

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, November 2, 1972

[The House met at 2:30 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to introduce through you to the House a distinguished visitor sitting in your gallery, Mr. William Epstein. Mr. Epstein, Mr. Speaker, is from Alberta and is now the Director of the Disarmament Affairs Division of the United Nations Secretariat. I ask all the hon. members to welcome Mr. Epstein.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you and through you to the hon. members of this assembly, 80 students from McKay Avenue Junior High School in my constituency of Edmonton Centre. Mr. Speaker, today they are accompanied by their group leader, Mr. Sanson. I wonder if they would now rise and be recognized by the hon. members of the assembly.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, from my constituency of Edmonton Belmont, I should like to introduce to you and to this assembly 60 students from Grade VI in the Northmount School. They are seated in the public gallery. I should like to ask them to stand and be recognized by this assembly.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Calgary Power - Increase in Rates

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. Does the government support the application of Calgary Power for its proposed and unreasonable high request for an increase in rates?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I'm confused because I think the question is out of order, but I will answer it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Who's out of order?

MR. WERRY:

It is clearly not within our jurisdiction --

MR. LUDWIG:

Don't confuse the issue.

67-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

MR. WERRY:

You're the only one who is confused, hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. Under the authority of The Public Utility Act, there is set up a Public Utility Board which has the responsibility of hearing and weighing evidence that is brought before it by any utility company in the province that requires rate relief. It is up to that autonomous and independent body to review, investigate, and hear all sides to the dispute and make a ruling as to the amount of funds that are required by the company, and then allocate the funds required by industry to different classifications. The arbitration or the settlement is between the company and the Public Utilities Board, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Will the government be making any submission to the Public Utilities Board in opposition to the rate increase?

MR. WERRY:

First of all, on a point of clarification, I'd like to state that the government, as a rule, does not appear before its own boards and tribunals. The Deputy Premier indicated in the House last week that the government will be giving support to the association of REAs to ensure that that group are well represented at the hearing.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, and this is further to a question I raised last week. Is the hon. minister in a position today to specify exactly what procedures consumer groups, other than the REAs, can take to obtain redress for the money that they must expend in order to present a case before the Public Utilities Board?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, if any consumer organization in Alberta were to approach my office, I would be most happy to receive them and to try to give them some direction and any assistance that they may require, whether it is financial or otherwise.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the minister if he has had any representation dealing with Section 54 of The Public Utilities Act that makes it possible for the board to make an interim order which would, in fact, increase the rates of Calgary Power before the hearing is completed?

MR. WERRY:

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I cannot recall whether or not any groups or individuals have made submissions to my office regarding Section 54. Of course, Section 54 is, under most circumstances, normal proceedings in any rate hearing, and I would assume that within the provisions of the act the Public Utilities Board will themselves be making a ruling on that.

MR. RUSTE:

Supplementary question to the minister. Could he indicate what amount of support he will be giving to the R.E.A.s in this case?

MR. WERRY:

A letter has gone out to the association of REAs and I am waiting for the president of the REA Association to contact my office and we will sit down and discuss what kind of support they would desire. It may be technical support; it may be directing them to proper legal advice, and it may be financial - I'm not quite sure what the nature is at this time, because I really don't know what they need. I am anxious to get together with them at the earliest possible date.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-3

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. Are you aware that a motion opposing any power rate increases was defeated at the recent Alberta Municipal Association convention, solely on the basis that the municipalities could not afford the cost of making such a submission to the Public Utilities Board?

MR. WERRY:

Yes, I am, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister elaborate on the term, 'other ways of assisting', as was used last Thursday in reference to facilitating fair hearings before the Public Utilities Board?

MR. WERRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, fair hearings mean different things to different people. As I have indicated in the House in the last five or ten minutes, certainly my office is prepared to sit down with REA and consumer associations and I would have to say that municipalities such as Red Deer, Calgary, etc., represent a large number of consumers. I would be most pleased to sit down with them and indicate, firstly, what kind of supporting staff they may require, and what kind of supporting evidence they should put in at a rate hearing, and also any financial support to which they may wish to make representation. All of this, if they are willing to sit down with me, I will be pleased to discuss and take it under advisement. Possibly I could direct them in any number of ways so that they do, in fact, get a fair hearing before the Public Utilities Board.

I would just like to straighten out any misconception in this House that the Public Utilities Board does not give a fair hearing, because the experience I have had with the Public Utilities Board is that on the basis of the evidence that is submitted they have certainly done an adequate job in evaluating all material that is placed before them, either by the utility itself or by the interveners, and on the basis of that evidence have had to make rate increases, which in today's society, are certainly not well accepted. It's the same whether it be a utility increase or a consumer price increase, none of today's society really likes those sorts of things.

I would like also to point out at this time that with respect to power rates that we want to draw up some comparisons, power rates are fairly low on the scale of increases as compared to the consumer price index and Calgary Power has, in the last 10 years had two rate decreases, and I think all of this will be taken into consideration when the evidence is placed before the Public Utilities Board.

MR. SPEAKER:

We have had a number of supplementaries on this topic; there are others waiting with questions. Perhaps we could revert to this topic again if there is time left before the end of the question period.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Pairview followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, with deference to you, I am wondering if I could direct this question to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities and ask him to be, perhaps, a little more specific to this question of compensation. Have you as yet determined any tentative formula for compensation, and secondly, do you have any tentative proposal as to what group would be entitled to compensation?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I have not received any direct representations other than the REAs and I have indicated to the REAs that I will be pleased to meet with them at the earliest possible date, and if any other consumer group in Alberta wishes to approach my office I will be pleased to sit down and review it with them.

67-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Automobile Insurance - Licence Plates

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Highways. Mr. Minister, is your department accepting automobile licence plates from the owners in order that the motorists may cancel their auto insurance, as some insurance companies apparently are asking for a receipt from the motorist before they are able to cancel the insurance policy?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, we are not asking for their licence plates back when they have cancelled their automobile insurance. We don't think that this is necessary because many of the licence holders -- its a small thing to start with -- and many of the people who put their automobile up for the winter cancel the insurance and they are well aware of the penalties they are liable to if they operate the automobile without insurance. I don't think that it is a necessary thing to do.

MR. DIACHUK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, therefore there is no direction from your department to the insurance companies or no discussion or negotiation on this aspect of accepting the responsibility of receiving the licence plates back?

MR. COPITHORNE:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Student Credit Transfer

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Advanced Education and ask him what steps have been taken in the last year to facilitate the transfer of students' credits between various post-secondary educational institutions in the province? That's following the report which the minister tabled in the Assembly last year.

MR. FOSTER:

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I could get some clarification. By the transfer of credits, do you mean to assist in the transferability of students, for example NAIT to the public colleges?

MR. CLARK:

Or NAIT to the university or Mount Royal College in Calgary to the University of Calgary.

MR. FOSTER:

I think it is clear, Mr. Speaker, that there still exists some confusion between the non-university sector and the university sector, and those discussions are now being carried on with each university individually and between the universities on the one hand and the non-university sector on the other, through the Colleges Commission. I know the Colleges Commission are very hopeful that the matter of transferability can be resolved as quickly as possible. It is a serious problem in that sense in the advanced education community, but I am not proposing to resolve it by legislation at this time.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Then the progress which has been made in the last year would be progress only in the area of discussions?

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-5

MR. POSTER:

Progress in the area of discussions, Mr. Speaker, with respect to universities. The other non-university sector has, in the past year, reached a complete agreement on it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stettler followed by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

Agricultural Regions

MR. HARLE:

My question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. Is your department going to develop a regional agricultural office at Stettler?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the question of the agricultural regions in the province under the Department of Agriculture is one that we are giving consideration to at the moment. We would like to see the regions redesigned so that they would fit into the census divisions which would give us much more accurate statistics in relation to the types and kinds of agriculture that are going on in the various areas. I can say this to the hon. members though, that we are also giving consideration to a variety of ways in which we can move out from the capital city a substantial number of the present functions that are being handled and don't need to be handled in the City of Edmonton.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen followed by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

AGT Toll Policy

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Telephones and Utilities. Will the minister make sure that the Alberta Government Telephone commitment, namely that Craigville will be included in the Hanna toll free area, is included when you are formulating policy?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any commitment, and if the hon. member will give me a copy of the letter, or whatever it is that is a clear commitment, I will be pleased to review it.

MR. FRENCH:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware, or does he remember the reply that he gave me on May 16, 1972 as recorded in Hansard, when it states that the study will "be completed in early June, and the analysis will be completed by some Bell people and also from some people in the United States that are experts in the area of extended area service." And then I asked the question, "Is that June, 1972 or 1973?" and the answer was "1972."

MR. WERRY:

Well, this relates to the question that I answered in the House yesterday, Mr. Speaker, when I said I would be making an announcement in the next week or two with respect to extended area service or toll free service. With regard to the question that the hon. member posed, all of the exchanges that have made representation up to now, will be included in the documentation that will be filed in the House. The study was completed, as the hon. member points out in there. From that overview a detailed study took place, and that is the one that will be tabled in the House in the next two weeks.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, has the hon. minister, in formulating the policy, given cognizance to the representations that every farmer should, in so far as possible, be included in a toll free area with its main marketing centre?

67-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

MR. WERRY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would not like to get into the whole area. I indicated yesterday to the House, and I indicate again today, that I will be making an announcement and providing each member in this House with a copy of the completed study. I will be most pleased to answer any member's inquiry regarding exchanges at that time.

MR. FRENCH:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. So that there is no misunderstanding, I do understand the minister to say that he will be only reporting on those areas that have requested this extended area service? Going back to Hansard on May 16, these are the statements of the hon. minister; "We are looking at all the exchanges in Alberta, we are not just looking at the 80 who have applied." At that particular time I made representation on behalf of one or two of my areas --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please come directly to the question. The questioning is getting toward the nature of debate.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, all I would like is for the hon. minister to advise if all the areas in the province will be included in the report?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, the report is divided into two areas; those that have formally requested; and those that are likely to request as a result of the policy.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin Leduc, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

AGT Decentralization

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. I believe he is aware of the fact that the City of Wetaskiwin is concerned about the reduction of AGT staff in that city. Could the hon. minister explain the policy of decentralization of AGT services in light of the government's policy of decentralization of public services?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is in the nature of a general policy question. As I mentioned the other day, that type of question would perhaps be more suitably placed on the Order Paper.

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat Redcliffe.

Disinfecting Telephones

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. Are you aware of medically and scientifically proven tests which shown that pathogenic bacteria can live for days in human saliva ejected onto telephone mouth pieces, thus creating a hazard to public health?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member --

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does AGT have an approved disinfecting device?

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-7

MR. WERRY:

The only one I can think of is our collection department, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, --

MR. SPEAKER:

May I ask on which topic the question is supplementary?

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, the questions are supplementary to the general topic of the health hazard that occurs because of bacteria on telephone mouthpieces. Supplementary to the hon. minister, have you considered mandatory disinfection of all public telephones?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, if the subject is as much of a problem as the hon. Member for Calgary Bow seems to think it is, I will be very pleased to look into the matter.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. minister considering stopping all kissing in telephone booths?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Member for Drumheller has anybody specifically in mind, I would be pleased to pass an Order in Council or something.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliffe, followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

Bennett Dam

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs -- no prompting, please. Has the Government of Alberta made a submission to the Government of British Columbia for compensation due to the construction of the Bennett Dam?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WYSE:

Will the government be making a submission?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, we have not decided on that matter. We are not considering at the present time before cabinet.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the hon. minister not recall that they had taken a policy during a debate in this House?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is in the nature of debate.

MR. HENDERSON:

It is just a simple yes or no.

67-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Medical Fee Schedule Increase

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Is the government considering increasing the rates in the fee schedule for the medical profession?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's question relates to recent publicity originating with the doctors and I have asked that a response be made by the hon. Minister in Charge of the Health Care Commission, Miss Hunley.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I presume this arose from a newspaper column last night which is the first knowledge we have of it. We sat down with the doctors as recently as three weeks ago and there was no firm discussion about a fee raise at that time. We realize that it is a possibility, some time in the future, and at this stage of the game it is a hypothetical question because they haven't asked for one.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

AGT Contracts

MR. LUDWIG:

I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Telephones. Does AGT generally follow the tender system of awarding contracts of AGT to contractors?

MR. WERRY:

Yes Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary, who determines the exceptions for instance to award cost-plus contracts, the minister or someone in the department?

MR. WERRY:

I'm not aware of any, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, does the hon. minister sign all projects and works contracts awarded by his department?

MR. WERRY:

No Mr. Speaker, the purchasing department approves all contracts and lets all purchase orders.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, is it then possible, supplementary, that major contracts could be awarded by AGT without the minister's knowledge or signature?

MR. WERRY:

Well Mr. Speaker there are major items and the only couple I can think of are with respect to exchange equipment. These are handled by the planning and engineering department and generally the exchange is designed and engineered

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-9

around a specific piece of equipment and the contract is let, on that specific piece of equipment with the manufacturer. There is one other area where there are two major tenders, a major tender, that goes out twice a year and that is with respect to the buried cable program which has been under way for eight years now and will be completed next year. In order to complete this cable program, AGT purchases somewhere in the neighborhood of 10,000 miles of cable a year. These major requirements are issued by the purchasing department and the AGT commission reviews the bids in order to ascertain whether or not they meet the requirements. The AGT Commission lets the tenders on those, and they are on the basis of the lowest bid.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may be permitted one more supplementary. Has the hon. minister had any complaints about the fact that a certain firm in Calgary has been awarded a rather large number of cost-plus contracts without the tender procedure being followed? Has he had any complaints about it?

MR. WERRY:

No. Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Taber-Warner followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

School Transportation

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education. Mr. Minister, are you prepared to give support to school districts or divisions who are exploring the changeover to natural gas for use in the school transportation systems in the interest of economy?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I would certainly be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to receive and look at any requests they might have in that regard. I think the matter relates partly to matters under the authority and jurisdiction of the hon. Provincial Treasurer. But if letters and submissions are received, I would certainly look into them and if there is a matter for viable and useful future debate, and perhaps cost-saving, we would certainly wish to look at it, and assist in any way we could.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliffe.

Long Distance Revenue -- Edmonton Telephones

MR. DIXON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the hon. Premier. I would like to ask the hon. Premier if the City of Edmonton has made any representation regarding the moratorium in Bill No. 120 that no long distance revenue will be shared? I was wondering if the government does plan on bringing in an amendment that would allow Edmonton to share in the long distance telephone charges.

MR. LOUGHEED:

As important as is that matter, I would suggest to hon. members that it is more appropriately dealt with in debate under Bill 120.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliffe followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Beverage Container Amendment Act

MR. WYSE:

I would like to direct a question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Is the provincial government considering an act in legislation

67-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

making it illegal to market soft drinks in Alberta in containers other than an official standard size?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, this legislature passed revisions to The Beverage Container Act during the spring sitting. There is no intent to make any revisions to this legislation. The regulations are being formalized in regard to that legislation, and there is just no intent to change that legislation at this time.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question. Is the hon. minister aware that the price of soft drinks in Alberta is being raised by up to 20 per cent as a direct result of the amendment to The Beverage Container Act?

AN HON. MEMBER:

That is your opinion.

MR. YURKO:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is the hon. member's opinion. I would like to indicate that the new regulations will be in effect as of the 1st of January in respect to the changes that were made to The Beverage Container Act last spring.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question. Why is the beer industry exempt from joining 'Contain-A-Way'?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker. In regard to standardizing a bottle for the soft drink industry -- I might answer that part of the question first -- I have turned this over to the Advisory Committee to make a recommendation to the minister in this regard.

With respect to the beer industry being exempted from the universal depot concept. They are exempt from the one cent handling fee by the depot. They are not necessarily exempt from being part of the universal depot. Any universal depot that is established, can in fact reach an agreement with the Alberta Brewers' Retailers Association to handle and return beer bottles at the average costs to that industry.

MR. WYSE:

I have another question, Mr. Speaker. In relating back to an answer to a question from the hon. minister yesterday. Are all soft drink manufacturers in Alberta forced to join 'Contain-A-Way'?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking -- order please -- the hon. member is asking for a legal interpretation of the legislation and --

MR. WYSE:

No I'm not. And I'm thinking specifically, Mr. Speaker, of Coca Cola and Pepsi.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, no manufacturer is forced to do anything. I would like to suggest that it is to their advantage to join with Contain-A-Way in recycling their containers. They have given the matter very close scrutiny and I believe that they have decided that the obvious thing to do is to join with Contain-A-Way. Contain-A-Way is a company that is put together by all manufacturers, except Coke and Pepsi, to recycle containers from the universal depots. All I say is no one has forced Coke and Pepsi to do anything. But they certainly, I think (in reality with the new regulations that are going to be passed by the government), would find it very advantageous to tie up with Contain-A-Way and join together with the rest of the manufacturers in order to solve this problem.

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-11

MR. WYSE:

One supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the hon. minister, in any way, threaten them if they did not join Contain-A-Way?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I am a very mild mannered individual. I don't threaten anybody.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a point to that particular item. I would hope that all hon. members of this legislature and of the public would do what they can to work to see that The Beverages Containers Act --

MR. LUDWIG:

-- out of order. Under Rule 181(2), all gratuitous remarks concerning a question are entirely out of order (sic "cannot contain gratuitous references"). Therefore, the hon. Premier is not entitled to make one.

MR. SPEAKER:

My understanding is that according to the custom of this House and of other Houses, that wherever a minister is able to assist a questioner by adding supplementary information, it is ordinarily done.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the point of order, it says here, "An answer to a question placed by a member (sic "on the Order Paper") cannot contain gratuitous references." I wonder if this does not violate the rule, although I wouldn't object to the hon. Premier's answer.

MR. SPEAKER:

May I respectfully suggest that we listen to the references and then perhaps if they are found to be out of order we might deal with them?

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Keep going, Bill, keep going!

MR. WYSE:

Did you accept any of the recommendations of the committee and is the committee still operative?

MR. YURKO:

Well, to answer the second question first, Mr. Speaker, the committee is definitely operating. It is operating under the chairmanship of the hon. member, Mr. John Ashton, and he is doing a very capable job in this regard. I would like to suggest, as I indicated earlier, that I asked the committee to consider the question in depth, and to make a recommendation to government, as to whether or not the soft drink container should be standardized. My understanding is that, in fact, the committee is going to be looking into this matter at the earliest opportunity.

Now, if he might repeat the first question, I was so windy on the second I forgot the first question.

MR. WYSE:

I forget what it was too, but I think -- did you accept any of the recommendations of the committee?

MR. YURKO:

Well, the committee basically made one recommendation and that was not to implement the act at this time and revert to an extended period of study in

67-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

regard to universal depots. This simply was not acceptable by the government in that the government has a responsibility to take action in this area. The government has taken such action, basically, to do two things; first of all, action which favours, to a large degree, the returnable, refillable container; secondly, the government has taken action to provide far greater convenience for the public in the returning, handling, and recycling of beverage containers. This was done after a considerably extended program of canvassing the public, as well as consumers, in regard to this legislation, and exactly as to what the public and consumers desired.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Alberta Gazette

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Premier. Which minister is responsible for the production of the Alberta Gazette?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer the question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

MR. CLARK:

I'd like to ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer if he is aware of the Alberta Gazette of Saturday, September 30, 1972, page 915, where the major portion of the page deals with The Police Act, an Order in Council, and the regulations following it. The whole thing is captioned under "Hog Producers." Would the minister take some action to see that this is rectified?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Government Cafeterias

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I had led a question to the hon. Minister of Public Works with regard to the dissatisfaction in the cafeteria in the courthouse, and I was interested in obtaining a report of the Deputy Minister, who was apparently compiling a report on the cafeterias in government buildings and leased buildings. I wonder if the minister would agree to table the report compiled by the Deputy Minister when the same is available.

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, if the questioner is asking me to table an inter-departmental memo, I don't think this would be in the normal interests of the department. However, if he is asking for a report on the general cafeterias, if he would be a little more specific in his request, I'd be very happy to try and provide him with the necessary report.

MR. LUDWIG:

I take it then that the minister, in a roundabout way, has agreed to table the report when he gets it, or not.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that if there is to be a report, the proper way to do it in this House is to put it on the Order Paper under Motions for a Return.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, under the circumstances, if the hon. minister prefers that we read the report in the Civil Service paper rather than get it from him, I might have to get it that way.

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-13

AN HON. MEMBER:

If you can read.

MR. LUDWIG:

It's getting from bad to worse. A supplementary question to the minister. Has he had an opportunity of reviewing the contract entered into between the Department of Public Works and the caterers of the courthouse, to determine if the caterer has the authority to forbid civil servants from bringing lunches into the cafeteria at the courthouse?

DR. BACKUS:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Could the minister undertake to do so?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. Possibly the hon. member could read the contract and decide what it means for himself.

MR. LUDWIG:

Then in that case, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister table the contract so that I may read it?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Put it on the Order Paper.

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I was asked to look into this on a previous question, and I certainly am in the process of looking into it. A similar sort of question was put just recently, and this is certainly something that will take a day or two to provide an answer for. However, I can assure the hon. member that he will get his answer, and I was just asking for a little bit of patience.

MR. LUDWIG:

Would the minister assure the House it will get the answer before this fall sitting is over, please?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. LUDWIG:

You are not the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliffe.

Liquor Advertising

MR. DIXON:

Thank you Mr. Speaker. My question today is to the hon. the Premier in his capacity as chairman of the Executive Council. I was wondering if his government is planning to make an announcement fairly soon regarding the advertisement of alcoholic beverages on radio and TV media throughout the province?

MR. LOUGHREED:

Mr. Speaker, there is no present intention in the near future to make a comment on that matter.

67-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

MR. WYSE:

I'd like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier. Are we going to have TV coverage in the House in Friday, as there was in the spring session? I'd like to know.

MR. SPEAKER:

The answer to the hon. member's question is in the Rules.

MR. WYSE:

Is it?

DR. HORNER:

Read them.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Educational Finance

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, today I'd like to advise the House of the baselines of the government's new three-year school financing program. These baselines involve four major principles.

1. In 1973 and subsequent years, the instructional portion of the School Foundation Fund will be increased by up to 7.5 per cent. Increases in 1974 and 1975 will be related to fluctuations in the gross provincial product, or some other index of economic productivity in the province. The 7.5 per cent annual increment represents a government target in other social service delivery areas.
2. Instructional grants to school boards will be made on a per pupil basis. Per pupil grants and percentage increases in each year may vary in respect of elementary, junior high and high school pupil categories. Because grants will now be tied to each individual student, instead of groups of 26 students, some school boards may receive added funds. Under the old plan, remainders of less than 13 students received no grant. Other existing grants for such items as transportation and vocational programs will remain approximately the same.
3. In addition, an Education Opportunity Fund will be established to help introduce and improve selected educational services and programs. Emphasis will be on those services and programs which either serve the unserved, or are of benefit to all Albertans. Selection will be according to government priorities, with some reference to local expressions of need. Details and methods of payment will be announced early in the new year.
4. Controls over school board supplementary requisitions and funds raised from local taxpayers will be retained. The present plebiscite system, however, will be dropped.

Full details of the new plan, Mr. Speaker, which were based on many of the recommendations of the Minister's Advisory Committee on School Finance will be announced in January. Meanwhile, the four major guidelines are expected to provide school boards with information to plan next year's budget.

In explaining the shift to a per pupil grant, I would like to note, Mr. Speaker, that since costs are calculated on a per pupil basis, revenues should be paid in the same way. Group grants, such as we have had, in my view only serve to confuse the public and make educational finance more complex than it really is.

And what sort of controls would be instituted to replace the plebiscite? I would offer one, and perhaps a number of alternatives now being considered. That would be the petition for a vote method presently available to ratepayers under the School Buildings regulations -- one alternative of a number perhaps. Under this method, if two per cent of the ratepayers -- that's in a larger centre and there's a formula for smaller centres -- asked for, by a petition, a

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-15

public vote must be held to approve expenditures; this is only one of the options that we are considering.

With regard to the increases in foundation funds, about the 7.5 per cent, I would like to point out that Alberta now enjoys high quality education. We have one of the lowest teacher-pupil ratios in Canada, some of the best school buildings and a very convenient school transportation system, and it costs money to maintain that quality.

Further, it should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that education is a labour extensive industry and labour costs are rising faster than other costs. Some have asked from time to time how increased labour costs might be held in check while still maintaining the quality of education. I might mention two possibilities; one is differential staffing, a method which emphasizes the division of labour with payments by job level and specialty, which could lower the total labour costs. Another possibility might be the introduction of new ways of delivering education to students. Here I am thinking about the greater use of media technology, such as that proposed for the Alberta Academy in the Worth Report.

Slave Lake Veneer Mill

DR. WARRACK:

I am very pleased today to announce to members of the legislature that a new forest industry complex is being developed in the Lesser Slave Lake area of Alberta. The Edmonton based Zeidler Corporation has commenced construction of a veneer mill which will go into production in July, 1973. This will be followed immediately by a saw mill and later by a plywood plant. The complex will cost approximately \$5 million and will be located in the Mitsue industrial park near the town of Slave Lake. The veneer and saw mill plant will employ 80 people and eventually, including the saw mill, the plywood and the woodlands operation later employ a total of some 200 people when in full operation. Both spruce and poplar timber resource will be used in the operation and when in full operation the capacity will be roughly 44 million board feet.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

Non-ward Children

219. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question which was answered by Mr. Crawford as indicated.

1. How many non-ward children, who are under agreements for temporary care by virtue of the terms of The Child Welfare Act, are there in the province?

Answer: There were 457 children in non-ward care in the province on October 31, 1972.

2. Are all of these children being cared for by their lawful parents? If not, how many are being cared for by other than their lawful parents?

Answer: None. Four hundred fifty-seven children are being cared for by persons other than lawful parents.

3. What is the total amount paid for the care and clothing expenses, etc., for non-ward children from April 1, 1972 to October 1, 1972?

Answer: \$163,362.61.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

Senior Citizens Lodges

220. Mr. Cooper proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. R. Speaker.

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

A list of the ten unit additions made to the senior citizens lodges constructed in 1971 and 1972, including:

- (a) The locations and costs of each addition;
- (b) Naming the architects or designers of each addition;

67-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

- (c) Naming the contractors of each addition;
- (d) Listing the names of tenderers for construction of the additions;
- (e) Listing the names of the tenderers for the furniture and the successful one in each case;
- (f) Listing the extra facilities and improvements which were included in the new additions which were not included in the original lodges; and
- (g) Estimating a comparative quality and cost of the furniture in the extensions as compared to the original lodge.

[The motion was carried.]

Ferries

221. Mr. French proposed the following motion to the assembly, seconded by Mr. Mandeville.

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

- (1) The number and location of ferries operated by the Department of Highways and Transport for fiscal year ending March 31, 1972.
- (2) A statement showing the number of vehicles transported by each ferry for fiscal year ending March 31, 1972.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I have the pleasure to accept that motion and also table the request.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Private Schools

MR. ASHON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is my privilege to move, seconded by the hon. multicultural Member for Strathcona, as follows.

Be it resolved that, the government of Alberta consider methods of increasing their financial support to private schools in the province whose curricula include the requirements of the Department of Education.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been on the order paper for some seven months. I am delighted that I finally have this day in court, so to speak, before the legislature. I might say that I don't intend to speak very long. I hope that the hon. members can appreciate that there is a limit to the length of time I can stand on one foot.

I understand that there are several thousand students attending private schools in Alberta. One's first reaction might be that, perhaps we are discussing a matter which does not concern a large percentage of Albertans. I would submit to the hon. members that this resolution does concern the aspirations of a much larger number of Albertans than actually attend the schools. It is basically a financial problem.

The provincial government's support for private schools in Alberta is relatively new. It started in 1967, I understand, with a grant of \$100 per pupil, and was increased in 1970, to \$150. The actual cost of operating the schools, of course, is much higher. The deficit is paid by the parents. In the face of such financial penalties, one must ask the reasons why do parents continue to send their children to private schools. Now I have no children attending private schools, but I can appreciate some of their motivations. The basic reason from the inquiries I have made is that parents in Alberta seek emphasis in education which do not exist in our principal institutions. Now these desires for emphasis on education takes several forms. One form is an emphasis on a religious or cultural background.

The Edmonton Society for Christian Education is an example.

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-17

Secondly, many parents wish emphasis in education on such matters as building moral and character strength, perhaps in academic fields, discipline -- whether this be through individual sports or competitive sports. An example of this might be the St. John's School at Genesee.

There are many parents who are just generally discontented with our financial institutions. So I would suggest that the resolution really raises the problem of whether or not the provincial government should discourage, tolerate, or encourage the private school system in Alberta.

Briefly, the arguments against private schools are -- one example is that religion and culture should be banned from the schools and left to the home. Another suggestion is that they are divisive and snobbish; another one is that they were, in effect, developing inferior citizens because the school systems themselves are inferior.

Another interesting argument opposing private schools is that -- rather than just protecting the democratic rights of parents to choose the type of education they want their children to have -- they were, in effect, riding roughshod over the rights of the children by forcing them to go to schools they might not want to go to.

Another argument against private schools is, in effect, they are duplicating the school systems -- the public and separate systems -- that we already have.

Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to deal with some of these arguments, and also set out some of the rather compelling reasons as to why we should encourage private schools in this province. First of all, anyone who has a sincere belief in the value of their religion, I do not believe, can buy the argument that this factor should be anything less than a full time influence in life.

Life in school can be a dominating factor in influencing children. If you read the Worth Report, and I am sure all the hon. members have, the predictions for the life-style and values which we may be encountering would indicate that many parents would say, at this time, we probably need the influence of some of these private schools more now than ever before in our history.

The other suggestion that private schools are divisive again I submit that is not a valued argument. I would submit that there is unity in diversity. I was delighted last week when the hon. Premier reiterated the commitment of this government to a multi-cultural attitude. I firmly believe that multi-culturalism is one of Alberta's most positive assets, and private schools can do much to encourage this.

On page 47 on the Report of the Commission on Educational Planning, the so-called Worth Report, it states that one of the general goals of education in the province is "to nurture the development of personal values and a social conscience." Now the rather extensive Greely-Rossi Report -- which did not cost quite as much as the Worth Report, but it was done about 10 years ago in the United States -- studied the Catholic parochial school system down there. It found that one of the most outstanding features of these schools was its assistance towards achieving this objective set out in the Worth Report -- "to nurture the development of personal values and a social conscience." Now many of our private schools do have some of the characteristics of the Catholic parochial schools in the United States.

Going on to further objections, the suggestion that private schools are educationally inferior, I have no evidence one way or the other. However, some of them are under terrific financial pressure, and if there is any inferiority, that in itself is justification for supporting this resolution.

Going on to the matter of duplication, again there is little validity to that argument. There may be some duplication of administrative cost. As an example, the very fact that the Talmud Torah school exists in Edmonton saves the Edmonton public and separate schools the expense of building and operating approximately 10 classrooms.

Now we can go onto the issue of whether or not there is efficiency in bigness in education, but perhaps that is another issue which the hon. members may wish to discuss some other day.

In the area of cost to the taxpayer, I don't think that many members of the public understand that by having these private schools, they are saving millions of dollars every year. Now first the province saves a large sum of money by virtue of only \$150 grant when the cost to the parents is much, much larger.

67-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

Secondly, you will find in many of the private schools the per pupil expenditure is much lower. Now I might refer the hon. members to the report of the Department of Education for 1971, and we note in there that the per pupil expenditure on education in 1970-71 for city public schools was \$805.73. For city separate schools it was \$738.63. Now you will note that the public schools' expenditures are about nine per cent higher than the separate schools. Again, that is another issue which the hon. members may wish to explore some day in the future.

Dealing with the private schools you will find that the expenditures are much more dramatic in difference. For example, if you take the Edmonton public at \$805.73, and perhaps the hon. Minister of Labour can correct me on this, but that includes all expenditures, of course; but I attempted through my mathematics to determine what it was on operating costs and it appears it is somewhere between \$650 and \$700. Now if we look at some of the private schools we see that the Society for Christian Education in Calgary and Edmonton have an operating expenditure per pupil of \$378.12. It's quite a dramatic difference. We find the Prairie Bible Institute's grade school, \$254.38; the high schools, \$554.44; so this would seem to suggest that if the Prairie Bible Institute ran all our schools in the province we would cut our education budget in about half.

But I might say another positive factor about private schools is the way they can be a safety valve for education. If any Albertans become dissatisfied with government they have an out; they can always vote for one of the minority parties represented by the members opposite, or they can even vote Liberal.

Similarly, our education system must have an outlet; we must have an educational outlet for dissatisfaction with the present public institutions. The way it is now, only the rich have that outlet, because it is only those who can afford to achieve this particular type of education for their children that they want.

One cannot, of course, discuss any educational topic today without referring to the Worth Report. I will ask the indulgence of the hon. members to allow me to read about three sentences from the Report dealing with the topic of private schools. It says on page 282 near the end,

Developing a rational basis for public support of private schools and colleges is very difficult. The submission of the Association of Private Schools and Colleges in Alberta suggests that the present grant to private schools of \$150 per full-time student is sufficient to ensure the continuance of many of the well-established private schools. If this is so, then a grant of this magnitude -- with annual adjustments for inflation -- may also be appropriate in the years ahead."

So it would appear that the report disagrees with this resolution before us. I have two basic comments. Quite frankly, I am astounded with the conclusion reached at this particular point of the Report. It appears that the private schools do not need financial help. I would like to read a portion of a resolution passed by the Association of Private Schools and Colleges in Alberta which was adopted at their annual meeting in Red Deer a year ago this month. It says, and I will read the relevant parts:

Whereas the private schools are largely financed by the parents, which creates grave financial difficulties due to increasing costs of education, be it resolved that the Association of Private Schools and Colleges in Alberta urgently request 100 per cent increase in financial support for qualified private schools, effective for the school year 1971-72.

I do not understand the Worth Report on that point. The second comment I would have on the Worth Report --

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I wonder if the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell would attempt not to debate the Worth Report because, as Government Motion No. 3, this will be debated later. Reference to it the Chair would accept, but please do not debate the Worth Report at this time; debate the motion as you have presented us.

MR. ASHTON:

With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, the Worth Report is very relevant to the topic that we are discussing on private schools.

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-19

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

I accept your argument and I appreciate it, but please make reference to it because your motion is with regard to private schools and you are placing arguments that you are disagreeing or agreeing with the report that is on the Orier Paper as Government Motions No. 3.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker on the point of order. Just so we might have clarification. Would it not be satisfactory for the hon. member to use the Worth Report to prove what he wants to prove in regard to private schools?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

This is what I indicated. Use it as an example, but refrain from debate for this afternoon. I am afraid we will get into debate of the report which we have on the agenda, rather than your motion.

MR. ASHTON:

On that basis then, Mr. Speaker, I will just make one further reference to the report and then leave it, as my left leg is playing out. Again, I point out that near the end, the report disfavoured private schools it would appear, and yet, if we go to the beginning of the report where he lays out the general goals that it appears Albertans are seeking for education, he says, "personal autonomy to nurture growth towards self-hood and individual freedom, social confidence to nurture the past and to satisfying relations with others, ethical discretion to nurture the development of personal values and social concepts", and so on. Now I submit that these very goals that he outlines are the very reasons which would justify supporting private schools.

Now, again, I'll leave the Worth Report with this comment. It would appear to me that Dr. Worth had the same difficulty with his report that I had. And that is, by the time I got to the end of the report, I, too, couldn't remember what had been said at the beginning. But, Mr. Speaker, the resolution proposes that the government consider methods of increasing financial support to those private schools which are within the prescribed curricula. Now, I'm not in anyway suggesting that the public or the provincial government should assume all of the cost. I would suggest that indiscriminate splintering of our educational institutions is not in the public interest. However, healthy private schools supported by sincere parents, who are prepared to pay some cost to achieve these particular objectives that they are seeking, are essential to the public interest, and the present situation is that this cost to these parents is too high. And although the resolution doesn't speak about specific amounts, I would suggest that the resolution that was passed by the Association of Private Schools & Colleges a year ago that the grant be doubled, is very realistic, and from that point we should be considering further increases. Thank you very much.

MR. KOZIAK:

En Francais? Mr. Speaker, one of the fortunate things about having the Worth Report, and the contents of the Worth Report, is that there are quotations within the document that support both points of view. And knowing full well that members who might take the other point of view can take equal solace in the report, I refer only to those quotations which support my seconding of the motion.

I would like to refer the members to a quotation which appears on page 70 of the Worth Report dealing with the topic of 'Planned Differentiation'.

Like the church of the past, our educational system is rapidly discovering that a monopoly does not guarantee majority acceptance of rigid doctrines. However, there is still a strong tendency toward uniformity in both public and separate schools. This homogeneity often stifles both the learning and teaching process. Controlled course offerings, stereotyped teaching methods, limited learning resources, inflexible scheduling, and consonant philosophies -- all contribute to this sameness. Greater differentiation with respect to these factors, especially at the senior school level, would benefit both students and society at large.

Then dealing with the matter of private and proprietary schools on page 61, the report goes on to say:

Private and proprietary schools within their limited functions, can produce good results of considerable social consequence at relatively low costs. Sometimes they can also serve as pacesetters for public institutions." Further on the same page, "Growth in the number of private schools in Alberta in recent years has accompanied the trend towards pluralism in other aspects of our social life. Continuation of this correlative tendency is foreseen in the decades ahead."

When we think of private schools, quite often there are two types of schools that come to mind. The first is a school that serves a particular religious discipline, and the second is a school that may be set aside for a particular class of society. I don't propose to deal with private schools of those natures. However, I think that if we look into the future -- and I hearken to the title of the report which is fondly referred to as the Worth Commission, and it is A Choice of Futures. We have a future which we must look to and we have a choice. Which direction shall we go in? I look at the direction which our school system has taken us to date, a school system that primarily leads us to the universities. Yet, facts bear out that somewhere in the vicinity of approximately six per cent of the students who enter the system, ultimately enter university. Even less graduate. So we must look at a school system in the formative years of a person's life as perhaps directing us in other directions than just university.

First of all, the area of sports comes to my mind. In the last year especially, we have seen the great opportunities that are available for Canadians in professional sports. We have seen the material wealth that can be acquired by being proficient in hockey. Bobby Hull is an example. We can perhaps foresee, with more leisure in the future, a greater need for professional sportsmen; people who will show their skills to a paying public. I can foresee individuals who feel that their child may be proficient in hockey, football, baseball, or what have you, that these individuals might well desire a private school that would give their child the basic curriculum that is set out by the Department of Education, but at the same time concentrate on such areas as hockey or football. There are innumerable sports. So, at the time that that particular child completes his Grade XII, not only does he have the same educational standards as most individuals who have completed Grade XII in this province, but also he would be extremely proficient in a certain area. That would be in sports.

Now that individual need not go on and play professional sports. Again, looking to the future and the direction in which we are going -- more leisure time -- and at the same time hearkening back to the social forecasts in the Worth Report (such forecasts as rising mental illness, crime, drug abuse, alcoholism, which to a certain extent can relate to an inability to use properly one's leisure time) I think we have to look in that direction in the future; schools that will prepare an individual to use leisure. I feel that sports is an area where leisure can be put to good use, to the benefit of the individual, mentally and physically.

We all recall the Cultural Heritage Conference which was held in June of this year under the splendid leadership of the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation, Horst Schmid, and I attended that conference, Mr. Minister, and I must congratulate you on the excellent job you did.

I have read through the resolutions of the various committees that developed, and these were committees, Mr. Speaker, that didn't speak to specific, planned, programs. These were people who got together and developed their own concerns, developed their own solutions for these concerns, and presented them as a total document. Mr. Speaker, concerns that were developed show that a number of people are concerned about the learning of languages; the learning of the language of their forefathers, and the learning of languages of others which form the partnership of Canada. I think it was five years of French that I took in the system that now teaches languages, and Mr. Speaker, I'm not fluent in that language. This condemnation is borne out again by "A Choice of Futures." On page 189:

The crucially important thing is that we stop playing around with language study and make it possible for children and adults to become truly fluent in the language they wish to learn - be it Cree, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Ukrainian, or whatever. The tokenism of today is not good enough.

I marvel, Mr. Speaker, at the people I have met from Europe with a European education who can speak fluently a number of languages -- four, five, six, seven, eight, going through the same school system, but with a different approach. It may be that there is a group of people out there that would be willing to set up a private school which would include all of the curriculum

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-21

that may be required by the Department of Education, but would guarantee to the family, to the parents, that if their children proceed through that school, they would become fluent in one, two, three, or four additional languages, and in addition have completed the same educational requirements as anybody else in a public or separate school. There is music; there is ballet; there is dancing; singing; means of expression, Mr. Speaker, which enable the person to properly use their leisure time. These are means which will permit an individual to take greater enjoyment of the life that he has here.

I can foresee a group of interested individuals setting up a private school, again teaching all of the requirements of the Department of Education, but at the same time saying, "Mr. and Mrs. Parent, or parents, you enroll your child in this school and we assure you that at the expiration of the nine years or twelve years, your child will be able to sing, play five or six musical instruments, and enjoy and appreciate music." How many parents today are spending money on music lessons, piano lessons, singing lessons, over and above the normal school requirements? And how many people are acquiring proficiency in music because of the additional facilities that are available, only because their parents make those available to them at an extra expense -- facilities that might not be available to poorer people? If financial support were given equally on a per pupil basis to private schools, as to public schools, that choice would be theirs at no added expense.

What about life styles? What about being prepared for life? Having life skills? How many people who graduate from a high school with a high school diploma can fill in their own income tax return? How many people are aware of all the good qualities and all the bad qualities of alcohol, of drugs? I mean truly aware? How many are prepared to enter into family life on a meaningful basis; people who can cope with economic problems, with legal problems, and Lord knows that the law grows in leaps and bounds with every year. How many people who leave grade 12 know anything about the law? Perhaps a group of people may consider such matters as consumer knowledge and the other items that I have listed -- life skills, etc. -- important, so important that they might be prepared to set up a private school which would not only teach the students in that school the basic requirements of the Department of Education, but also prepare them for life. It's an exciting possibility, and the possibilities, Mr. Speaker, in continuing, are unlimited as long as we look to the future.

There may be financial problems in this respect; I am not sure that there are, I am not sure that they are not. A proper study in this regard may reveal some very important information, but one thing that I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, and I can read into the figures that Mr. Ashton has given us, is that where parents and people are interested in setting up something that they feel is a worthwhile goal, it's amazing the amount of free time that is donated, the amount of ability that is donated, and this is where the dollars go down. So that if you can interest the parents and you can interest the communities in private schools -- well, they've got something that brings stars to their eyes -- I think we can see a direction in the other way, Mr. Speaker, rather than the incline that we are used to.

There are other possibilities. As our cities grow out and our centre cores change, as the people move out and children move out, we find schools which are no longer attended and we build new schools on the peripheries of the cities and towns. Perhaps some of these old schools can be used for exactly this purpose; for the creation of these private schools thereby reducing the requirements on the periphery for the construction of classrooms.

There are numerous possibilities -- in the few minutes that I've got here -- and the resources that are available to me personally, I can't determine whether or not financially this is feasible, but I think that if we are concerned about the future, Mr. Speaker, it would be well worth seriously considering the possibilities of using grants on a per pupil basis, as suggested in the news release that we heard today and the announcement made by the hon. minister, and not limiting that just to the schools that we know today, the public and separate schools, but also to the independent schools as suggested in some of the information that appeared in the boxes of the members this afternoon from the Camrose Lutheran College. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West followed by the hon. Member for Camrose.

67-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take just a few minutes to comment on the motion that is before us today. At the outset, I want to indicate very clearly that I am in favour of the motion as put today. I am in favour of public support for approved private schools; I think that we have to make that distinction. I think that the motion indicates that the curriculum should be an approved curriculum, and I am in favour as long as it is an approved private school.

The problem that I have with the motion is that it calls for a study, but I am most concerned that if it is passed as it is, and I presume that it could be, the study will be incomplete and this bothers me a little. If we really want a good study, a thorough study, I think we should pass motion No. 14 which will take a real good look at the whole concept of a choice of schools for parents and for children, not only private schools as mentioned here. So this is one of the weaknesses in the problem that I see with the motion, but nevertheless it would be a start and I would certainly support it for that reason.

We now recognize private schools as has been indicated. They get this very token, and I emphasize the word token, recognition now, of \$150 per pupil per year. Now a choice of schools is desirable, but a choice on this basis is really only open to the upper and middle-class people. It isn't open to all people in our society. There isn't really a choice there when you have to dig up that much extra. I believe that parents, if they want to send their children to private schools, of course, should pay something, because this establishes particular value that they have, and they should be and usually are, prepared to pay something for that which is something extra.

One of the big things about supporting private schools, I think, it is a real benefit to the total problem, to the total educational system. There is no school that is more innovative, that is more imaginative, simply because of necessity, than what private schools are. I hope in the minister's statement today, when he talks about this Educational Opportunity Fund, which looks like a rebirth of the innovative projects, will very seriously consider allowing private schools to take advantage of any benefit that might be arrived from that particular fund, however it is set up. I think this is very important.

Now, President Nixon in the United States raises this question of support for private schools on a frequent basis but he always runs into this road block of the constitutional problem -- every once in a while it comes up and then the Court says, "Whoops! sorry boy! we have a constitutional problem!" and it dies right there.

There has been the suggestion made there that at least they get tax relief. You know, I think these people who are educating children on their own behalf, the least the province could do to give them a donation receipt for income tax purposes, because, they are in fact, saving the taxpayers of the province a lot of money. So I think there should be some recognition of this.

The point is, Mr. Speaker, and I have to re-emphasize, the real solution to this problem isn't just saying we are going to give more money to private schools, because how much is the right amount? How are you going to determine it? And I am submitting that the closest way to solve this problem, and nearest to the perfect solution, is the voucher system as I have suggested earlier. I think we have to embark on that type of study if we are really interested in our parents and our children having some sort of choice in the type of education that they want, and also putting the public system, the tax supported systems, in the position where they have to compete for their clientele. I think this is really a worthwhile project.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that my friend, who is a former school trustee, has brought this forward. I think it is worthy of support, I hope that we will pass it, but that we will do as I suggested. Let's go farther on this and do a proper and thorough study, not only for private schools, but let's talk about this whole area of how we can let the per pupil grant follow the student and not worry too much about the capital grant. I don't think the private schools even care about capital development. There are prepared to look after that. But they should get the benefit of the taxes they pay towards school taxes, should go to themselves.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to move an amendment to Resolution No. 1, the addition of the words 'and colleges' after the word 'schools,' and this is seconded by the hon. Member for Stettler.

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-23

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

It has been moved by the hon. Member for Camrose, seconded by the hon. Member for Stettler the following amendment ...

MR. CLARK:

We are not voting on this right now, are we?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

No, I am just presenting the amendment --- the additions of the words 'and colleges' after the word 'schools.'

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to my amendment on behalf of the private and post secondary schools in Alberta, which include Camrose Lutheran College, Canada Junior College, and Concordia College; these colleges, that have made such an outstanding contribution to the field of education and to their own areas, are now facing such financial difficulties that one of these colleges may be forced to close its doors. Their financial difficulty, Mr. Speaker, can easily be pointed out. Their problem is that the grant does not follow the student. The grant should follow the student for operation, not capital.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out that last year the colleges received approximately \$400,000 in gifts and grants from their constituent bodies, friends, and alumni. In that these funds were used for operational and not for capital expenditures for which they were designed, because the grant no longer followed the student, Mr. Speaker I maintain that the grant must follow the student. It almost did once, but now the disparity in the grant is out of proportion by over \$600 per student.

Mr. Speaker, in 1967 and 1968 the private colleges received a \$900 grant and the public colleges received \$1,050. This year the grant to the private colleges is \$1,100, and to the public colleges \$1700. In the case of Grande Prairie for 1970 their grant was \$2300 per student, or \$1200 difference.

Mr. Speaker, these institutions are vital to the entire education process, in that 17 per cent of the university transfer students in the college system were educated last year at the Camrose Lutheran College. These colleges together educate 24 per cent of the university transfer students in the college system.

Mr. Speaker, they all have vital and essential residential high school programs. In fact, a number of the programs are serving as catalysts for the private sector benefit. Mr. Speaker, the quality of education has always been a concern for these colleges. Their curricula and professors are all approved by the University of Alberta. Camrose Lutheran College has had an affiliated agreement since 1959, one of the first institutions in the province to do so.

Its academic reputation in the university is outstanding. Its students do well. A number of the alumni are distinguished and noted Canadians, such as Dr. Chester Ronning and Dr. Buck.

DR. BUCK:

Agreed.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, there are over 60 years of progressive public service in the education at the Camrose Lutheran College alone, and over 170 years for the three private colleges named. For a province with only 67 years of history, that is quite a contribution.

Mr. Speaker, these colleges have always welcomed the demand for the highest academic standard possible, and they are open to any qualified student who wishes to attend. Again, Mr. Speaker, may I point out that the saving to the government in the past has been immense. Cost on a per student basis for operational and for capital for government, would have increased by \$600,000 and a maximum of \$1,200,000 if these University transfer students had entered the public colleges or the Universities. If the Department of Advanced Education would allow the grant to follow the student, it would cost the government an additional \$200,000 but would be a very very sound investment. After all, Mr.

67-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

Speaker, that \$200,000 only represents, in the Highways Minister's budget, one-half mile of pavement.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a moment on what the Camrose Lutheran College's survival means to my constituency, and to East Central Alberta. When you have a college that has served the education needs of an area for sixty-seven years, it becomes a tradition. It is a vital industry to the city of Camrose and if given the opportunity will grow considerably.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak both to the amendment and to the motion itself. Is that all right?

MR. SPEAKER:

Go ahead.

MR. LEE:

First of all I would congratulate my colleagues on the very fluent preparation that they have presented to us today. I, myself, in my Grade XII year had the opportunity in fact, to attend the sister school of the Camrose College in Saskatchewan, the Lutheran Collegiate Bible Institute and I have been able to personally experience some of the real benefits that you gain from attendance at a private school. Some of the elements of community that you can never get within the public system itself. These schools have a very traditional, meaningful, contribution to make to the education system at large and, like my colleague Mr. Ashton, I am somewhat dismayed by the treatment of this whole area of private schools, private sector, within the Worth Report, and I feel disturbed to a certain extent that it was not dealt with more adequately.

I support the amendment that has been presented as an extension, perhaps, of the original motion which was a rather limiting type of motion, limiting this to schools. The amendment has now expanded this to include colleges. I'd like to expand this even further, and speak not so much of the private school and the private college, but the extensions that can be further made into the entire private sector, and its whole contribution to the whole field of education. And I want to speak basically in five areas here and none of these will be in the institutional sense. In each of these cases what I will be doing is supporting, supporting this extension of the use of the private sector in educational program and educational implementations. First of all let me indicate about five areas beyond the private schools and the private colleges that are now utilized in educational programming, most of these to a very limited degree, almost haphazardly in an accidental way.

First of all we have a certain amount of use of the private sector now in programs, such as work experience, training in industry, training on the job, and the apprenticeship system. In each one of these cases we have a co-operative arrangement between the public sector and the private sector. For instance, in the case of apprenticeship, for a certain number of weeks in the year the student will attend a technical institute or a college, and for the remainder of that time under a contract arrangement, will work in industry. And it has proved through the years in Alberta to be a very happy marriage.

We have a reputation throughout the world, in the preparation of skilled tradesmen, that is very highly regarded. In training and industry we enter into contracts, for instance, with private companies; an example of this might be in the Grande Cache area where we have entered into contracts there. To use facilities and resources in the training of miners, and this type of thing, once again is a co-ordination of resources between the public and the private sectors.

The commission on Educational Planning has recommended more extension into what we call work experience programs. And the implementation of this would mean that students might attend a public school for a certain time, a certain amount of the day, and then go into an industrial setting. It might be a printing shop; it might be any number of industrial settings, and, therefore, get a combination of a practical with a general kind of education -- a very forward type of recommendation.

When we look at the training on the job, one of things I liked that Canada Manpower Corporation has initiated in these last few years is a very real emphasis in training on the job, one that I feel we can follow as a province. Just to give you an example. How best can we educate a person who is physically handicapped? Well in the past we have assumed that we should build sheltered

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-25

workshops, that we should send them -- almost 'ghettoize' their education -- but if we were to extend into, say, a training on the job type of concept, where we take individuals, work them in almost as an apprenticeship with an employer, perhaps we can aid their total, not only vocational but personal development in this sense. And I go on record as supporting to a very great degree, an extension of this whole aspect of industry and the public sectors combination.

I think we can go beyond this too, not just speaking on actual contracts type of thing. I think we have to use more advisory types of activities with industry. Those of you who have had experience, for instance, with program developments at NAIT and SAIT can see the very extensive use of the advisory capacity that is being used in the development of their programs, and the very great pride, in fact, that people from industry take in developing these programs, keeping a quality control emphasis on the programs that are occurring there. This is the type of emphasis that could be spread throughout our colleges, our universities, in a much more extensive manner. As it is now it is SAIT and NAIT.

We can involve industry and people from the private sector in the whole instructional procedure. Why do we have to go in all cases to certificated teachers, to full-time staff within our educational institutions? I think that those of you who have been in teaching will see the very great impact that it has upon a group of children, a group of students, when you bring in someone from the industry -- an alderman, a policeman, any number of people -- and the very great contribution that this makes to the classroom situation. We would want to see an expansion of this.

But let's not let it happen in a haphazard way, more of an emphasis on an individual teacher. Perhaps we could emphasize it more within our total educational system and integrate this type of thing. Once again, this is recommended to a certain degree in the Commission's report.

One experience, or one insight that I think those of us who are on the Special Committee on Professions and Occupations have been able to ascertain is the very real emphasis that is growing within our professional, our volunteer, and our occupational associations in what we call program development. Now professional development, these people are seeking assistance. I can remember one day speaking to the Veterinarian's Association, and their very real emphasis on professional development. And here is another area where our private emphasis through these associations can be tied to the public post-secondary institutions and the development of program of post-graduates or certification programs for them.

Finally, one other area that we do see function to a certain extent now, is the use of private contracting within education. This has occurred, to a certain extent, in the United States and I'm not so sure I agree with the kind of very extensive contracting they have used. We can use private contracting to a lesser degree. I worked with Mount Royal College and the example there is that they have contracted their musical program out to a private concern. This has been a very healthy addition to their program. Those of you who are acquainted with adult education programs know that every time they bring in an instructor, he is a private contractor. They are bringing in somebody who will teach a course in lapidary or in perhaps Mandarin Chinese. He is not a member of the regular staff in a lot of cases. It is a private contract outside.

These are just some of the things we now do in the use of the private and public combinations and co-ordinations. I would recommend that we expand this kind of an emphasis. As I earlier said, I think right now it is almost a tentative accidental approach to education and one that I think we should take a much more conscience approach to.

I was delighted last year to be associated with the Priority Employment Training Program. I would like to relate to you how this program put it all together. It really did. It brought together a combination of the public and the private sector. As an example, the use of private schools. One of the great contributing schools in the province was Alberta College through their programming specifically for this particular program. In the case of an advisory type of capacity, each of the colleges was put in the situation last year where they had to draw very quickly upon resources. I was amazed at the very quick manner in which they brought together resources from the community. I think of an example of a program called Motor Transportation which was basically a truck-driving course. This course was developed by Mount Royal College and was taught by instructors. Both of the instructors used to own transport lines. They were using something like six trucks which were donated by private industry. They were using instructors on, perhaps, a one week basis. They came in and taught the course. The only person, I think, who was really

67-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

involved in it at the college was the person who was co-ordinating for the college. It was almost a private type of thing. It worked very well.

I just want to reiterate by quickly making about five proposals.

(1) I would propose that we expand the concept of the use of co-ordination between the private and the public sector, recognizing and consulting the private sector in total programming and implementation in the educational area. I would say that this should not occur only in a supplementary sense, but very often in a replacement sense; in those areas where we may not want to employ a full-time staff to do this.

(2) I would propose that our public institutions (school boards, colleges, and universities) be encouraged to develop a community services concept; a community services division which will work with industry and the private sector. I refer here to Ontario, for instance, where they have developed this within their public colleges. They have three functions occurring within community services division. One of them is to develop short courses; short non-credit recreational courses. A second division here works with professional and occupational groups. The third one is programmed strictly for training in industry, working closely with Canada Manpower and their vocational manpower development capacities at the provincial level.

(3) I would recommend an extension of the use of advisory committees in all areas of educational programming. This one, I think, is vital. If we're going to prepare students for work in certain areas, then let's involve the people or the employers who are going to employ these people. Let's not assume that our full-time academic staff can adequately prepare curriculum in these areas.

(4) I would recommend a more expanded use of industrial facilities, staff, and resources in educational implementation.

(5) I would recommend a more extensive use of the principle of internship in all programs of vocational preparation.

Just briefly, in this area we have now for instance, in the preparation of lawyers, doctors, an articling, internship type of activity. I would hope that we could expand this to most of our vocational preparational programs and perhaps this would, to a certain degree, lessen the total general education aspects, the total institutional length of training. I must say at this point that I am delighted to see the development of a Manpower Development Program in Manpower and Labour, because I think that a lot of this planning and leadership, these liaisons with industry, can come from here. I hope that we would retain this emphasis also, with Advanced Education through a further education division, or perhaps the retention of a vocational education division, whatever the extent would be. I would hope that we would retain the very extensive contributions that have been made within the agricultural division through agricultural extension programs and their very extensive liaisons with farmers and farmers' groups.

I would like to propose then these recommendations in support of both the amendment of this motion and the motion itself.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the amendment, I recognize that it is almost 4:30 and that at 4:30 we move into Private Bills. I'll really try to condense my remarks so that perhaps anyone else who wants to speak on this matter can speak quickly and then we could perhaps get a vote on this particular resolution. It is possible that it won't come up again this session.

Let me say at the outset that I support the amendment that has been made by the hon. Member for Camrose. Let me say very directly that I support the principle of the grant following the student. It is interesting to note that the federal government -- the former federal government or the present federal government, depending on who has the most seats right now -- in the last two or three years, gave serious consideration to the grant following students as far as post-secondary education is concerned. I think it is a valid principle, and one that I hope the assembly will support.

Just one other comment in that area, and that is that I would hope that the members of the assembly would seriously consider the remarks made by the Member for Camrose concerning the Camrose College. I think it has made a contribution

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-27

to the province, and I would urge the government certainly to give it support at this time, and if special support is needed, I think it would indeed be very appropriate.

If I could move on to two other areas quickly, Mr. Speaker, one is the question of government support and educators' support for the private school system. I think we must recognize that if the government is to move in this direction and have equality in the type of support between the private and public school systems, or independent school systems, that in fact this is going to have to be a decision that's made by the politicians and is not going to be a decision recommended by the professional educators. Professional educators, with all due respect to them, are people who have gone through the public school system or the separate school system. Generally speaking, in fact in very large terms, they are not supporters of the private school systems. I don't say that critically, but that is a fact of life, and if we are going to move in the area of giving good and substantial support to the private school system and the private college system, it's going to have to be a decision that is made at the cabinet level, and at the level of the legislative assembly, because the initiative is not going to come from the civil servants.

The last point that I would want to make, Mr. Speaker, deals with another cultural conference which was held somewhat earlier than the conference which the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona alluded to. This conference was headed, I believe, by the former Provincial Secretary, Mr. Holowach. I would just like to draw attention to the statement which Mr. Strom, the Premier at that time, made, on page 5 where this statement is included: "My government is prepared to consider financial assistance on a per pupil basis to ethno-cultural groups in the conduct of their own private schools. To this end it will take steps to obtain a thorough study of such schools, and this will help to determine the level of support, relative to the annual grant for each private school pupil." I think this puts on record very clearly the position of the members on this particular side of the House. And so in the hope that we can vote on this amendment and motion today, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just one or two comments, because I support this resolution very much, the amendment and the resolution. I think the arguments have been very well covered by the movers and seconders and the other speakers, but I do think there is another point that should be emphasized, and that is that where a private school reduces the load of either the public school or the separate school system, it is really grossly unfair for that load to be carried by parents, even though they may wish to have their children in a private school or may be forced to have their children in a private school.

Actually, I am thinking of a school such as St. Mary's Salician School in North Edmonton with which many members are acquainted. Many of the boys who are sent to that school are boys who were not able to be looked after to the satisfaction of the parents in the public school system, and consequently they had little choice. They either had to send their youngster to a school where they got individual specialized treatment by highly trained teachers, or their children became dropouts. So there is really not much choice and yet they have to pay their regular taxation, and pay something extra.

I would like to see private schools receive -- where a private school is, in the opinion of the Department of Education, effectively reducing the cost on other schools -- the same grant as the other schools or a proportional amount compared to the amount of the reduction of that load from the private or public school system. I think that would be fair, I don't think we should use the private school system in order to save money at the expense of the parents who want to do the best thing for their children, and really sometimes it becomes the only chance of that child becoming a citizen who can contribute to society.

There is one other point that I would like to emphasize. That is the right that is contained in the Human Rights Charter of the United Nations; the prior right of educating children rests with the parents and the choice of school, providing that school meets the curriculum of the Department concerned, should rest with the parents. I think too long now we have been getting away from the point that the parents shouldn't have very much to say about the school to which their own children are going. At one time this was the number one requirement. I think we should get back to that, where the parent has practically everything to say, within reason of course -- practically everything to say as to what school his child should go. That's a sound philosophy and I think the fact that it is part of the Human Rights Charter is worthy of consideration as part of the educational system of this province.

67-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

The question on the amendment, are you ready for the question on the amendment?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The amendment adds the word 'and colleges' so that the resolution would then read: Be it resolved that the government of Alberta consider methods of increasing their financial support to private schools and colleges in this province whose curricula include the requirements of the Department of Education.

[The amendment was carried without dissent.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question on the main motion?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I beg leave to adjourn debate on the main motion.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I believe there was a roster of speakers taken by the Deputy Speaker and I think that since we are relying on him to call speakers in that order someone else should adjourn debate.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I thought there were no more speakers and I did wish to be able to make a few remarks in future, but others on the roster... I would be happy to defer to such other as in next on the roster to adjourn debate at this time.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think my name is on the roster, but if no one else will adjourn the debate I would certainly do so.

MR. SPEAKER:

If the House is not ready for the question on the motion as amended and the hon. Government House Leader has asked for leave to adjourn the debate, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Bill No. 208: The Corporate Farming Act

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to move second reading of this bill, I would point out that I could hope today we could have a discussion of the principles contained herein. I appreciate that there will no doubt be some differences over the clauses as such, but it is the basic principle that I believe is important to discuss at this time.

Might I say, Mr. Speaker, that the bill is based on three central assumptions. Assumption number one is that it is desirable to arrive at a genuine balance of ownership within our economy. There are some things that are better publicly owned. There are some things that are better owned by corporations, co-operatives, but there are certain areas of the economy where ownership by individual Canadians is by far the most preferable approach.

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-29

The second assumption is that if we are going to talk about preserving rural life in the largest sense, in talking about the villages and the towns, even the smaller cities, we may say a lot about decentralizing industry, but the most important thing we can do to preserve rural life, is to maintain the family farm. The third assumption is that the long run interest of consumers in this country is tied to the continuation of agricultural production by a large number of family farm operations. I cannot imagine any greater power that large corporations could ever gain, than to get control of the production of food. It is my view that the question of reasonable food prices in the future, for all the people of Canada, will be answered by whether or not we save the family farm.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you hear a great deal about whether or not small family farms are really efficient. In the last 20 years, there has been a good deal of talk about the need for bigness in operations, and there have been some who have even gone as far as to suggest that corporate farming is a more efficient way of developing agriculture in this country. I suppose it depends what kind of yardstick you use, Mr. Speaker, in answering this question. I suppose if you look just at the efficient utilization of capital, large farms are the best. Perhaps corporate farming is desirable if you are talking about more efficient utilization of a very expensive combine, or highly expensive, costly equipment.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the factors of production, land, capital, and labour, and we look at the other two factors, we look at the efficient utilization of the land, and the efficient utilization of labour, then we come to a totally different conclusion, because all the available evidence that I have been able to gather is that if we are talking about using the land is the most productive capacity possible, the family farm operation is clearly the most efficient way to get the maximum production per acre. And when we look at the question of the proper utilization of labour, I am not just talking about the direct inter-relationship of labour capital and the land, but I am talking about the total utilization of labour including the social cost, quite clearly, maintaining a large number of independent private operators in the agricultural economy is absolutely necessary.

I suggest then that when you consider the balance sheet quite clearly the family farm must be preserved. It is time, in my view, Mr. Speaker, that society must reject this idea, this dehumanizing idea that bigness is somehow synonymous with progress. Sometimes in my judgment, bigness is synonymous with insensitivity and with a dehumanizing process which downgrades the people concerned in a particular pursuit.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think most of the members to this point, can probably concur with the arguments that I have advanced. But let me go one step further and take just a moment to ask how big a problem do we face in our province and in Canada today? Just across the border from my constituency a group of American promoters were designing a very large corporate farm which would, in the process, buy out some 180 farmers in the North Peace and British Columbia. It is my understanding that this operation has now fallen through. But the fact of the matter was, in one single stroke, 180 farmers could have been replaced by this giant integrated corporation. I know that in other parts of the Peace River country and Alberta Marathon Realities have purchased large tracks of land. But I suppose that one of the best arguments for outlining the concern is contained in a brief presented to the Saskatchewan Government by the National Farmers' Union on their Bill No. 115. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. members realize that Bill No. 115 presented to the Saskatchewan Legislature was one designed to stop absentee ownership of farm land. But the NFU says, and I would like to quote from that brief if I can to back up my argument.

We believe that the greatest threat to the family farm and to rural communities is the encroachment into the field of farm production by industrial corporations and other off farm interests. It is generally conceded that the most acceptable and efficient form of production for farm commodities is the family farm unit. Management decisions are flexible and the operator has a personal interest in careful and timely application of agricultural procedures within the production unit.

The brief goes on to point out the creeping tentacle of expanding involvement in monopoly control of food production by large corporations continues to grow, a trend, which if allowed to prevail, will repeatedly cause chaotic conditions for farmers and, in the long run, the consumers. I think it is very important, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the question of legislation to control corporate farming that we recognize the long run implications for urban consumers.

67-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

Judge James Ross in his report of the inquiry into the egg industry in Ontario expresses our views on page 71 and 72 of his report where he says:

The gradual concentration of ownership and decision making into the hands of relatively few, large, diversified companies proves unfair competition to independent producers in the short run. These companies are in a better position to produce eggs at a loss for extended periods of time because this is usually only a small part of the total operation, and they can use the returns from other branches as a cushion.

The brief then discusses that point and makes several other observations. I just quote from the last paragraph from this brief:

We emphasize that governments at every level should regulate to prevent the take-over and control of the means of food production, processing, or marketing at any level by corporations.

In this respect there is clear evidence indicating that large, foreign corporations are becoming dominant in the Canadian dairy industry.

The brief then goes on to discuss that point in somewhat more detail.

Mr. Speaker, not too long ago one of the farm publications carried an article by Mr. Guy Halverson, writing for the Christian Science Monitor. Mr. Halverson is dealing with the problems posed by corporate farming in the United States. For the benefit of the hon. members Mr. Speaker, I want to quote a few excerpts from Mr. Halverson's article because it reveals the extent of corporate farming in the great republic to the south of us. I quote:

Despite what many farm critics believe to be indifference and apathy of government and academic circles, corporate penetration into farming has tended to become more and more pronounced over the past several decades, and seems likely to become more so. To assume that the family farm will not be further affected or damaged would be not only to misread the deep changes in agriculture since the New Deal, but perhaps many believe, could be risky as well.

Corporate America is now a full partner in the farm economy. The time to re-examine unemotionally, carefully -- and then define -- the proper limits of that economic penetration is very important.

The article goes on to point out some of the area that has been taken over by corporate penetration. For good or bad, U.S. farmers now include such industry giants as Dow Chemical, International Telephone and Telegraph, Boeing, Coca-Cola, Standard Oil of California, The Bank of America, some giants need little introduction; Swift and Co. in meats, Consolidated Foods, and a number of others without going down the list. A recent Ralph Nader task force report charged that 19 corporations own about twenty-one per cent of California's timber land and 21 corporations own about twenty-one per cent of Florida's crop land. In California according to other sources, it is estimated 31 per cent of the agricultural land is in corporate hands. Quite clearly Mr. Speaker, there is a growing problem in the United States and a problem, which I submit to the members of this assembly, is beginning to grow steadily more serious in Canada as well.

What steps are necessary? Again, I suspect that most of the hon. members, regardless of their political ideology, will agree with me that there is a growing problem. What steps are necessary? I would suggest to the members of this assembly that a minimum step would be the establishment of a study on vertical integration so that we have more facts and figures as to just what the trends are right here in our own province. And I suggest that whether this assembly approve the principle of the bill I am presenting or not, at least a study or some form of monitoring system is a reasonable step in the right direction. But I submit that legislation is necessary, and the bill I have presented to you is modelled on The Corporate Farming Act introduced many years ago in the State of North Dakota. As a matter of fact it was introduced and passed by the North Dakota State Legislature in 1932, some 40 years ago. Under the terms of that legislation, the corporations were given ten years to divest their holdings. The history of that legislation is worthy of note, Mr. Speaker, because, although it was passed 40 years ago, the matter arose four years ago in 1968 when the Chamber of Commerce in the State of North Dakota lobbied and persuaded the state legislature to have a plebiscite on the reappeal of the Corporate Farming Bill. At that time there was a great debate in the State of North Dakota and as a result of a large vote in the rural counties of North Dakota the statute remains on the statute books of North Dakota. It seems to me that that is an important thing to remember, Mr. Speaker, because the bill was

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-31

introduced in the first sweeping era of the New Deal, and perhaps it could be argued that what made sense back in 1932 is no longer relevant in recent American history, but quite obviously the farmers of North Dakota didn't agree with that, and when they were given the chance to vote on their corporate farming protection legislation they made sure that it was retained on the statute books.

Now there are several other points that I want to raise with respect to action that is being taken in the United States on the corporate farming question. It is not just the fact that North Dakota has this legislation and several other states as a matter of fact, there are a total of four states that have various types of legislation but in addition to that there have been recent moves in the United States Congress, and again I quote from Mr. Halverson's article in the Christian Science Monitor.

The so-called family-farm act of 1972, introduced by Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D) of Wisconsin, would amend the Clayton Anti-Trust Act to drive corporate farming from agriculture.

Any individual or corporation with more than \$3 million in non-farm enterprises or more than \$1 million of stock or shares in one or more non-farm businesses would have to divest agriculture holdings. Farmer co-operatives, charitable and non-profit research groups would be excluded.

Rep. James Abourezk (D) of South Dakota, a co-sponsor of the act, says the measure is essential farm legislation.

In addition to the Gaylord Nelson Act which is before the Congress of the United States, Mr. Speaker, One other bill that would strike at the very heart of corporate farming is the Reclamation Lands Authority Act, introduced by Sen. Fred R. Harris (D) of Oklahoma, a longtime opponent of corporate farming. The bill would enforce the Federal Reclamation Act of 1902, which limits the amount of land for which a landowner may receive federally irrigated water to 160 waters.

Under the controversial Harris bill, excess land would be purchased by the federal government at pre-irrigation prices and sold or leased at post-irrigation prices with profits to be used for education and conservation and for the economically disadvantaged.

Now, Mr. Speaker, without going into greater detail in outlining the efforts that are being made in the United States of America, it's quite clear that the Americans are concerned about the penetration of corporate farming into the traditional preserve of agriculture, and that in some states they have already taken action and the American Congress is, at least, deliberating options.

Mr. Speaker, it can be argued, and no doubt it will be argued in the course of this debate, that there is really no point in bringing in a bill of this nature until we have more evidence. But when we find out that there is a serious problem, then perhaps we can act, and to act before would be acting in far too hasty a fashion.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you, that the suggestion I am making with respect to this bill is very similar to The Public Lands Act. I happen to be a member of the committee studying The Public Lands Act, and it is quite clear, to date anyway, that a very small portion of the public lands in Alberta had, in fact been, sold to non-Canadian residents. Almost an infinitesimal portion had been sold to non-Canadian residents. I think most of the members of that committee agreed with the principle of Bill No. 107 because we felt that an ounce of prevention was really worth a pound of cure. That the problem was not one which faced us today, but it was one which we recognized was probably going to grow in importance tomorrow.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the same arguments apply to The Corporate Farming Act that I am presenting today. While the evidence is not overwhelming, nevertheless when you look at the trends elsewhere in Canada, when you look at the trends in the United States, and when you see that other jurisdictions are beginning to act, then, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that it behooves us carefully to evaluate whether we should act too. And I submit we should. I don't suggest to this legislature that were we to pass second reading in principle, we should immediately go forward -- not that this is likely in any event, but theoretically it is -- and that we go through Committee of the Whole and third reading. But probably the best approach would be to pass it in principle and then let the farm organizations comment on it. I know that at least one of the farm organizations is fully behind the principle of legislation

67-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

in this respect, and I know that many other members of the other major farm organizations are concerned about the question, too.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would be deceiving the members of this legislature were I to suggest that simply passing a bill modelled on North Dakota legislation is in any way a panacea to solve the problems of the family farm. Because we know this is just not true. I think if we are going to preserve the family farm unit in Alberta, we are going to do that in Canada; we are talking about a whole range of things. We are talking about increased emphasis on marketing; we are talking about a price that is related to the cost of production. We're talking about a reasonable and sensible transportation policy that rejects this idiotic abandonment of rail-lines which are going to force farmers to add to their hauling costs to truck grain to delivery points that are now 10, 15, or 20 miles further than they would be otherwise because of the rail-line abandonment. We're talking about a whole series of things. But, I submit, one of the things we must consider in the total picture (and not look at it as a panacea) but one of the ingredients we must consider carefully is whether or not some measure of legislative protection is necessary. Mr. Speaker, after reviewing the situation, it is my view that The Anti-Corporate Farming Act that I presented with the exemptions for family farm corporations and for co-operative organizations, is one which is well worth the time of this House to consider, and, in a small way, would help to defend a type of agriculture which, in turn, would contribute to the preservation of a very important way of life in our country.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter the debate long enough to make a few comments with regard to some reservations I have about certain portions of the bill, and make a few comments also about ways in which this legislature and this government might, in fact, might proceed with our desire to preserve what has been referred to as the family farm.

I would like, first of all, to suggest to the hon. members that most of you and all of rural Alberta, at least, should have concerns about the definition of a farmer as it is described in the act. Only yesterday I was talking with a fairly large farmer in this province who has incorporated his farm some years ago. He has reduced his land holdings and is prepared to put some of this income derived from that into an agricultural processing business. That, in my opinion, is one of the ways in which farmers in this province are moving in order to preserve the family farm and the farm income. I would suggest that that farmer, if he is fortunate enough to invest in a good agricultural processing industry and finds himself in that unenviable category of deriving more than 20 per cent of his income from the results of his efforts to preserve the family farm in Alberta, could be forced to sell his land under the terms of this act.

That is just one of the areas and situations that you can get into when you get into passing specific legislation which says, 'thou shalt not do something'. I would prefer, Mr. Speaker, that there be some way in which we could take a, perhaps, more positive attitude and maybe write some legislation or do some things in government.

I would like to expand on some of the things we have done. We would preserve the family farm rather than strictly limit those who might be involved in agriculture. I suggest also that when you say directly in the bill that the farmer is defined as, "one whose principal occupation is farming", you're suggesting that probably more than 50 per cent of his income should come from farming. Many people who own land in rural Alberta (and there are some in my constituency and some in neighbouring constituencies) do not live in the northern half of the province. They, in fact, live elsewhere; maybe in large cities. In my view, absentee farmers or absentee land owners are perhaps as big a problem as we have in Alberta. I'm not overly concerned whether this absenteeism takes them into the United States, other parts of Alberta, or wherever. We just can't have a viable rural economy and a rural way of life if all of our land is owned by people that live out of that community. I'm suggesting that many of those people who do not, in fact, live in the area, but do have land there and do, once in a while, attend to see that their interests are looked after, could probably qualify under this act as a farmer.

The family farm, Mr. Speaker, is a definition that arose a number of years ago, and I think it is safe to say that during the last provincial election all of us expressed -- and rightly so -- a concern that it should be preserved. We have to start on that route by ensuring that the rural way of life, the rural community, and the farm income, are sufficient to provide for those people that are on the family farm at the present time; sufficiently attractive to those

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-33

young people who are attending high schools and just concluding their education, perhaps, to return to the family farm and find a way of life there.

I'd like, Mr. Speaker, to review two or three of the ways in which, during the last 14 or 15 months, this government has striven, in a very major sort of a way, to provide that kind of a thing in rural Alberta. First of all, I would mention the very extensive credit program, a credit program that has been condemned by some people when they suggest to us that giving money to farmers only makes their position worse. I want to review perhaps some of the statements that were made in this House previously by the Minister of Agriculture, when he outlined the tremendous numbers of dollars that are required for agriculture credit in Alberta. That ran into the hundreds of millions of dollars every year. When you open your mail like I do and many of you do, weekly, and you find that people are writing to you who have some very serious financial problems; when you inquire into them, you find out that they are paying not one per cent above prime rate, not two per cent, but 15, 16 and 20 per cent interest rates on purchases of machinery and equipment, and operating capital, and all the other things that go into a farm unit. I want to suggest that the very extensive programs that were developed by this government with regard to guaranteed loans -- and I refer to the dairy loans, the beef cattle breeding loans, the sheep loans, together with loans for operating capital -- have assisted the preservation of the family farm in a very major sort of way by lowering the operating costs that go into that farm. So many people disregard the cost of credit as an operating cost in agriculture today, but very definitely on many farms it is, and it will continue to be, one of the major costs. The credit programs that were designed by this government were not designed to get farmers into more difficulty, but rather to lower a cost which, in my view, had been largely ignored previously.

Some of the other areas, Mr. Speaker, that we have striven for -- and I think we have come a long way in the past 15 months in preserving the family farm and preventing, perhaps, a takeover by corporations -- are things like the establishment of an agricultural week, a week which was set aside, Mr. Speaker, so that the people in all parts of this province could, in fact, recognize the contribution that there is from the family farm and from people in rural Alberta, people in agriculture, to preserve the economic viability of the entire province. I'm sure that that concept of an agricultural week will be expanded on in years to come. Unfortunately, this year it wasn't as entirely successful as we'd hoped it would be, because of the very drastic weather conditions that occurred during agriculture week, and many of the people who had been actively involved were still out in the field.

I would like to suggest also that only this week on Tuesday afternoon and evening I attended a meeting of the Agriculture Products Marketing Council and observed for the first time a lady member on that Council who was representative of consumers in this province, sitting down with other farmers and farm organizations, marketing boards from around the province and trying to, through her presence on that board, bring to the consumers of Alberta -- the people who live in the urban areas in particular -- better understanding of the family farm way of life, a better understanding of the problems that there are in rural Alberta.

I would like to dwell, just for a moment, on the very major thing with regard to the family farm, and that is simply the price of agriculture products we receive and the net profit that we have left over at the end of each year. Certainly I would be the last one to say that you can contribute all of the increases in agriculture products during the last year to the provincial government in Alberta, but I do believe that the increases in grain prices, hog prices, beef prices, grass seed prices and a number of other areas can in some way or another be directly attributed to the drive with which the Minister of Agriculture here has asked the other provinces and the federal people in the field of agriculture to expand on marketing opportunity that exists.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, those are some of the ways in which you can take a positive role in ensuring that corporate farming does not in fact become a way of life in Alberta, ensuring that the family farm way of life will continue without the kind of controls that could possibly get us into a problem of having some very fine and upstanding members of our community who may, for some reason or another, from year to year, derive a little more of their income from some other source other than agriculture. On that very subject I would like to mention, Mr. Speaker, the clause in the bill, once again, that refers to the definition of farmer as being "his principle occupation is farming." I am a little surprised, as a matter of fact, that the hon. member who presented the bill failed to recognize that in his constituency and in my constituency and in many others in Alberta, where we have in fact a large number of homesteaders, the amount of income which they actually derive from agriculture is sometimes

67-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

quite small in those early years, and often times eight or ten years, when they are trying to establish a farm unit.

Those people go out into raw land situations with a lot of courage and skill and determination, carve out acres of land and build housing for livestock and many other activities. In the meantime they get a job on an oil rig or at the local service station or somewhere else, part time perhaps. They spend six or seven months every winter in the bush cutting logs, so that they can try and develop that farm into a family farm unit. Mr. Speaker, I would hate to face many of those people in my constituency with the situation that they cannot in fact be classed as family farmers unless their principle occupation is farming, and unless the majority of their income is derived from farming.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley followed by the hon. Member for Macleod.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I have to rise; I have some misgivings about the act and I think the definition of a farmer and the definition of a corporate farmer are certainly not very clear to me. First of all, Mr. Speaker, we must remember that we have quite a number of corporate family farms who have banded themselves together for the simple and one reason of survival, because of the low price of agriculture products in the past. I'm not afraid of corporate farming as far as the number that exist today in Alberta. First of all we must remember how corporate farms came into being in Alberta. The low price of agriculture, the products that were grown below costs, over a period of years, is the one reason why corporate farms, people had a little more money to spend, banded in and formed farm corporations.

Now, in my area, we have a number of family corporate farms, farms that are no more than a section and a half, no more than two sections at the outset. Now, are we going to say that these family farms are corporate farms, and have to be dismantled? I think the hon. member that drew up the bill, and the classification of a farmer, had no knowledge of the farming industry of the province.

I believe that farming is an industry and I will have to say that this is the first time in the history of the Province of Alberta, that any government has given priority to the selling of farm products. We have come to a stage at this time, where the family farm has a real break even chance of success and survival. This is the first time in the history of the Province of Alberta, that any department of agriculture has gone out to make a determined effort to sell out products.

I have in the past, raised hogs. No more than a year ago I sold them for \$17 and \$18 a hundred dressed weight. And when I look at the price of hogs today after the agreement that we have with Japan, they have gone up 100 per cent. To me, this is an incentive to improve the family farm. Our beef prices have risen. All products of the farm have gone up, and this is the only danger that we have; if we force the farmer to produce below the cost of production. The family farm will take care of itself, if we provide for the sale of farm products.

I am convinced that with the extensive program of selling, and increasing the family farm income and of supplementing it with some loans that we are prepared to give the farmers today, we are in no danger of ever losing the family farm concept in Alberta.

We have in my area one corporate farm, and that corporate farm employs something like 25 local people. It supplies an income, the same as the hon. member for Smoky Lake mentioned. I believe up until last year, at least 90 per cent of the farmers in my area supplemented their income other than agriculture. This has to a shame for a government to face a decision to set out corporate funds. I am not saying that the farmer today is not making more off the farm than he is making on the farm, but certainly it is a means of sustaining himself and his family. If we are going to deprive the farmer by clause section 2, subsection 3, and say to him that you must earn 50 per cent or the major portion of your livelihood from the production of farming, then I think we might as well admit that we have lost another 20,000 or 30,000 farmers in Alberta. There is a real danger if we are going even to exclude the family corporate farms in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I can only say this. I have some misgivings about this bill. I propose to vote against it when it comes up.

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-35

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Macleod.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words to Bill 208 on corporate farming. The Member for Drayton Valley just mentioned another type of corporate farm. It is one in which several farmers, or several families can go together and you might call it a corporate family farm. I think what the bill intends is a corporate farm, as mentioned by the mover of the bill -- Dow Chemical or Marathon Realty -- it does not make a great deal of difference. If we are going to split hairs on the definition of a corporate farm then we could probably spend as much time on it as we have spent on trying to define a family farm.

I would just like to know how many corporate farms we have in Alberta of this nature. Are we worried about something for the future? Are we worried about something for the present? Because from my point of view and from what I have observed in agriculture, if farming has such a poor return that many people tend to give it, why would many people want to invest in anything along the agricultural line, whatsoever? There would be no return here. I am concerned that a corporation could end up in specialization; they could make it very difficult for the average farmer to compete.

When it comes to family farms, they have sort of come into their own in the last two or three years -- everybody is going to save the family farm, including the NDP. But no one ever worried a great deal about the family farm until just recently, and yet most of us today do our shopping in the great supermarkets of our country. These supermarkets were actually the corporate marketing boards that took over from a lot of small operators. They forced the little grocer, or the little corner store out of business. But we do our business there because we have a wider selection of products and they have more money to spend in giving us a wider variety of services.

In a sense I am rather surprised that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview brought this bill in. Because nationally on the one hand, and even provincially if they were the government, they are trying to socialize everything and put it in under large corporations, whether they are state operated or a state monopoly. So when we talk about corporate farms I think we have to look at the total picture. There is quite a difference in agriculture between the United States and Canada. We have, for example, in Canada and Alberta today, family farms that range all the way -- if you call a ranch a farm -- from a township down. Nobody complains about the big rancher or the big farmer. In fact I have one in my own area, a family farm, that employs a dozen men the year around and provides homes for them. This is one of the better, more progressive farmers of our area.

I think today rather than belabour the fact we need a corporate farm or whether we do not need it, we are living today, say within the next year or two, at a breathing point for agriculture. It has a breathing point because we have markets for all our grain and cattle prices were never higher. I go along with the philosophy of the hon. Minister of Agriculture that in developing our markets this is the time when we are not possibly going to sell more today than we have sold in the past. But when you are looking for markets, when we do have a surplus of goods -- and we will have a surplus of agricultural products in a very short while -- the markets that they have found could make the difference between profit and loss.

We come back, as far as I am concerned, to all farming. It is not a matter of whether they are large or small. It is a matter of inflation and markets. If we could somehow control inflation, or widen the gap between the cost of production and what we sell it for, we would have half our problem solved. We must have markets over and above what we have today. The ability that farmers have today in Alberta to produce is almost unlimited. In fact I would say the average farm and when I say the average farm I know there are others whose production is much higher, but the average farm today is producing on about 60 per cent of its total capacity. If we really had markets and could product 8 to 75 per cent of our total capacity, our farmers would be much better off.

We talk about family farms and saving family farms, and yet many of the things that we have put in, the loans that we are making to farmers, are of such a nature that we're going to have to assimilate some of the smaller operators to give other farmers a more viable farm. So in a sense, no matter what we do, we are going to have less farmers in the future than we have at the present time. I feel today that if we had greater markets, greater potential, the agricultural picture is very optimistic, not only now but in the future. If we have an

67-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 2nd 1972

ability to product, we would have young men and young women wanting to go back, or at least stay, on the farms. I can understand a young couple today who would like to go farming and find that the economic means is such that they just cannot afford it. I never could understand youngsters, farmers' sons, when a farm was almost given to them, they couldn't stay on the farm, and yet it has given their fathers and grandfathers an adequate living, a good life, over a great many years, why they throw away this heritage because one of these days they are going to look back and wish that they had saved it. They say today if you have enough money to buy a farm and to staff it, you really don't need the farm; you could live on the interest. There wouldn't be any point in you farming at all. But I am concerned with the inflation -- inflation of land, and I think we have already seen, in trying to help farmers and in loaning the money to buy cattle, what the inflation has done. It's actually driven the price of cattle up and if we're not careful we could drive the price of land up, so that we're not really helping anybody. I'm not afraid of corporate farms as long as we have our marketing boards. We have quotas; these can be governed by the government and they can be checked from time to time. So I can say, in all fairness, that I can see very little merit and cannot support this bill.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, my remarks on this particular Bill No. 208 have to be short because of the time. However, there may be more merit in this Bill No. 208 than might presently appear to some of the hon. members. Although the involvement of corporations in farming thus far in North America has not been a very singular success, there has been some success, of course, with the expansion of various complexes that involve themselves in many different areas of endeavour and they have also included farming in this particular operation. But thus far, this has not met with too much success. Truly, democracy has been nurtured by the concept of the family farm. This possibility was the power base that underwrote the growth and strength of the Roman Empire. The result of the deterioration of the farm base in the economy of Rome was probably one of the greatest factors in the down fall of the Roman Empire. No longer, as more and more farm land was taken over by fewer and fewer landlords, the rural base of the Roman Empire was weakened and more and more people were drawn into the cities, with the resulting social costs, welfare and so on. And at one time in history, it was no longer possible to field fighting men who were the sons of farmers.

I just quote this as a matter of history to bring to the hon. members the particular point I want to make.

I can see, as we expand further along the roads to the world of tomorrow, that there will be far greater a threat to the small farmer than exists today. So possibly in Bill No. 208, there may be recognition of this possibility. The trend, of course, which was mentioned by the hon. Member for Fort MacLeod, and assuming that the processes of inflation will continue, will increase the desire of many people and many corporations to save themselves from this particular malaise. And the only method that they can probably adopt would be the buying of more and more land, which then poses a question. There are today many areas in the Province of Alberta of land that was held and has been owned by landlords from other areas, as the hon. Member for Smoky River has mentioned, and which are utilized for no good purpose and are held onto totally on the basis of long-term gains.

I do not believe, however, that by simply passing an act like this, any solution can be brought about for the family farm. There are certain things that are beyond the abilities of laws and I am sure that it is quite within the power of this legislature to pass a law requiring water to run uphill, but I question very much whether this will occur.

As a direct result of the French Revolution, the states said land should be divided amongst the people of France in the proportion to the number of people, and that it should be held in perpetuity for those who were farmers and rural members, which was an example of legislation. The result was that the sound economic base of French agriculture was thoroughly destroyed and it remains destroyed today. The only way that agriculture can properly function in France is by the state underwriting the farm economy with great subsidy. We wouldn't want a situation like that to occur here in Alberta.

Certain deficiencies, of course, are related to the largeness of farms, and I would think probably when we think in the realm of unit trains which would result in a net saving there should be some larger farm units in more concentrated units of delivery for farm products.

The size of farms, of course, is something that has been dealt with already in this particular discussion. It has been pretty well decided that there is no

November 2, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

67-37

limit to what a farm should get to, although there are countries in the world where this has been done.

Although it has been said many times in this legislature, and it is really something that is difficult for anyone to disagree with, there are many advantages of farm life. There are some disadvantages as well. There is a social loss which a lot of people are not prepared to accept, and I think there is a psychological affect that is prevalent, to a greater degree, among people who have been cut away from their fellow man for the amount of time in their life that is represented in their years on the farm.

However, it is encouraging to see a new resurgence in the rural way of life, the encouraging results of various shortages in the world that have increased the possibilities of our markets (the growth in population and so on). I foresee that in the future this trend will continue and it can be expected that there will be an increased growth in the farm community. Probably, the future holds much more good for the rural areas, and the hardships will be fewer than they have been in the past.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. Member for Athabasca leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

It being now 5:30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until 8:00 p.m. this evening.

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

