister would consider reviewing this situation and possibly coming up and making some of the municipalities do a little bit of landscaping to try and restore some better aesthetic appearance to some of these old abandoned gravel pits?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, for the hon. member's knowledge, that aspect is completely treated under The Land Surface Conservation Act and it is a part of that act rather than The Litter Act.

[The motion was carried without dissent, and Bill No. 51 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 62 The Maintenance and Recovery Amendment Act, 1972

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Member for the Rose constituency, second reading of The Maintenance and Recovery Amendment Act, 1972.

The act is, generally, of a housekeeping nature although there are some considerations I would like to describe, particularly in three areas. It improves the procedure for the recovery of maintenance for children of unmarried parents and it makes these improvements in two ways.

First, where the department has incurred expenses for the maintenance and medical care of a mother in this circumstance, the department may still recover these expenses from the putative father, even though the mother subsequently marries or resumes cohabitation with her husband.

The second way is where a putative father has made an agreement to pay maintenance for the care of such a child and he later moves out of the province, the department when they take action to enforce this agreement may serve the notice on the putative father outside the province.

Another change that this amending act makes is that formerly the department could only place caveats on property owned by social allowance recipients in those circumstances where they were paying on mortgage or agreements for sale. Now this amendment allows the department to place caveats where the department has expended monies on such property to make repairs or make improvements. And this, of course, would prevent such social allowance recipients from becoming unjustly enriched when they resold the property.

A final aspect of the amending act is that, as all members are probably aware, the present act prohibits disclosure of information on children and adults that come into existence by virtue of the act. The amending act increases the penalty and, therefore, should

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-83

increase the deterrent effect of this section by increasing the fine from \$100 to \$500.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent, and Bill No. 62 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 66: The Hospital Visitors Committee Act

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the hon. Member for Stettler, second reading of Bill No. 66 The Hospital Visitors Committee Act. This act sets up the machinery whereby a board of twelve members may be set up for the visitation of all hospitals under the Department of Health including mental hospitals in the Province of Alberta.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent, and Bill No. 66 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 67 The Legal Profession Amendment Act, 1972

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the hon. Dr. Hohol, second reading of the Legal Profession Amendment Act, 1972, No. 1. This bill, Mr. Speaker, contains three amendments to the Legal Profession Act.

The first one authorizes the education committee of the Benchers of the Law Society of Alberta to admit as a student at law someone who has been a practicing lawyer in England, and who has spent three of the last five years working with the Department of the Attorney General of the Province of Alberta. A person by that amendment is placed in the same position as the members of the Bar of England, Scotland and Northern Ireland and certain other Commonwealth countries who now may be admitted to articles if they have been practising three of the last five years prior to their admission in any one of those countries.

The second amendment, Mr. Speaker, deals with the procedure on the application of members of the law society for reinstatement to the Law Society. Under the act as it now is, three members of the Benchers sit on disciplinary matters and then report to the Benchers, and when the matter that they have sat on comes before the Benchers, they are eligible to take part in the proceedings. That wasn't so in the case of the Companion Action by the Benchers, namely the application from someone who has been disbarred for readmission to the Law Society. His application is also heard by three Benchers who report on it to the Benchers and then when the matter is dealt with by the Benchers, they were under the existing legislation, prevented from sitting on the hearing. This amendment cures that -- what appears to have been an oversight in the original legislation, Mr. Speaker.

The last amendment merely prevents municipalities from licensing or from requiring members of the legal profession to obtain a license from the municipality before being able to practise their profession within the municipality.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent, and Bill No. 67 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 69: The Alberta Health Care Insurance Amendment Act 1972

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I move seconded by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development that Bill No. 69 be read a second time. The

45--84

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

purpose of this bill is twofold, Mr. Speaker. One of the amendments will enable a commission to re-assess claims and having re-assessed them, collect from or pay to a resident or a practitioner as the case may be, any amount resulting from the re-assessment.

The more important principle of the bill is the amendment which enables Albertans to register without paying the premium back to July 1st, 1969. It is hoped that the few who have not registered will now be encouraged to do so.

Another clause of the bill will give authority to restrict a long period of treatment outside Alberta for a service which is readily available in Alberta. It makes the medical treatment the same as hospital services. Without this amendment a person might find their hospital care limited but not their medical care when outside the province. And also, of course, in it we have moved out of the regulations and placed in the act the exemption from payment of premium for those people over 65 for optional services which are available under the Alberta Health Care.

[The motion being carried, Bill No. 69 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 72 The Milk Control Amendment Act, 1972

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Dr. Paproski, The Milk Control Amendment Act, 1972 which will be replaced with the title The Dairy Board Act. The principle function of the board will be the control of fluid milk marketing, and the name Control Board is used in most Canadian provinces and hence would maintain a certain uniformity of understanding. The board's duties would also be to control marketing of industrial milk under the market-sharing plan. The word dairy is widely interpreted as both basic farm animal production as well as dairy plant production. Hence the word control might help to minimize this interpretation. The change would allow increasing the members on the board from three to five which would include a cream shipper and a consumer, probably a lady. The combination amendment, for safeguard, will be subject to the necessary approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

[The motion being carried, Bill No. 72 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 74 The Alberta Art Foundation Act

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, would I be allowed some latitude first to thank you and the other hon. colleagues on both sides of the House for a magnificent display of ball-playing to officially open the Little League baseball season. Despite injuries, our MLA's managed to soundly trounce, under the able coaching of the hon. minister Alan Adair, the supposedly superior team of presidents of the Little League. The new Minister of Recreation was coached by the hon. Member for Drumheller on how to throw a ball because it was the first time I threw a ball. And in case you wonder why the hon. Member for Drumheller is still a bachelor besides his thinking that marriage is something like a bath, after you get into it, it is not as hot as you thought it was. He also tells me that the same thing happened to him as happened to me about 17 years ago, that a date I had, I took to a ball game, after about five minutes I asked her who is it -- the ball game or me, and she said the ball game.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the hon. Minister for Municipal Affairs, Bill No. 74 entitled The Alberta Art Foundation Act be now read a second time. The intent of this bill, as I think all hon. members are aware, is to make provision whereby the province can purchase artifacts and works of art, not only as an

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-85

encouragement, a proper encouragement, Mr. Speaker, to Alberta artists, but as an investment in our own cultural future. The sum we have in mind, Mr. Speaker, is \$50,000 annually and believe me, hon. members, it is a trifling sum in relation to the potential of the project. It is, in actual sense, Mr. Speaker, exactly .004364% of our total budget, just four one-thousands percent of our total budget.

That the members of this Assembly may fully appreciate what I am about to say on the worth of our investment, I ask them to visualize how much highway could be built for this. How many dry wells have companies exploring for oil put down each one perhaps costing this much or more, in the sure faith --

AN HON. MEMBER:

. . . they have twice as much.

MR. SCHMID:

I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER:

I was just commenting on that question.

MR. SCHMID:

-- in the sure faith that this was a necessary investment. Mr. Speaker, few private business firms would consider \$50,000 a large investment in advertising alone.

And this is what I am asking for the people of Alberta in terms of art.

What does this mean to us, Mr. Speaker, in economic realities alone? Let me suggest to this Assembly that it is an investment long, long overdue.

I mention the names of four of our better-known Alberta artists -- names that will be familiar, I am sure, to you all...Gissing, Leighton, Schintz, and de Grandmaison. If you are not familiar with these names, your children, I am sure, will be.

These artists are all Albertans, in the sensible definition of that word. I think it is correct to say that all had humble beginnings; down around Calgary and Banff, they were referred to not too many years ago as, "Oh yeah, those fellows who dabble at painting."

And today, Mr. Speaker? Well, a very small de Grandmaison fetches \$5,000, I am told. His really good works bring far higher prices - probably \$15,000 or more. This man is in a class with Charles Russell, with whom many of our Alberta artists painted. Russell's works, once given away, now bring \$100,000 readily. Alberta's de Grandmaison is regarded as the most famous painter of Indian portraits in the world, not just in North America, Mr. Speaker, and there are plenty of art dealers, even in this city, who assure me that one day de Grandmaison's works will rival Russell's in dollar value. I ask you to remember again that, in his early years, \$100 was a goodly sum for one of those paintings, worth \$15,000 today. And I ask you, wouldn't it have been wonderful if the Alberta Legislature of bygone years had voted just a little money to buy the works of de Grandmaison and his fellows?

If I may say a word or two about these other famous Alberta artists, Mr. Speaker, it is that Gissing is called "the pretty landscape painter." He worked first in pastel, and then in oil.

45-86

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

Leighton's best works were in water colour, so the experts assure me, even as they tell me that a tractor company -- not the government, Mr. Speaker, not even a public gallery -- had the best collection of Leightons. Some of them, by the way, were shipped to Italy, and one Alberta art dealer, at least, would give much to bring them back. As for Schintz, his cattle and horses are unsurpassed. This colourful page of our past is almost finished, and the work of Schintz is more and more compelling because of it. "Look at how he painted cattle," the experts say to me. "His work in a few years will be in a class with Russell's, too."

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, mentioning people like Illingworth Kerr -- we have a painting of his hanging out in the hallway, of the former Premier -- Sylvain Voyer, Len Gibb, but surely I have made my point. Economically speaking, \$50,000 invested in the work of our artists is a bargain beyond belief -- if not today, then surely tomorrow.

The reason people flock to the art treasures of the Louvre or other world-famous galleries today is because other governments of other times had the foresight -- the plain common sense -- to purchase the art of their own time.

History tells us, Mr. Speaker, that what those without vision look on as the ordinary art of today has a habit of becoming the great work of tomorrow.

This \$50,000, Mr. Speaker, is to ensure that at least some of our art treasures of tomorrow will be a lasting legacy of the people of Alberta.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I want to just say a word or two in connection with this particular bill. I'd like to commend the hon. minister and the government for bringing in The Alberta Art Foundation Act. Too many times we think that man lives by bread alone and that we haven't got time for art, music and dancing and so on. I remember seeing one time when I was in Quebec City, some 50 or 60 young people painting on one of those little side streets, and trying to sell their art to passersby. Hundreds of people, particularly from the United States were buying this art. I thought at that time that here were some young people developing a new culture of Canada, of Quebec, and trying to make a living from it. I think this act will have a great deal to do with developing a Canadian art and an Alberta art and will have a great deal to do with improving the culture and the way of life of people in this country. It will also depict to people for generations to come, what the cultural conditions were in the period in which we live.

There's one little disappointment, and possibly I shouldn't say it's a disappointment, however, I would hope that this act will expand to include poetry and music. There are also people in Alberta and in Canada who are writing various types of music and who are writing poetry, and this too, helps to build up a new culture and part of the Canadian culture and part of Alberta culture. I hope that it won't be too long before we will be able to expand this type of thing that we are now doing for art into the musical field and into the poetry field at least.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of short questions for the hon. minister on this bill. Would he advise us as to whether or not the administration costs come out of this \$50,000 sum, and would he advise us as to how he envisions that the works of art will be purchased. I am thinking in terms of the government going into competition at art shows to buy works of art against the private

May 8th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

45-87

sector or at art auctions. Would he give us a brief description of how he plans to eliminate those problems.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, hopefully the administration costs will be very low. The board for the Alberta Art Foundation will be comprised of representatives of other strata of our society from I would say, connoisseur collectors down to the housewife, and they will only be getting their expenses paid so we felt that the administrative costs will be quite low.

As to the second question, the decision on which works of art to purchase will rest with the Board of the Art Foundation. May I suggest they would probably purchase from art galleries as well as from artists directly.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, there is one point in principle here I was quite concerned about. I wondered why it was spelled out that a member of the Legislative Assembly is not allowed to be on this board. I feel this is one board where it has to do with our culture at the present time, and I can't see any reason why a member from the House -- even if the male members of the House feel they are not entitled to be on the board, maybe we should consider that we have two ladies here who I am sure would do a good job.

I am wondering if the hon. minister -- when he closes the debate -- is to give us the reasons why he feels that there shouldn't be a member of the Legislature, if he or she wishes to be on this board.

AN HON. MEMBER:

There is not enough money in that --

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Is the hon. minister permitted to close the debate now?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank hon. members for their thoughts and expressions on The Alberta Art Foundation Act, and I would like to ask the hon. member who just mentioned the fact that maybe we should provide for an MLA to be on the board, to bring it up during the discussion on the committee meeting, and then he can go from there, and maybe add that suggestion to the act.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion was carried, and Bill No. 74 was read a second time.]

Bill No. 78: The Agricultural Societies Amendment Act, 1972

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, the second reading of Bill No. 78, The Agricultural Societies Amendment Act 1972.

45-88

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 8th 1972

This allows for the exemption, as I noted on the introduction of the bill, for those societies particularly close to the urban areas to have the benefits of agricultural societies generally.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent, and Bill No. 78 was read a second time.]

MR. LOUGHEED:

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It has been moved by the hon. Premier that the House do now stand adjourned until 2:30 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. Is that agreed?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The House rose at 10:45 p.m.]