

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Wednesday, May 10th, 1972

[The House met at 2:30 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

POINT OF PRIVILEGE

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, I have been held up to ridicule, contempt, and mockery in the Edmonton Journal of today where they stated I was the Social Credit MLA for Camrose. Mr. Speaker, I may have lost my shoes, but I still retain my seat as the Progressive Conservative Member for the Rose constituency.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have the utmost sympathy for the hon. [laughter] and the hon. member is no doubt well aware that losing the shoes is often preliminary to facing 'da feet'.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 84: The Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1972

DR. PAPFOSKI:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 84, The Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1972, the proposed amendments to The Child Welfare Act being chapter 45 of the revised Statutes of Alberta, 1970 and amendments thereto. The majority of the proposed amendments to The Child Welfare Act are for the purpose of defining more fully and adequately the rights of children in the Province of Alberta.

There are a number of very important amendments, I feel, that are significant. One amendment allows for appropriations to be used to provide for special needs for children on probation rather than just ward children. Another one provides for increasing the fine to protect confidentiality and breach of confidentiality for these children. Another amendment would allow the apprehended child to be placed in a shelter or a foster home and not merely a shelter. Another provision allows for application to juvenile court to enforce these amendments, to enforce maintenance orders, the director and the director of maintenance and recovery under The Maintenance and Recovery Act may make application to a Juvenile Court and related Juvenile Court judge and not merely a judge of the District Court. Another amendment deals with non-ward agreements for temporary care and deals with faulty amendments as just stated. Another amendment deals with the rights of the child to the protection of the Director of Child Welfare. The Director of Child Welfare may apply to the judge of the District Court for an order rather than a warrant calling for the arrest for refusing to return a child. There is another significant amendment under the adoption rules and this would increase flexibility with respect to adoption proceedings.

47-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

I feel probably the most important section is part five that is added to this act. Part five deals with services for mentally retarded children. The proposed introduction of part five would bring mentally retarded children within the ambit of The Child Welfare Act. The mentally retarded children would be afforded the protection of the director of services to the handicapped and it is expected, by providing the care of the mentally retarded children under The Child Welfare Act, that the cost of this care would be shareable with the federal government. This would probably bring several million dollars a year back to Alberta for the care of these children.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 84 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 84, a bill to amend The Child Welfare Act, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders, seconded by the hon. Minister of the Environment.

[The motion was carried without debate or dissent.]

Bill No. 85: The Off-Highway Vehicle Act

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being Bill No. 85, The Off-Highway Vehicle Act.

The Off-Highway Vehicle Act, Mr. Speaker, is devised to fulfill the need of regulating such vehicles that are primarily designed for travel on various types of unprepared surfaces. The Off-Highway Vehicle Act incorporates and updates The Snow Vehicle Act, insofar as this act may apply to snow vehicles. It will extend control and provide for means of adequately regulating many types of wheeled, tracked and amphibious vehicles, to which neither The Highway Traffic Act nor The Snow Vehicle Act per se could be suitably applied. This will also include vehicles of miniature types, such as mini-bikes and miniature motorcycles. In line with the necessity of record keeping for these vehicles, The Off-Highway Vehicle Act will provide for such basics as identification as to the description of the vehicle and the name and address of the owner, the registration and licensing of such vehicles on such basis as may be decided upon, the licensing of dealers of off-highway vehicles, the licensing of rental agencies holding such vehicles for rental.

This act provides for basic rules of operation, particularly applicable to these vehicles in such matters as the manner of crossing highways, yielding the right of way to all other vehicles when so crossing, the minimum age limit of the operator, limitations as to the use of any roads, and reporting of accidents. The act will provide for regulations by by-law of off-highway vehicles by municipal and other local authorities, when operating in areas under their management and control. In this way, Mr. Speaker, local governments will be able to decide the extent to which these vehicles may operate in accordance with local preferences.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the objectives to be served by this act are: (1) to provide a means of regulating classes of vehicles that do not ordinarily conform to motor vehicles as are generally used by the public; (2) by this means of regulation, to create a basis upon which these vehicles can be separated from the general traffic without, at the same time, being in a sort of limbo with no means of either controlling or prohibiting the use of these vehicles; (3) to provide a means of regulating these vehicles in a manner which would not deprive the users from the enjoyment of the use of these vehicles under circumstances that would not infringe upon the rights

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-3

and the safety of other people; and (4) to control such factors as may relate to noise pollution and deterioration of ecological factors.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 85 was introduced and read a first time]

Bill No. 81: The District Courts Amendment Act, 1972

MR. LEITCH:

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

This bill increases the number of judges in the northern Alberta district to nine. It also removes from the act some sections which have become superfluous because of the increased monetary jurisdiction granted to the district court by a recent enactment. A further purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to remove what is sometimes the fatal consequence of a mere technical error in the commencement of an action. As matters now stand, if an action is commenced in the wrong judicial district, and a limitation period intervenes before that error is discovered, the action is lost. The amendment will provide that in those circumstances the action may merely be transferred and continued in the proper judicial district.

The last purpose of the amendment, Mr. Speaker, is to give to the judges of the district court jurisdiction in divorce matters.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 81 was introduced and read a first time]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce to you and on your behalf to the members of this Assembly, 23 enthusiastic Grade VIII students from the Rosslyn Public School, which is located in the Edmonton Calder constituency. These students are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Gordon, and are seated in the members' gallery. I would like to congratulate them on their interest in observing the proceedings of this House. They assured me earlier that there was no other attraction which could have induced them to leave their classrooms this afternoon. I would now ask that they stand and be recognized by the members of this Assembly.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud to stand in this House and introduce to you and through you to the members of this House, and to welcome to Canada, to the Province of Alberta and to this House, seven teachers from Tanzania. They are in the members' gallery today. They are studying education at the University of Alberta, and they are accompanied by their leader, Mr. Jim Brown. I would ask that they stand and be recognized by the House, please.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, 40 members from the Carline High School. These Grade IX students and their teacher, Mr. Ken Macki, have come today to watch democracy in action. I would remind the House that just last Friday we had another member from the Carline School in the Speaker's gallery, who was one of those who won a prize in the 'Name the Lake' contest. So you can see that I am

47-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

very proud of these members of my constituency. I would ask that they stand and be recognized.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of the Legislature, a group of 27 boys and girls in Grades VII and VIII from the Runsey School. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. D. Maishment, their bus driver, Mr. Bud Upton, and Mrs. Upton. These are a very fine group of young people who are touring Edmonton, and I would ask them to stand and be recognized.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of the Legislature, a distinguished visitor from the Province of Saskatchewan. I refer to Mr. Gordon Grant, MLA for Regina, who is a member in the Saskatchewan Legislature. Mr. Grant has built up a very enviable record through the years. He has been Minister of Highways in the Thatcher government, and also Minister of Health in the Thatcher government. We are very happy to have Mr. Grant and one of his beautiful daughters in your gallery today.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly 45 high school students from the Ross Sheppard High School. I would request that they rise and be recognized.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Syncrude and Federal Budget

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In your statement yesterday regarding the federal budget, you expressed some concern that the tax break on equipment might not apply to the Syncrude operation. My question to you is, have you ascertained from the federal authorities whether or not Syncrude will come under this provision?

MR. MINIEMI:

Mr. Speaker, I think, as I indicated also in the same article the hon. member is referring to, the matter will require clarification. I am sure Syncrude themselves, in their economic analysis of the project, will be very quickly in touch with the federal government with respect to this particular provision. At the present time I am in the process of examining in greater detail as they have become available, some of the other provisions announced in Mr. Turner's budget, as well as some of the revisions he announced in his budget with respect to the federal tax revisions passed in the House of Commons in January of this year. Until I am able to examine all of these provisions, I will not be in a position to advise clearly on that matter, but I am sure Syncrude themselves are looking at it immediately.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question. In the event that Syncrude are not successful, does the Government of Alberta intend to make formal representation to the federal authorities asking for concession to Syncrude?

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-5

MR. MINIELLY:

We will be working with, as has been indicated in the House, a management committee of Syncrude and members of our government's Cabinet. In connection with the entire Syncrude application these will be factors that Syncrude themselves will be taking into account in analyzing the economic viability of the operation. And certainly any assistance that we can provide to Syncrude with respect to supporting the application or the needs they require under federal tax measures, our government will be prepared, in co-operation with them, to do so.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Abortions

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health regarding abortions. In Canada they have tripled, and Alberta is one of the leading provinces according to the reports of abortions being carried out. As a matter of fact, you are probably aware that Alberta is double the other two prairie provinces. And I was wondering if the minister plans to have an investigation more in line with the fact that some people are complaining that abortions are getting preference over other urgent surgery in Alberta hospitals.

While I am on my feet I would also like to ask if there are going to be any changes in the Alberta Medicare plan? As I understand, it pays about \$70 now towards each abortion in Alberta, and maybe this is one of the reasons why there are so many being carried out in the province.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the answer to the second question in regard to Medicare is one that I would refer to my colleague, the hon. minister Miss Hunley, the minister responsible for the Health Care Insurance Commission.

In regard to the allegations that preference is being given at Alberta hospitals to abortions over other operations, according to my informant from the Hospital Services Commission who I have asked to be in touch with hospitals in regard to this type of problem, that is not the case. There are indeed a large number of abortions taking place, but my understanding is that it is not, in fact, interfering with more important surgery.

MR. DIXON:

I have one supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Is there any hospital in Alberta where they frown on this type of operation and have notified the department? Or are there any hospitals that do not carry out this type of operation in Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I could only speculate on the answer in that I would think there are some that either don't or prefer not to, but I can try to ascertain that information for the hon. gentleman.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed --

47-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

MRS. CHICHAK:

Supplementary, to the hon. minister. Is he aware that a fair percentage of the medical profession would prefer it if the abortions were not covered under the Medicare premium?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly, in the sense of the views of the profession being made known to the government, anxious to receive views from the medical profession. This is a subject where some representations are made from time to time, but I was not aware of the particular viewpoint the hon. member referred to.

MR. GRUENWALD:

I would like to ask a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. You are saying, Mr. Minister, that you will try to ascertain if some hospitals in the province do not carry out abortions or prefer not to. When you come forward with this information and you find that some hospitals don't allow abortions in their hospitals, what would you do about it? Any recommendations?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Well I think, Mr. Speaker, I should begin by getting the information that I indicated I would get for the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, and see if it seems to suggest a further response.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Supplementary. Would you expect to bring that information back to the Legislature then?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I thought when I answered originally that I left my options open on that, but since the hon. member is pressing the point I'll be glad to bring the information back to the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Inflation

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In view of the budget that was brought down in the House of Commons and some indication that its impact on Canada may be inflationary, has the government any contingency plans to deal with any possible upsurge in inflation in this province?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I have said many times in the House our position on that question.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Does the government intend to make any representations to Ottawa on this very important issue to all the people of this province, namely inflation?

[Interjection]

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-7

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I gather that the government has no plans whatsoever to deal with the issue.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. In light of the announcement this morning from Ottawa that the cost of living last month went up either eight-tenths or nine-tenths of one point, would the hon. minister still consider that hypothetical?

MR. MINIEMI:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Holy Cross Hospital Chapel

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Because of wide-spread concern and inasmuch as the government position is not publicly clear, would the hon. minister please advise what his stand is in regard to the preservation of the chapel in the 1928 wing of the Holy Cross Hospital in Calgary?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there has been some concern expressed over a period of months in regard to that matter. I would begin by saying that the position of the government is known publicly in Calgary, in that a press release was issued a couple of weeks ago in respect to the government's position on it, and it was carried by at least one Calgary daily newspaper that I saw.

Prior to that resolution of the matter, which was a difficult decision and a compromise, the decision arrived at was to preserve the art work in the sense of the splendid marble statuary that is in -- and will shortly be removed from -- the 1928 wing chapel. The basis for that decision, which was arrived at after much consultation with the hospital board and the advice of the Glenbow Foundation in regard to the historical merits of the site as such, was that the principal concern would be to retain the art work in a way that it could be made available to the Roman Catholic authorities in Calgary for such other use as they may be able to put it to, and it therefore wouldn't be damaged in the renovations that are taking place. The statuary cannot remain there after the hospital -- that part of it -- is renovated and reopened for another purpose. I might add that long consideration was given to this. The Roman Catholic authorities did make representations both to the hospital board and to the government. I feel that the resolution of it is one that will be satisfactory to them. From the government's point of view we felt it important to proceed to use the space that had become available in the 1928 wing, despite the interesting and excellent appearance, and apparent historic interest of the chapel because of the fact that the space, when renovated, will be the site of one of the new programs in regard to mental health that the province has undertaken.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier. Was this decision made after considering the wishes of over 4,000 people who

47-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

sent a petition to you expressing their concern and desire to have the chapel preserved?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the petition was well known at the time it was taken up late last year. It did not make the decision any easier. We wanted very much to accord with the wishes of the people of Calgary, but I might say that the degree of acceptance, if I can put it that way, of the compromise proposal appears to be excellent.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, and it should be to the hon. Minister of Public Works, but in his absence perhaps the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development could answer. When will demolition start?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that question. I'm not sure that the work is being done by the Department of Public Works; it probably has been contracted out by the hospital district to a contractor in Calgary.

I suppose I should remark on the use of the word demolition. What's happening of course, is that the premises are being renovated inside. The wing itself is still in good condition and there is another chapel, I understand, in the new part of the church, smaller and less historic but quite adequate. This was another factor in the decision, the end result being that once the art work is removed the renovation will proceed in order that, if possible, the new facilities, which will include both in-patient and out-patient services, will be available by late in the fall.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

Highway Speed Limits

MR. HO LEM:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the hon. Premier. Mr. Premier, what consideration is presently being given by your government to the proposition of making uniform the speed limit between Calgary and Edmonton? Mr. Premier, I mean that portion which lies between Calgary and Red Deer and that portion north of Red Deer. There is a differential there. Is it the intention of the government to review this and bring it up to uniformity?

MR. LOUGHFEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am well acquainted with the highway which the hon. member refers to, but I believe the question should be more properly directed to the hon. Minister of Highways.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I've had this request on many occasions and I have found out that the people who made this request usually had a vested interest. Certainly we have considered this area very seriously. We have looked at the rules in Montana where they have a rule of just and prudent speed. We have looked at the statistics which show the death rate on those highways has had a dramatic climb and we're told by those people in the area that administered that act -- incidentally it's a very popular move in Montana, if you survive to

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-9

enjoy it. So we have decided that we will not be changing the speed limits drastically throughout the province because it's very difficult to come up with a uniform speed limit that is satisfying to the whole of the Province of Alberta. Consequently we have to set them in such a way that they will be compatible to the area.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker; is the government contemplating enforcing a minimum speed limit on the major Alberta highways?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, we have maximums and we have minimums in some areas. But not minimums on any highway. We feel that each driver should be able to judge in his own sense of feel and security whether he's exceeding his ability of a maximum.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, just to clarify my question. Do you not feel there is a danger when a driver driving on the inside passing lane is crawling at 35 miles per hour, and other vehicles are passing on the right side going at the speed limit?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is a danger, particularly if the fellow behind is infected with ants in his pants.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, in regard to speed limits. I'd like to know if the hon. minister knows when the new computerized speed testing equipment will be put into use to enforce speed limits that have been recently announced by the RCMP?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker --

MR. GRUENWALD:

Incidentally, you can take it that I do have a vested interest; I travel that road often.

MR. COPITHORNE:

I'm glad to hear the hon. member does not have a vested interest in this particular question. I'm not really aware of the exact date when it will be put into effect but I'm sure that I will know shortly after it is put into effect.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, so that I can just follow this -- you knowing is pretty important but it's a lot more important that I know -- and I'd like to know when this is going to happen. I would also like to know if this is going to be in marked cars or unmarked cars and on which highways?

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, in following the question that the hon. member for Calgary McCall mentioned on the passing on the inside or the outside lane. Is this situation being reviewed so that possibly one lane would be used exclusively for passing and the other lane for the slow moving traffic? Is this being considered?

47-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

MR. COFITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, this has been considered, but it is very difficult to have a hard rule on this because sometimes it would slow traffic, particularly with a truck that pulled out to make a left-hand turn. Certainly if you said traffic could only pass on the right, then you would have a back-up of traffic on the twin-lane highways. So in this way we feel it moves the traffic the quickest by allowing passing on both sides on twin-lane highways.

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What I'm trying to get at is now the signs say 'Passing in both lanes,' and the point I'm trying to make, if the signs were to say, 'Passing in the left lane only -- Slow moving traffic in the right,' this would possibly avoid the passing in the two lanes.

MR. DRAIN:

Supplementary going back to the question asked by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall in relation to the speed limit in which the hon. minister mentioned Montana. Are these statistics correlated with the amount of traffic when they determine by the statistics that there are a greater number of accidents due to an unrestricted speed limit?

MR. COFITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, most of the factors were taken into consideration in this regard.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the hon. minister. Would the impeding clause in The Highway Traffic Act not in a sense act as a minimum speed?

MR. COFITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, The Highway Traffic Act has covered most of the legislation in this regard, and I think it is well covered.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller.

Highway to the North

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could address a question to the hon. the Premier. In the light of what the hon. Premier said last night regarding the importance of the highway that Mr. Trudeau mentioned, I'm wondering if the government has considered offering some of the highly experienced engineers in the Department of Highways to Ottawa? The number of engineers who know how to build roads in heavy muskeg and permafrost are very, very few, and Alberta is fortunate in having some very highly competent engineers. And I was wondering if the government might not move this highway ahead much faster by offering to the federal government some of the excellent know-how that we have in Alberta.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think that's a very excellent suggestion, subject, of course, to our own priorities, and the department's

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-11

priorities. And I'll take that up with the hon. minister in terms of the anticipated visit of Mr. Jamieson to Alberta.

MR. STRCMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the hon. Premier. In regard to newspaper articles, with Mr. Bennett taking over the Yukon by railroad, will you be putting top priority into getting the road into the Arctic?

MR. LOUGHFEED:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think there is something of concern there that is expressed by the hon. member in his question. And that is a response, and a natural response, by the Government of British Columbia to the announcement, referred to in the previous question, by the Prime Minister regarding the road to the North. And I think that Albertans should be aware of this development. As I mentioned in my remarks last night during estimates, I think that our future priorities regarding road construction -- and this involves all members of this House -- should take into consideration the need for this province to assure that we are doing our part in determining that the road will, in fact, commence here in Alberta, and move primarily through Alberta, and that Alberta will be the staging area.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Inflation (Cont'd)

MR. STRCM:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Provincial Treasurer. Do you feel that the federal budget just brought down has inflationary potential?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, with due respect, I've just answered that question. The question is hypothetical; I think that 'inflationary' is a very complex factor. And only the results as they come in over a period of time will actually indicate whether in fact it is or not.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, if I might ask a supplementary question then. My reason for raising the question was because of the one that I want to ask now. If it does prove to be inflationary, is it the government's intention then to cut back on their borrowing program as announced in the budget?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader's question is very hypothetical and doesn't comply with the requirements.

Big Game Hunting

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests and I asked this previously. I would like to know if there is any progress being made on looking at closing some of the areas within the area surrounding Edmonton as far as big game hunting goes. The reason I raise this again is because the people just east and south of Fort Saskatchewan, the farmers especially, are very, very concerned that if something isn't done fairly soon the

47-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

next hunting season will roll around and someone is going to get killed. I would like to know if the hon. minister is looking at some type of restrictive legislation possibly to shotgun slugs and bows and arrows, or he has forgotten about my request?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the Fish and Wildlife Advisory Council has met and reported, and as a consequence of that meeting and reporting I have recommendations before me. I responded, I think, less than two weeks ago in that regard saying that I would be in a position to make decisions on those regulations reasonably soon, and at that time I would bring them all before the House. I would like, at the same time, to assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that this is the place in which these announcements will be made first.

Sun Oil

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Is the minister aware that Sun Oil has begun drilling an 18,000 foot exploratory well at Adam's Lookout in Willmore Wilderness Park?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I will have to check into that in terms of the detail.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

RCMP Air Patrol

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Highways. When was the RCMP Air Patrol of speeding on highways phased out in Alberta?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge it has not been phased out.

MR. LUDWIG:

When was it operating last in this province if it hasn't been phased out?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I think those last two questions ought to have been directed to me because that comes within my department. Far from phasing it out, there was an increase in the appropriation for that patrol.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I will not comment on that reply as to the increase in the budget, I thought there was a decrease. Are they operating at the present time?

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-13

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I receive reports monthly on the patrols. I don't recall seeing one for the month of April, but I am sure there was one on my desk for the month of March.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in the event that the air patrols had been operating during the month of April, would the hon. minister table the number of charges laid by the patrol against offending drivers for the month of April?

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. member could await the result of his first enquiry and if it turns out to be positive, he might place the second on the Order Paper.

Senior Citizens' Executive Positions

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session I was asked by the hon. Member for Little Bow as to the number of citizens who have been appointed by the new administration since September 10th who are senior citizens over the age of 65. There were three: Mr. Roblin on the Board of the Alberta Resources Railway Corporation, Mr. Anderson on the same board, and Dr. Weinlos of the University of Alberta Hospital Board.

Sun Oil (continued)

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to the one I directed to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, this time to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals, and ask him if he can advise the House whether he is aware that the Sun Oil Corporation is drilling an 18,000 foot exploratory well at Adam's Lookout?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I am unable to answer that question at the present time. I can advise the hon. member, however, that we have had reports dealing with all the parks, the resources in the parks, the activity of wells in or around those locations, so I am sure by checking our files we will be able to determine that information for the hon. member.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question, to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. When that information is located, will the minister make sure to advise the House?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to advise the House or the hon. member directly, but I think he is suggesting that I advise the House and I would be happy to do that.

47-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table today in the House an abstract, a summary of the Holdaway Report which was commissioned by the hon. R. C. Clark as he then was last July, 1971, on the subject of an examination of non-instructional positions, functions, and costs in school jurisdictions in Alberta.

This study was conducted by Dr. Holdaway at the University of Alberta for some \$10,000 and I received the full report yesterday, which is about two inches in size. I have arranged to have another 100 copies printed, but I thought the House would wish the information as soon as possible. In Dr. Holdaway's report there is an 11 page abstract or summary, so I will table this at this time, and any members who would wish to receive copies of the entire report should let me know and I'd be happy to provide them with copies.

Just to read some of the highlight recommendations, firstly; that the Department of Education continue to perform and even to expand its functions regarding the organization of a school system, the development of curricula, and the organization of mental and physical disability classes for children. Secondly, the recommendation that regional offices of education should continue for another three years. Thirdly, that a boundaries commission should be established to examine the present size of school systems, and recommend changes. The report recommends an absolute minimum enrollment of 2,500 pupils in a school system in Alberta, which would be a reduction to about 20 school districts for the entire province. Another recommendation to be highlighted is that school systems should be encouraged to provide far more adequate services relating to special education.

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I wonder if we could revert to the introduction of visitors for a moment.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

DR. BOUVIER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly some 29 students from the Ft. MacKay School in my constituency. They represent Grades III to IX. They are accompanied by a teacher, Mr. George Costello, and others in the group accompanying them are Gertrude Vilna, Cecilia Bouche, Theresa Bouche, Maggie Latord. This trip was made possible through the assistance of the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation, of specifically the Alberta Service Corps. We are indeed thankful for them. They are seated in the members' gallery. I'd like them to rise and receive the recognition of the House.

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-15

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS
(Second Reading)

Bill No. 50 The Alberta Opportunity Fund Act

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals, that Bill No. 50, The Alberta Opportunity Fund Act, be now read a second time.

The act is sufficiently clear in its terms to give scope, dimension and direction to the new and effective program, and it is at the same time broad enough to allow for flexible response to the changing needs of industry and to involve traditional finance institutions for the needs of industrial development in Alberta. The purposes of this important legislation include the following: the establishment of a \$50 million Opportunity Fund and the creation of the Alberta Opportunity Company; it provides the means whereby new and expanding enterprises can be stimulated in this province. With broader approaches and greater flexibility, the programming which this legislation makes possible will provide development assistance in the form of money and other important and necessary inputs for commercial enterprises, not included in programs of the past. The act will promote the growth and expansion of manufacturing and processing, as well as further development of our valuable tourist industry. However, this act will go farther. It will introduce assistance programs for such employers as service industries; and through loans for applied research and development, will see the creation of new products and new industries which, in turn, will be given assistance. The result in economic growth will afford new job opportunities to Albertans.

Direct loans will be made available to the new higher level of 80% of approved capital costs of new facilities or expansion of existing facilities. Terms and conditions for repayment will be tailored to meet the needs of each individual case. To best ensure that new and growing industry is given a maximum assistance during formative periods, provision is made in this act for deferment of payment of principle, interest, or both during the first 30 months of the life of the loan.

Now, to deal with the often serious problem of interim or bridge financing, as well as to better involve the banks, the act gives authority to the Alberta Opportunity Company to guarantee the loans made by the banks of Alberta to Alberta industries under certain circumstances.

For the information of this House, it might be interesting to know that such circumstances occurred, in one instance that we have had, for the North American Stud Company in the Slave area, in which they were getting a federal loan. Before they could bring down this federal grant, they required some interim financing. At that time it required an Order in Council on behalf of the Province of Alberta to afford that interim financing, which has now been paid back because of the advance of the federal loan. This is the sort of thing we are talking about, because that particular industry is very important to the future of the province of Alberta, as it makes use of aspen, which constitutes almost 50% of our forest inventory. That particular plant is making use of that particular product.

Interest rates applying to all undertakings under this program shall be retained at moderate levels at all times, to ensure the greatest growth possible. All emphasis in the program is upon firstly, the individual Albertan who is a resident, and thereafter, upon the rural community, the small business enterprise and industry in general, and the province as a whole without discrimination of any kind.

47-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

Financial aid and management guidance will be provided to student business enterprises. Since the two cardinal causes of business failure are those of under-capitalization and lack of suitable management, the program goes beyond providing for capital needs; and provides a business management counselling service aimed especially at small and struggling businesses, which often cannot afford this temporary guidance, or may not know how to obtain the same.

It is interesting to note for this House that we are developing some seven district economic councils. As the hon. Premier just alluded to, we will be using senior citizens on these councils and drawing upon them, for such guidance in the business development of the smaller companies throughout the province in this area.

The Alberta Opportunity Company will aid in a co-ordinated utilization of other programs offered by other government departments and agencies for the benefit of Alberta industry. Committee structure has been designed to provide for quick decision-making. The Board of Directors will deal with loans to a maximum of \$500,000. This legislation will further promote the principle of free enterprise. This is, therefore, not a free money program. Viable free enterprise does not grow on handouts, but must have capital in sufficient quantity available at the right time, and under the right terms, and at the right interest rate.

In addition to this, it must have available to it needed management expertise and the facilities of all government services and proper co-ordination. That, Mr. Speaker, is what this legislation and the programs under this legislation are all about, the pursuance of which my department and the Government of Alberta are dedicated.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak on Bill No. 50, The Alberta Opportunity Fund Act. I believe any industrial development policy should be designed to promote responsible growth and quality of life for all Albertans. I believe our goals should be to make possible a free and creative society with strong social concern. Mr. Speaker, I feel these are goals which are shared by many Albertans.

An aggressive program of scientific research into the human, physical and technological aspects of industrial development is essential. Further, it is important that we avoid unnecessary government interference. Local, home-grown business operating under a system of private, competitive enterprise, will bring Alberta an ever-growing economy.

Social Credit considers that the purpose of our industrial and commercial system is to produce and distribute the goods and services which consumers individually and collectively require, with the least waste of either human or material resources. There is a role for government in achieving such a purpose. It is well recognized that government has an important role in the development of human resources. The presence of government in such areas as education and social insurance are examples of this point. Government also has a role in creating the proper economic and political environment for our industrial and commercial system. Through various incentives government must stimulate a just and efficient allocation of our resources. This is an ever changing and ever increasing task.

But we must carefully walk that thin line separating incentives and interference. We cannot destroy our private enterprise initiative and hope to have a just and efficient allocation of our resources. We cannot destroy the competitiveness of our private enterprise system and hope to produce and distribute the goods and

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-17

services which consumers individually and collectively require with the least waste of either human or material resources.

Some may argue that, in effect, we exist in a mixed enterprise system and that in many cases it is desirable to have public enterprise. However, generally it cannot be denied that in an economic sense we should strive towards a competitive system if we wish to efficiently allocate our resources. The role of government then is to support and strengthen private enterprise, to foster a competitive system and not to undermine it. And this way we can take a strong, positive step towards ensuring a just and efficient allocation of our resources.

My initial reaction, Mr. Speaker, when I first heard of the proposed concept of Bill 50, was one of skepticism. At that time I feared this government was allocating \$50 million for meddling with the natural and businesslike development of Alberta industry. I must stress that my position then and my position now is that it is not the role of government to interfere in the natural operation of private businesses, but to establish the economic and political climate that will allow industry to thrive and grow in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the objective of the Alberta Opportunity Fund, that is, to promote the development of resources and the general growth and diversification of the economy of Alberta. For our economy to develop and progress, it is necessary that we develop our resources, both material and human. Furthermore, it is of general benefit to Albertans to promote the general growth and diversification of our economy. Such an endeavour will be reflected in employment statistics, consumption figures, and social welfare accounts.

Some of the priorities expressed in the bill are commendable. We should be concerned with commercial enterprises offering a high degree of job opportunity, relative to capital investment; and for commercial enterprises to be owned and operated by Alberta's citizens. Similarly, it is important that small businesses be encouraged, strengthened and expanded. It is absolutely vital to the future of this province that Alberta students be given the employment and business experience through loans for the creation, expansion or operation of student business enterprises, and that this opportunity not be restricted only to the summer months.

Equally as desirable is the stimulation of increased economic opportunities for residents of smaller population centres. We should consider the need for supporting companies, associations and groups formed for the purpose of attracting industrial development and expansion within their communities. It is desirable that we support industries involved in pollution control, that we encourage research and development directed towards increased productivity and improved technology, that we promote Alberta services and products to enhance their marketing and export potential, and that we support projects and facilities that enhance the tourist potential of Alberta.

Bill 50 states the Alberta Opportunity Company may provide loans or guarantees for capital, business management counselling, or services to assist in the co-ordinated organization of economic research programs, production techniques, adult training programs, marketing programs, marketing promotion, and channels of liaison with appropriate federal, provincial and private agencies and departments of the government.

It is at this point, Mr. Speaker, that my skepticism is stirred. Where does the initiative of private enterprise end, and the role of government begin? More specifically, what assurance does this bill give us that individual private initiative will be encouraged and rewarded? It is worth noting that nowhere in the list of priorities of Bill 50 is there mentioned encouragement of individual private

47-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

initiative. Has the oneness and unity of the Lougheed team blinded its eyes to individual initiative? What assurance does this government give that individual private initiative will be encouraged and rewarded? There are no guidelines limiting the salaries or remuneration paid for technical and professional services. What is to prevent this company from expanding into a mammoth organization draining the taxpayers' pockets? Competition? Hardly.

This House and the people of Alberta need assurance that we are not, through this bill, establishing an uncontrolled, unwieldy bureaucracy that has unregulated access to public money. I am dubious of the merit of some of the functions of the Alberta Opportunity Company. How did this government justify the need for the company to buy, sell, and deal in any goods, wares, merchandise or natural products, either by wholesale, retail or both?

Is this not an area better left to the competitive sector? Where is the line drawn between private enterprise and government interference? Further, how does this government justify the cost of such an excursion into the competitive sector?

Another concern I have, Mr. Speaker, is what criteria determines the assistance of a company. What criteria does a company use to differentiate between one commercial enterprise -- owned and operated by Canadian citizens residing in Alberta -- and another? What criteria does the company use to determine which small business it strengthens or helps expand? What are the operational criteria that will characterize the Alberta Opportunity Company?

Further, what specific efforts will the Alberta Opportunity Company make to promote Canadian capital for equity position? This issue is one of concern to all Canadians as well as to all Albertans. My contention is that specific methods of ensuring Canadian capital of opportunities for equity positions have not been fully or satisfactorily outlined. It is noble to say that commercial enterprises with Alberta and Canadian ownership are a priority, but it is not enough. In its present form, Mr. Speaker, I cannot fully accept Bill No. 50. I agree with objectives of the Alberta Opportunity Fund as expressed in the bill. However, I feel Bill No. 50 would have been a stronger piece of legislation if an effort had been made to include such objectives as fostering individual private initiative, promoting responsible growth for the balance between government and private enterprise.

I cannot fully accept Bill No. 50 until the Lougheed government has satisfactorily answered the questions raised in this speech. These questions are very serious concerns in my mind and in the minds of others. For Bill No. 50 to be acceptable to Albertans, the Lougheed government must outline a clear position on such concerns as the role of private individual initiative and the competitive sector, the operational criteria of the Alberta Opportunity Company, the efficient and economic use of public monies, and the position of Canadian and Albertan equity capital.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity at this time to voice my approval of Bill No. 50. I know it's hard for the hon. members opposite to understand, and even comprehend, because I think the mistakes that have been made by the former government and the amount of burning of their fingers on their national resources railroad must certainly still be ringing within their ears.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the hon. member who has just spoken does not come from a small community, where the population is continually declining, industry that is in there is having a tough time getting along. We find our small towns and villages are disappearing. This certainly will give them a new life

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-19

and new hope which has never before been promised by any other government. I know that we must screen, and I hope we will, to the best of our ability, supply funds which will give us the most man hours possible of employment.

I'm not going to delve into all possibilities of the industry that we are going to try to stimulate, but certainly, Mr. Speaker, it has shown that this Conservative government, under the leadership of the hon. Premier Mr. Lougheed, has given a direction some years ago in planning and laying the foundation of a party that was willing to boldly step out and try and decentralize industry and also decentralize every government department.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to be a member of a government which, through long range planning and in keeping with its promise to the people of this province, more than two years ago promised this type of legislation if elected to govern the province at this time. The people of last August certainly endorsed this type of legislation. I'm sure that the hon. members opposite would have been very proud if they could have possibly thought of bringing in this type of legislation.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, --

MR. SPEAKER:

I think that the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo won the tie.

MR. GHITTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to respond very briefly to some of the comments that were made by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow with his stern skepticism, because quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it surprises me that there could be any scepticism whatsoever with respect to a bill of this nature, which is so important and vital to the industrial economy of the Province of Alberta.

How many times have I experienced, Mr. Speaker, the problems of the small industry when it comes time, to not only know where to go to receive the vital financing that they need, but from the point of view of where there has not been any financing available for the many small industries that would like to get off the ground and do something in this province?

I can think back, Mr. Speaker, to only a few months ago when I was contacted by a small business in this province with the attitude that they wished to buy out an American concern. It was a firm that was operating in an industrial capacity outside of the limits of the City of Calgary and there was nowhere that they could go to obtain the right incentives, from a private enterprise point of view, whereby they could accomplish their ends by purchasing the shares of this company, which would have brought it back under the guise and control of Canadian ownership.

So many times businesses are discouraged because governments, and government in the past in this province, have not entered in an active, viable way, the assistance that is necessary. Therefore, when the hon. Member for Calgary Bow talks about his stirred skepticism I am indeed surprised, Mr. Speaker, for how can one be skeptical of a program that sets out the objects that are set forth in Section 2 of this bill? A program that hopefully will expand; a program that will hopefully assist small industry in the very many projects and objects which are so easily and so well explained.

47-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

I felt for a moment, Mr. Speaker, when I heard the hon. Member for Calgary Bow discuss his skepticism, that we're, in fact, reading a different bill. But he is, in fact, as I checked out, speaking to The Alberta Opportunity Fund Act with his skepticism and so as we are talking about this same bill, I can only ask the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, where can one be sceptical with a bill whose objectives are to encourage the commercial enterprises offering a high degree of job opportunity in relation to capital investment? Is that something to be skeptical of, Mr. Speaker? Should the hon. Member for Calgary Bow be skeptical over a bill that encourages commercial enterprises to be owned and operated by Canadian citizens residing in Alberta? Should he be skeptical over a bill that encourages the strengthening and expansion of small business? Should he be skeptical over programs and projects that will be encouraged by this bill which will create increased economic opportunities for residents of smaller population centres, particularly where there is extensive community involvement?

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, from the point of view of the number of objects which are contained in this bill that I think are most laudatory and, certainly, to the hon. Minister of Industry I can only offer my support from the point of view that I hope this bill will progress so that, instead of only \$50 million, it will triple and quadruple that amount.

For the hon. Member for Calgary Bow seems to have some very excellent principles of which he is concerned about from the point of view of intervention of the government and we're all concerned from that point of view. But certainly the thought that he is skeptical that this is interference is, indeed, surprising to me, for to me this offers every incentive possible from the point of view of small businesses to get off the ground and come to government for needed assistance.

I would suggest that this bill is really a highly incentivized bill. A bill that will not in any way interfere with the conduct of private enterprise but will hopefully bring it home and move it along in a forward pattern, so that Albertans can come to the government of this province and receive assistance where necessary.

I can only say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, if we have stirred the scepticism of the hon. Member for Calgary Bow --

MR. WILSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker! I don't have a hang-up on scepticism as the hon. --

MR. SPEAKER:

A valid point of order must be a breach of the rules of the House.

MR. GHITTER:

I apologize, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member. I did write down on a number of times from his dissertation this afternoon the word 'skepticism'. As a matter of fact, the first thing he said was that he was skeptical of the bill when he first saw it. He then went on and he talked in terms of 'his skepticism was indeed stirred', later on as he discussed it. If I've misquoted him I apologize, however, I think my writing was valid and I can read it.

If I might just carry on in conclusion and suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we have stirred the skepticism of the hon. member, let him not be worried; let him not be concerned with government interference. Let him not lock upon this bill in any negative way; for I suggest to the hon. member that this bill is set forth with the

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-21

greatest intentions of this government to encourage private enterprise, to not become a large bureaucracy but to enter into fields which were hitherto unentered into by this government. It is time that this was done and I would only suggest that he sit back and watch and then, if after a year, his skepticism is aroused again we would indeed be happy to hear from him. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Jasper Place and the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I suppose the hon. Member for Calgary Bow attacked this bill from right. Perhaps I can offer a few sentiments from the left. May I say just at the outset that I intend to vote for the bill even though I don't believe that it is really an adequate bill to deal with the whole question of industrial development in Alberta. But because it is at least a step in the right direction, I wish to support it.

The whole question of incentive programs has caused a good deal of public scepticism right across Canada. We had the DREE program, which has now run into a great deal of controversy throughout this country and especially in Alberta. One of the reasons is a good deal of concern about incentive programs has been that, frequently, the major beneficiary of these programs has not been the small businessman we are talking about today, but rather some of the larger multi-national corporations who are very quick to take advantage of whatever incentive scheme is available. I think in our own province, for example, we have the case of Procter and Gamble, a large multi-national corporation which last year had a gross income that equalled the budgets of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, that were able to obtain from DREE a considerable amount of money, in addition to which they received subsidies from the Province of Alberta. This is the kind of incentive example which I believe has turned a lot of people in Canada off the whole question of incentives to industry.

So it's my view that, when we talk about incentive programs, we should very clearly distinguish between large multi-national corporations on one hand, and those smaller corporations or small businesses on the other. I certainly have no objection to providing assistance to the small business sector of our community. But I frankly object to seeing public money -- either in the form of incentive grants, or in low interest loans, or in information which would cost the taxpayers money indirectly -- I certainly object to seeing this money syphoned off by huge corporations that are perfectly capable of standing on their own feet.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that as the question arises of where we should funnel this money, I believe by and large it should be directed to light as opposed to heavy industry. When we look at the question of heavy industrial development in Alberta, I would differ with almost all the members of this Legislature, because I feel if we're going to promote some of the large enterprises which this province can develop, we should be looking at an Alberta Development Corporation with considerable public investment. I don't pretend for a moment that I'm going to be able to convince the hon. members of the advantages of an Alberta Development Corporation, so I won't belabour the point, other than to state the principle.

I do want to go on to say something about the need to decentralize industry in our province. There is really no doubt, Mr. Speaker, when you look at the facts, that outside of the two major cities of Calgary and Edmonton, the rest of the province is

47-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

essentially standing still. Last spring I took the time to look over the population trends, and it's really quite amazing when you analyze what has happened in the last five years in our smaller cities, what has happened in our towns, what has happened in our villages. The picture emerges very clearly that, outside of Edmonton and Calgary, the rest of the province has been stagnating. So it is necessary that we de-centralize industry. There is clearly no doubt about that.

My first criticism of this bill is that while we talk about setting as one of our objectives, one of our priorities, the encouragement and strengthening of small business in the smaller communities of our province, we don't specifically exclude the two major cities. Now frankly, one of the things that I liked about the Industrial Incentives Act passed by the Legislature last year, was the fact that the former government had the courage to say this act will not apply to the two major cities. The two major cities possess advantages now in the competition for industrial growth in our province such as the availability of markets, the many other assets that they offer to the business enterprise as it is. Even though this bill is talking about setting as one of the priorities the de-centralization of industry, I think frankly we would have been much better advised to say that the two major cities would have been excluded in precisely the same way as they were excluded from the Industrial Incentives Act passed by this Legislature last year.

The second point that I would like to make on this general question, Mr. Speaker, deals with the matter of incentives themselves. I, in my introductory remarks, pointed out that there is considerable skepticism about incentive programs in our country. Certainly any incentive program brings with it a whole host of problems. It can be argued that it is unfair to provide incentives to one industry that is establishing, compared to another industry that is in existence.

I recognize that these arguments have some validity, but it seems to me that if we are to tackle this question of decentralizing industry in any meaningful way, we are going to have to look at incentives.

I frankly suggest going back to the legislation of last year, that perhaps it wasn't perfected. Nevertheless, the former government was going in the right direction with their refundable loans, because we are not going to persuade industries to settle in our smaller communities in Alberta unless we are prepared to use both the carrot and the stick on occasion.

With all due respect, in reading over Bill No. 50 very carefully, while there are provisions which will offer slight encouragement, it will, I submit, be slight, not significant encouragement. The principle that I think we had last year of forgivable loans would, in my view, be a much more practical way of drawing industry out of our two major centres and encouraging it to settle in the small communities of Alberta.

I suppose, Mr. Speaker, we really have to ask ourselves how important a principle do we consider decentralization of industry? I want to say today that I consider this one of the most important things we must do over the next decade. I consider it absolutely insane to think that in a province as big and beautiful as Alberta that we have to coop up our citizenry in two major metropolitan areas, while the rest of the province slowly stagnates. With the greatest respect to the hon. minister and the people introducing this legislation, I frankly doubt that this legislation is going to offer the kind of incentives necessary to meaningfully redistribute small industry in the Province of Alberta.

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-23

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I noticed in reading over the objectives carefully, that there are several things that weren't pointed out as specifically as I would like to see them enunciated. For example, I believe that co-operative ownership should be encouraged. Small business has a valid place in the economy, there is no question about that. But at the same time so does the co-operative movement. There is really no doubt as we look over the province, and especially when we examine the history of our own economic growth in Alberta, that the co-operative movement has played a profoundly important role. I would like to see it specifically included as one of the objectives that the promotion of the co-operative movement is something which we, as a Legislature, encourage. In addition, I noticed that there really isn't any consideration given to the encouragement of companies to unionize. Again, I believe that in a free society, free collective bargaining is necessary and we should encourage workers to organize, because that is the only way that their rights can be defended. Again, I think that we don't have this specifically pointed out in the legislation.

In addition, the legislation talks about the encouragement of Canadian ownership, which is fine. But in the same way as it talks about the distribution of industry in the smaller centres, it doesn't specifically set aside the two major cities. In the case of Alberta ownership, it doesn't specifically exclude funds going to foreign controlled concerns either. Again, Mr. Speaker, I would submit to this Legislature that if we are going to use public funds in this province, if we are concerned about placing the emphasis on the smaller industrial concern or tourist concern or what have you, that we should not be making public funds available to foreign controlled concerns. I think that they are perfectly healthy and able to look after their own future. They don't need any kind of subsidy from the taxpayers of Alberta, either directly or indirectly.

Therefore, as I review the legislation, I find, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, that while it doesn't go far enough in my view -- and, of course, as a socialist you can hardly expect me to be overly enthusiastic about some of the things this bill talks about.

Nevertheless, it is at least a step in the right direction, and one which I intend to vote for, but I assure the hon. members that I'll be watching it very closely and perhaps next year those of us in the opposition will be in a position to offer many, many amendments, hopefully to improve this legislation and to strengthen it. All of us, when we really consider our position, are concerned about the decentralization of industrial opportunity in this province. I believe that must be our major objective and my criticism of this bill is that while I think it is well-meaning, in my judgment it doesn't go far enough in achieving that aim.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, in commenting upon Bill No. 50, I think it's pretty important to start off with some view as to the responsibility of government toward business. It is my interpretation or analysis of our economic system that we have neither a strictly private enterprise system in the sense of a totally laissez-faire system, nor do we have a socialist system. We have some kind of a combination. Mr. Speaker, I believe that is fitting. As a government we have a responsibility to our society and to our province. Since we're a provincial government, we have a specific responsibility to Alberta. One of those responsibilities, and to me it's the overriding responsibility, is to create in the order of 20 to 25 thousand jobs in the next while. As a government, that has to be a priority. It has to be a basic objective. We are put in the position, as a government, where we have to balance off different groups, usually by means of looking at distribution of wealth and income and material well-being. We have always to be making sure that opportunity exists for new people to enter the labour force, for people already in the

47-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

labour force to be treated fairly, for enterprise to develop, and private initiative to show itself.

This particular bill concentrates, to a great degree, on a means of stimulating enterprise and the creation of jobs. That's what the whole bill is about. We have, in this bill, looked at the social challenge that is thrown up to us, of creating jobs and diversifying our economy, and trying to do that diversification in a method as to give us a good geographical balance across the province. In other words, to treat the province equitably in all its portions.

In response to the Member for Calgary Bow -- I note that he's not here -- but for the rest of the House, I think it would be well to just dwell for a moment on section 19 of the bill. It's important to understand what this bill replaces, for it will resolve some of the questions raised by the Member for Calgary Bow.

First of all, it replaces The Commercial Services Act and The Industrial Development Incentives Act, being the two most important. The Commercial Services Act has in it a provision for the sale or disposal of Crown assets, and unused or unneeded materials and equipment of the province. I think one of the points made by the Member for Calgary Bow related to that, in that he was quite concerned about buy, sell, etc. That provision in Bill No. 50 is intended to provide for the functions presently carried out by the Alberta Commercial Corporation in the disposal of Crown assets.

The Member for Calgary Bow also raised a question of the balance between private initiative and interference -- the term he used on several occasions -- in the capitalistic or private enterprise system. I would like to suggest to him that this bill will create considerably less interference than the bill which it replaces, called The Industrial Development Incentives Act, which was passed last year.

This raises a topic on which I would like to make a lot of comments, but which perhaps deserves but a few in this particular context. We find ourselves in Alberta in a position of having many federal programs. These federal programs can have the effect of reducing the influence and the ability of our government to influence the development of the province in terms of the geographical dispersion of industry. The term I have heard applied to it on different occasions is 'the relative inconsequence of the provincial government' in the determination of where the province will grow, what portions will grow, etc. A good illustration of that at the present time is the fact that we have a very large portion of the southern section of the province designated in the Department of Regional Economic Expansion program.

I am sure -- perhaps I shouldn't be sure -- that this was one reason the previous government decided to bring in that particular bill, to try to neutralize (if you will) the effects of federal initiatives. That is a problem the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs is working on. It is my hope that it is one that can be resolved outside of this particular bill. But it exists, and I draw it to your attention. This particular bill, in that sense, goes further toward meeting the aims enunciated by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, than the legislation introduced by the government of last year, the party of which he is a member.

Some comments have been made with respect to the financial elements of this particular legislation. I would like first to draw attention that we are keying this as much as possible to the small businessman. There is a provision that the authority of the board which will administer this opportunity fund is limited to decisions not exceeding loans of \$500,000. That should be fair evidence of the government's intention to try to assist the small businessman.

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-25

On another related point, Mr. Speaker, my task force was involved to some degree and did some background work to this legislation. I would like to point out that we encountered a number of concerns from communities outside of Edmonton and Calgary. These concerns are valid and fair. They are concerns relative to the availability and kind of service provided by our financial institutions. Unquestionably, if one is to build a building, or install machinery in a plant in a town or a hamlet, which is, let us say, 100 miles from Edmonton, the resale potential and possibility of that building, in the event that the enterprise does not succeed, is considerably less than it would be if it were to be located in an industrial park in or near the city of Edmonton or Calgary.

This legislation will provide the opportunity for loans on a last-resort basis. It is not intended to replace commercial, financial institutions. For that reason, I think it will go a long way toward overcoming some of the handicaps in these communities which are outside of the two major centres, because they should have more reason to be eligible for this kind of assistance than enterprises in the cities of Edmonton or Calgary.

It is my hope, and I believe, a fair comment, that this bill will tend to balance out the opportunities for businessmen across the province, and make sure they are not hindered or hampered in developing in outlying areas, either because of the increased risks due to the location, or because possibly, of the immaturity of our financial system, in the sense that managers with good financial expertise are not located in banks in those particular towns.

Mr. Speaker, another point was made with respect to the fact that we did not in this particular piece of legislation -- I'm not quite clear on the point, but it had to do with equity and how were we encouraging Albertans to develop or to take portions of equity. It is my view that it is wrong for the government, generally speaking, to involve itself in equity positions in business development. It may happen in special circumstances that we should do this, but I for one would, be opposed to it. I didn't understand a member's point that he felt the bill does not make appropriate provision for Albertans to become involved in equity positions, because it seems to me it leaves the initiative for the individual in that particular role. It is the individual who must participate in the equity position. This legislation tries to provide a very substantial amount of financial assistance by way of loans. The minister has emphasized it can provide up to 80 per cent of the needed amount of loan.

The only other point that I would like to comment on briefly is some of the other services which are contemplated in the bill. It is mainly in the area of managerial assistance and training. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, -- and this is borne out by some of the discussions we held with businessmen -- that one of the real problems to development is the deficiency of managerial ability which exists in our business community. And I say this without reflecting upon businessmen in Alberta because I think it is a deficiency which would be identified in any province and probably in any state. It may be a little more acute in Alberta because of the nature of our development. We have, in fact, emerged as an agricultural economy, or an agrarian economy, being blessed with natural resources, and we have, therefore, over a period of time developed expertise in these two areas.

But by and large we have not had a tremendous depth in manufacturing and processing. And it is natural that we will have problems and shortages of skills in these areas. I think it only natural then, that the bill should make provision for assistance to businessmen when they apply for loans. The kind of assistance envisioned in the bill is not the kind of assistance which I suspect can be profitably supplied on a commercial basis. I would be very

47-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

much concerned if we, as a government, moved into the supplying of managerial assistance, whatever specialization it might be, on a basis or on a scale sufficient to begin to replace in a major way any commercially available services. But I do think that we are in the position where we are required to display leadership and that we ought, for that reason, to be prepared to assist businessmen who may be deficient in this area, and to assist any groups by putting on courses for them who may come to us and request assistance. It need not always be, I might add, done on a free of charge basis. There are all kinds of courses now provided through our educational institutions and I see no harm in providing some subsidized assistance of that nature in the area of business management.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few brief remarks concerning this bill. In the beginning I wish to say that there are several very good aspects about the whole bill, but there is also, in my view, some cause for serious concern on three or four different matters regarding this bill and the pronouncements made in support of it.

When I say some concern, I am somewhat more than sceptical of some of the contents of the bill and the motive of some of the claims that the hon. minister makes that this bill will achieve. I appreciate the fact that the remarks of the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo were devoid of political motive, but I question seriously that he says this bill should not concern private enterprisers. I am very sceptical as to whom he speaks for. As a private enterpriser, a free enterpriser, I am very concerned here. There are many good parts of the bill, but that doesn't mean that because three or four sections are good that we have to accept the whole thing without some serious question. Maybe he isn't sceptical of the bill, but if I were a small businessman who started my enterprise of manufacturing or whatever it is, with my own hard-earned money and family help and struggled for many years, I would be alarmed and sceptical right now because the government, with the way that it has taken the bit in its teeth on this bill, may set up somebody across the street who can break me -- by competition from public funds. Maybe you might say that this isn't possible, but it has happened. It has happened where the government gets in to help someone compete with an industry that has been eked out and established and made viable for many years of struggle and perseverance and determination. There are many pitfalls -- as I stated this is a step in the right direction -- but there are pitfalls in this kind of legislation as has been evident in other parts of the country, of Canada.

I would say that there are other grounds for scepticism on the part of myself and perhaps many other hon. members here. But I would like to deal particularly with Section 15. It sets up a competition to any business in this province if the government wanted to go that far. I'm not entirely prepared to stand up here and state that I have complete confidence that this government will stand by their commitments. I believe that when you hear questions answered by everybody from the Premier down they commit themselves but they leave their options open. They say yes, but maybe. That isn't the kind of thing that inspires confidence that their word is their bond, that we can have no scepticism. When you deal with this bill you have to deal with it not only in its contents but in the setting in which it is presented to us.

Certainly I'm not prepared, when I listen to the hon. Premier answer questions and nimbly break promises every day, that I am going to not be skeptical of what they are proposing here, particularly if Section 15 can be -- may not be -- but I'm sceptical that it can be used to hurt present established business in this province. I would like to see someone refute that, perhaps the minister. If he says that it wouldn't do that then why have the section?

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-27

Section 15 was read by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow very effectively, but it says: "Subject to the provisions of this act the company may do all or any of the following:" and it sets up the objects of an ordinary private enterprise, commercial corporation. Many small companies have objects like this. So we have here a bill that clearly and beyond any doubt sets up competition to private enterprise. You can't be sceptical of that, but the scepticism that is aroused in me is that the Conservatives are doing this. They preach free enterprise out of one side of their mouths and then commit themselves to do the opposite.

So that is the concern I have. When I see this bill -- and they are now supporting it so well -- I'm convinced that the hon. Premier is not a Conservative by conviction, but he's a Conservative by inheritance. This is not a Conservative measure at all -- setting up competition to private enterprise, when they preached for years that they are the champions of private enterprise. Well with friends like this who needs enemies?

I'm telling the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo that if he spoke for the little businessman he hasn't spoken to him lately because they are not happy with this kind of a threat. There are thousands of businesses in Alberta that have been established, as I stated, by the sweat of their brow, and borrowing, and turning a business into a viable business after 25 or 30 years, and now they are going to set up the adversaries with easy borrowing.

So, Mr. Speaker, let's not be too carried away about the expression of an hon. member that he's sceptical about this bill because it is not only the hon. member but many, many people in this province. And I'd like to hear from some of those men who change their views on private enterprise if it suits their purpose, especially the hon. minister who's responsible for this bill. Is he a free enterpriser or not? And if he is not going to go into competition with the business then strike that section out.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I thought you were going to be brief.

MR. LUDWIG:

I don't mind you trying to cut me off as long as you don't disagree with my pronouncement.

Mr. Speaker, I share the fear and the concern and the scepticism of the hon. Member for Calgary Bow and many members who are free enterprisers, if they mean what they say. I have to question that very seriously. I want to point out that a venture of this nature -- going into business -- I'm not saying that they will but the authority is there, and that's what we're concerned about. The power to do a lot of damage is there and as I stated I haven't got such implicit faith in this government as they might feel among themselves that they deserve because, as I have stated, for many reasons I have my grave doubts as to whether any promise or any commitments they make, unless it's in legislation, is very binding in this province. Therefore, as I stated, let's not get too concerned about someone's scepticism when the reasons for same are so well set out.

The one area here that makes me more than sceptical is Section 18: "The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations." This 'may' frightens me because one hon. minister puts himself over the people of this province in the Legislature and suspends an act because it says 'may' instead of 'shall'. Why may? Or did you overlook it with all the high-priced help you have on the front row? This is an unpardonable oversight. May -- if he feels like it I suppose -- and if he feels like it he will suspend the act.

47-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

There is good reason to assume the line of debate that I am right now, Mr. Speaker, because this has happened. There's support for what I'm saying. So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that, once again, it isn't in their pronouncements and their touting themselves as having set a new trend and that they're going to make Alberta industrial. It's not in their pronouncements and they're tooting their own horn -- it's in fulfillment that I'm concerned and I'm looking at that, as in many other instances, that their word is not necessarily their bond. The proof the pudding is in the eating thereof, as far as I'm concerned and we'll wait and see. But I believe that the minister should explain some of the points that I have raised.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill is next followed by the hon. Member for Ponoka.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Here's the expert!

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Chairman, I enter this debate as a small businessman like the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce and the industry critic from the opposition side of the House. And I must say that some of the remarks made by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow make me wonder if he can really put his mind back 20 years to when we were small businessmen together on the North Hill.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Did the government help you or did you do it yourself?

MR. FARRAN:

All enterprises, big and small, --

MR. LUDWIG:

Will the hon. member permit a question?

MR. FARRAN:

No, wait.

MR. LUDWIG:

Why?

MR. FARRAN:

I'm talking, primarily, to the businessmen who really understand free enterprise and not to the small-town lawyers, Mr. Speaker.

All businesses, large and small, begin with individuals. An individual has a seed of an idea. He probably has a little bit of entrepreneurial flare. He has some ambition and he's ready in the early stages to pit his energy and perhaps his health against the more plentiful bucks of competitors who had been longer established in the field and who have, perhaps, certain advantages over him.

Now one handicap he always has, having sowed the seed, is for capital. The analogy is true of the water on the seed and the tree growing therefrom. It doesn't really matter very much whether you are talking about the beginning of a Noranda Mine or Henry Ford starting the automobile industry. The same things apply. If he doesn't have capital he cannot proceed at a proper rate. Now there

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-29

are some of us who have succeeded by the skins of our teeth, struggling along over the years, but we haven't succeeded to anything like the degree we might have done if capital had been more readily available -- not over-capitalization, but just enough to keep the taxicab going, because no taxicab can run without gas.

So here you have the small businessman who starts with a small industry and he achieves some initial success. Perhaps he's starving his family, not taking a proper wage home himself. He gets to the point where he wants to expand a little bit to increase his staff, to increase his market, to increase his plant. The first thing he does is to go around to the chartered banks; this is the normal way to go. And I have to tell you that the attitude of the chartered banks in Canada towards enterprise in the west is not very encouraging. They regard this as very high risk territory, and Canadian chartered banks, generally speaking, are not in the game of risk. They will lend money to people who have money; they'll lend money to people who have good collateral; they'll lend money to large corporations, even though they may be foreign. Well there is nothing wrong with that in principle because it's good sound business; I would rather see them lending Canadian money to Imperial Oil and the interest being paid to a Canadian bank, than to see the interest being paid to an American bank. However, they are not all that ready to lend to some small entrepreneur who is recently in business. This is the common attitude of eastern Canada towards the west.

I can remember 20 years ago when I went for my first loan to a chartered bank in Calgary. I had \$14,000 worth of accounts receivables and I received an absolute flat 'no' from one of the large chartered banks. All I wanted to do was to borrow \$7,000 to buy a small printing press. Fortunately I met somebody else from another chartered bank in a coffee shop down the street, and he took me in immediately. So it wasn't a question of an assessment of a situation, it was a question of opinion by the bank at that time of the degree of risk.

This is probably one of the most important bills that will come before the House this session. There are other very important ones but I believe this one points the way to what the Conservative plan is for Alberta, for the hope of diversifying the economy and providing more jobs.

I think one should ask oneself why industry is more diversified south of the border than in Canada. Part of it comes from the fact that American banks are more ready to gamble and to lend than Canadian banks. It's one of the reasons why small American businesses can sometimes establish in Canada with greater ease than the home grown variety.

The other provinces have recognized shortage of industry and have offered incentives, at least for the last ten years. The Province of Alberta has not. It has chosen not only to look askance at the federal schemes, and this may be traditional and in part may be justified, but it has introduced no schemes to parallel the schemes in the Maritime provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, or British Columbia. The Commercial Credit Corporation was a very weak move in this direction. About all it would do would be to finance inventory, which isn't taking much of a risk at all, less risk than the chartered banks were prepared to take. The trouble with the approach of the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, a sort of laissez-faire approach saying that you could pull yourself up by your own bootstraps, is that it is very difficult to do in the modern industrial world.

MR. LUDWIG:

Point of order. On the point of order, I said nothing of the sort --

47-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

MR. FARRAN:

Well that's what you were --

MR. LUDWIG:

...to pull yourself up by your own bootstraps. The hon. member ought to take back those words. He's putting words --

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down!

MR. LUDWIG:

I'm up on a point of order -- and I want to make my point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Please state your point of order instead of placing the argument.

MR. LUDWIG:

The hon. member made reference to me as having made some remarks which are entirely untrue, and he knows it. I didn't say that the businesses should pull themselves up by their bootstraps. He should be a little more precise in how he makes allegations concerning someone else. And he should be made to retract those words and speak the truth from now on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to apologize if I've misunderstood him. I don't believe anybody else misunderstood him. I think we know well enough what he was trying to say, but if the words were inaccurate, I concede and I withdraw them.

The difficulty in 1972 is that taxes are very heavy even for a business starting from scratch. Around the turn of the century there was no income tax. The people who grew with the growth of Canada got off to a head start around the turn of the century. In 1972 it is not so easy. Every buck you make, you have to pay tax on it. You cannot build up within your own little enterprise enough capital for expansion without assistance from outside, either by diluting your equity, or by borrowing from some other source.

Also, of course, the established large corporations are in a position which makes it very difficult for a small businessman to attack, even from a flank. Certainly they may have high built-in costs, with unionized labour, big plants, the assistance of a large corporation, which may be running fat as compared with a small man's greyhound. But the trouble is that they have so much money behind them that they can react against a small competitor by cutting prices, dominating the market, driving him out before he really gets established. So I believe that something must be done to provide capital for small business to grow if we do intend to diversify our industry.

I will give you some examples which the hon. Member for Calgary Bow will recall in my own city, examples of industries that would not have grown had it not been for an accident or a fortuitous event which gave them the capital they needed. I refer, first of all, to

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-31

Carma Developers. The hon. Member for Calgary Bow is the president. Carma Developers was, in the beginning, a league of 45 little builders in Calgary who had been squeezed out of the market by a large land developer. No land was available for them. A small businessman called A. R. Bennett who had done well making window sash and millwork and building a few houses a year, put together these fellows in a league called Carma Developers and they went to City Hall and said, "Look, it is not fair that we should all be squeezed out of the market in favour of one big enterprise. Can you help us?" City Hall came to the rescue. I mean, it may have been against the basic principles of free enterprise, but they provided them with land on the North Hill for their first sub-division. They don't need the help now, but remember, once-upon-a-time they did.

MR. WILSON:

We paid for it.

MR. FARRAN:

Oh, you paid for it eventually but the terms were pretty easy terms. You got Rosemont on very easy terms, you know that. I give you another example, Navajo Metals. There was a fellow with a hardware store out at Delia and he had an idea for breaking up old automobiles. He couldn't afford a \$1 1/2 million machine so he made a machine. He had about \$125,000, I believe, from the sale of his farm and his hardware store. He invested this in a machine he made himself and ran out of capital at an early stage and was unable to modify the machine to properly function in this capacity of crushing. The need was there. There was a huge market. There were dead automobiles all over the province. Nobody was doing it. He obviously had the right idea, but he just hadn't got enough money to maintain his little grip on it. The hammers of his machine were made of too soft a metal; they were made by a local foundry. We haven't got a foundry capable of making very hard manganese, tungsten treated hammers. So, he got some assistance from the City of Calgary.

The City of Calgary was extremely tolerant with him. They postponed taxes, they extended his agreement, and they set up meetings with Stelco and with experts from the east to tell him how he could get the hard hammer. Today he is doing a tremendous job. In fact, he is even short of cars to crush. It is the one place in Alberta that is crushing cars and selling the crushed automobile bodies to the steel rolling mills in Edmonton and Calgary for reinforcing steel for concrete. But he would not have succeeded if government had not helped him at a point of crisis.

I will give you another one. The Alberta Trailer Company run by Ron Southern. It was started by his father who was a fireman. If he had not had the security of a job with the City of Calgary Fire Brigade, I wonder if that large industry would ever have got as far as it had. There was another example of Western Rolling Mills in Calgary. Mr. Harry Cohen was the successful operator of a firm called Ace Salvage. His dream was to put in a steel rolling mill in Calgary. He invested every penny he had in this steel rolling mill. He could only put in second-hand machines, a rather beat-up factory. He ran into trouble from residents who complained that he was burning the paint off cars, which was the cheapest way for him, the only way he could do it to feed his mills, and eventually he very nearly went bankrupt. He was saved by one of the large corporations coming in, and the mill is still operating. He himself died of a heart attack. But if he had had assistance at the right point, this would probably still be an Alberta-owned company and operating as a home-based Alberta enterprise.

47-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member give us some examples of this in small towns?

MR. FARRAN:

I don't live in a small town. I can only give you an example in Calgary - yes, I can give you some in small towns. The Mennonites, the Linden Machine Works, one of the most successful little enterprises in the country. It could, perhaps, be as big as Massey-Ferguson if it had had some help from government at an early stage. I'll give you another one -- Noble Plow in Nobleford, Alberta. That's another one that could probably do with a little help and a push along. They may be as big as Versatile, if they were given some sort of help. McCoy-Renn, another one in Hoist. Those are some small town ones which could do with some help. [Interjections] Well, I hope I'm being practical on this, because I'm talking to the businessmen. I don't want to talk to the lawyers.

Many things are imported into this province which could be made here. We have a small market, I know. Only 1.6 million people, but many of the things we use, especially in the two cities are imported. This applies especially to the small things connected with the industry of agriculture. Things like pick-up reels for combines, and so on. They could easily be made here, but they're imported. Do you know that no barbed wire is made in Alberta? I don't know how many miles of barbed wire we've got in Alberta, but it's probably more than in any similar part of the world.

One of the things, of course, that makes large industries reluctant to come here is the weak infrastructure of service industries -- the small machine shops that can make valves and can make repairs to bigger machines. If you go into areas like Detroit, or Birmingham in England, you'll find all sorts of little machine shops operating in back yards, which supply -- it's almost parasitical on the large industries -- but unless they are there, the large industries are reluctant to come. It's the only way you can develop any technical know-how, too, for larger industries. But I believe most of the federal government incentives have been directed to large corporations, and I tend to agree with the hon. member from up north that there should be more attention paid to the promotion of small industries, certainly if we want diversification.

There were huge distortions in the DREE program, for instance. I mention ATCO, which is a home grown industry, operating in the used air force hangers in Lincoln Park. What does the federal government do? It promotes Boise-Cascade in Kelowna, an American company, to go into direct competition with them.

The point I think is pretty obvious that small businesses will not be able to grow unless they have a reasonable approach to loan capital at an early stage. They don't need it when they get to the size of the hon. Member for Calgary Bow and myself, but they do need it in the early days of their business history. They need it in the first two or three years. After about three years, small business gathers its own momentum, and it continues and stays, but it's in those first three years of survival that the thing is either made or broken.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Ponoka, followed by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, and then the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-33

DR. McCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few remarks in support of this bill. The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View was mentioning scepticism. Since I've been in this House, he's been sceptical of everyone that has spoken, every word that's been uttered, and I understand that this has been his policy for the last ten years or longer, and about everything and every person. I wonder if the hon. member, when he talks to himself, if he believes himself.

MR. LUDWIG:

Well, I don't believe you, and I'll listen from now on.

DR. McCRIMMON:

Now, getting back to Bill No. 50. The principles supporting the decentralization of industry in the smaller towns has been well debated in both the Throne Speech and the Budget Speech. In these debates, I believe, it has received the support of the majority of people from both sides of the House.

This act is the vehicle by which this principle of initiating industry throughout the province can be initiated. Hopefully, in the course of a few years, it will reverse the trend to centralization to make for a better balance between rural and urban areas, and develop a better balance of economy through the whole province.

The effect of utilization of the opportunities that this bill presents, I feel, are three-fold.

(1) The opportunity to develop secondary industries in our smaller towns and communities. This should stabilize the work opportunities and prevent the draining away of our population to the major centres. However, the opportunities available are directly in proportion to the drive and the incentive and the desire of the individual community. You can make the opportunity, but you can't make them do it. If they are prepared to work, this bill gives them the opportunity to go out and do it.

(2) The stabilization of job opportunities to decrease the dependency of this province on primary industry. If we follow the pattern that we have in the past, two major primary industries -- agriculture and the oil industry -- we can look forward to nothing but fluctuation of our total economy in this province in the future.

(3) Stimulation of the tourist industry with its ensuing creation of employment, the high points of this employment taking place during the summer months when we have our chronic problem of student unemployment.

The fact is that this is no give-away program, but a program designed to help those people who are prepared to help themselves. Groups and communities who are prepared to help themselves are the ones who will benefit from Bill No. 50. For these reasons I support this bill, knowing full well this is just the first step in reversing a trend to high centralization, the first step towards a reasonable balance throughout all of the province, of industry opportunity, jobs and a sound prospect for the future of all Albertans.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I intend to keep my remarks brief on this matter. It has been something that in the course of the last four years in the Legislature I have had considerable interest in. I shuddered for a moment, as a matter of fact, when I heard the hon. Member for Mountain View appear to be about to tell us whether or not he had confidence in the bill. The shuddering came when I thought for a moment we had his confidence, because if anything would worry me about this bill, it would be whether it was along the lines of his

47-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

thinking and something he would come up with. There is no question in my mind that one of the things this bill has going for it is the lack of the member's confidence.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. GETTY:

I will take it later.

MR. LUDWIG:

This doesn't rock anybody's confidence.

MR. GETTY:

The member with the thickest head somehow has the thinnest skin.

MR. LUDWIG:

I thought he had one on me with thick heads, Mr. Speaker. I established that last year.

MR. GETTY:

In any event, Mr. Speaker, his concern, as I heard him, was that he was really upset that someone has finally taken the bit in his teeth to do something about something that is so important in Alberta. That is exactly what the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce has done. It is so important -- this bill is not only needed now, but the fact is it is so over-due. I certainly appreciate the time and the energy the hon. minister has spent in developing this bill. I know his department and his officials have worked very hard to get it in here, and I am certainly very, very pleased that it is.

I think the hon. members should consider just how important it is to the Province of Alberta. I would like to refer to some comments that were made at the First Ministers' meeting on November 15th to 17th in Ottawa, when the hon. Premier of this province was addressing the other premiers and the Prime Minister. It was important to highlight some of the situations that were facing the Government of Alberta.

"The new Alberta government faces the current economic situation in Canada at a time when the province has already moved into a difficult and challenging period in its own development."

The reasons for this, Mr. Speaker, as they were developed, is that the marked decline in oil and gas activity, and investment in our province, has reduced one of the major economic stimulants upon which too great a reliance has been placed in the past.

One of the things that always amazed me as a member of the Opposition in past years, was the staggering inability of the previous administration to comprehend the need to diversify industry in the Province of Alberta, rather than to continue to lie asleep relying on the revenues that were coming from the oil and gas industry. And how long, if any member now thinks about it, how long has it been apparent that that industry had moved through several phases, and into one which was now leaving the government benefiting mainly in the province, benefiting mainly through royalty income, with no longer the massive infusion of lease dollars and investment?

Certainly we have debated the issue of industrial development and the need to diversify our economy in the past in this House. One

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-35

of the things that has consistently come up, is all the problems that the members of the Social Credit party see in doing that. I can never figure out why it was their desire to dwell on the problems, without coming up with these suggestions and the reasons that change is needed. Now I heard it before from the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View -- no question about it -- but I was staggered when a new member of their party comes into the House, and when he is dealing with a bill of this importance, starts to regale us also with all the negative thinking again that we have heard for years.

What is really needed is to appreciate that this bill is a start in something that should have been started long ago. Our minister has taken it upon himself, with the full backing of the government to strike out with a bill that gives, and I am glad it gives, a wide latitude of action. The last thing we want is a bill that is cluttered up with the restrictions and the various checks and limits that were built into the previous administration's legislation in this regard. Because certainly all that did was keep most people from being able to benefit in any way from their legislation.

I certainly would urge the members of the House, on both sides, to give serious consideration to the type of problem that this bill will go a great way towards solving. There will be problems. Nobody said it was going to be easy, but it has to be done. It won't be easy, but this is the kind of leadership that is necessary if our economy is going to develop in a manner that is so needed in Alberta.

MR. DRAIN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, thanks for the opportunity -- I appreciate very much the opportunity of addressing myself to the task of talking about Bill 50. I appreciate what has been said by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place, and also the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill. Certainly he took us on sort of an industrial review and it brought to mind the best seller book that we used to have when I was about 11 or 12 years old. And this was the Alger series, the Horatio Alger series, and maybe I date myself when I talk about this, because there may be many fellows here that haven't heard about Horatio Alger. But anyway, Horatio Alger was a writer and he wrote along this particular theme, and it was always the same theme: country boy goes to the big city, country boy sells papers, country boy saves money, country boy decides to buy bicycle, thinks now he'd better buy a wagon and horse, saves some more money, buys out the boss's business, and marries the boss's daughter and lives happily ever after. And so if this is the intent of this bill, this is what I would like to see.

However, the part that I shudder about -- and I do shudder; it seems now in 1972 no one is prepared to crawl, everybody wants to start at the top and when they get at the top they zoom, and as they zoom they acquire the experience that they are supposed to pick up at the bottom on their way up. It has been mentioned here about managerial ability -- that somehow or other we are going to acquire a pool of managerial ability for private enterprise. Now I like this idea. If these people have this ability in private enterprise, how are they accessible, as a pool, to private enterprise? Why aren't they out there cutting and producing? This is where the people who have the ability in the purview of private enterprise should be belong. This is one particular point.

The subject that has also been touched on, and this part also makes me shudder -- in fact I'm starting to feel chilly -- I'm thinking about some of the particular situations that have been evolved where government has stuck its beak into particular areas that it should have kept out of. I can think of the atomic energy development in Nova Scotia. I can think of the Churchill falls development in Manitoba. I can think of this development in northern Saskatchewan which the present government in Saskatchewan fortunately

47-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

was able to extract itself from. I can even mention the Alberta Resources Railroad, and I don't think anyone can fault any of these particular governments in their endeavours, because certainly their intentions were good.

The intentions in Bill No. 50 are very good also, Mr. Speaker, but what we are looking at and what we are thinking about, is what will the ultimate results be. There is -- especially in government and any particular government organization -- a bureaucracy created, and with the bureaucracy the desire to achieve is also created. Because somewhere down the road results must be achieved. So then the checks and balances are put into the background and the desires of achieving are put in the foreground. In many cases we could have a situation where we would have a potential for some of these sad instances that I have mentioned.

It is also mentioned that there is a great desire to, and properly so -- and certainly who is against sin, or who isn't against sin, Mr. Speaker, and who isn't in favour of motherhood, who hasn't got the intense desire to see the rural areas of Alberta go. But you know, it's an interesting thing in the five years that I have spent in Edmonton attending the sessions, the change that has taken place in the centre of Edmonton on Jasper Avenue. It's amazing the number of small businesses that are knocked out on Jasper Avenue, closed out completely, because even here in the city core a small business can't compete. Why is this? The biggest enemy of a small business is inflation. In my own area, I can think of 25 grocery stores in the Crowsnest Pass where we have six now. Why is this? Because 25 years ago a man making \$1,200 or \$1,100 on a corner grocery store was making a fine living. He was a member of the middle class in a small town. Now this doesn't pay his taxes. These are some of the things that you have to consider in the overall concept of assessing where you are going to go.

So the thing that I console myself with about this bill is the fact that the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce has had some experience and hopefully he is not going to get carried away. All I want to say is that there should be a reconciliation between the things that you desire and you would like to achieve and the realities of what you can properly achieve. Thank you.

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Speaker, --

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Member for Calgary Millican is next, followed by the hon. Member for Stettler.

MR. DIXON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will only take a moment or two because there is just one point that hasn't been touched on today, which I think is very, very important if we're talking about goals in business that we are hoping to see come about in the rural areas outside the major cities. I believe we have to take a hard look at every situation when we're talking about spending the taxpayers' money because we have to tax the businesses that are operating now in order to get the money to set someone else up in business.

The thing that concerns me is that this government, in particular, is going to have to face a tough situation, because in many of our small areas in Alberta -- let's face it, if we want to be honest -- there are some towns that aren't going to survive regardless of how many opportunity programs this government or the federal government brings in.

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-37

I wish there was a section in this bill that would assist in a survey, so that we would have an up-to-date recent evaluation of the smaller areas. And I'm sure if any of us go out to any constituency and drive down the road, you can go into one town, it looks quite active, you can go into another one and you can see that it's dying. The tank is closed, the elevators are closing down. I think we can face the fact that with amalgamations -- and as the hon. Member for Crowsnest Pass put it just a moment ago -- where there were 12 grocery stores they're down to six and then they go down to two. But I think number one, before we spend a lot of the taxpayers' money, we should spend a little money on a hard-nosed look at whether some of these towns will survive or not.

Let's put it the other way. Maybe this hard-nosed look will see that maybe some town that is dying is the one we should be putting the money in, and maybe one of the other towns some distance away may be the one that could be slipping in a few years. The particular industry that is working in that area may slow down which would mean that that particular town won't survive.

We can look at the hospital and school situation with this government, because it can have a great bearing on whether a small town survives or whether it doesn't. For example, if the hon. Minister of Education is going to recommend, or I should say, the closing down of a school or a high school, this could have a real bearing as to whether that town is going to survive or not.

This is what I'm talking about. I think we have to have this co-operation first, before we get into spending a lot of the taxpayers' money, because you may not be doing a businessman a favour. You may be helping him temporarily. But it's only extending his death maybe five years whereas he might die in two years under the present situation.

I don't want the hon. members to get the idea that I'm being hard-hearted but I think sometimes you have to be in business, because situations come about and for a business in any particular town, or city for that matter, management has a lot to do with it. There are so many things enter into it as to whether they're successful or not. There are people who go broke right in the heart of a downtown area where there are a lot of people. They just haven't got the management. I notice in the bill it does make provision whereby we are going to give some direction and help in that area.

Mainly, Mr. Speaker, whether this bill does it or whether it is some other bill that the government can come up with, I think what we need is a survey with some long-range programs. We need to know whether some of these smaller areas are going to survive or whether they aren't. Because what happens in the small town? First of all the railway station closes and the next thing you know the branch line is abandoned and, of course, this has an effect. There are so many things that enter into this picture. So I think one of the most important things we can look at which will do the businessman a favour in the long run, is to find out if your survey shows that the life expectancy of that town is five years, ten years, or twenty years down the line.

The other factor, as I mentioned before, is the location of government and municipal buildings, schools, and hospitals, in particular. They can mean a great deal.

But there is one thing about this bill -- I think every political party can vote for it because as I sat here today and listened to the hon. members -- we had the hon. member from the left saying he could take a step right and vote for this bill; we had the hon. minister, when he introduced the bill, say this is the right step forward; then we had the hon. member, Mr. Young, saying well you

47-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

can make a step to the centre and still support this bill. I think it is a good bill, but I think it could be a better bill if some research can be done, some honest research, where we do not encourage people to go into business in an area where the future looks very bleak. Because all we will be doing is just putting enough money in to encourage them to go forward, with really no future, and they could lose what little bit of money they put in, plus the money that the taxpayers will be called upon to assist. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stettler followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller, and the hon. Member for Camrose.

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, I am a small town lawyer, and as such am a businessman and am a free enterpriser.

I support the principle of the bill, and especially the priority, which is given in it, to the encouragement and strengthening and expansion of small businesses, for the encouragement of programs and projects which create, and increase economic opportunities for residents of smaller population centres; and for the encouragement that is to be given to companies, associations and groups, formed for the purpose of attracting industrial development and expansion within their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the order in which they appear in the bill does not in itself set priorities, because I am particularly concerned with the ninth item in Section 2(2)(i), which is the one that will encourage companies, associations and groups formed for the purpose of attracting industrial development and expansion within their communities.

I'm glad that the bill has not introduced or reintroduced the idea of making grants and forgivable loans. I think that the system of giving grants and forgivable loans only favours those who receive them. There are many people in our rural areas who are prepared to go it alone, and they receive no benefits; in fact, they really receive competition from industries that have received the benefits of grants and forgivable loans.

The hon. member for Calgary North Hill mentioned the problem of machine shops. This is perhaps a most important part of development in rural Alberta, because any industry relies on the service of machine shops and like entities, and they simply do not exist in all but a few centres in rural Alberta. We have problems of rural power rates, which right now, I think, are prohibitive, and which will discourage any real industrial development outside of the cities of Edmonton and Calgary. We have problems of roads -- the carrying capacity of roads -- and as I see it at the moment, there is absolutely no way that we can have industrial development without further development of the roads. Roads, after all, must be used by an industry to distribute its products and to receive the goods which it in turn uses to create those products. We have the problem of amenities in rural Alberta -- such things as sewer, water and housing for employees. These are the things which will have to develop as well if we are going to see much in the way of rural development.

The Industrial Development Bank has a process whereby it goes out to areas in order to promote its resources of capital funds. I hope that the new Alberta Opportunity Company will not be based solely in Edmonton or Calgary, but that it will step outside the boundaries of these places in order to be in contact with rural Alberta.

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-39

I make a strong plea for encouraging local participation in the program of rural development. Every local municipality, whether it be a town, a village, a county, an MD, or a small city, outside of the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, needs an expanded tax base. They are all, of course, vitally interested in development in what is known as rural Alberta. But the members of these councils have their hands full looking after their own council matters. I believe they should not also be asked to take on the job of being rural developers as well. There is, therefore, a need in rural Alberta for the creation of an entity which is charged with the subject of rural development. This entity simply does not exist in rural Alberta at this time, outside of the cities of Edmonton and Calgary.

I share the concern of the hon. Member for Calgary Millican regarding the problem of which small communities in Alberta are to survive. But I think we also should look at the experience of the United States in this area. Our neighbour to the south has, I believe, on the records that I read of late, shown quite definitely that their new businesses and expansion has occurred in rural America. There is a tremendous effort at this time, south of the border, to encourage development outside of the large metropolitan areas -- to put it in rural America. There is a wealth of experience down there which we can draw from to develop our own process up here. They have shown that any small community has a possibility, as far as rural development is concerned. I think our small centres have just about reached the point where there will be very little left to reduce further. There are some villages, there are some hamlets which will obviously disappear. But I think our small towns and our small cities are stable and are only looking for this type of development which is provided by this bill.

If the entrepreneur has got to go to Edmonton to a government office to get assistance, then I object, because frankly I feel that civil servants are really not equipped to give guidance in business matters. There must be, I submit, local input in the area of business experience to the venture if the venture is to survive. I am afraid that the competition from the two great big cities in Alberta is just simply too great at the moment. Unless we try to develop a feeling in the rural areas that will encourage, that will attract, that will hold those entrepreneurs who are willing to enter into risks and to venture into rural Alberta. I hope, therefore, that conditions can be attached to the loans so that they are callable if, in fact, the entrepreneur decides to move to the two large cities in this province.

But I still support the principle of the bill. It does set the stage for rural development in Alberta and I am sure that with some other things that are needed, we will find that this source of capital is the start to what we hope will be a different province in the years ahead. The bill, I believe, is in principle, the most important piece of legislation which will affect rural Alberta and I support it. Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I want to go on record as supporting this bill also. I don't have the apprehensions of a lot of the hon. members in regard to some of the clauses in the bill. I consider the government a free enterprise government, and I frankly can't conceive of the government setting up businesses in competition with other businesses in our towns or cities or villages. If I thought that was the case, I would certainly not support the bill, but I just can't conceive of that being the case.

Secondly, I think there's a need for this type of legislation. We have today, as some hon. members have mentioned, a number of hamlets and villages and towns that are having a difficult time to survive. I am not one of those who thinks the government should be

47-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

placing a stamp of approval of life on some and the sting of death on others. I don't know which ones will survive and which ones will not survive, but I would like to see every one of them have the opportunity to survive. And this will give them the opportunity. Nobody is going to force the money on our villages or towns, and nobody is giving them anything.

I'm surprised at some of the remarks about giving. This is a loan. I can't see anything in the act that leads me to believe the government is going to hand money out to individuals to go into business. They're going to have to have a pretty fair starting base or they are not going to get the loan. But it is a loan. It's giving them an opportunity.

I want to say that there is a need in this province, and probably in every province in Canada, for increased capital. There's a need for that capital, and there are a lot of our people who have ideas of how they could go into business, who have a certain amount of capital but not enough, who have vision, who have the know-how, and they do need some assistance. They can do things that will provide jobs and help the buoyancy of this province. I'm glad to see a bill of this nature. I have seen many times over the years people who have what I considered acceptable ideas, but very little capital, and they couldn't go into business. They remained in the labour field. This, I think, is going to give that type of person, with a reasonable amount of capital, a lot of know-how, a lot of ambition and a lot of vision, an opportunity to do something. He wants to live in his small town. He wants to live in his hamlet or his village, and he wants to have the opportunity of living there on a reasonable income. Without capital you just can't do that kind of thing. This is a free enterprise bill, and free enterprise requires capital to survive. It just won't survive without capital. If it wasn't a free enterprise bill, it would mean there would have to be hand-outs -- hand-outs of public money that might be lost or might not be lost.

This is going to be based on pretty sound principles when it's being handled, as the hon. minister, I think it was said, by the Alberta Commercial Corporation. This corporation knows what it's doing in the business field.

I'm glad to see this particular bill, because there is a need in our hamlets and towns. I have 13 to 15 hamlets and villages and towns in my constituency. Perhaps over the next few years some will die. Perhaps none will die, because Mr. Speaker, what's going to determine whether they remain alive and buoyant or whether they go under, is whether or not there is an industry in that town. If there's an industry there, there'll be jobs there. They will stay alive and become more vibrant as the industry increases. But they are not even going to have a chance unless there's some industry in our towns. The towns and villages can't survive without industry and we need industry. Consequently, anything that's going to give the people of the villages and hamlets and towns an opportunity to show what they can do, to develop their powers, to develop their potential, I think is worth advancing. I see that opportunity in this particular bill.

Secondly, there's not only the need for capital, but there's a need for a number of industries in this province. In my own constituency, I know that there are some who are now making a go of small vegetable farms, who, five years ago, were pretty much down in the muck, because they didn't have the capital. They secured some capital. They secured some inventory from the Alberta Commercial Corporation, and today they're doing pretty well. We have need. Why do we say we have to continually import millions and thousands of tons and bushels of small vegetables, for instance, from the United States, when we have the soil and we have the people, and about all we don't have is the necessary capital? If there are those who are

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-41

prepared to do the work, and the soil and the other items are there, then I see an opportunity of this becoming a very excellent item in meeting the needs of this province.

The other point I would like to mention for a moment or so, is that the bill sets out -- at least in its note, if not in its provisions -- that priority will be given to the smaller centres. I think that is properly so. I am not adverse to someone who has a brilliant idea, who lives in one of our major cities -- and who may develop a small business that will employ five or seven or 12 persons -- getting some assistance. That will help to provide jobs in the province, too, and help to provide jobs in the country. I think there is a greater need for this type of thing in the smaller centres than there is in the two metropolitan areas. But I frankly, would not want to deny this to someone in the major metropolitan areas if he had a business that was suitable for those areas, and which would provide jobs. So, I am not really too apprehensive because I notice the government has put in a note that the smaller centres will be given the priority.

There is another thing about this bill that I like, and that is the counselling services. Sometimes people need help and advice in how to run a business. I know of a co-op that went down in my own particular constituency, largely, I think, because the people who were running it continued to give credit, and credit, and credit until they simply were unable to carry on any longer. If those people had had the opportunity to receive some sound business counselling -- someone who knew his way around in the business world, someone who knew how much credit to give and how much they could safely give and when to stop, that co-op might still be serving the needs of the people in that area today. But it didn't have the necessary counselling. Maybe it would have gone under anyway, I don't know, but with counselling and help in the business world, many of our people can provide good, sound businesses. Without that advice and without that type of counselling, they are certainly going to have a difficult time in staying alive and sponsoring a really good business.

I place as much emphasis on the counselling, on good sound advice to the small business people in our hamlets, when they are getting started and after they have started, as I do upon the loaning of money to them. With the loaning of the money in the hands of people such as are found in the Alberta Commercial Corporation, I am quite satisfied to say that this bill is going to fill a need. If its performance shows something is lacking after a year's operation, then I would hope the government would bring it back and correct those items that are going to help other businesses to get assistance and other businesses to stay alive.

I don't think we can ordain which of our towns and villages are going to die and which ones are going to live, but I think we have a responsibility in our society, as supporters of free enterprise, and as supporters of a free enterprise government, to give our towns and villages and our people, individually or in groups, an opportunity to show what they can do. And having given that opportunity, we will discharge our responsibilities. I am hoping -- and maybe that is all we can do at this stage, is to hope -- that the people will come forward with the ideas to meet the needs in order to make this, their community, their province and their nation, a more buoyant place in which to live.

The other section of the act that I want to deal with for a moment is the priority given to some of our young people. Our young people today are apprehensive because many of our businesses are becoming closed businesses. A wall is being built around them. So much capital is required it is almost impossible for a young chap to get into business today. This is worrying many young people. I think young people who have an idea for meeting a need and can show

47-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

May 10th 1972

the basis for a good sound enterprising business in this province should receive some assistance, and should receive assistance in the form of capital and counselling. And I think this again has an opportunity of meeting the needs of young people. I am glad to see that that is emphasized in the bill as well.

In closing I want to say that Bill 50, to me, is a step towards a more bouyant province if it makes capital available to people, and if capital is given out on sound business basis and for purposes that will meet the needs that are very evident in this province today.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words with regard to this bill because I believe it is one of the most important items of legislation that we are presenting to the House this session.

I would like, first of all, to say to the hon. Member for Drumheller that I can appreciate some of the points that he presented, and I think that what is very important is that the Annual Report which is referred to in the bill, be a matter that is considered carefully by the Members of the House. I was disappointed, until I heard the last speaker, with some of the comments from the other side. This bill needs the support of all members, and it needs the support in a very positive and concrete way. I had hoped, frankly, that we might hear from other members who are involved in smaller centres, but I believe that the hon. Member for Stettler and the hon. Member for Drumheller spoke effectively about the concerns that I have for the smaller communities.

The bill is certainly a step, a legislative framework, and it places a great deal of responsibility upon the minister, and upon the selection of the people who are involved. But I think it is a very important bill. With respect, I regret very much the comments of the hon. Member for Pincher Creek, because I think what we have to have is the positive attitude by members working with their constituencies, the local involvement that was expressed by the hon. Member for Stettler. It is going to require the member working with the local group to help them in the way that is necessary to assure that this Alberta Opportunity Company in fact, takes a very careful look at the opportunities in their particular area. I hope the minister took note of the remarks made by the hon. Member for Stettler because I certainly support them, that it should not be that the input is centred in the metropolitan areas, if the emphasis is going to be in the smaller centres of Alberta. I appreciated the fact that the hon. Member for Drumheller noted that there could be those cases in the metropolitan area which obviously warranted the support, even though the priority should be in the smaller centres.

And for those members who might think that this is strictly an economic bill -- I don't think that at all. I think it is a bill that has some very major social implications in three important ways. First of all, as the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs pointed out, there is the very important need for doing everything we can to provide jobs for younger people; second, to assure that to the extent that it is possible to do so, community spirit and pride in the smaller centres is recognized and fostered.

And we'll make mistakes. There is no doubt about that. But I don't think you go into a bill like this or a program like this in any negative or sceptical way.

I feel too, that it is also important, in a society such as ours, to support small business, to give many of our young citizens an opportunity to recognize that they may be able to control their own economic destiny, and not merely be employees of large corporations. This is another important step.

May 10th 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

47-43

And I frankly don't understand how three members could have spoken in this debate and not recognized Section 12 as being one that clearly limited the \$500,000 as a maximum. With respect, Mr. Speaker, you would almost wonder if, on this important bill, some members hadn't spoken without having read the bill. But there is a very important need, as the hon. Member for Stettler pointed out, to follow through. And it is not just going to be simply this bill. There are going to be matters such as roads and power, the size of our educational institutions, and where they are located in the future -- the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking has some knowledge and experience with regard to that -- it is going to involve the financial institutions in this province and the way they work with the Opportunity Company. There will be mistakes made, but I think the tone of the bill is a positive tone.

I had an interesting argument with the minister. I won. It was over the name of the bill. He wanted to call it -- [Interjections] Yes, it was an important argument. He wanted to call it The Industrial Development Bill -- he won most of the other arguments in regard to the bill -- I wanted to call it The Alberta Opportunity Fund and I'm proud to support it.

MR. FENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, am I privileged to speak now?

MR. SPEAKER:

Actually if we are following the list, and we are getting close to the end of the time, the hon. Member for Camrose is next, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Calder, and the hon. Member for Tater-Warner and the hon. Member for Olds Didsbury.

MR. STRCMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. Member for Camrose adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree to call it 5:30?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 5:25 p.m.]

