

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, November 7, 1972

[The House met at 2:30 pm.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this afternoon to introduce to you, and through you to the hon. members of this assembly, 28 students from the Edwin Parr High School in Athabasca. They are accompanied this afternoon by their teachers, Mrs. Rita Sequiera, and Mr. John Roberts. The students are members of the law class. I will ask them now to rise and be recognized by this assembly. They are seated in the public gallery.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to the assembly, two members of the County of Vulcan, along with their secretary treasurer; Mr. S.T. Smith, Mr. D.A. McNiven, and Mr. K.H. Gatenby.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly, who is out of the House on business this afternoon, I take pleasure in introducing to you and through you to the hon. members of the assembly, students from St. Nicholas School in the Edmonton Beverly constituency, Grade VIII. They are seated in the members' gallery and I would ask them to rise and be recognized.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

Drilling Incentive Program

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a Return requested by the assembly. The information in the Return deals with the information on the government's new drilling incentive program.

Submissions on Human Rights Legislation

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table additional copies of 16 submissions received by our office with respect to Bill No. 1 and No. 2. This is a supplement to the material tabled on the 30th of October.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Hospital Services

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Is the government going to reintroduce a user's fee for hospital services? I'm thinking of the kind we had three years ago, the \$2 fee.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there is no intention at the present time to introduce such a fee.

70-2

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, if I could ask a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Have any studies been conducted in this particular area to determine whether or not something ought to be done in this area to try and control costs?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the question almost struck me as a two-edged one. When he said, "In this particular area", I related that to the \$2 fee again. And then the question concluded by saying, "In order to control costs."

Of course, we have many continuously going-on areas where we are studying data to see where the costs are in the system, and to see if there might be some way. We feel from time to time, along with the other provinces who are having this same difficulty -- and we are comparing notes with them -- that we are identifying this extremely difficult area where it may be possible to begin to control costs. But a particular study on the \$2 fee that the hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to, no special attention has been given in that area.

Medicare Costs

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio dealing with the subject of Medicare costs. I'm wondering if the government is thinking of introducing a plan which would force medical doctors to a mandatory fee and collect the same from the patient as an attempt to discourage over-utilization of doctors' services.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, this has been discussed. We are not considering it at the present time.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, do I take it then from the hon. minister's answer that there is no study being made in this particular area at this point in time?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, we are reviewing the entire field of Alberta Health Care Services, and that takes us right through the whole gamut of how we are doing it, how best we can do it, and what we should do in the future. We have considered the acceptance of a mandatory fee, but at this time we don't feel that it is necessary. We have indicated to the doctors our great concern that we should keep costs down and we feel we have their co-operation. The doctors themselves have some ideas that will be helpful, and part of their suggestion will be presented to the House in the form of a bill, this session, which should have some impact on it. I feel that these measures will be satisfactory for the present.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I have a last supplementary question. Would the House be able to receive some background information that would be available to us at the time we would be studying the bill?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I really don't think that the type of bill that I'm bringing in, and which I hope to have as soon as possible, requires that much background information, but if there is any information they would like specifically, if they would put it on the Order Paper, I would try to get the answers to them right away.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Is it clear then, that fee for service will be maintained as it is now for medical fees?

MISS HUNLEY:

Fee for service will be maintained, but I don't know for how long.

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-3

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I know that certain of the professions -- one that I am quite closely associated with -- are receiving only 90 per cent of the Alberta Dental Association fee schedule. I'm wondering if this is going to become a policy that would be possibly looked at in relation to medical doctors, optometrists and chiropractors -- is this being looked at?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, yes. They have had some discussion with the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission, but they have not met with the cabinet committee or with me to have any just general discussions. The thing we are looking at is the whole picture -- what we are getting, how much we are paying for it, and how we can do it better. Hopefully we can have that resolved within the next few months.

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister be able to tell the members of the House how the medical fee schedule in Alberta compares to, say, Saskatchewan or Manitoba as far as what percentage is paid of the fee schedule? Would she know that off the top of her head?

MISS HUNLEY:

No, I don't know that off the top of my head, but I'll be happy to get it if you will put it on the Order Paper.

Pheasant Hunting

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Has the minister received a number of representations to discontinue the legal slaughter of hen pheasants caused by the present permissive departmental regulations?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, in all sincerity, I appreciate that question, because in the 1971 season, the game regulations passed when the hon. member would have been at the desk that passed them, included a hen pheasant season for the entire duration of the hunting season that applied to pheasants. Now the difficulty with this, Mr. Speaker, is that late in the season when you get colder weather, the pheasants -- particularly the hens -- tend to covey, and when they are in clusters, it is easier to shoot a lot of them and cause a real problem by shooting too many of them. That's the basis of the objection to the hen pheasant season, particularly late in the season. This year, on the other hand, we have cut it back so that the hen pheasant season expired on the 31st of October. That is to say, on the 1st of November henceforth the season only pertained to males. That's been a very happy change as far as southern Alberta is concerned, as far as the pheasant areas of concern in Alberta, and a change that we have made in contrast to the way it was the year before.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Will the minister consider then discontinuing this hen pheasant shooting completely?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I'm so reasonable I'll consider everything including that; it would be based largely on the biological facts as they pertain to the situation. I was more impressed with them than the previous government was, evidenced by the fact that we did cut back the hen pheasant season in 1972.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. What does Women's Lib. think about all this?

MR. HO LEM:

On the same subject regarding pheasant hunting, would the minister care to inform the House how he disposed of the misunderstanding between the French hunters who were invited to Alberta and given to understand that there would be

70-4

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

no non-resident licence fee imposed on the members of that party, and consequently somewhere along the line, the rules were changed? Would you like to comment on that?

MR. SPEAKER:

If the hon. minister wishes to answer, but the question is very, very doubtful in the category of supplementary.

DR. WARRACK:

I don't have the news release handy to read to you, but it was released in Calgary at the time. There was not an offer for free hunting licences to the large group of people from France that were coming, and the reason that there was not that offer of free hunting licences is that we do not feel that people who are not citizens of this country of Canada should be given additional consideration beyond that the citizens of Canada and the province of Alberta would have.

MR. WILSON:

Is it true that the party purchased approximately 600 birds and stocked the land, in fact, before they started hunting, at their own expense?

DR. WARRACK:

They might well have done so.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it true that less than half of the pheasants which they purchased were shot?

DR. WARRACK:

How many shots did they miss? I wasn't there, Mr. Speaker, but it is important to make a distinction that all sportsmen of Alberta appreciate, and this is a very serious distinction and that is the distinction between killing things and having the hunting experience and the opportunity to hunt. Nearly every sportsman in Alberta will say in very clear terms that when you are talking about hunting you are talking about a recreational activity that is an outdoor recreational experience and that is what they do, rather than kill things.

MR. COOKSON:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, --

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, was the decision to give the French hunters a --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member give the hon. member opposite the opportunity to state his point of order?

MR. COOKSON:

The question was to define the hunting of male versus female pheasants and then we had the Frenchmen getting involved in it and all other sorts of things. I don't think the questions are really following the trend that they should be.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's point of order is well founded and possibly we could revert to this subject if there is time left in the question period, as I am sure we have a number of other subjects which people who have indicated they wanted to ask questions are intending to ask.

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

MR. RUSTE:

I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Highways. Is the minister aware of the highways in the State of Montana, or in South Dakota,

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-5

rather, in which the highway right-of-way is left unmowed during the nesting season?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the policies of the highways in North Dakota are.

MR. RUSTE:

Just a supplementary question. Would the minister consider such a policy for Alberta?

MR. COPITHORNE:

The question obviously is difficult to answer. If the hon. minister --

MR. RUSTE:

I should have rephrased it a little differently, Mr. Speaker. The policy, as I am given to understand, provides that the right-of-way along highways in the State of South Dakota are not mowed during the nesting season. My question to the minister is, would he consider such a policy for Alberta highways?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have severe drifting problems in the winter time and excess cover in the ditches would create a snow trap that might quite often create a snow trap across the highway. Perhaps in South Dakota they don't mow the undercover in the spring but we have to do it in the fall in order to prevent the snow cover trap for the winter months.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, just a supplementary to that question. I believe it is the nesting season, not in the fall as you mentioned.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar followed by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

Commonwealth Games

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation. My question is, what percentage of the operating and capital cost can the City of Edmonton expect from the provincial government towards the expenses of the Commonwealth Games in 1976?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the member's question, I would like to state that our Premier, in a letter to the Commonwealth Games Commission, had mentioned that we are happy to help the Commonwealth Games in Edmonton to our best abilities. We are just right now considering and discussing these abilities.

DR. BUCK:

The thing that concerns me, Mr. Minister, is this: there was a press report that was brought to my attention saying that they would be sharing up to 25 per cent of that cost. Was this incorrect or was this someone's speculation?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, this may be called a speculation since in the past, the proportion has been 50 per cent from the federal government, and 25 per cent from the provincial government, and 25 per cent from the municipal in the Canada Games capital expenditures.

70-6

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

DR. BUCK:

Supplementary, because I am sure that the hon. minister is aware that the people who are concerned will be looking at budgeting. Will we know this fairly early in the spring session?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned before, we are very seriously now considering this matter, and the announcement will be made as soon as possible.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Drayton Valley --

DR. PAPROSKI:

Supplementary on that if I may. Hon. minister, surely this is not a concern, considering it is such an important event for Alberta. Are you concerned about funding the Commonwealth Games?

MR. SCHMID:

We are so concerned, Mr. Speaker, as I have mentioned before, our Premier gave a commitment to the Commonwealth Games Federation that provincial help will be forthcoming.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Pigeon Lake Sewage Disposal

MR. ZANDER:

My question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. What is being done about the complaints of citizens living in the area of Pigeon Lake regarding the raw sewage disposal into the Pigeon Lake area by residents surrounding the shores of Pigeon Lake?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the pollution control division of the Department of the Environment conducted a three week survey on Pigeon Lake in July of this year. During this time the sewage disposal facilities at every cabin surrounding the lake were inspected. The survey was a joint effort of several departments. Beside the Department of the Environment it included the Department of Labour, the Department of Health and Social Development and the Wetco Health Unit. A report is being compiled on this entire matter and I should have it in my hands before too long, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HENDERSON:

It was the same question that I was going to ask -- that the member just asked as a supplemental to the minister. Would he make a copy of that report available to the member?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I will certainly take it under advisement. I see no reason at all at this time why the report should be retained in confidence.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary followed by the hon. Member for Smoky River.

Weekly Newspapers

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. What steps have you taken to assure that weekly newspapers have a fair and competitive position with the other media sources who are the three recipients --

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-7

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is in the nature of debate. Could the hon. member come directly to the factual matter of the question?

MR. WILSON:

How, Mr. Minister, are you assuring that weekly newspapers are in a competitive position with the recipients of government sponsored teleprinter machines?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not completely sure of all of the various procedures that the Bureau of Public Affairs follow in this regard. I think it is an important one, though, to follow up on and I will get the information for the hon. member.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Do you have guidelines and controls in existence regarding the partnership of Canada News Wire and the government?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister be prepared to table a copy of those guidelines and the contract?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I would check into that information and give it consideration and report back to the hon. member.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it true that the government has granted a contract to private enterprise to operate out of the Legislative Building?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, there is a free period of time under the communications network that has been set up. It appeared advantageous to provide some income to the people of Alberta, and we have made an arrangement to allow these facilities to be used.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Were the services granted to Canada News Wire tendered?

MR. GETTY:

I am not sure of that, Mr. Speaker, but I will check into it.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary ---

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this topic?

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the government providing secretarial and telephone answering services for Canada News Wire?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, that is another interesting question I would be happy to look into.

70-8

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Smoky River, followed by the hon. Member for ---

Commonwealth Games (cont)

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the letter the hon. Premier submitted to the Commonwealth Games Federation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Table it.

MR. SCHMID:

I would be pleased to table them, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister's offer has been accepted.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. minister wants to read it I think it should be put to the House.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, he has already stated what is in it, and if the hon. Premier doesn't know what is in it, let him get the letter himself and read what is in it. We don't need him to tell us; we are not all that dumb, we can read.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister has already accepted the suggestion that he table it. The hon. Member for Smoky River, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

Crop Conditions

MR. MOORE:

I have a question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Deputy Premier and Minister of Agriculture relative to the very serious harvesting conditions in northern Alberta, in particular the Peace River country. Can the hon. minister announce to the House what steps he has taken to alleviate the conditions suffered by those people who still have a major portion of their crop in the field?

DR. HORNER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier in the House -- I think just after the fall session started -- that were doing an in-depth survey of the area that has been effected in the Peace River country. We have done that survey; we have opened negotiations with Ottawa on a technical level with regard to what assistance might be available there. We have notified PFRA, and we expect that PFRA payments will be made in the area on a general basis. We will be back to Ottawa as of November 15th to get approval of cash advances in regard to unthrashed grain. We have moved along in our contingency plans with regard to the availability of forage, the availability of seed grain. We intend to do what we can to provide off-farm jobs in the area this winter. All of these things will be put into a package that will substantially, I hope, alleviate the situation in that area.

DR. WARRACK:

I would like an opportunity to mention something that we have been able to do through the efficient Wild Life Division of the Department of Lands and Forests. We received in Grande Prairie, when the cabinet meeting was held there, representations from a number of farm groups on the difficulties they were having with wild life, particularly water-fowl damage to their crops, and

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-9

we made a decision that day to go ahead and extend the operation of the lure crops, not only near Grande Prairie, but also on Beaver Hill Lake, through to the end of October, to hold the ducks off from the crops that were in danger of being damaged with the difficult harvest we had in 1972.

MR. NOTLEY:

A question Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Mr. Minister, on October 25, you mentioned the survey. My understanding was that it was going to be a farm-by-farm survey. My question to you today is, is that in fact the case? Was it a farm-by-farm survey, or a general survey of the area?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, it was both. Of course, the quick result was to do a general survey and to get some feeling as to the general amount of damage, but the on-going survey will be on a farm-to-farm basis.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, again dealing with the announcement on PFRA payments. Again, on the 25th, Mr. Minister, I raised a question about a \$10 an acre payment on unthreshed grain, up to 250 acres, and an additional \$5 an acre thereafter. Can the minister be a little more specific as to what kind of direct assistance will be provided to the farmers who have unthreshed grain?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member wasn't the first one to raise that problem. The farm organizations in the Peace River area placed this program before us in the cabinet meeting in Grande Prairie. As I said then, on the 25th, and as I told the people in Grande Prairie and in the Peace River area, we would be consulting with the federal government to see, in fact, how much assistance we could give to the farmers who were affected in that area. There is another area in the province, in the western sections, west Red Deer and Rimbey, that also has to be considered in any program of assistance in this area.

MR. NOTLEY:

A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the severe problems faced by the farmers at hand at the moment, can the minister advise the House as to when an announcement might be made with respect to this specific proposal for assistance?

DR. HORNER:

Just as soon as we conclude our negotiations with Ottawa, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. What percentage of the producers in that area are covered by crop insurance, and what steps should be taken under that to alleviate the situation?

DR. HORNER:

As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, I can get the hon. member exact coverage statistics, but not many of them were covered by crop insurance because they have had several poor crops in a row, and most of them couldn't afford the kind of crop insurance scheme that we've had in this province in previous years.

MR. RUSTE:

The second part of my question, though, what steps are being taken for those being covered by crop insurance, or are any being taken?

70-10

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

DR. HORNER:

Well, that will be taken into consideration in relation to the negotiations with Ottawa. If the hon. member isn't aware of it this particular problem was considered in the glosses which they had in Quebec and Ontario in which those that were covered with crop insurance were given some assistance as well as those that were not.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lacombe followed by the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake.

Crop Insurance

MR. COOKSON:

The Minister, in view of the poor plan that was initiated with regard to crop insurance, is our government contemplating some recommended changes in crop insurance?

AN HON. MEMBER:

You were on the committee, remember?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we are looking forward with a great deal of anticipation to the committee's report on crop insurance, and we hope that we can develop a program of insurance in Alberta that will be worth while.

MR. BARTON:

Supplementary to the Minister of Agriculture, do the northern farmers especially have priority under The Agricultural Development Act in the consolidation of their debts?

MR. SPEAKER:

A questionable supplementary. Possibly the minister may wish to deal with it.

DR. HORNER:

The priorities under The Agricultural Development Act, Mr. Speaker, are for the small farmers in Alberta. This is for a variety of uses, both to consolidate their debts, and also to improve their income possibilities by expanding their operations. And as the hon. Member for Lloydminster said last night, the program of cattle loans that we have had in Northern Alberta has been of substantial help. Not only did it put \$12 million into Northern Alberta, but the calf prices this fall have been exceptionally good, and I would expect this will help their income situation a great deal as well.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the Alberta Grain Commission in which we were able to obtain a substantial increase in the price of barley, particularly in Northern Alberta, because of the new pricing arrangements -- the pricing base is Vancouver instead of Thunder Bay -- meant an increase in the price of barley to the producer in the Grande Prairie area of seven cents a bushel. When one considers that the ARR only gave them a nickel a bushel increase, it becomes pretty substantial indeed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of his comments about the crop insurance program, will the hon. minister agree to a discussion in the House when the report on crop insurance is tabled?

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps the hon. member could refer to that matter again when the report is tabled.

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-11

The hon. Member for Wainwright followed by the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Would the minister take under consideration the advisability of announcing changes in the crop insurance program well in advance of the January date? It is, I believe, where the farmer has the right to cancel out if he so desires.

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is now anticipating the report of the Crop Insurance Committee. I haven't seen that report and I hope that it will be tabled in the House sometime shortly so that, in fact, we can move ahead with these kinds of programs. . . [Interjections] . . . Anything would be better than the Social Credit plan of insurance in this province, and that is why one has to anticipate something.

MR. SPEAKER:

If this is on the same topic, the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake has a supplementary, and then I think we should go on to another topic.

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this a supplementary?

MR. ANDERSON:

No, but I was next on the list.

MR. SPEAKER:

I realize that, but the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake has a supplementary.

MR. BARTON:

According to the previous remarks by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, I don't think my question would do any good.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Water Pollution

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Has the hon. minister taken any action with regard to the complaints about water pollution emanating from the city packers in Lethbridge?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I'd have to check into this matter and report back to the House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Unemployment Insurance

MR. WYSE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. In view of the recent announcements that the unemployment

70-12

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

figure in Alberta has jumped to 3.7 from 3.3 per cent, what steps is the government taking in the area of winter works and other programs, and methods to combat this serious situation?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very timely and excellent question. I plan to deal with this matter in a ministerial statement under Orders of the Day.

MR. MOORE:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am wondering, in view of the serious labor shortage in the northern part of the province, if the hon. minister has under consideration anything that might alleviate that situation?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I could deal with this particular question in the report this afternoon.

MR. BARTON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does that mean that they are going to expand the designated area?

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps the hon. member's question will be answered when the statement is made.

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place.

Manpower Centres

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Premier. Mr. Premier, at the spring session it was stated that the federal government had opened the door for a larger provincial role in manpower centres. My question is: what is the involvement of the provincial government in the existing federal Department of Manpower centres in the province?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer that question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the situation with respect to offices in Alberta is briefly this: there are two senior supervisors; one for southern Alberta and one for northern Alberta. Both report to the regional office in Winnipeg, the region being Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and Alberta. Negotiations are continuing at the present, and have for some time, to re-arrange both the region and the reporting system.

MR. COOPER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Is the provincial government then considering setting up manpower centres of its own, with or without federal assistance?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I would say that the question is merely intriguing, but it is premature in the sense that we're now developing what we call a manpower policy for Alberta. The nature of its operations is sometime in the future. The functions we're fairly clear on; things like direct assistance to obtain jobs and so on, and counselling. But the nature of the structure is still in the future.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-13

Commercial Fishing

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, my question, I believe, is probably directed to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. What government considerations are underway to improve the position of commercial fishing in this province, particularly with respect to marketing?

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the brief history on this particular matter and problem, particularly the marketing side of the important commercial fishing industry in Alberta, involves the establishment, in 1969, of a Crown corporation between the federal government, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and the Northwest Territories. This was a marketing and were successful, in getting as a new direction of our government, local marketing of whitefish that was a very pleasing decision with respect to local fishermen. I understand at a recent meeting, the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation has asked that this matter be reconsidered and is apparently an area of dispute between the fishermen of Alberta, or a least their association, and that corporation. We are arranging to have a meeting with the Alberta fishermen later this week and then we'll know from there how we might assist them.

MR. YOUNG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister advise where the corporation requires the fish to be processed for marketing? Is it in this province if the fish are caught in this province, or is it out of the province?

DR. WARRACK:

They have a new and primary processing plant at Transcona, which is just outside Winnipeg, Manitoba. I attended the opening there this summer of that particular plant. Also they do have some processing done on an arrangement basis more locally. The exception I was talking about with respect to the local marketing of whitefish would be to market them fresh, and not force them to go through the marketing channel and pick up the costs that would be incurred that way, and in addition then be selling the product that was frozen rather than fresh fish.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister. What percentage of the catch in Alberta is sold locally and what percentage is shipped out?

DR. WARRACK:

I don't know the answer to that question, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact the part that is sold locally would only have begun late last fall when we were able to implement the change. So in any case then, across the year it would be a somewhat misleading figure, even though I don't know it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Opposition House Leader.

Wilderness Areas

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. What is the intention of the government regarding a proposal made by Wild Kakwa, a Grande Prairie based conservation group, concerning the establishment of a wilderness and restricted development area in the Kakwa Falls region?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, we had an opportunity, on October 17th when the cabinet held its meeting in Grande Prairie, to have representation from delegates of that particular organization where their concerns were put forward, both with respect to the nature of area establishment that they wanted, and what type of area they felt ought to be established for the purpose outlined. This is largely in the area of wilderness and we have just at this sitting of the 1972 legislature,

70-14

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

passed legislation that establishes three wilderness areas in Alberta. This is a rather marked step forward, and I think a good time to look at the entire concept of wilderness areas and whether the concept, as reflected in the current act, is entirely what the people of Alberta want. After having had an opportunity to do some of that assessment, we would consider additional possible wilderness areas in various places in Alberta, representing various geographic features characteristic of Alberta, and also considering what size they ought to be, including the possibility of a whole profile of wilderness areas sizes. So these are some of the questions that are before us as a matter of policy, and once they are reasonably resolved in terms of the consensus of the public of Alberta, I think then it would be a reasonable step to look toward serious consideration of additional wilderness areas. There have been several suggested in addition to Wild Kakwa.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government given any consideration to public hearings concerning the proposals of Wild Kakwa?

DR. WARRACK:

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, public hearings were held prior to the 1971 Wilderness Areas Act, and those hearings were held prior to the act itself. There were representations made there for areas beyond the three that were established, so some considerable degree of public hearing has already taken place. It may well be that at the appropriate time, which I suggest is not at this time, this might well be done.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, then, dealing specifically with the proposals of Wild Kakwa. Until such time as public hearings are considered, or will be held by the government, will the government consider imposing a moratorium on all commercial activity within the disputed region?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, in fairness, I must mention that this matter has been brought to my attention in a very thorough way by Marvin Moore, the Member for Smoky River, and also the hon. minister, Winston Backus, with regard to the fact that the area in question was very close to their constituencies. We have looked at this area in question and it turns out that the degree of commercial activity that is occurring in the area specified at this time is extremely limited. While we are looking at it further, it may well be that additional action of that nature, restricting people's activities, would not be necessary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Opposition House Leader, followed by the hon. Member for Lac la Biche.

Dental Plan

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a biting question for the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in charge of Health Services. In view of the appalling condition of the teeth of thousands of our boys and girls in rural and urban Alberta, and in view of the very high charges for dental services at the present time, has the government completed its study for a dental plan for Alberta, particularly for boys and girls?

MISS HUNLEY:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, is the government studying the matter at the present time?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, all areas of health care are our concern. Maybe we should consider reducing the fees we pay the dentists.

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-15

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Does the hon. minister think she or it will get its teeth into the problem shortly?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Smoky River has a supplementary.

MR. MOORE:

Has the hon. Miss Hunley been able to have a look at the studies that were carried out in this regard by the previous government?

MISS HUNLEY:

No, I haven't, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure there are any, but perhaps the Health Commission has some over there. We are looking at what's happening in Quebec. Perhaps this would be of interest to the members of the House. They are interested in a plan whereby only those children from one to seven receive assistance under a health care plan. Any time we increase the services available of course we immediately increase at a fantastic rate the cost of the health services, and I think that is a very real concern.

DR. BUCK:

Is the hon. minister not aware this study has been done? Has she not been in contact with the Minister of Health and Social Development to find out if there has been a study and presentation made to him?

MR. CRAWFORD:

I can volunteer something in that regard. The hon. gentleman, of course, for the record is a member of an Association which has responsibility for treating patients in respect to this. Part of the conversations and consultations have indeed been with the Dental Association, both by the hon. Miss Hunley and myself. I think that answers that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

Janvier Facilities

DR. BOUVIER:

I would like to direct this question to the hon. the Premier and perhaps he will want to redirect it to one of the ministers. Earlier, in your opening statements to the legislature this fall you reported on your visit to Janvier and what had been done up to that date. I was wondering if I could hear an up-to-date report on what has been done since then?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think my remarks in the House on October 25 were pretty well restricted to the question of water wells. When we made that trip in there, it certainly was the sort of trip which I feel is important for government to make and be able to make a decisive decision at the time when you are on the spot. On that occasion we committed ourselves as a government, to come in an drill some new water wells for the people in the area, adjacent to the reservation. But there are a number of details, and perhaps I could refer it to the Minister without Portfolio responsible for Northern Development, Mr. Adair, to give further details to the House.

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I am really pleased to answer that question and relate to the people of Alberta an excellent example of the workings of our particular government and the fact that a problem was presented to us, we investigated it, we acted on it. Of course, as the hon. the Premier mentioned, the ten water wells were drilled in the Janvier area, providing the Metis people of the area with the water that they were lacking. Of course that arose from the fact that there were some wells drilled earlier by the Department of Indian Affairs on the reserve, and of course, the problem came to our attention, we looked at it, we

70-16

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

took care of it. There were other areas of concern. One of them related to the lunch program and that was a joint project, a pilot project in the Janvier area, relating to a school lunch program involving the treaty children and the Metis children. We were made aware of the problems, we looked into them, and I am pleased to report that a cheque from the provincial government was forwarded to the Janvier school lunch program on October 26, as our full portion of that particular program.

A number of other areas of concern in relation to communications have been looked into. As a matter of fact we have attempted to provide some form of communication for the area; we have had some difficulties, but I might say we are working very closely with the Minister of Telephones and Utilities in trying to provide that.

Health care was another area of concern and that is being looked at and being worked on right at the moment by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. I think possibly, if I may, one of the other areas that was brought to our attention was the use of the facilities that are locked up at the present time, formerly occupied by New Start and possibly the Minister of Advanced Education would like to comment on that.

MR. FOSTER:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on that. Among others, the hon. J. Allen Adair, and the hon. George Topolniski and myself, Dr. Worth, and the area coordinator for that part of the province, Doug Schmid attended Janvier and Fort Chip and other centres in October to assess the former New Start facilities. We had a very excellent meeting with the Indian-Metis representatives in Janvier to discuss two issues with them, of the possible relocation of the training facilities from the edge of the reserve, to the centre of the reserve, to gain their assurance and understanding that these facilities will be open both to Indian and to Metis, (for that matter, all Albertans in the region, but primarily those two categories), and to discuss with them possible program development. I am pleased to report the response from both groups was very encouraging. They seemed to accept that the facilities could and should be transferred to the centre of the community. I realize that this will create some transportation problems but we are prepared to work with them on the solution of that, and I think we have their agreement.

Generally, Mr. Speaker, it was a very satisfactory meeting from my point of view. We are now in the process of developing programs in cooperation with the people locally. I think we will be able to use those facilities to the benefit of the local community.

DR. PAPROSKI:

Supplementary, to the hon. Minister of --

DR. BOUVIER:

Supplementary question to the hon. Minister in charge of Northern Development. In view of the fact that the only means of transportation out of Janvier is by air, and the airstrip there -- if you have been there you will notice that it is very short and usually in very poor condition -- is there any thought about doing something about the air facilities there?

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, that was brought to our attention as well, not only by the people of the Janvier area, but by the fact that landing on a very short strip presents some problems in itself as you well know, for maximum performance in and out. It was brought to our attention -- that particular strip is located on the Janvier reserve, and we have discussed it with them and with the people from the Department of Indian Affairs about seeing if there are some possibilities of extensions for it and some proper work done on it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The time for the Question Period has expired.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, as you have already called my name, would you give me the privilege of asking a question?

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-17

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has the leave of the House to ask his question.

Vista Heights, Calgary

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder if the minister would clarify his statement made to the House regarding the Vista Heights Agri-Mart issue? Yesterday, you stated to the House that we might take the initiative in keeping this new industry in Alberta and trying to find an attractive alternate site acceptable to all parties. The point of clarification Mr. Minister that I would like is, will you in fact be taking the initiative or is this only a possibility?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have heard from everybody else concerning the Agri-Mart controversy. It is nice to finally hear from the M.L.A. involved.

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, may I rise to a point? On a point of order, I wonder if the minister was in the House last spring when this was first brought up by myself?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, to answer the question about the initiative that could be taken by the provincial government; that initiative has been taken. I think it would be sheer speculation today to offer any announcements or advice with respect to potential sites. I am encouraged by progress to date. We have received excellent co-operation to date and those activities are proceeding with all energy.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. When I addressed my question to the hon. Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation, I said the Commonwealth Games in 1976. That should be 1978, just for the record.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

Winter Employment Program

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak, both in answer to the question this afternoon, and also as an intended ministerial statement that is both timely and important -- important because it has to do with the Province of Alberta winter employment programs, and timely because the labour force employment and unemployment statistics for Canada and for Alberta were issued today. Mr. Speaker, again I apologize for my personal sound equipment; my report will not be too long, so the offence of the sound will be made up for by the brevity of the offerings and the importance of the message.

We have found that in Alberta the level of employment varies considerably during the course of a year, in particular that a pattern has evolved over the last few years in which unemployment rises considerably during the winter months. The reason for this is, in part, the reflection of the structure of our employment situation in Alberta; and part of it is because certain commercial activities, such as construction, have to level off in terms of employment. While this is partly offset by oil, and forest employment, other factors tend to move unemployment to a high level during the winter months.

The report, Mr. Speaker, for the month of October, 1972 is as follows:

The employment rate for October, 1972 was 3.7 per cent, an increase of 0.4 per cent from the September, 1972 unemployment rate of 3.3 per cent. The

70-18

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

total labour force in October, 1972 was 694,000, a decline of 2000 from the previous month, and an increase of 19,000 over October, 1971. A very significant statement of figures, Mr. Speaker.

There were 667,000 employed in October, 1972, a decrease of 5000 over the previous month and an increase of 17,000 or 2.6 per cent from the 12-month period from October, 1971. The total number of persons unemployed in October, 1972 was 26,000, an increase of 3000 over the previous month.

Until recently there has not been this occurrence of a very sharp increase of unemployment during the winter months, but beginning with 1969 the trend was clear. The 1970 figures were considerably higher than 1969; 1971 were much higher than 1970 and so it was our view that special measures had to be taken during the winter months.

This led to a specific and deliberate decision by the government to develop a contingency plan which was the priority employment program, first instituted last fall and properly known as the PEP program. It is this program, Mr. Speaker, that we will pursue again this year.

Attempts have been made, even now, to predict the various economic conditions throughout the province and to establish certain guidelines that will enable us to move in with programs into those areas that most need the assistance. This could then mean that even if the employment situation were to stay reasonably sound in Alberta, certain areas will become identified as high unemployment areas and it is these to which we will particularly adjust ourselves.

However, as I said in this House some months ago, the September figures, which are very crucial in the prediction of unemployment for the season ahead, were such that I was not one of the optimistic ones across the nation who felt that unemployment would not be high this year. The national figures have borne this out. Ours have been reasonably good but combined with the drop-off in employment in the construction industry, and the federal figures, are such that we have to take the measures that we are.

With this in mind, I would like to announce that by special warrant we will be making a minimum of \$2 million available to educational institutions throughout the province to carry out programs designed to reach those people who need the assistance in upgrading and training to better match up with existing, open jobs.

Our two-pronged program, Mr. Speaker, of helping to train and re-train people and to find direct employment, to intervention by government and co-operation with industry, will be repeated this year. For example, in the training area we found from the second phase evaluation program which we conducted on the PEP program of last year that a significant portion of people who got the training subsequently got jobs. Secondly, and I think this is even more important, that a significant number of those people who got jobs were still on those same jobs six months later.

The second phase of the Priority Employment Program, Mr. Speaker, for this winter, is to continually monitor the economic conditions, so that if unemployment occurs in certain areas, we can develop programs with a minimum loss of time in those particular areas. This programming will be done through the various departments and the actual programs undertaken will depend on the types of skills of the people who will be unemployed in that particular area. I should like to mention two specific programs.

One, which we used last year and will use again through The Agricultural Societies Act, we will invest \$1 million for employment for the unemployed of Alberta. We found that this particular program last year was extremely effective and so that based on this record last year and the sure knowledge of what it can offer to the unemployed of Alberta, we will assign this \$1 million to the program which will be administrated through the Department of Agriculture but co-ordinated, as will all unemployment programs, to that of Manpower and Labour.

I should like also to announce Mr. Speaker, that we will assign an equal investment of \$1 million for the provincial and joint provincial-municipal projects of surface water management. I should like to say just a bit about this program. The projects will involve erosion control, channel clearing, stream-bank protection, dike construction for flood control, and some needed drainage projects. The program will provide employment throughout rural Alberta. Many of the projects will be cost-shared on a 50-50 basis with municipalities and these particular ones will require municipal approval. This

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-19

program will be administrated through the Department of the Environment and co-ordinated, as will all employment programs through that of Manpower and Labour.

I should like to move to a closing statement with respect to the Ottawa programs. Following our experiences with Ottawa on this LIP program, and following a national kind of review in addition to our own, we made substantial and clear recommendations to Ottawa on this matter. The results were reasonably happy in the sense that many of the recommendations which we made to Ottawa were taken and accepted by them and are now part of the federal program for unemployment for Canada. One of these is that the provinces, in this case Alberta, will co-ordinate the LIP programs in this province. We found last year, that what often happened, and regrettably -- but you learn from your first year program; we learned it personally, and we learned it later from the evaluation and assessment report -- very often a federal program might be one, if you can put it that way, or be assigned to one municipality or even one town, or even one village. A provincial one might also be assigned in the same one, and yet the neighbouring one would be without a provincial or a municipal or a federal program. With Alberta co-ordinating all levels of program, it would be inconceivable for this to occur again.

I should like to emphasize what I have said before, in all fairness, that on a long-term base, a program that is designed to offset a seasonal unemployment circumstance or, in the summer, to offset unemployment by a particular group of people, for example students, is not the lone or long-term approach to unemployment. It becomes that when the two programs and other programs of departments of the private sector and the training programs become so conceived and developed, that the long-term second industrial developments and the training begin to get parallel. So that we will begin, and have begun, an inventory of the kinds of things that Alberta intends to do that is on record to be and labour. doing from industry looking at its records on its own, and looking at the kind of skills and competence that the people of Alberta will need to meet this kind of growth in Alberta in the next decade and beyond. Thank you.

QUESTIONS

Farm Gas Distribution Co-ops

222. Mr. Henderson asked the government the following question:

Re: Farm Gas Distribution Co-ops.

1. How many groups of rural citizens, since January 1, 1972, have requested financial assistance under co-operative activities legislation towards construction of Rural Gas Distribution Co-operatives?
2. What are the names of the groups making the above request and the municipal or country areas in which the groups reside?
3. What is the number of natural gas distribution co-operatives that have been approved by the government since January 1, 1972, the names of the co-operatives, the total cost of each proposed system, and the amount of the government guarantee given?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. Deputy Premier wish to state whether the government wishes to table this information now?

DR. HORNER:

Not at the moment, Mr. Speaker, because it will take some review of the files, both in my office and in the office of the Director of Co-operative Activities, but we would be quite willing to have the question be made an Order for a Return and file the necessary information.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

70-20

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

AGT -- City of Edmonton

223. Mr. Henderson asked the government the following question:

Re: Sale of AGT Facilities to the City of Edmonton.

What was the actual investment made, year by year, by Alberta Government Telephones in the facilities now being sold by Alberta Government Telephones to the City of Edmonton under the terms of Bill 120?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that this question be made an Order for a Return so that the information can be compiled and supplied to the hon. member.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, on the point, I thought the hon. minister indicated yesterday the information was going to be made available today. Is he now saying it is going to be a return, that it is not available?

MR. WERRY:

There has been some misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker. Last night when the hon. member posed the question, I think that I said I would accept the question today.

MR. HENDERSON:

Is it going to be made into a return then, Mr. Speaker, or is it going to stand as a question?

MR. SPEAKER:

My understanding is that once the government agrees to a question, it, in effect, becomes an Order for a Return, and all that is necessary is for the Clerk to put it in the proper wording on the Orders of the Day.

MR. HENDERSON:

In view of the fact that the bill is before the House for third reading, will the hon. minister give some indication when the return will be tabled in the House.

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to hope that the information will be made available within the next two or three days, but I certainly can't state equivocally that it can. But I can assume the responsibility for supplying all the information that I can, which will, hopefully, be enough to satisfy the hon. member.

Surface and Mineral Leases

226. Mr. Ruste asked the government the following question, which Mr. Dickie answered as indicated.

What are the details of the surface and mineral leases exchanged in the Wilderness Areas as outlined in the schedule of Bill 93, The Wilderness Areas Amendment Act 1972, in return for surface and mineral leases in other areas of the province.

Itemize such things as:

- (1) Areas involved;
- (2) Types of lease;
- (3) Companies involved; and
- (4) Terms of leases.

Answer With respect to Ghost River Wilderness Area

(1) The areas involved totalled 3,200 acres, more or less, as described in Appendix "A" of Schedule 1 hereto, which were surrendered to the Crown in exchange for a new lease comprising the area of 3,200 acres, more or less, as described in Appendix "B" of Schedule 1. The exchange has been completed.

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-21

(2) The types of the leases involved were petroleum and natural gas.

(3) The only company involved was Shell Canada Limited.

(4) The leases were for a term of 21 years commencing January 23, 1961 and the new lease granted to the company is for a term of 21 years commencing January 23, 1961.

With respect to Siffleur Wilderness Area

(1) The areas involved totalled 5,120 acres, more or less, as described in Appendix A of schedule 2 hereto, which are being surrendered to the Crown in exchange for new leases comprising areas totalling 5,120 acres, more or less, as described in Appendix B of Schedule 2. This exchange is now being completed.

(2) The types of the leases involved were petroleum and natural gas.

(3) The only company involved was Western Decalta Petroleum Limited.

(4) The leases were for a term of 21 years commencing October 5, 1962 and the new leases to be granted to the company will be for a term of 21 years commencing October 5, 1962.

With respect to White Goat Wilderness Area, there were no mineral leases in this area.

Schedule 1

Appendix "A"

Section 13 in Township 27, Range 10; the North half of Section 16, the North half and South East quarter of Section 19, Section 21, the South West quarter of Section 28, Section 30 and the South half of Section 31 in Township 28, Range 10, all West of the 5th Meridian, an area of 3,200 acres, more or less.

Appendix "B"

The North East quarter of Section 32 and the North halves of Sections 33, 34 and 35 in Township 28, Range 10; the South half and North West quarter of Section 2, the South half of Section 3, the South half and North West quarter of Section 4 the East half of Section 5, the South East quarter of Section 8 and the South West quarters of Sections 9 and 11 in Township 29, Range 10, all West of the 5th Meridian, an area of 3,200 acres, more or less.

Schedule 2

Appendix "A"

Section 16, the East half of Section 20 and Sections 21, 28 and 29 in Township 34, Range 17; the West half of Section 4 and Sections 5, 7 and 8 in Township 35, Range 17, all West of the 5th Meridian, an area of 5,120 acres, more or less.

Appendix "B"

The North West quarter of Section 4 in Township 46, Range 5, West of the 4th Meridian; the South West quarter of Section 11 and the North West quarter of Section 13 in Township 36, Range 21, West of the 4th Meridian; Section 6 and the South West quarter of Section 7 in Township 53, Range 23, West of the 5th Meridian; Section 22 in Township 55, Range 24, West of the 5th Meridian; Sections 20 and 30 in Township 58, Range 2, West of the 6th Meridian; Sections 5 and 8 in Township 62, Range 4, West of the 6th Meridian, an area of 5,120 acres, more or less.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, supplementing the answer to 226, just tabled, which pertains only to mineral leases, I would like, as my responsibility in the Department of Lands and Forests, to restate as I did on second reading of Bill 93, that with these mineral lease matters taken care of now, there are no lease problems that would encumber the wilderness areas in either the legislation as it reads or in

70-22

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

actual fact in the use of wilderness areas. There are no leases that encumber the wilderness areas of Ghost River, Siffleur, and White Goat as of now.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister provide the Clerk with a copy of the reply, since an answer given at this stage must appear in the Votes and Proceedings.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

Mental Health Patients

224. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the assembly, seconded by Mr. R. Speaker.

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

What were the maximum number of patients in each of the following instances during each month in each of the following institutions from January 1st, 1971, to August 30th, 1972:

1. Alberta Hospital, Oliver;
2. Alberta Hospital, Ponoka;
3. Alberta Hospital (Rosehaven), Camrose;
4. Alberta Hospital, Claresholm?

[The motion was carried without debate.]

225. Mr. Wilson proposed the following motion to this assembly: seconded by Mr. Mandeville.

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

What policy changes have been implemented, as a result of the current transportation study, on the overall review of the transportation needs of the Province of Alberta?

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like a ruling from you as to whether or not what is on the routine and Orders of the Day as a Motion for a Return is properly a Motion for a Return. I draw your attention to annotations 209, particularly parts 1, 2, and 3 on pages 176, and 177 of Beauchesne. This is a question rather than a request for a copy of any document or report or statistics available to the government. While I personally cannot comment on the ability of the minister to respond to it, either as a question or a motion for a return, I would like it clarified as to whether or not the hon. member has proceeded properly in framing it as a motion rather than a question.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the statements just made, I point out that I was referred to the Order Paper --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member, in speaking at this time, would be closing the debate on the motion, but I take it that he can discuss the point of order without closing the debate. The point of order has been raised with regard to the question.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out that this whole issue started by an Order in Council on December 16th, pointing out that the funds were urgently and immediately required in the amount of \$41,500 to carry out a transportation study. In raising it in an oral question period recently, the advice I was given was to put it on the Order Paper in a return for a motion, because it was too lengthy to deal with in the Oral Question Period.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, clearly on the point of order, the hon. member should appreciate that there are a number of ways in which he can put questions on the Order Paper. Unfortunately, he has chosen the wrong one because this is certainly not where it should be as a Motion for a Return. You can hardly ask for a Motion for a Return -- for a return of what -- on the question that he

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-23

asked? I want to suggest that the hon. member should withdraw his motion and think about it for a while and then put the question on the Order Paper in a different manner. He might receive some answers.

MR. HENDERSON:

On speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I think you should give it serious consideration because I have a question that I have asked on the Order Paper which will be coming up which is, once again, as the result of the instructions of the Chair. I asked a question and the Speaker suggested that it should be placed on the Order Paper in a more appropriate manner.

Insofar as the words of wisdom just offered by the Deputy Premier, I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it gets a little difficult to understand just what it is the government wants. I put two questions on the Order Paper for today in which there is ample opportunity for the government to prepare returns on. They have been on there since Thursday. Now they stand up and ask if they can be made into a return instead of a question. On the other hand, the matter comes up as a question and we get a little lecture from the hon. Deputy Premier about putting it on the Order Paper as a question. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, there may be some very valid points raised and I think the Chair should give brief consideration to it, because the way it is developing now, we're being circumscribed from asking the government to respond on policy matters. We can't do it in the question period and we are now having the hon. Deputy Premier say that he doesn't like the way we are doing it on the Order Paper. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the matter be taken under advisement so that we can see what the proper procedure is. I can't follow the statement of the hon. Deputy Premier that the matter is out of order at this point in time.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I really think the issue is quite clear. When the suggestion is made that something be put on the Order Paper, it can be put on either as a written question or as a Motion for a Return. Those are at least two distinct ways of getting it on the Order Paper. Now the question arises as to which is preferable in a given situation. It seems quite clear that a request is made for a Motion for a Return if you want a particular document which you can identify as being in the possession of the government. A number of them are listed; they are reports, accounts, or other documents, "papers and dispatches from the Imperial government," and on and on the list goes. Aside from particular documents which are in the possession of the government, the other thing which is habitually asked for as a Motion for a Return, is statistical or bookkeeping accounting information in the hands of the government.

My only concern is that questions of a general nature which are not requesting the physical presentation of documents in the hands of the government are not Motions for a Return, they are written questions, and that that is how they should be dealt with rather than as Motions for a Return. We are not saying the information is not available or that the hon. members cannot have it. We are simply requesting that they learn to ask for it in a proper way.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, if the hon. minister involved wishes to move that this Return be made a question, we certainly would have no objection. There is no difficulty in the minister's moving that a question be made a Return, so if they want this now as a question, there is no difficulty in moving that a Return be made a question. That's just a detail.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Deputy Premier mentioned that the whole Motion for a Return No. 225 should probably be reconsidered. For instance, it starts out by, "What policy changes have been implemented?" Policy changes over what other policy? It was very difficult to establish if there was any policy in many cases, Mr. Speaker, so whose policy would we have been changing? I think if the member wanted to draw the information out as to what new policies he might want to attack it along those lines, but surely who knows what old policies existed that are now being changed because many of them were carried around in people's heads, I expect, in the old days, Mr. Speaker. I think there is plenty of room for restructuring this Motion for a Return.

DR. HORNER:

I'd like to carry this point a bit further in regard to the point raised by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc. I think that while you are taking this

70-24

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

whole matter under advisement, you might also consider the fact that having regard to the activities of the hon. member and some of his associates over there, that you might get the Clerk to run a small, short course on parliamentary procedure for them so that they would know what is going on.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, after getting all the learned advice from the Premier No. 2 and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, I think that this question is really superfluous. There has been no indication of any leadership or policy changes on the other side, and we are wasting our time trying to find out.

MR. SPEAKER:

Unless the House agrees that the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View has now answered the question, perhaps if the Chair might take the point of order under advisement, and in the meantime, if the mover and seconder so wish, I'm sure that they could suggest that it be withdrawn and replaced as a question, or they might leave it stand. If the House agrees, it could, perhaps, stand on the Order Paper until the Chair has had a chance to consider the arguments which have been made on both sides of the House.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, so many ministers on the government side came to the rescue of the minister by whom this question would have ordinarily been answered, that he has not had his opportunity to say anything on the issue. Could we please allow him to say something on the issue?

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it the House has agreed that the motion will stand and that the Chair take the matter under advisement. If that be the case, then we can consider the matter disposed of for the time being.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, in the process of examining the issue, would you also take into account the desirability of a question versus a Return, and the fact that if it is a question it is written into the record in Hansard, I understand; if it is a Return, it isn't, it just goes into the journals. This has some bearing on the matter of whether it is placed as a question or as a Return.

DR. HOHOL:

I should like to table two reports that I had intended to table when I had concluded my remarks on the Provincial Funding program.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might the hon. minister revert to tabling reports?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

DR. HOHOL:

Thank you Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen. The two reports are; The Province of Alberta Winter Employment Programs which I summarized in the verbal report and the summary of the 1972 PEP Program and particularly for the information of the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, this is not the bulky document that has all the summaries of questionnaires but rather a summary of the results of the evaluation. Thank you.

MR. CLARK:

Will the minister table the bulky document?

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-25

DR. HOHOL:

It isn't my intention to do that, for no other reason, probably, than the fact it is nearly non-usable in its researched form, as I am sure the member would agree. I had a summary of it and gave the information to the Executive Council and I give it here, if anyone especially wants to see it, inches and inches of print-out and summaries. This is fine, but the report in its raw form, if I can put it that way, is not a usable document. The information which I presented today is. If anyone wants additional information I would be happy to provide it.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Relocation of Native Workers

1. Dr. Bouvier proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Barton:

Be it resolved that, the Alberta Government study the feasibility of implementing regular air transportation of workers from areas of heavy unemployment in the North to areas of employment with special reference to transporting workers of Native origin from their settlements to work in the Fort McMurray Tar Sands.

DR. BOUVIER:

At first glance, Mr. Speaker, this motion may seem rather parochial, but I can assure you that it is not, because it has implications for all of the province and possibly on a national basis also.

The hon. members will no doubt remember that during the spring session I introduced to this legislature, the idea of providing air-commuting services for the work force of the North to enable them to live in their home communities and hold meaningful employment primarily in the oil sands development. Now at that time that idea seemed to be fairly well received by the government, however, I haven't heard too much about it since and I am not aware of just how much consideration it has received.

My motion, Mr. Speaker, requests a study of the feasibility but I think it has to be broader to include a cost-benefit analysis of the proposal. I think we have to weigh the costs of providing the service against the cost of doing nothing, or of some other alternative method of solving the problem. The only other alternative would appear to be relocation or bringing the jobs to the people involved.

I won't go into great detail about the feasibility of the proposal, Mr. Speaker, because this motion asks for a study. At this stage I don't know how feasible it is. I will only try to outline some of the merits of the proposal to try to convince the House that they should support this motion. Now the time to do something in the North about the unemployment, I think is overdue and I think we have done nothing long enough. Now we've noticed today, during the question period and also in the report of the Premier to the House, where the Premier can make a decision and so can his government. With regard to the visit to Janvier, we have heard that he went and viewed the situation, made a decision and then acted upon it immediately. I am hoping that he will do the same in this area.

I won't go into great detail about the availability of jobs in Fort McMurray because I don't think anybody is going to debate that point. There is actually a shortage and with the development that is visualized in Fort McMurray there is no doubt that there will be enough jobs to have a supply of jobs to every person that I am talking about in the North. There is a work force available also. I won't go into great details because I think it is quite obvious that there is a large work force composed primarily of native people who are now on welfare, and this is true throughout the northern part of the province. The people I am visualizing today in my motion are not just the people of native origin, but include many small farmers that would like to hold a job, that actually can't make a living on their farm. They have a small marginal farm and would like to supplement their income, but they are not willing to leave their farm and relocate to Fort McMurray for job purpose. So, therefore, these people could be considered also.

Then there is that other group of people that would prefer to live where they are now, and it might be a small town like Lac La Biche or Slave Lake or other similar small areas that would like also to work in Fort McMurray but

70-26

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

because of the expenses involved in relocating would rather stay where they are but have a job available.

In his opening address to the legislature this fall, the Premier announced that the NewStart facilities would be reopened shortly for a vocational type of training in my area. Now these NewStart facilities are throughout my constituency, there are in Kikino, Janvier, and Fort Chipewyan. This was certainly a welcome announcement, I was particularly interested in the fact that the local people will be involved in developing the program, because I have felt for some time, that Alberta NewStart failed to involve the native people in the development of their program and that this is vital to the success of any program for training of native people.

Another shortcoming of the New Start program was that it was geared almost exclusively to relocation for employment purposes. They did look casually at the idea of trying to develop industry in the areas where they were training and, of course, they met with the same obstructions that anybody else has tried in that there are just no natural resources available and therefore it is very difficult to develop any type of industry.

Now all attempts at relocating disadvantaged native Canadians adjacent to job opportunities have for various reasons failed miserably. The desire of the native person to live in his own community overrides the benefit of having a job. Now they invariably return to their homes because they know that even though there are no jobs, they will get welfare. Now throughout my constituency there are native communities where the only means of existence is welfare. If we are to reopen the NewStart facilities and start training the native people of these welfare communities, the program must provide not just job training, but it must provide an opportunity to hold a job. We know that there are no opportunities for jobs in these welfare communities at present, and little likelihood of developing any, because any business venture would be economically unsound under present conditions and the natural resources necessary for the development of viable industry are lacking.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the only logical answer is to provide a commuting service between home and worksite as a means of equalizing employment opportunities for these disadvantaged communities. Now air-commuting services from home communities to place of work supplied on a weekly basis would, first of all, provide opportunity for employment, and therefore, be an alternative to welfare; and two, allow native people to work in economically viable jobs while living in their own communities.

Now I say on the work-week basis, because it is my feeling that with longer shifts -- the work-week could be cut down to four days, and I say four days because it would allow for a normal rotation of shifts, four days on the job and then four days in their home communities. It would allow also for two shifts to be transported for the airplanes to transport in both directions and therefore not travel empty. It would certainly be more economical.

The life style of being home for a few days, and off for a few days working, parallels the family role of earlier times. The Indian male is a hunter, a trapper or a warrior and was away from home the majority of the time, returning only on a sporadic basis. Kahn-Tineta Horn in a letter to a newspaper, not too long ago, asked that developments for employing Indian males consider this point. Other points in favour of my proposal are:

(1) Relocations are very expensive, and indeed have not worked. There are costs involved in re-location, not just to the individual but to the government, and to the employing company. The development of a new town such as Fort McMurray or Grande Cache, is certainly costing the government of the province, even though it may mostly be indirectly. Companies such as Great Canadian Oil Sands subsidize the housing of their employees in Fort McMurray, and it is safe to assume that Syncrude, when it starts development, will be doing the same. Therefore, there are costs involved to the employing company.

(2) Mr. Speaker, this approach would also remove the trauma of native families being transferred to a foreign environment. Now this is a very important point because when I spoke to people who have relocated for a temporary period to Fort McMurray from communities, such as Kahn-tineta and Janvier, they have found that when they were transported into this foreign environment juvenile delinquency developed in their children; invariably there were problems in the family -- drinking problems and other problems that families who had lived in smaller, isolated communities were not able to cope with. This, in many cases, if not in most cases, was the reason for the people leaving Fort McMurray where they had a good job and returning to their home communities and going back on welfare.

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-27

(3) This concept is not new. It has been used successfully by companies such as Anglo Mines and Dominion Bridge and probably many others. On an individual basis the Mohawk Indians in New York State, who are adept at steel rigging, have been successfully commuting from their place of residence on the reserve to their place of work for years. Alberta Lands and Forests is presently carrying out commuting program to fire areas almost identical to the one I am suggesting. Native people invariably try to be included when Alberta Forest Services comes to their communities.

(4) The present approach of DREE incentive grants is very susceptible to criticism. Instead of people who are poor receiving help, all the grants go the wealthy corporations -- which recently have been termed "corporate welfare bums". The provision of commuter transportation is a way in which the disadvantaged people can be subsidized without directly subsidizing the private industry.

(5) Economic studies may show this approach to be more economical than building new towns adjacent to industrial development. Just briefly, to give an example of this, using Grande Cache, for instance, McIntyre - Porcupine at the time when this study was done, employed on site some 450 people. Approximately 150 of these could work in Edmonton in administration and so on, just as well as in Grande Cache. This leaves some 300 weekly commuters who work in the actual production of coal. The cost per trip at present charter rates is approximately \$30. Now the annual cost in simple arithmetic worked out at \$30 per week, for 50 weeks times 300 men equals \$450,000. There would probably be the additional cost of providing camps on the site which has not been taken into consideration here. Now if you compare this cost to Alberta and Canada in building the town, which I understand is running in the vicinity of about \$35 million the interest on the loan alone barely meets the annual cost of transporting these people. Now I think it's something that requires some study and certainly could be looked into. There are possibly some favourable side effects of this proposal also. Native communities will tend to develop adjacent to air strips. Hence, centralization will occur naturally and will not have to be imposed. Also, with the natives probably becoming accustomed to working in a place like Fort McMurray, they may later on, especially the younger generation, decide on their own to relocate themselves. With the advent of steady income into the community, many businesses which were not viable may become sound. Spin-offs in other business ventures may result from the development of first-class air facilities in these areas. Tourism and native tourist facility development, catering and guiding services, and also the smaller northern air service companies will receive a boost which they need at this time, since certainly existing companies should be used rather than the government getting involved in providing air services.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my proposal is that a consulting firm be engaged to carry out a feasibility study and a cost-benefit analysis. Suggested topics, one, the attitude of the residents of disadvantaged areas should be found. I might say that I have, myself, talked to people, especially in the Janvier area and the Fort Chippawin area, and they are very receptive to this idea. The people of Fort Chipewyan were especially quite intrigued by it and are very hopeful that this will come about. The attitude of industry towards this program certainly has to be found out, because without the involvement of industry, it's not likely to get very far.

Secondly, the long-term implications. The provincial and indeed the national implications of such a mobile work force have to be studied and have to be weighed.

Thirdly, the economic analysis should be made up of costs involved in setting up the community services, including the up-grading of the air strips. Many of the places that I am visualizing already have good air facilities, so that the up-grading of air strips may not be that costly a proposition. This should be compared to the benefits accruing, as well as social cost and human waste occurring if the program is not established, because I don't think you can get a true picture unless you weigh what happens if you do nothing.

Fourthly, I think an investigation of the breakdown of the cost as to who should be responsible, and here I am visualizing federal government, provincial government, employing company, and the individual. I think we have to get a complete breakdown in our study of how the cost should be borne, and I feel that all four should probably be included in the cost.

Fifthly, recommendations should be made by the consulting firm that studies this proposal, as to the best machinery under which this service could be established and operated. Then also, if they visualize an experimental project,

70-28

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

they should detail the terms of reference under which such a project should be carried out.

Lastly, the effect of such a program on the development of natural resources which were previously left undeveloped should be weighed.

Mr. Speaker, I think I've outlined very briefly the benefits of this program, I really can't see anybody speaking in opposition to it, and certainly I hope that the hon. members will support this motion, and we might even bring it to a vote today. Thank you.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, in seconding this motion, I compliment Dr. Bouvier for doing his homework, he has done it well.

There is one area I would like to bring up to the legislature, especially to the new government and the new members, as being a past member of the Northern Development Council. Most of these communities are serviced by air strips built by the Northern Development Council. The five major centers, High Level, which is now . . . Lake, has a beacon; Fort Chipewyan has an all-weather one; Fort McMurray, hard-surface; Grande Prairie and Peace River, hard-surface; and currently Slave Lake, hard-surface. The two strips that I think need a higher priority are the one in the Lac La Biche area, and one, probably, in the Assumption area. I say the Assumption because of the Indian reserve there and the lack of an actual service out of that community, other than Fort Vermillion Contact Airways.

Each one of these communities and reserves in the North, and colonies, are being serviced by private northern -- if you want, call them bush-pilots, who could be feeder-lines into the major plane that is going to take these residents to their particular job site that they are working at. And I think to prove the point that it is feasible, that most of the oil companies in the isolated communities run it on a 'ten days in', and 'ten days out' basis. One definite trait that has to be established, is that relocation is not the answer. And I think, if the government does take this seriously, and will look into it, I think there is a precedent that they could look at, as in the Fort Chipewyan lakes area, and a little pioneer as you may call him who runs a trading post who is now in Athabasca who worked this very proposal very successfully. He bid slashing lines with his private little plane, took the people of his community to that slashing line, and came back and made it work very successfully.

In closing, it has to be a cost-sharing; it has to be cost-sharing from the point of social development; it has to be cost-sharing in the form of Canada Manpower, and the companies involved.

I would hope that the government would take a better attitude than they have in the past year to the northern development policy of this province, which is virtually nil. I appreciate they carry a big weight in the north, and it's total lip service, and I hope this achieves more than lip service. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. APPLEBY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to participate in this debate because some of the connotations within the resolution affect a great many residents of, not only my own constituency of Athabasca, but also many areas throughout the north with which I am familiar. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize right at the beginning that I am pleased to see the concern expressed by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-Fort McMurray, the hon. Member for Slave Lake, regarding employment possibilities for native peoples in particular, as the resolution states, although I note the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-Fort McMurray has added a few more since then, throughout the northern sections of the province. One thing, Mr. Speaker, that I would have liked to have seen indicated by both these hon. gentlemen is, what they consider to be the areas of high unemployment throughout the north, and where they consider the areas of employment opportunities exist at the present time. I do note that the resolution indicates that the Fort McMurray is specified as a possible area of employment where some of these people can be transported to. However, it is a fact that at Fort McMurray, a place which I visit quite frequently, at the present time there is an unemployment situation there. Employment possibilities only exist there for people who are skilled in certain occupations, certain

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-29

trades, and certain professions. I think, Mr. Speaker, that when we're considering this resolution, this is one of the important things we do have to consider. The matter of unemployment in the north is keyed very strongly to the fact that many of the people who are unable to find employment do not have the technical skills that are necessary to fill the positions that are available in the north. Of course, Mr. Speaker, it is very, very encouraging this afternoon to hear the reply to the question put to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in charge of Northern Affairs, regarding the revising of the facilities that New Start had used previously in the north for the training of personnel, and also to hear the comments that were made by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education, with respect to the same type of program that they are going to encourage and assist in the future. Also, it was very, very encouraging to hear the outline given by the hon. Minister of Labour when he told of the programs that the government is going to bring into effect to assist with winter employment, and to train the people in the necessary skills and retrain others, so that they would be available for positions.

Another view that I would like to present, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that because the native peoples -- and anybody who is well acquainted with the native peoples will know this, and I'm sure the hon. Member for Lac La Biche and the hon. Member for Slave Lake know this too -- prefer very much to work close to their own home community or nearby. This has been emphasized by these two speakers this afternoon. For this reason, I am very pleased that this government has seen fit, by means of the Alberta Opportunity Funds, and also through The Alberta Agricultural Development Act, to make funds available for developing secondary industries in some of these local communities. Employment will be created, so that people -- and they have been trained by some of these programs that have been mentioned previously -- will be able to find employment.

We can see many opportunities for this type of development in the north. There are more and more enquiries regarding these types of developments every day. We can see this type of opportunity arises in fish processing, mentioned earlier this afternoon; certainly in forest products, which is a big developing industry in the north, not only with production of lumber as in the past, but for other forest products too, in the matter of plywood, veneer, chipboard, and such things, and of course the agricultural products that are being developed through alfalfa processing plants, rapeseed plants, and so on. Many more of these can be developed in northern Alberta and many more of these, as they are developed, will provide the necessary employment close to home, not only for the native people who were mentioned previously, but for the other people who want to get seasonal employment.

One of the problems, of course, Mr. Speaker, that this government has had to face has been the fact that we have had to try to revive or make viable certain projects which were set up by the previous government a few years ago, and which, because of insufficient planning and insufficient provision for the necessary resources, fell flat on their face. I have an excellent example of this in my own constituency, because in the area of Calling Lake a few years ago, the Calling Lake Logging and Slashing Co-operative was set up which was a native co-op. The government provided all kinds of funds for the purchase of machinery and equipment, but they forgot to provide the necessary timber. When this government came into power we found this co-op sitting up there with all this equipment, a lot of people who wanted to go to work, but no timber to use these facilities for. This was something that our Minister of Lands and Forests had to take into consideration. After some negotiation, he was able to bring about an exchange of timber with one of the larger concerns who had a monopoly on most of this area as far as timber quotas were concerned. He traded them some timber further out, a little more remote, which was also accessible to their holdings, and got back some timber so the Calling Lake Co-op could get back into action, which they have done now.

This is the type of thing, of course, that we are looking at every day. We have to rectify some of these inadequacies that came about previously. Fortunately, we have been able to do so in many, many instances. I think this is what is necessary -- to bring these industries closer to home.

I don't quarrel with the fact that in certain areas of the north -- and I notice that when the Member for Slave Lake was mentioning the necessary airstrips, he didn't include Athabasca among them -- but we do need some improvement in the Athabasca airstrip as well. But myself, I do not think that transportation by air is going to solve this problem of employment in the north. Right now, the areas that have been mentioned here this afternoon are small in population, and they will not have that much effect on the employment within the province. I do believe, though, that if we can bring these centres -- they don't have to be large, and they -- but through the facilities that this

70-30

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

government has provided, this is the type of thing that can and will be brought about, and this is what I think is necessary in northern Alberta. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments, firstly to congratulate Dr. Bouvier for the splendid address he made, and the two supporting speakers. I do not believe that I could add much by way of facts, except to lend my support to the motion. I think that the government stands challenged to do a little more than just bemoaning the plight of the north and the Indian, and telling us that they are appalled. They have a chance to stop talking and do something for a change. I believe that we can all appreciate the problem expressed by Dr. Bouvier. It is not an insurmountable one. A little bit of leadership on the other side, and something can be got underway, because the Indians are already beginning to say that they have had a lot of talk from the government which, previous to being in office, showed serious concern for the plight of the north, the Metis, and the Indians. I feel that perhaps it ought to be brought to the attention of all concerned here that at one time, when this important motion is being debated, there are only 20 members on the government side. It shows the serious concern that they have for this problem. As I stated, I give full support to this. It can be worked out, and I believe that this is a challenge to the government -- to stop talking and let's get doing something with this; let's get doing something for these people. This is the kind of motion, Mr. Speaker, that ought to be disposed of today. It isn't something that can be dropped and then taken up again next spring with a view to being dropped to the bottom again. We should keep this motion on the floor until it is disposed of. That is the support that I am prepared to give. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Northern Development, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood.

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I want to say right at the outset that I wholly support this resolution. I'd like to make a couple of corrections to some of the remarks made by one of the hon. members from the other side. I am reminding the hon. member that he was a part of a team which saw the death of the former Northern Development Council, up until 1971, and he is a skeleton of that particular machine -- actually a fairly fat skeleton. He referred at one time to the --

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I think that if I am a fat skeleton, then the hon. member who is just speaking is rather a fat windbag.

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I am really concerned that he felt I was speaking about him.

MR. LUDWIG:

My remarks are still good, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is unnecessary for the hon. member to make any bones about that remark. We all understand his problem.

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I also recognize that the hon. member thought I was speaking of him as a former resident of the north too. But referring to the mention about the Wabamun Lake having a beacon near High Level, I might point out that Wabamun Lake is in the middle of the Buffalo Head Hills and does not have anything other than a trail leading to it, and as a member of the former Northern Development Council, I am thoroughly disappointed to see that he couldn't remember the name; it was Footner Lake.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House.

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-31

MR. ADAIR:

Now that I have that particular point aside and getting back to the resolution; I feel personally that it is a very worthwhile idea and that we should certainly consider some method of going about doing that particular request that comes about in that resolution.

I feel that there are a great number of the areas in which we have people living, whether there be only 20 people or 200 people, or 500 people that do have feelings about where they live and why they want to live there. Recognizing also the fact that these people are in areas that may not be viable in one sense of the word, and that the fact that we could provide them with jobs by offering some kind of a service as air transportation to an area wherever it may be; whether it be Athabasca, whether it be Grande Prairie, Slave Lake, MacMurray, Peace River, High Level, Lac La Biche or any of the communities in northern Alberta, they have a reason for wanting to be at home. Family reasons, reasons of the traumatic moves that would be involved in moving from their particular environment to one of an unknown environment, and if a study could be done to provide the service that the hon. member speaks of, I am quite sure that in the long term it would provide these people with a job situation, again providing us in government with a relaxing of the welfare role; it would not be a part of that. These people then would have a reason for wanting to be there.

Again, coming back to the fact that the failure of trying to relocate these people has been more or less pointed out on quite a number of occasions, I again feel that the individual involved, after taking the opportunity possibly to be transported to a work situation, would be able to make that decision himself somewhere down the road and to be able to decide, with his family, as to whether he would like to move, or it may be his children that would like to do that. That is a decision, I feel, that should be left to the individual person.

I think, of course, that we must consider the fact that a number of the companies are already doing a similar type of a situation like this and I refer to Imperial Oil who, I know, have a great number of employees working in the Rainbow Lake area that are living in Peace River or Edmonton or in Devon or in other areas, and it is working reasonably well. Something along this line, if it was worked out in conjunction with all levels of government, the federal government, the provincial government, industry itself and with the individual -- because I do feel that the individual also has a part to play in the cost involved in providing a service of this type -- we also get back to the fact that although we have a great number of air strips in the North, the possibility of providing this service would supply the need to see that these are upgraded, possibly lengthened, weatherproofed -- whether it be gravel or otherwise -- so that they can provide a strip that would be available for all types of weather, and getting them in and out on a weekly basis or a two-week basis or even every 20 days type of thing. But I do really feel that the resolution as presented by the hon. member has a great deal of merit and I whole heartedly support it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood followed by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, in looking at this motion from perhaps a different point of view from that already expressed, I find it very interesting and I think it has a great deal of merit. I think there is no doubt that industry has been very critical of the kinds of problems that it has been faced with in the employment of the Native and the Metis people in the North, perhaps for several reasons:

1. By requiring a regular employment schedule which deviates from the way of life that these people have lived through the centuries.
2. Because of the assistance that is available to them through the welfare or social development assistance and through the federal government programs and their way of life their needs have not been felt on the same basis as those of the people in our, as we call it, "white society". And so, they have been reluctant to deviate from their way of life drastically, going into a clockwork time schedule, having to move away from their environment, and having to uproot their families perhaps, to take them into the areas that are alien to their way of living. Even for those natives who did not have to uproot their families or move away from their particular environment, the sudden change of working on a punching the clock time schedule, is really quite alien to them. They have found it almost

70-32

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

impossible suddenly to make this drastic change in their nature. Where this motion relates to these comments that I am making is this: that should the study show that there is feasibility and a program of this nature implemented, it would provide to those people an opportunity to try and fit gradually into a work schedule that ordinarily is alien to them. It gives them an opportunity to try employment for a period of time and find whether in fact, they are suitable for the particular type of employment that may be available to them. Or, on the other hand, this may leave open to them, the possibility of different types of employment so that they could experiment with what may be more suitable or what they may become more accustomed to.

Their reluctance to uproot their family, when they must move away from their area of living, is understandable. They are really not sure that they will be accepted by the white society or that in fact, they have the capability to stay within the kind of employment that is made available to them. This gradual introduction to 1) working on a time schedule, but 2) being able to get back to their own environment makes the shock of this change that much less.

It gives them an opportunity then to have the ability to train themselves into a different way of life, and then to have a choice as to whether they wish to remain in the kind of life that they have led, an unproductive one as we see it in the white society, but perhaps not so in theirs, leaving open to them the possibility of a new horizon, and giving them the opportunity to their children to go into a new kind of life which to them appears foreign.

So I think it is important that we endorse this motion that a feasibility study is made, perhaps on a broader basis than the motion indicates, and if it is found feasible that a program be implemented. I would like to suggest further that should a program be implemented, in transportation costs, there should be some participation on the part of the individual so that such programs are not abused, and the involvement of the employee breathes some small responsibility. So I think with these views and the possibility of opening up a choice way of life as a result of such a program, we may improve the human relationships between the white society and the Native and Metis society. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, followed by the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, looking at the motion I don't see how anybody could really object to the question of the study on it. I am really not too sure in the final analysis what my views would be on a proposition to implement such a program. I think previous speakers have pointed out that such practices are already in existence in industry. I think the question that would come to me is: to what extent should the government become directly involved in the operation of such a program? I could see it acting as the organizer or the motivator of getting such programs functioning where there are specific problems that are peculiar to the particular people in question. But I also have to say, Mr. Speaker, that really the same types of social problems that the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood spoke about really go beyond the question of Indians and Metis.

One of the decisions I think that the governments in this country are going to have to come to within the next few years in this country -- Alberta and Canada -- is, to what extent should government have a responsibility for trying to create employment where people are? When you really look at it it is somewhat contradictory to the whole basic motivating forces on which Canada and this province was developed. The people went where the employment opportunities were. It's really only since the introduction of the welfare state that this philosophy has somewhat fallen into disrepute. I am still not convinced in the long run that the question of saying in the final analysis that the citizen is going to have to go to where the work opportunities are, is not really the only logical approach to take to the problem. I could certainly support a program which deals with the question of relocation of workers.

In the final analysis if a person doesn't want to accept the employment opportunities -- it is a decision that only he can make -- then no amount of shuttling him back and forth is going to change that. I know of the experience in Alberta where they tried to bring coal miners from the Maritimes to Grande Cache. These people in the Maritimes felt the same way about leaving the

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-33

Maritimes as some of the native people do in the north country, or the same way a number of people in the oil industry feel right now about the fact that the new employment opportunities are increasing in the Arctic. There is an in between, which I think is workable, where one can compromise and, to some extent, transport people back and forth on a routine basis between the employment opportunity and place of residence. But really as an overall government policy it is fraught with many pitfalls and perils. My wife would like to live in Victoria and I say, "Well, that's fine except I am not aware of any oil wells out that way." The employment opportunities are here. I would have to say, "I've got to live here anyway -- " I won't bother going into the rest of the argument.

But nonetheless this is the way the problem actually evolves. Everyone in society has his choice as to where he wants to live and where he wants to work. I can clearly see some government initiative in trying to encourage people to relocate themselves in those areas where work exists. The manpower programs that have been involved in and I won't bother going into the rest of the argument. But none the less, this is the way the problem actually evolves. Everyone in a free society has his choice as to where he wants to live, and where he wants to work. I can clearly see some government initiative in trying to encourage people to relocate themselves in those areas where work exists, and the Manpower programs that have been evolved in recent years are aimed at this particular objective. But I also have to say that I think a program that is going to be established on a basis of transporting workers daily back and forth at government expense or industry expense, between their place of residence and their place of work on an on-going, regular basis, is fraught with as many perils as a policy which we've seen our federal government embark upon, and that's in trying to create work opportunities with the infusions of public funds into enterprises which are not really economically viable, as opposed to going in the opposite direction of trying to encourage people to go where the work opportunities are.

Of course, it's this motivating factor that's accounted for the fact that Alberta has grown so phenomenally in the last 30 years as compared to the other two provinces on the prairies. You can look at it, Saskatchewan and Manitoba have stood still, really they are back at the same populations they were before the depression, and Alberta has moved ahead.

You know, one takes a look at it and has to say to what extent should the people who have moved where the work opportunities are, be paying taxes to support those who like to live in one place and work in another? And so while the motion may have something to commend it in the form of study, I would certainly hope that if the government intends to undertake such a study, that they view the proposition with the realities in mind, and not with the view of getting into some of the messes that the federal government exercises on spending public funds to establish economic industries some place in a province in Canada, where they really can't be economically justified.

In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, I have to subscribe to the view, that the citizen, if he wants to maintain his freedom, and his freedom of choice in the long run, has to accept the fact that he has to go where the opportunities are. If, on the other hand, he chooses to accept the sub-standard of living as a privilege of staying where there is no work, but where he likes living, maybe that's an option he should have available to him.

But I wonder if we haven't gone a little bit too far in this country along that particular road already. The question of unemployment was one which received and is still receiving a lot of attention nationally. A few years ago in this legislature it received a lot of attention. Alberta now enjoys the unique position, I think, of having about the lowest unemployment problems in Canada. But I'm also convinced, when it comes to looking at the question of unemployment and what one should do to get unemployed employables employed, that the welfare state clearly detracts from the many programs the government is initiating on the one hand, and on the other hand, coming up with welfare programs that encourage them to stay put and accept a sub-standard of living.

I have to think that in the final analysis, if an individual wishes to refuse employment, to live in a place of his own choosing where there is no employment, and to accept the lower standard of living that goes with it, he should have the prerogative. But I'm not too sure of the extent to which public money should be used in subsidizing and encouraging him to stay there and accept that lower standard of living. So the motion seems to be one somewhere in between, trying, so far as the north country is concerned, to encourage many of our citizens of native origin to investigate and more seriously consider the opportunities of employment that exist within the province in industry and so forth. To that extent I think the motion is well motivated. But I say in

70-34

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

conclusion again, Mr. Speaker, if the government is going to undertake a study I hope they will very seriously consider the implications of pursuing a policy which is based on the philosophy of taking work to where the people are or the philosophy that it is the government's responsibility to shuttle people back and forth on a day to day basis between the point of where they live and where they work. I realize in the cities you can say we have our bus systems that do accomplish this, but there is a practical limitation to which the taxpayer's dollar can be spent in trying to meet everybody's individual whims and wishes as to where he wants to live as opposed to where he wants to work.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise and indicate my endorsement of this motion. I would also like to commend the hon. member for bringing this to the floor of the legislature. I like the resolution; I like the resolution from two points of view. The hon. member has indicated his concern for the people of his riding; the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View earlier indicated the number of members in this House, but I ask you today to look at how many members on the opposite side have indicated their concern for the people of their riding. Can they point to resolutions like this on the floor --

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order. On the resolution -- will the hon. member speak on that, and exactly that, before he starts being critical of the people on this side of the House?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, well I was trying to give some advice to the hon. members on the other side. I had hoped they would accept it; it might be worthwhile. What I was trying to draw to the attention of the hon. members was the concern of the member for proposing this motion, for the people of his riding, the concern for the native people. And I ask the hon. members on the other side, if they take a look and consider some of the things that they are raising in this legislature, if they are concerned about the people in their riding, instead of getting concerned about some of the procedural aspects that have been raised in this House, when they showed a complete --

MR. HENDERSON:

Out of order. The hon. member is completely out of order. The procedural matters are completely referred to in this House that cause all the headaches, are coming from the opposite side. We just witnessed it this afternoon.

The hon. member is completely out of order, and I think he should withdraw that statement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I've sat here for a number of days now and listened and watched the comedy of errors by the members on the other side in relation to the rules. If they would just pick up the rule book and read it, we could save a great deal more time. I'm trying to tell them today that if they would do that, we could have more time to debate the concerns of people -- the people in their riding, and this is what we are trying to do, and I'd like to suggest that they follow the procedure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, first he mentioned the concern of the people in his riding. I think that is a good and valid point, he also had the concern of the native people. I can recall some of the instances that happened to me during the course of my time in this legislature, and I vividly recall one cold evening in Edmonton when one of the native groups came to me with the concern they had, that they had been employed to go and work at Fort McMurray and when they arrived there, they had been immediately fired because they were native people. Of course, all members in this legislature, I think, would express concern about that, so I asked them what steps they had taken, where they had gone with this complaint? They said they had seen members of the 'then' government, they had then talked with the 'then' Premier, and they had said there was no solution to this problem. And, Mr. Speaker, I can tell hon. members today that this was an appalling situation, and certainly the 'then' opposition took steps to rectify

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-35

this situation, to see that this kind of thing didn't happen, and I think the existing laws today in this province do protect the people, and then the amendments that are being suggested by the 'this' government now will make sure that these situations can't happen and can't happen in the future.

But they did happen, and they did happen in other instances, because also in the various debates we have had on the floor of this legislature when we stood up and talked about the native people, I can recall time and time again the 'then' government saying, that was a federal responsibility -- that was a federal responsibility, and this is how that government shirked their responsibility. And I'd like to say to you today --

MR. LUDWIG:

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

AN HON. MEMBER:

Shut up!

MR. LUDWIG:

Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say I'd like to entertain intelligent questions at the end of my remarks and then I'd ask the hon. member to think about it in the meantime to make sure it is an intelligent question.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'll provide an intelligent question. I hope I get an intelligent answer which is seldom forthcoming from the other side.

MR. DICKIE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I was relating to the debates that have taken place in this legislature and the concerns that we have had for the native people and some of the defenses that have arisen to say that it was always a federal responsibility. I can remember one occasion, when trying to convince the hon. members who were in government at the time, I brought forth in this legislature a Bible and quoted from the Bible. Many of them were more knowledgeable of the Bible than I was, but I took some time to study it and find some passage in that Book in the hope that they would find concern for the native people. However, I must advise all hon. members on this side, who are new, it fell on deaf ears very disappointingly.

However, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the point of the concern for the native people here, I would like to say too, after listening to the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, I take it from what he really said, you can't solve these kinds of problems, there are no solutions to the problems.

I would like to say to you today and tell all the hon. members that this government found a solution to it, because when we took the Syncrude project, we considered the application in cabinet. What did the government do? They attached five conditions to that permit. One of the conditions concerned the utilization of Albertans and employment for Albertans. Mr. Speaker, I can say every member of this legislature standing and speaking on both sides of the House can be proud of those things because it does show our concern to utilize Albertans and give opportunity to Albertans. That, Mr. Speaker, is quite a bit different from the situation the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc was talking about, taking coal miners from the east and bringing them into Grande Cache. We're talking about the four corners of the Province of Alberta, giving the people of Alberta the opportunity for jobs and opportunities here.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to say, another one of those conditions that was attached to that permit provided meetings with Syncrude to discuss this close relationship between government and industry, to see how we can carry out these conditions. I would also like to advise the hon. members of this House that that has taken place. Discussions have taken place concerning the question of how we can utilize the native people, how we can help them, how we can train them so that when future projects are developed in the tar sands, they'll be well-equipped to be able to handle the jobs and the job responsibilities.

70-36

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

Mr. Speaker, I think too it is fair to say that if you do look at the situation that has happened in the past, perhaps there has been some concern by management in respect to some of the native people. But these are the challenges that we face and let's remedy these. Certainly, one of them is the training aspect. I know the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour has been working on this. He has been discussing this how to overcome these problems so we can make sure that not only the native people are trained, but they're going to enjoy the work in developing this. All I can say to all hon. members today is that these are steps that this government has taken; the steps that hon. members on the other side can be proud of and talk about when they go out to show what this government is doing and they feel a part of it. We're looking forward to them if they can make some concrete suggestions and improvements. We're always looking for that and would welcome any concrete ideas along these lines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned there were two points that I really liked in this resolution. One was the concern of the hon. member for the people. His insight into the future of the North; what is happening in the North. This, of course, involves the resources up North. We see the resources developing, we see the interest all over the world in our minerals resources in Alberta and the tar sand development. We look at the world reserves and we read the speeches made, not only in Canada but in the United States, not only concerning the shortage of energy, the question of cheap energy, and so forth, the prices and the things that are happening -- we can see the whole North developing. It is exploding. I think these are some of the things in which the hon. member shows his foresight in seeing these kinds of things happening. How is Fort McMurray going to develop as a city or or a town? What steps are being taken along these lines to see it develop, develop properly, and develop for the people of Alberta?

Again, I would like to come back to the job opportunities and utilization of Albertans, because another thing that we have endeavoured to do -- we talked about the future tar sands up there, the by-products, we can see secondary industry developing up there. I know the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce is doing what he can to make sure and encourage secondary industry; take some of the by-products that we have from the mineral resources that we have in that area, and develop different kinds of industry that will give the opportunity for jobs in Alberta. So I think again, if these . . . sees down the line with the resources that we have here with proper development of them, I'm sure (and I can tell the hon. members on this side of the House) that we are all working toward making sure we develop these programs for the benefit of Albertans. These are concrete steps that are being taken by this government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the motion actually requires a study into feasibility of implementing regular air transportation. Again the whole question of air transportation is a really exciting field. Certainly as we had our cabinet meeting in Grande Prairie and went from different locations up in the north, we realize that one of the means of doing that is air transportation. It has to be a factor, and a way of using modern techniques to get communication. I think this is a step in doing that. Certainly there are problems involved, but again, when you are talking about the role of the government and what can the government do, when they say, there are no solutions, we've said we've set solutions now, we're going to look for more solutions like this. Mr. Speaker, I think that's why we can't consider a report and a study on this. Thank you.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister raised the --

MR. DICKIE:

Don't forget Mr. Speaker's statement that it had to be an intelligent question.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Good luck!

MR. DICKIE:

I must say that in the past couple of days I haven't heard too many from that side of the House.

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-37

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member shouldn't be cringing until he gets the question. He should wait till he hears it.

The hon. minister made a remark that we, on this side, took the stand that the Indian was a federal responsibility. I recall many instances when the hon. member was in the opposition and he stated that the Indian was a provincial responsibility. What stand is he taking on this issue now -- is the Indian a federal responsibility or a provincial responsibility?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to answer that, and that's what I've tried to do in the comments that I have had. The native people in this are people of Alberta and we are trying to take steps to help them. This is why I've spoken on this motion. This is why we set these conditions on the permit to make sure we utilize people in Alberta and give them the job opportunities for Albertans. That's what we are trying to do with the native people.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I obviously have wasted my time in asking him a question if he doesn't know the answer.

MR. WYSE:

I would like to say to the hon. minister that I am concerned about my people in my constituency, but I can't get the government --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has not a valid point of order.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. He did ask some questions that do involve some very difficult legal problems, and I'd be glad to give him some legal advice on that. I have some very deep books on the constitutional aspects of it. They are this high, and I might have to read them to you after he has completed his first year law course at the University of Calgary.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I have been in this House for 14 years and I don't know anyone who needs legal advice more than the hon. minister.

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Would the House kindly agree to reverting to Introduction of Visitors. The hon. Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation has some visitors who have arrived.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, thank you for giving me the opportunity to introduce to you and through you to the members of this assembly visitors who are here for the 4-H Leaders Conference in our City of Edmonton. We have 300 other Albertans attending this conference. From Saskatchewan we have Mrs. Inez Dewar, Mr. & Mrs. Bruce Dand, Mrs. Rita Bastin, and Mrs. Mary Penner. From Manitoba we have Mrs. Darlene Haberstock, Mr. Bruce Haberstock, and Mrs. Georgina Taylor. From Montana we have Mrs. Norman Borgen, Mr. Duane Olsen, Mrs. Duane Olsen, and Mrs. Russell Warner. Would they please rise and be recognized by the House.

Mr. Speaker, while I am standing, may I add a few comments to the present debate?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister might be taking undue advantage of the arrival of his visitors. Actually, the next member is the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican. Then I have the hon. minister's name on the list.

70-38

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

Relocation of Native Workers (cont.)

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, considering the heat of the discussion this afternoon, it's certainly very good that we all agree on the topic and that we are all going to vote in favour of the resolution. But the first point I would like to make is that since this is clearly a resolution calling for a study, this is something that we can all support regardless of some of the qualms that individual members might have as to what a study might bring forward.

I was rather interested in the comments of the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray about the cost benefits of the McIntyre-Porcupine coal operation at Grand Cache. It seems to me that the figures he cited, while by no means comprehensive, nevertheless struck right at the heart of whether or not it wouldn't be more valuable to have transportation of workers to a site rather than developing a new town. That's not always the case, of course, but it seems to me that the example he used was certainly one that should make us ponder this question carefully.

But going from that, I would like to take issue with perhaps the sense of what the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc was talking about when he was suggesting that perhaps we shouldn't move too far in decentralizing industrial activity in the country, and that we should be governed by the raw economic conditions, that is, what is economically feasible should dictate where an industry will settle and where a community will spring up. Of course, that's a laissez-faire argument which has been advanced by many people, but I would suggest that Canada itself is really a repudiation of the validity of that argument, because if we are only looking at laissez-faire arguments, Mr. Speaker, there is probably not much sense in developing a viable country north of the 49th parallel.

But from the viewpoint of the most efficient utilization of capital, extreme centralization would dictate that the large cities like New York, Chicago, San Francisco and others would grow increasingly large. It seems to me that as we look at the social balance sheet in North America we have to balance off the fact that economic conditions can decentralize on one hand, but on the other hand, that very centralization leads to tremendously difficult social problems, problems which wouldn't arise to the same degree where our population is more evenly dispersed. That is the reason why I have always felt that decentralization of industry, where it's feasible and where it's practical, is the sort of thing that we would have to take a very close look at, and even if that means some subsidization then, again, we have to be prepared to do that. Because we have all forms of subsidies now, Mr. Speaker. We have direct subsidies; we have the massive indirect subsidies to our taxation system etc., so let's not talk about subsidizing or not subsidizing. The fact of the matter is that when you look at the tax laws in this country, when you look at the facts of Canadian life, you see so many examples of subsidy that I don't really feel a further effort, as suggested by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray, to subsidize workers who want to travel from a more remote location to an industrial centre is really setting a bad or harmful precedence.

Mr. Speaker, we turn into difficulties as we look at this question, and we say, well all right. There is an industrial development taking place in Fort McMurray. Obviously the most practical thing to do is to take the workers from the smaller settlements and bring them into the larger community. There are many, many difficulties that arise, the blending of different cultures, for example. The fact that we have de facto discrimination in this province, notwithstanding, Bills Nos. 1 and 2, and not withstanding our efforts to do something about discrimination, it still exists and it's still a real problem. And so just bringing workers and their families to an area of industrial activity doesn't, in my judgment, solve the problem at all. We have instances of just how short-sighted a policy this can be. Just before the legislature opened, I was able to spend a weekend with Wally Firth, who I am pleased to say now represents one-third of Canada in the House of Commons. He was telling me the example of Fort Rae, where some of the policy makers in the Northwest Territories had decided that it would be prudent to move Fort Rae five miles so that it will now be on the main MacKenzie Highway when it is constructed. Now what is that going to do? Well, it is going to mean that the natives in the community who traditionally fish and hunt are going to have five miles farther to get to their traditional hunting and fishing grounds.

On the other hand, they are going to have all the so-called benefits of being by a major highway. But as Mr. Firth pointed out to me, most of the

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-39

native people themselves are very dubious about the advantages of being adjacent to a highway. They know that the illegitimacy rate is going to rise, that the venereal disease rate is going to rise, and all the problems of southern society will be imported into the community, and sometimes it seems to me, just taking a group of people who have developed a culture of their own, a culture that has a great deal of merit and is not an inferior culture, but a different culture, just packing them in to the so-called benefits of southern society, in my view, is a pretty short-sighted policy and a policy that creates really very serious trouble.

What does the proposal then, that we have before us, offer? It seems to me that it offers, in many respects, an out, a reasonable out, because there are going to be many young men in the smaller centres of the north, especially the native communities, who would like to take advantage of development opportunities, but at the same time they would also like to rear their families in their traditional community among their friends and neighbours. And that is only as it should be. The subsidized transportation would facilitate the travelling of these workers; it is not going to solve the problem. The individual worker is still going to have to put out, probably, a good deal more for transportation than they would if he were living in a larger centre. But nevertheless, it will make it possible for him to decide what his life style and the life style of his family will be, whether they can continue in their community or whether they will be forced to move into the larger centre. It seems to me that we are talking about a free society, Mr. Speaker. It is important that we preserve for people the option of choosing their own life style, and at the same time, having as much economic opportunity as they choose and is possible. The proposal advanced by the hon. Member for Lac La Biche-McMurray is, in my judgment anyway, at least a step in the right direction.

I would hate to see us ever get to the point where we accept centralization for the sake of centralization. I believe, and I mentioned this when I rose to speak, that one of the real problems in North American society today is the over-centralization of industry, and that, as long as we allow raw economic terms to dictate where people will live, we will have increasingly large numbers of people living in huge unmanageable size cities, and that the hinterland in between, will be depopulated. In a continent, Mr. Speaker, as large and beautiful as North America, such a policy, in my judgement, is absolutely insane.

I should point out before closing, that one of the additional advantages of this proposal is that it would not only apply to natives in northern Alberta communities, but also the large number of people in all Northern ridings who work out the homesteaders who are just getting started and have to find jobs during the winter in most cases. A program of subsidized air transportation would make it possible for them to get home at least more frequently and look after the interests of their farm operation.

So when you total all these things, at the very least this province can well afford a sensible feasibility study. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that when we consider all the factors carefully it seems to me we can't afford not to pass this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, there is only one point I wanted to touch on regarding this resolution today. I approve of it and support it wholeheartedly because I believe that any province, growing like the Province of Alberta, wherever possible should encourage transportation -- whether it be air, rail or road -- because this is vital to the growth of any province.

I was rather amused, Mr. Speaker, by one or two statements that were made. In particular one by the hon. member, Mr. Appleby, when he said that somebody had started a lumber company and didn't have any lumber. Now that sounds like somebody going ranching and they don't have any cattle. He didn't enlarge on it, but it would seem to me the first thing that anyone starting in the lumber business would want to know; where the supply was coming from before he puts up any capital. So I'm afraid that if it did fail it failed for a very good reason -- it was unsatisfactory in the first place because they had no supply of wood.

The other remarks were from the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. I'm telling you my hon. friend for Calgary Glenmore is certainly funny I don't know

70-40

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

from his remarks if he was a Liberal when he saved the country, or if he was a Conservative when he saved the country. I don't know. I can only remind him when he started quoting the Bible a few years ago to the hon. Premier at that time, Mr. Manning, he slipped up quite badly. I think he did the same thing again today because apparently he didn't read his Bible too well. I think there is something in the Bible that says those who are free from sin cast the first stone. So I think the hon. minister should think that one over.

I liked his pious attitude when it came to whom is responsible for the native people. I would just like to remind him that something has happened here in the last few months I can remember getting up during the Question Period regarding the school children who were kept out of school at Cold Lake. When I asked the hon. Premier and other cabinet ministers on the other side, they said it was a federal responsibility. Lo and behold, two weeks ago, when the hon. Premier was making his address on the state of the province, he said he took one trip up to Cold Lake and the school situation is settled. Now I think the question was asked by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View whose responsibility the native people are, because even if they are not the responsibility of the province, I think we should let the province in on it any way if they can settle these things so easily.

It's amazing how many things have been organized here in the last 12 months, and the reason they are able to be organized by the present government is due to the wonderful ground work that was laid by the former government. It's alright for the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals to get here and say what a wonderful thing we have going in the Tar Sands. We encouraged the development of the Tar Sands when there was no market for oil that there is today. This is who should be getting the credit.

I would like to remind the government, in particular the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals -- I'm sure he will be interested in this -- that the former government of Alberta in co-operation with the industry and the people of Alberta has made Alberta the leading mineral producing province in Canada, displacing Ontario. That is something I'm sure the minister is proud of it, but it didn't happen in his time. It happened when the other government was in. So it's like when father leaves you a nice estate, it is a lot easier to say, "Well, I am going to buy a house," because you have the money to buy it.

I would just like to remind the hon. minister of two or three things, but I am glad that he got up into the debate Mr. Speaker, very pleased, because I was going to touch on the tar sands. I think if there's anything that can help our northern people, is a development of our tar sands, not only to help the native people, but also to ensure oil development in our province, because we are reaching a serious situation. For example, in 1970 we produced 90 million barrels of oil more than we found by exploration that year, and in 1971 we have had 217 million barrels produced (that is conventional oil produced) more than was found by exploration in 1971.

Today in the House, the hon. minister laid before us a Motion for a Return which pointed out that under the new Drilling Incentive Program, 91 wells had qualified for the Wildcat Development program; but there's only one well out of 91 that is qualified for the royalty right-off up to the present time. So it's a serious situation.

I'm not faulting the government for their program, but I'm just showing the seriousness of finding oil in Alberta. I'm sure there's oil here and I congratulate the government for encouraging it, but I'm pointing out the fact that we must turn our attention to the tar sands. And I think that if this government wants to do anything towards helping the native people and at the same time helping the whole economy of Alberta, is to come up and encourage the Great Canadian Oil Sands and all other companies, to get greater production in the oil sands because it's going to be needed. It's going to be needed a lot quicker than we may even have thought of four, five, or ten years ago. It's going to be needed and needed quickly. And I think, as pointed out here in this mining magazine that with the development you do help individuals. I'll just read this Mr. Speaker, it's just one paragraph -- "The modern mining community offers special attraction for the enterprising. As exploration opens up new areas of mineral development, model towns are constructed, offering opportunities for a full and satisfying life. Older communities have also benefited from the production of their mines." And it goes on to say attractive homes and all this.

Getting back to the transportation part of this motion, I heartedly agree with it, because if you have a development the size of The Great Canadian Oil Sands, and Syncrude, and other people interested in it, then I think you are going to have a large work force. You might be able to implement a ten-day work

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-41

week. Ten days in there, and ten days out, something like they're doing in the Arctic at the present time, so as to encourage these people who want to go to work, but yet want to remain in their own community. And as the hon. Member for Spirit River pointed out a few moments ago, there are a lot of people in that category, who wish to remain in their residence, but don't mind being transported to a job, if industry is not coming into their particular area.

I emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that this government is in a very fortunate position if it comes up with a greater encouragement to the development of our oil sands which are needed. It's all right to say well we don't need to worry about them because they'll always be needed, but that may not be the case. We should take advantage now, and encourage capital, and to make sure that we find ourselves in a position to continue to supply the energy needs of North America, because we are going to have a great need for them, not only in Canada, but also throughout North America. Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister for Youth, Culture and Recreation followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I will make my remarks very short because I am sure that all hon. Members would like to have the question put on this motion, today. May I just state that what I have listened to up to now were maybe the materialistic concerns of the hon. members for our native Indians. However, I am very happy to report to the hon. members that this government has also taken steps to think of the human heart and soul of the native Indian. May I state a few examples; a native Indian was appointed to the Northern School Division; we appointed a native Indian to the Alberta Art Foundation, and native Indians were invited to the reception of Premier Kosygin. My personal feeling is that no matter what you do materialistically for anyone on this earth, it's very important that you also have this person asked to contribute to their best knowledge and possibilities, to the fabric of society. And this our government is doing now.

MR. LEE:

I want to speak briefly to this motion (and I hoped we could bring it to a vote before 5:30), and in doing so I want to express the view that although it is restricted to a certain part of the province, perhaps the whole concept should be expanded. At present in Alberta, there is functioning under the direction of Canada Manpower Corporation, what is called a mobility policy. And the submission that has been presented this afternoon is just one part of their total mobility policy. We have seen in Alberta where this has been applied, for instance in the Grand Cache area, where a number of miners were brought in from, first of all, Great Britain, and then apparently from down in the Maritimes. And this was a mobility program in which relocation grants were presented to these people. They were moved to this particular area under the mobility policy much similar to what you are talking about, but on a one-shot basis, on a relocation grant. This was a mobility policy.

The commuting kinds of assistance that are being referred to this afternoon are also part of this more total policy. Within Alberta then, this has functioned, but what I would like to express is the idea that it doesn't go far enough. The mobility policy as it now exists within Canada Manpower, and as also expressed within this motion, really doesn't solve the total problem of an individual who is moving, or being moved from one part of the province or the country to another, either on a daily or on a one-time basis. And I would like to look at just some of these proponents and provide and present a short amendment to this, which I am sure won't change the essence of the motion too much.

When we are looking at an individual who is going to another part of the province to undertake work, we may be looking at four possible financial considerations for this individual. First of all, he may want to relocate, but in relocating he may want to explore the situation first. For instance, if I were to go to Fort McMurray now, where I have never been before, it would be very doubtful if I could make that decision right here at arm's length distance within Edmonton or Calgary. I may need some kind of financial assistance, or many people may, in order to explore that possibility. And this is the type of thing that can be presented to the worker and possibly to his family. Let us not forget when a worker does go to another part of the province it is not only himself that will go, but also his family. So this type of financial assistance first of all, might be an exploratory financial assistance for the worker and, or, his family.

70-42

ALBERTA HANSARD

November 7th 1972

Secondly, he may need some kind of assistance in the actual relocation. The relocation of his home and his belongings, the actual transportation of those things he owns, to his new work position. The second aspect of financial assistance he may require is a relocation grant or assistance.

The third one, covered in this motion, which may be only one of these possibilities, is the fact that he may commute. In other words he may live about 50 or 60 miles away, or within the area that is expressed in this Fort McMurray area. He may require some kind of financial commuting assistance. It may mean the supplying of an aircraft, as seems to be implied in this particular motion, or he may require some type of daily financial assistance to help get him from one area to another while his family remains in another location.

The fourth possibility, is that the individual may need some supplementary assistance, related perhaps to relocation. He may need some assistance which is now presented in many industrial companies, where an individual in moving from one area to another is given some help in the selling of his home, and in the purchase of another home.

So, what I am saying is, that this particular motion may not solve the problem for all of the people in that area. Some of them may not want to commute, some may actually want to move to this new location. This particular motion, perhaps does not solve the full problem of a population that may want to partake of this work, but I can't, because of some of the problems that I have brought up.

I'd like also to say that the financial considerations that I have just now presented to you are only half of the answer. There are other social and family considerations that we must look at. For instance going back to the situation of a person perhaps working in southern Alberta, planning to go to Fort McMurray to work at the Tar Sands; the decision for him to move may not be only a financial one. What kind of information is available to that person right now within the province, about job opportunities in other parts of the province? I would suggest there is really very little assistance in the educative or informative sense for a person who wants to relocate, finds himself unemployed in Calgary or Edmonton, and just doesn't know where to go from there.

Secondly, there are certain aspects of personal assistance that must be conducted while the person is undertaking this move. For instance, an individual may go up to Fort McMurray to look the situation over, come back, pick up his family on an exploratory grant, bring the whole works of them out there, and they will all look the situation over and they make the decision to go. So they apply for a relocation grant and they are relocated, through assistance, to Fort McMurray. Their problems still may not be solved, because all of this time they have really been exploring. They've never really been into the situation. I think this is probably what happened to a lot of these gentlemen who came from Great Britain and the Maritimes. A lot of them have gone home. They came down, looked the situation over, and made a decision. But they were not given the kinds of assistance while they were relocating, the kinds of assistance that their families may require of a counselling nature and a community involvement type of thing. This is perhaps more of a social work consideration, but it just isn't available in too many cases.

The other thing that may be required is some kind of consultative and negotiative service; some kind of arm's length service to the person who wants to move. He may require someone who is acting as a liaison while he is sitting down there, in say Ponoka, deciding that he wants to go to Fort McMurray. He may require some help of a liaison nature by an official, say a manpower officer who would assist him in this move, in negotiating the sale of the home, signing contracts for his new job, and so on.

So what I would like to do right now is expand this motion by presenting an amendment to it. The amendment would be as follows: to delete the word 'air' and to delete the words 'in the north', and to replace the word 'feasibility' with the term 'cost and benefit'. This doesn't have any effect on the actual reference to the last part of the motion in which particular reference is given to those of native origin from their settlements to Fort McMurray. But it does expand the first part of this particular motion. This amendment is seconded by the hon. member, Mr. King. So I would propose that motion.

MR. DIXON:

I would like to ask the member a question just to clarify one point. When he says 'cost and benefit' wouldn't that automatically be covered under feasibility because you'd think that would automatically be taken into account?

November 7, 1972

ALBERTA HANSARD

70-43

MR. KING:

As a seconder to the motion, I'll just speak very quickly to that. Sometimes when you explore the economic feasibility of a thing you do it within fairly narrow limits. That is, you're exploring the feasibility relating particularly to transportation. Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Just hold on!

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question on the amendment? I have not yet a copy of the amendment for the opposition, I'm sorry to say. But the amendment moved by the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight, seconded by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands is that the words 'air' and 'in the north' be deleted and be replaced by the word 'feasibility' and the words 'cost and benefit'. Are there any hon. members who are not clear on the purport of the amendment?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Could you please read the amendment, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

There has been a request for reading the motion as amended. I believe it would read, "Be it resolved that the Alberta Government study the feasibility of implementing -- sorry, the cost and benefit of implementing regular transportation in -- I'm sorry, I can't follow clearly without writing it down on the text.

MR. LEE:

The motion so amended should read:

Be it resolved that the Alberta Government study the cost and benefit of implementing regular transportation of workers from areas of heavy unemployment to areas of employment with special reference to transporting workers of native origin from their settlements to work in the Fort McMurray Tar Sands Development.

[The amendment and the motion as amended were carried without further debate]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of information, tonight at 8:00 o'clock we will begin with Government Motion No. 3 on page 7, "Resolved that the report of the Commission on Educational Planning be received."

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 5:30 o'clock]

