

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, October 23, 1973

[The House met at 2:30 o'clock.]

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, again from the O'Leary High School, from the constituency of Edmonton Belmont, approximately 50 Grade 11 and 12 students are in the members gallery visiting with us this afternoon. Attending with them is faculty member, Miss Jane Warren. I should like to ask them to stand and be recognized by the House.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in introducing to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 33 Grade 12 students from Tofield High School, who are studying social studies and sociology. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Bill Askin. I would ask them to rise and be received by the House.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table Sessional Paper No. 141.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table Sessional Papers Nos. 114 and 247.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table additional copies of the report on the Calgary meeting, held by the Director of the Emergency Measures Organization.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

University Hospital - Utility Corridor

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works and ask what the status is of the proposed utility corridor to serve the University Hospital?

DR. BACKUS:

The status of the utility corridor is that this year we are continuing the practice of providing the utility services to the university through the Department of Public Works.

There has, however, been some concern expressed by the university and their development people that they would like to have better control over the utilities. Therefore, following this year, the utilities will be handed over and will then be financed by the university. They will make application for the necessary grants for this work through the Department of Advanced Education.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is the government involved in having carried out, or financing, work done on the provision of utilities to the University Hospital at this time?

DR. BACKUS:

Yes. To this time, the Department of Public Works has carried out the supervision and the costs of utilities to the whole university campus. This has been in consultation with the university development committee, but the actual maintenance, supervision and funding of extensions of it have been carried out by the Department of Public Works.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the government been advised of the concerns of people at the University Hospital, that unless there is an upgrading of utility facilities right now the hospital may not be able to carry on its usual services to the people of this province this winter?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I haven't personally received any complaint on this. I've had general concern expressed by the university people with regard to the upgrading, and we have actually undertaken quite extensive work in this direction this year. But if some more recent complaint like this is being extended, I'd have to take it under advisement.

MR. CLARK:

One last supplementary to the minister. In light of this concern, will the minister immediately contact the University Hospital and move on this project so that, in fact, there is a guarantee of continuation of service?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think I can add to the previous answers and, as well, answer the supplementary the hon. Leader of the Opposition has just asked.

The terms in which he expressed the question of concern on the part of people who are knowledgeable of the situation there, about the University being able to carry on its normal services, has not come to me in that form. The way it did come to me is that some improvements were required. As a result of that, I believe in the month of August, I had a meeting at the University Hospital with the board and on that occasion discussed with them the immediate short-term requirements prior to March 31, 1974 of the University Hospital.

Included in the provision which followed that by way of special warrant of approximately \$1 million to the University of Alberta Hospital, was the sum - going from memory - of at least \$115,000 for the upgrading of utilities. I believe, as of that time, the funds were provided to the university, which would have been probably during the month of September - everything was in order and their plans were on schedule.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary then to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. CLARK:

Agreed. Supplementary to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Will the work be completed prior to freeze-up this winter so that a guarantee can be ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is tacking on representations to a number of his questions.

MR. CLARK:

Once again, Mr. Speaker, will the work be finished by the end of this calendar year?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know the precise schedule the contractor would have, but so far as it's possible to complete work within the limitations of climate in this province, I have no doubt that it will be done.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Oldman River Levels

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Does his department's study indicate a very low water run-off in the Oldman River system this year?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I'd have to check into the details of that matter. There has generally been a shortage, or a relatively dry year, in southern Alberta this year - particularly the southeastern part - but with respect to run-off into the Bow from the mountainous area, I'd have to check those figures.

MR. DRAIN:

Supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Does his department have under study any long-term plans to stabilize the water system in the Oldman River basin?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I've asked the planning section of the Department of the Environment to look into the possibility of additional storage on the Oldman River at some time in the future.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake doesn't wish to ask his question. The hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen followed by the hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

Sharp-Tailed Grouse

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Lands and Forests. What is the government doing in the east central part of the province to protect the declining population of sharp-tailed grouse, commonly called the prairie chicken?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the information I have received so far does not indicate a serious reduction in that particular species of wildlife. However, at the same time, I would draw to all members' attention the Buck for Wildlife program instituted in 1973, the intention of which is to deal with matters of wildlife habitat and in that way to bring back and increase the numbers of wildlife population throughout the area, including that of sharp-tailed grouse.

MR. FRENCH:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, was this matter brought to the attention of the department by a member of the Executive Council following your visit to east-central Alberta some three weeks ago?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

MR. FRENCH:

My last supplementary question. In view of information, Mr. Speaker, has the government given any consideration to cancelling the balance of the 1973 hunting season for sharp-tailed grouse?

DR. WARRACK:

That was one of the suggestions made, Mr. Speaker, and we're looking at that.

Oldman River - Sewage

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Taber-Warner followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of the Environment. Will the minister advise the House if he has received recent complaints on ineffective treatment of sewage by the City of Lethbridge prior to releasing it into the Oldman River?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I'd have to check into that matter. I don't remember any very recent correspondence in this regard.

MR. D. MILLER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. At the same time can the minister advise the House that Lethbridge effluence will be brought up to a safe standard before the winter months?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that the department is on top of every municipality in terms of treating its sewage properly.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East followed by the hon. Member for Highwood.

School Facilities - Improvements

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Premier. In light of the Premier's announcement in Magrath that a new band room addition for Magrath school would be approved, what is the reason for the present delay?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that isn't in any way, shape or form a reasonable question. We were there a month ago and we made a number of undertakings. Without any question that commitment will be met.

MR. ANDERSON:

Supplementary to the hon. Minister of Education. Has the minister replied to a recent letter from the Cardston School Divisional Board on the subject of the band room?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, there was a recent meeting, I believe within the last two days, with the deputy minister of the department on that subject and we're actively following it up. Certainly any commitments made will be kept. There are a

number of suggestions being made incorporating changes to and additions to the subject of a music room. We're assessing them all.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood followed by the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

Drivers' Licences - Photographs

MR. BENOIT:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is directed to the Minister of Highways and Transport. Could the minister tell us what the Department of Highways is instructed to do when applications are made for motor vehicle operators' licences by citizens whose conscience makes them refuse to have photographs of themselves attached to their operator's licence?

MR. COPITHORNE:

I didn't catch the last part of his question.

MR. BENOIT:

Would the minister tell us what the department has been instructed to do with the people who apply for a motor vehicle licence but whose conscience forbids them to have their photographs attached to their motor vehicle operator's licence?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, the photograph on the operator's licences now being issued, is a condition of operating a vehicle in the Province of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for ...

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question. Has the minister had an opportunity to view these regulations in the light of the freedom-of-religion concept in Bill No. 1?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, there's undoubtedly some objection by some people to having their photographs on their licences. One of the reasons why they are on is because of some of the problems that have been experienced in the past by law enforcement people in identifying the true holders of the licences. It is a condition, as I said before, for operating a motor vehicle in Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Highways. Have the Hutterian Brethren made representation to the minister on this particular matter?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think one member of the Hutterian Brethren made representation.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister disclose to the Assembly his decision at that time regarding that representation?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I have outlined pretty clearly that it is one of the conditions of operating a motor vehicle in Alberta on the new licences that are being issued.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Stony Plain followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Plastic Pipe Shortage

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Telephones and Utilities. Last week in the Assembly I asked a question with regard to the shortage of plastic pipe for rural gas co-op construction in the province.

Has the minister any information from investigating authorities as to what happened to 18 reels of plastic pipe that are missing from the West Parkland Co-op storage area?

MR. SPEAKER:

This question - I must say with respect to the hon. member - is of such a specific nature that it really should be put on the Order Paper.

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Provincial Park Leases

MR. WYSE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Is it the government's policy to honour all existing leases in provincial parks? To be a bit more specific, Mr. Speaker, is the government considering terminating any leases in Elkwater Provincial Park, including those to boy scouts and church camps?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, that is a rather specific question and if the hon. member would supply me with the detail of his concern I would be pleased to look into it.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Is it the government's intention or plan to phase out the various camps in Elkwater and force them into a group camp - a central camp?

DR. WARRACK:

The same answer applies, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question to the minister. Is it the government's policy to honour the leases it now has in that specific park?

MR. SPEAKER:

Strictly speaking, as I understand the parliamentary tradition as expressed in Beauchesne, questions asking whether a certain thing is government policy require to be addressed to the Premier.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, then, to the Premier. Is it the government's intention to limit the leases that are in existence at the park?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we will take that question as notice, check into it and respond back to the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Auto Body Recycling

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of the Environment. To what extent is the government ensuring the recycling of larger bodies of waste metal? I refer specifically to old car bodies.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the government has a program of assistance in terms of recycling car bodies, and the program of assistance is this simple: the government has established with the municipalities a series of holding sites across the province. It is uneconomical to ship some of the cars from these holding sites, so the government subsidizes their shipment from the holding sites to a steel plant. This subsidy is on the basis of tenders which are given out to industry. Industry then flattens the cars and delivers them to certain points on the basis of the subsidy that is provided.

MR. SORENSON:

Supplementary to the minister. How is the 1973 program progressing? Are you overspent or ...

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the 1973 program, in terms of subsidization, was related to a \$100,000 special warrant that was passed early this summer. This special warrant of \$100,000 has now virtually been fully allocated in terms of recycling - or subsidizing the recycling - of some 8,000 cars.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Will the government be implementing mobile pressing machines for baling scrap autos in 1974?

MR. YURKO:

No, the government leaves that up to private enterprise, Mr. Speaker. When we go out for quotations in terms of delivering these units or other types of scrap to industrial plants or steel plants, we simply leave it up to those people tendering to determine the best method of delivery, whether they press and load more on the car or deliver them just as they are.

Oldman River Levels (Cont.)

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, in light of the question that was asked of me by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, I would like to give him his answer at this time, if I might.

I must remark that he obviously has an information pipeline into my department because this only came into my office on the 19th, so he knew something about it. Actually, the 1973 total discharge in the Oldman River, as measured at Lethbridge, was only 39 per cent of the long term average.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for ...

MR. DRAIN:

A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. In view of this alarming situation ...

[Laughter]

... my question is, Mr. Speaker, when is something going to be done about this?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Now, now.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

University of Calgary Admission Examinations

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education. Is it true that students seeking early admission to the University of Calgary are being advised to write the California college entrance examinations?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am not specifically aware of whether or not students are in fact being requested to write admission exams in any particular faculty at the University of Calgary. It's entirely possible that some faculties have in fact requested that on behalf of the faculty for the students. I will undertake to inquire whether or not that is the case with respect to the University of Calgary if the member wishes.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has there been any discussion by either the minister or members of his department with respect to examinations of this sort, whether or not they would be Canadian examinations or examinations of other countries?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the question has been asked in the House for this reason: admission procedures with respect to universities and colleges, that is institutions for which the Department of Advanced Education does not have any direct operational control, are responsible for admissions themselves. With respect to NAIT and SAIT and the regional colleges which we operate we are, of course, responsible for admission procedures.

We have taken the position, to the extent that the institutions may be interested, that we would like to discourage if possible any additional artificial barriers - or any artificial barriers to the movement of students into universities and colleges. We are hopeful that admission examinations will not be necessary. I'm hoping that the universities and colleges are prepared to live for a period of time without the departmental examinations, assess the advanced education community at that stage and see how it is working.

If, in fact, some choose to use admission exams I would like to know about it and I certainly intend to inquire into it. I will pursue the matters with the authorities, recognizing that my office and my department has no jurisdiction as such in the question of admissions to universities and colleges.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, just one final question. Has the minister had an opportunity to look into reports that in the case of admissions to the University of Calgary students must write directly to Berkeley, California, in order to get their admission examination?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is stating rumour as fact. He may be correct. I will certainly inquire into the matter if he can provide me later, Mr. Speaker, with the information concerning the specific faculty at that institution. I'm sure the university will be very happy to provide him with the information.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Civil Servants - Conflict of Interest

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Premier. I would like to know if the government intends to introduce legislation, or guidelines, on conflict of interest matters for the members of the provincial civil service?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we haven't progressed beyond the point as set forth in my statement of April, I believe it was, in the House. I have called a meeting of all deputy ministers for, if my memory serves me correctly, November 14 of this year in which I will be meeting at a one-day seminar with all of the deputy ministers and senior management people of the administration. A number of subjects will be discussed, including interdepartmental cooperation. On the agenda is that specific item.

I think it is only fair, before anything is finalized, to get the views of the senior management people who entered into these positions without any conditions of that nature being established before we unilaterally establish them. But I would be very pleased to respond further to the hon. member's question, perhaps in December, after we have had that particular conference with the deputy ministers.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Premier. Was the hon. Premier aware that there is a bill before the House on this very issue?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar, I believe, has a supplementary.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Have there been any negotiations with the members of the civil service as far as bargaining and negotiating went, or as far as contracts went?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the management level of the public service doesn't negotiate - in the collective bargaining sense of the word.

DR. BUCK:

A supplementary. In any of the discussions with any level of the civil service was the matter of conflict of interest discussed - in negotiations?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I am having some real difficulty with the question because my initial response, and it's very accurate, is that the management people do not in fact involve themselves with government in the area of free collective bargaining with respect to executive pay, conflict of interest or any of these matters. So I would view the first question the same way as the second one.

DR. BUCK:

Just to clarify that, Mr. Speaker, at the lower levels of the civil service have there been any negotiations or discussions about the matter of conflict - the ones in the bargaining unit?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, in responding to that question so that there isn't any misunderstanding in the House, my recollection of my statement with regard to the matter of conflict of interest, beyond the members of the Executive Council, extended to senior management of the public service only, and to deputy ministers and people of a comparable position, but not to those in, say, middle management or less than that. I will check the statement, but my recollection is that that is what we said in the statement and that at least has been our intention.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Manpower and Labour. Are the Minister of Labour and the Civil Service Association considering a written code of conduct for those people in the bargaining unit?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the matter of a code of ethics and several others are at the present time before the policy management committee which includes the Public Service Commissioner, several members of the Executive Council and some of the senior members of the management staff. These matters will come before it over a period of time.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Import Duties - Oil Products

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question today to the hon. Premier. It has been brought to my attention today that the federal Minister of Finance, Mr. Turner, has announced that import duties will be lifted on fuel oil, gasoline and related products. In light of the effect this will have on our own oil industry and the establishment of Canadian prices, was the provincial government informed of this action prior to today?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think we would have to answer that by saying we were not informed. I find it rather interesting that we place export taxes on and reduce import taxes, or reduce import provisions, that is worthy of some interest and consideration in terms of consistency of policy.

The Minister of Mines and Minerals, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and myself were discussing it before we came in the House but we haven't yet had an opportunity to assess its implications.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could supplement that answer and say I have received some very preliminary information on it that might be of assistance to the hon. member.

The information I have received is that there are two tariffs, the British preferential tariff, and also a favoured nations tariff that includes Venezuela and the Arab countries. The British preferential tariff ranges from three-quarters of a cent to one-third of a cent, and on the favoured nation tariffs, from one-quarter of a cent to one cent. Mr. Speaker, we haven't received indications yet of the volumes involved, but that would indicate the amounts of the tariff.

In considering that, I also feel that in light of my recollection of the sales tax on gas at the pumps, which amounts to 2.4 cents, that might be a more meaningful figure if the federal government took a look at that figure with a view to removing it.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Public Works Tenders

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Public Works. In receipt of tenders on public works projects, can the minister advise if there has been any appreciable increase in costs of construction, or whether tender levels remain fairly well in keeping with estimates?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is still fairly well in keeping with estimates. I have noticed over the last few months that probably a greater number have been near, or slightly above, estimates than have been below estimates. Drawing a very rough comparison, without having before me accurate figures, I would say that perhaps there is a tendency for tenders to come in at a slightly higher rate in recent months. Of course, our estimates also have tended to increase as well, so it's very hard. I would say, certainly the tenders have come in higher than they would have done a year ago; there is no question of that.

Our estimating people have attempted to allow for this by increasing the estimates. So it's a relative picture. But certainly the cost of construction has gone up. There is no question about that.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary to the hon. minister. Have any major projects been tendered by the Department of Public Works in the last three months in Alberta?

DR. BACKUS:

No, I think it would be correct to say no major ones have been tendered in the last three months.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

Pollution - Suspension of Car Use

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. As a result of last Friday's pollution count of 122 in Calgary, wherein the temporary shutdown of some industries was imminent, can the minister advise at what pollution count or level the Department of the Environment would order temporary suspension of the use of cars?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, last Friday I happened to be in the air over Calgary at 11:00 o'clock in the morning. I had first-hand acquaintance with the conditions that existed in Calgary at about 11:00 o'clock on Friday. There was a total inversion and an accumulation of pollutants in a very rapid manner. When I got into Edmonton I phoned the branch in Calgary about noon ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. minister has lost the trend of the question which was, at what level does the department consider shutting down the use of motor vehicles?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the nature of the question requires some explanation indeed because it's a very serious matter.

At 12 noon I checked with the department in Calgary to see if we had a contingency plan on what we could shut down. We had a contingency plan in terms of industrial operations, identified in terms of the worst polluters and subsequently down the scale.

I then asked the department to take some action in regard to a voluntary request to some of the companies, and also asked the department to issue an emission control order to Tollstrup, which was putting out a pretty substantial cloud.

Now with respect to automobiles. We have done, this year, a major study in the two cities of the total volume of pollutants from automobiles as against industry and other sources. We recognize the major contributor in Calgary is, in fact, the automobile. As yet we have not devised any contingency plan with respect to the automobile should the pollution index continue to climb or, in fact, get up very high when we have a total inversion in either of the two cities.

I would say, though, that in Edmonton industry supplies about 50 per cent of the pollutants and the automobile about 50 per cent. In Calgary about 85 per cent is attributable to automobiles and only about 15 per cent to industry.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Do I understand you to say then, sir, that at this stage of development there is no plan to cut off the temporary use of automobiles regardless of the pollution control rating?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question has already been asked and already been answered.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Can the minister advise the House whether the Department of Health and Social Development has any monitoring system to record cases of illness caused by pollution?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I have such absolute confidence, as I am sure hon. members have, in the Minister of the Environment that we are fully satisfied with the way it is being handled.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. ...

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Is his confidence retained after the display ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. The hon. Member for Little Bow followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

Committee on Beverage Alcohol Legislation Report

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney General. What further action is planned, or legislation required, with regard to the recommendations of the beverage alcohol legislation report?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, is the hon. member referring to the report of the committee chaired by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo?

Mr. Speaker, I will refer the question to the hon. Solicitor General as the responsibility for that legislation now rests with her.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, it is our intent to review the report in total and make recommendations to Executive Council when we finish our review.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Does the minister plan any procedures so that the report may be debated in this Assembly?

MISS HUNLEY:

Not at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Censorship

MR. GRUENWALD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. My question, too, refers to a legislative committee report. Will the minister be putting on the Order Paper, or cause to be put on the Order Paper sometime for future debate, the report on censorship that was tabled in this Assembly within the last year?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, a typical example, I think, of the priority the Government of Alberta should have is the energy crisis that presently exists in this world. I think it is much more important than censorship.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who wrote that speech for you?

MR. GRUENWALD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am wondering if the minister could tell us then if he has had representations from the public at large asking the minister either to implement or not implement some of the recommendations in the report?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, recalling correspondence I had, I think there were a couple of newspaper articles and one letter by a Calgary film distributor, I think. That's all.

MR. HYNDMAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think some members are still labouring under the impression that only members on the government side can put a motion on the Order Paper to have a report of a select committee considered or debated. I wonder if Your Honour might consider making a statement as to the rule with respect to who can put on a motion of that kind?

MR. SPEAKER:

The Chair expresses gratitude to the hon. Government House Leader for having made the proper announcement.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, might I just say we appreciate an indication that the government is shifting priorities and backtracking.

University of Calgary - Entrance Examinations (Cont.)

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might add some further comments to the question I was asked by the Member for Spirit River-Fairview concerning the admission exams apparently required by the University of Calgary.

I have just been informed that the University of Calgary provides to students the option of writing certain college board entrance exams which are produced in the United States, but the students must get their high school marks and teacher recommendations as well. In the event of American citizens or American students who are attending the University of Calgary, I'm informed that the U. of C. requires the American students to, in fact, write the U.S. exam as well.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise the House whether or not students seeking early admission, while that option exists, are nevertheless advised to write the admission tests from California?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I have no information on that subject at this time.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Wildlife Certificates

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Does the government require that an applicant for a wildlife certificate produce his or her social insurance number and/or his or her driver's licence number?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, we find that information is very helpful when we are able to obtain it, but it is not essential. That is to say, if a person, for whatever personal reason, should object to giving that information, he can obtain the wildlife certificate without giving it.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is it the intention of the government to make this a requirement in the future?

DR. WARRACK:

No, Mr. Speaker. It's designed for information purposes and is helpful in some of the efforts we are making to keep track of all considerations and conduct some research. We do not intend, however, to demand it as a basis on which the wildlife certificate would be available. So it would be intended that it could be made available to the public in instances where people do not give us that number.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HENDERSON:

My question has been answered, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Resource Revenues

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Premier. Has any provincial government in Canada taken a stand that revenue from resources within a province does not belong to the province?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, it's a little difficult to answer that question definitively, because certainly the position taken by the Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan would indicate that his view is that the revenues of the export tax should all fall back to the Province of Saskatchewan insofar as Saskatchewan crude oil is concerned. But that seems to me to accept implicitly a position whereby the federal authority has a right to tax the resources of a province. I think that that's the only one where there has been a specific example.

We're doing some research in terms of other cases. There are a surprising number of developments, as we get into it, of cases where provinces are involved with their natural resources in terms of export, and with no interference at all in any way suggested by the federal authority. For example, the export of electric power from the Province of Quebec is one that comes quickly to mind.

Another interesting development is the question of the export of refined petroleum products by eastern provinces, utilizing foreign and off-shore crude oil, and then exporting. The consistency of the position with regard to an export tax on Alberta crude oil, relative to no tax on the refined products

using imported or foreign crude into the Maritimes, is another problem that concerns us.

So all of these things we are trying to assess and to evaluate. I think that's the only way I can answer the question at the moment until we conclude our research.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. In the light of the Premier's answer, can the Premier advise whether he has had any face-to-face discussions with Mr. Macdonald or any member of the federal cabinet on the proceeds of the federal export tax, as to whether or not all of it or part of it should come back to Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered that in the House before, but to refresh the hon. member's memory on the matter, my recollection of what I said is that the matter was raised in the meeting of October 3 with the federal Minister of Energy, Mr. Macdonald, and myself. We took the position with him that as far as we were concerned it was a clear invasion of provincial jurisdiction and we objected in principle to the tax.

When you object in principle to the tax it strikes me that you very quickly weaken your position, your position on principle, if you then get yourself into a negotiation where you are forced into haggling over the proceeds of that tax. I for one, and I think many members feel, that we would be placed in an impossible position to get into that sort of haggling. Well, I know you object in principle but are you prepared to take 50 per cent. I just don't think the people of Alberta want us to be involved in that position.

It was left on the basis that they understand our objection in principle, and at the meeting next Monday I presume the federal government will be more definitive than they've been to this date with regard to whatever proceeds they wish to give us in a tax to which we have a serious objection in principle.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to clarify this. I take it from the hon. Premier's answer that there has been no discussion as to the proceeds by representatives of the Alberta Government with federal officials, and no submission as to the proceeds?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that wouldn't be an accurate way to describe our position. That's exactly the sort of misconstruction of our position that I would hope the citizens would not have.

We have not at any time said that we would reject the receipt of some portion of those proceeds, but we refuse to be put into a position where we are obliged to say, well, we know you disagree in principle, will you accept 22 per cent with strings, or will you accept 35 per cent with qualifications?

Our position is that the only way we can deal with this matter is to take as strong as possible stand consistently, that we object in principle to a federal tax on Alberta-owned resources.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cypress with a supplementary, followed by the hon. Member for Smoky River with a question.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Have you sat in an audience with the Prime Minister to discuss this matter directly with him since the time of the confrontation, if we can call it that?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we haven't because we left the meeting of October 3 with the understanding that there would be a further meeting to review in particular, as I mentioned, the matters regarding Syncrude, the Montreal price index and the natural gas pricing index, all of which are on the agenda for Monday's meeting.

I'd rather defer an answer to the question from the hon. member on that approach until such time as we are able to evaluate the results of the meeting on Monday between the ministers I mentioned yesterday, who will be going to Ottawa, and the federal ministers, Mr. Macdonald and Mr. Turner. Having regard to the conclusion of that meeting and the nature of the results, the question the hon. member for Cypress raises is certainly one that we would then have to actively consider.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Smoky River.

Canadian Wheat Board - Grain Prices

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister received any word yet from the Canadian Wheat Board with regard to the pricing of Canadian Wheat Board stocks of grain which might be purchased by the livestock feeding industry in Alberta?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, we were in communication with the Canadian Wheat Board today and they've announced what is called the off-board prices, f.o.b. Thunder Bay or Vancouver, whichever is less. These prices will be backed up into Alberta, and just for the benefit of the House I might give you the prices briefly: for wheat it is a price of \$3.41 5/8; oats \$1.41 1/8; barley, \$2.20 4/5.

Those prices, Mr. Speaker, include a substantial amount of money to cover freight and handling. We would expect the price at which these feed grains would be available to the livestock industry in Alberta would be those prices less freight. At the present time I have two officials in Winnipeg in negotiation with the Wheat Board with regard to the amount of handling that, in fact, our livestock industry will have to pay [for] here in Alberta.

We appreciate the off-board price being established. Having regard to the livestock situation in Alberta using No. 1 feed barley as a gauge, I would expect a price to the livestock industry in Alberta in the range of \$2.05.

MR. SPEAKER:

I regret to say that the time for the question period is over.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order I would like to ask unanimous leave of the Assembly to revert to Introduction of Bills so that a bill that just arrived, Bill No. 81, could be introduced by the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 81 The Change of Name Act, 1973

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 81, The Change of Name Act, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, this new bill re-enacts certain essential provisions and procedures of the previous Change of Name Act, but at the same time removes conflicts with The Bill of Rights and has special reference to the principle of equality of the sexes.

It makes it easier and more rational in some cases to change the name. For example, where only the husband can apply under existing legislation, a provision is made that either spouse could commence the application.

A further feature is that where consents are required there are procedures laid out in the form in which the consent must be obtained and a clarification of the procedure that would happen in the event consent isn't forthcoming in an appropriate case. Provision is therefore made for an appeal to the courts.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

265. Dr. Buck asked the government the following question:

For each of the provincial constituencies outside the boundaries of Calgary, Edmonton and Lethbridge:

1. How many projects under the Early Childhood Services Program have been approved as of September 30, 1973?
2. What was the amount of grant for each project?
3. List the total grants per constituency.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, if it is in order I would like to, if I can, amend my own question - may I?

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly with the unanimous leave of the House. Perhaps the House would first want to know the nature of the change.

DR. BUCK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, just a point of clarification. I have been informed that the way the question reads now is by constituencies and the information is not available that way, so in place of "provincial constituencies", I would like to substitute "school districts, divisions and counties", and I believe the information can be made available that way.

MR. SPEAKER:

Then the hon. member has the unanimous leave of the House to change the question in that manner?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Very good, Mr. Speaker, that is in the preamble and in Question No. 3. Changes are applicable to both.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any indication as to whether or not the question is agreed to?

MR. HYNDMAN:

We agree to the question as changed.

268. Mr. Clark asked the government the following question:

Which organizations, companies and/or individuals, received fees or commissions, and what were the amounts, under the 1972-3 Estimates of Expenditures, numbered

- (a) 1151 Agriculture (Market Intelligence)
- (b) 1155 Agriculture (Domestic Marketing)
- (c) 1402 Executive Council (General Administration)
- (d) 1612 Industry and Commerce (Economic Research)
- (e) 1621 Industry and Commerce (International Marketing)
- (f) 1624 Industry and Commerce (Transport Research and Development)
- (g) 2020 Mines and Minerals (Oil and Gas Studies)

- (h) 2420 Health Commissions (Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission)
- (i) 2708 Treasury (Surveys and Commissions).

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker ... [Inaudible] ... in the absence of the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the House agree that Question No. 268 retain its place and stand over?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

269. Mr. Benoit asked the government the following question:

1. How many university extension courses are presently conducted in Alberta by each university?
2. Where are the courses being conducted and how many students are enrolled in each course?
3. Which courses were cancelled or discontinued in the last year before the full course was completed?
4. What are the reasons for the cancellation of such courses?

MR. FOSTER:

I am happy to accept the question, Mr. Speaker.

273. Mr. Clark asked the government the following question:

How many complaints have been dealt with by the Automobile Insurance Board since January 1, 1973, and

- (a) How many of these complaints were directed at the cost of insurance for male drivers under 25 years of age?
- (b) What action, since January 1, 1973, has the Automobile Insurance Board taken to reduce insurance rates for individuals under 25 years of age?
- (c) What constitutes a "reasonable rate" for automobile insurance, as stated in sessional paper 100/73?
- (d) What are the written criteria used by the Automobile Insurance Board in allowing the insurance industry to increase automobile insurance rates?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, the question is accepted and I would like to table the answer.

275. Mr. Wilson asked the government the following question:

1. What is the name and address of the consultant firm who recently completed a study of the ring road system around Calgary for the provincial government?
2. When did the government receive the report?
3. What was the cost of the report?
4. Have any decisions been made by the government as a result of recommendations in the report? If so, what were they?
5. What were the terms of reference of the report?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, we would be happy to accept Question 275 with one exception, Mr. Speaker.

I think I was asked a question the other day if the report was finished on Calgary and Edmonton. I'm not sure how I answered that. I think I said we had some of the report. We have it on the Edmonton part but it isn't completed yet on the Calgary part. I would like that correction made.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. minister could accept the question to the extent that he is prepared to go, and the remainder might then be left for further attention if necessary.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

270. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Wyse.

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

1. Copy of guidelines struck between the government and TV and Radio Broadcast Associations regarding beer and liquor advertising in Alberta.
2. Copy of guidelines between government and newspaper and magazine publications in Alberta regarding beer and liquor advertising.

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an amendment to Motion No. 270.

I move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Getty, that the word "liquor" in paragraphs 1 and 2 be deleted and the word "wine" be substituted therefor. It will then read correctly, in that it will read: "regarding beer and wine advertising in Alberta" in both paragraphs.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you all in favour of the amendment?

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, just a point for clarification to the hon. minister. Do I take it then that advertising in Alberta only covers beer and wine? There is no liquor advertising in publications of whisky or any other ...

MISS HUNLEY:

To the best of my knowledge. I haven't researched those. I assumed the hon. member was referring to the recent comments in the press and was attempting to get the guidelines which we had established.

[The motion as amended was carried.]

272. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ludwig.

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

A copy of all studies completed by, or commissioned for government departments, agencies or boards, on the subject of changes to the present delivery of automobile insurance to the public of Alberta.

[The motion was carried.]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Moved by Mr. Moore, seconded by Mr. Cookson:

Be it resolved that this Legislative Assembly support the Alberta Government in its applications to the Federal Government for the removal of quota

restrictions on Alberta rapeseed delivered to crushing plants within the province.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, may I first thank the House, that this motion, which I think is quite an important motion, was allowed to stand in my absence last Thursday.

In reading in Hansard the speech of the hon. Member for Smoky River, Mr. Moore, I want again to congratulate him for the amount of effort and the facts he put into his presentation. I would like also to congratulate the hon. Member for Lacombe.

At this time I would like to give an overview of the rapeseed production in the province because I think it has an important bearing on where we are going and on just how important this crop is to the farmers of Alberta and to the economy of Alberta.

The rapeseed crop has been called the 'Cinderella crop', primarily because during a period of surplus it filled a need in the farmer's cropping program to give them a cash crop. Over a number of years it became, bit by bit - even through the farmers didn't realize it - the third largest grain crop within the province.

We are talking today about crushing plants within the Province of Alberta; at the moment we have only one, the Alberta Seed Processors at Lethbridge. It has been suggested by hon. members on the other side of the House that in some respects we could, in developing industry throughout the province, grow these plants like mushrooms and have rapeseed crushing plants or oilseed crushing plants just by the turn of a tap. This is rather understandable when you are geared, and the whole process of government thinking is geared, to secondary industry. But it is not quite as simple and it is not quite as easy as many members would try to make out.

A short history of the Alberta Seed Processors would soon tell you they started some 12 to 15 years ago and they had a very difficult time getting started. Primarily they were short of capital. They were also short of getting farmers to see the need for growing oil-seed crops, primarily because the price was not that attractive.

They have mainly overcome the difficulties of that time and have now a very good factory and a good outlet source for the farmers in southern Alberta, in fact in the whole of Alberta when you consider we only have one plant. Now there are other plants in western Canada, one in Manitoba, two in Saskatchewan at the moment, and one in Alberta.

The numbers of acres of rapeseed in Alberta in 1972 was 1.3 million. The average production was 19 bushels per acre and the total production in 1972 was approximately 23 million bushels. Out of this the Alberta Seed Processors, in 1972, used 6 million bushels. They had contracts in the Peace, but their main contracts were from Wetaskiwin south. In 1973 they hope to process in the neighbourhood of 9 million bushels.

The new plant slated for Lloydminster, which we hope will soon be built and in operation, will have an approximate production capacity of some 7 million bushels, but a percentage of that will come from Saskatchewan. Now these two plants could handle some 15 to 16 million bushels in one year.

The proposed Peace River plant could handle some 6 million bushels. Yet the total crop in the area last year was only 8 million bushels. So there would be a surplus there of 2 million bushels for export.

If the three plants, the one in the Peace, the one at Lloydminster and the existing one at Lethbridge, were in full operation they could handle the total 1972 production of 23 million bushels. They could handle the total. There would be no rapeseed for export whatsoever. It would all go to the crushing mills.

I might point out, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. members that size and capacity of the mills is important. Any mill that handles less than 500 or 600 tons per day in continuous operation will not be economically viable. There is no profit in the smaller mills. At the present time there is ample export of the processed oil and the rapeseed meal is no problem.

More mills would be a benefit in Alberta, primarily because we would be able to have larger sales for export but we would also have combined sales. What I

mean by combined sales is, say, one in which the plant in Lethbridge would have 4,000 tons of oil for sale, the one in Lloydminster would have 6,000 tons; the two of them combined could handle an order for 10,000 tons of oil. When you think, Mr. Speaker, 4,000 tons of rapeseed oil, f.o.b. Vancouver is a \$2 million investment to that plant and it won't be paid for until it is loaded on board ship.

We have, Mr. Speaker, the benefits of almost total production processed here in Alberta. One of the greatest benefits would be that we would then have a high grade of rapeseed grown under supervision to meet an exacting market. The side effects will, of course, be that labour, the capital and all the by-products would be here in the province.

Now the danger, Mr. Speaker, to the rapeseed industry is quite real. One deals with supply. This one in particular deals with the competition, over the coming year, of other grain prices. Now in Farm Trends of July, put out by Unifarm, we have a dollar return for the three Alberta cash crops of barley, wheat and rapeseed. In 15 areas of the province, in only 6 did rapeseed give a greater return than wheat. This was an 80 cent spread between the price of wheat and the price of rapeseed.

We now only have a 5 cent spread between the price today of wheat at \$4.65 durum even at \$8.00 and rapeseed at \$4.70. Actually, with an 80 cent spread only in 6 districts was rapeseed worth more than wheat. I doubt very much that farmers would, and I hope they don't, but if they go from rapeseed production into wheat it could be a very difficult time for a third plant to get started.

The high price for wheat and barley, of course, is going to make quite a dent in the rapeseed market, particularly when you consider that with the other two crops you don't have the disadvantage of spraying for beetles and the trouble caused in harvesting by wind, et cetera.

We also could have an oversupply on contracts, another danger of supply which possibly creates just as many problems as a shortage. Then we have a third, cost analysis. We have this in other lines of endeavour besides rapeseed and this is say, in the south, corn versus sugar beets, rapeseed versus wheat, hogs and the high price of feed or even cattle and the high price of feed. But farmers in their options today will have to take a very hard look at where they are going.

I'm not going to speak, Mr. Speaker, on the pricing and marketing of rapeseed because this is not what the resolution is all about. It is about the low quotas to the processing mills in Alberta.

I don't altogether buy the argument that because rapeseed grown in Alberta should have no quotas in our own mills because they say, well, you don't have this with barley or feed grains. Barley or feed grains sold to feeders is generally converted into beef or mutton, or even pork. But the rapeseed really goes in as processed and goes as oil into the export trade. The amount that we produce and process compared to the amount that we actually use in the province is very small really.

The quotas are the bone of contention, Mr. Speaker. As far as this resolution is concerned, we have to again look back to the beginning when farmers in Alberta went into rapeseed in a large way. The increased growth and the production of rapeseed which is, as I mentioned, our third largest crop, has created problems as far as the Wheat Board is concerned. It is probably because of this that the Wheat Board got into the act. This is the competition - and this is dealing with our export trade of the raw rapeseed - for the existing elevator and rail facilities in western Canada.

Two provinces that are possibly more interested in rapeseed than others are Saskatchewan and Alberta. Alberta is a ready market for feed grain sales within its boundaries with no quota. For example, a farmer with 600 acres of wheat and barley can contract 300 acres to feeders for feed grains. He then has his 600 acres to apply to his wheat quota.

Saskatchewan, with a small feed quota because they don't have that large a livestock industry and no interprovincial sales, mainly relies on the export sales. So they are not as much concerned with the rapeseed quota as we have been within this province.

The rapeseed growers themselves have assigned acres to rapeseed, and they have quotas at a mill which are not interchangeable as I understand it. If a farmer has 200 or 300 acres in rapeseed, he must sell his quota of rapeseed. He hasn't the opportunity to sell to the same extent he would have with barley and

wheat. One of the bones of contention is that if we take off the quotas of rapeseed to the processing mills, the farmer then would, as I understand it - and I may stand corrected - be in the same position he would be in if his crop of rapeseed would not be covered by his quota and he would have an advantage if he grew wheat.

Now the Canadian Wheat Board is trying to apply regulations to fit all growers in western Canada. This is a very difficult job, to try to please all provinces and all conditions. The Hon. Otto Lang has asked farmers to vote on how they wish rapeseed to be marketed. This is fine if we can get across to the farmers the pros and cons of how rapeseed, at the present time, is marketed and how it would affect them in the future one way or the other.

There are a few farmers today, Mr. Speaker, who are total growers of rapeseed. Most of them fit their rapeseed in along with their other cropping program. Possibly wheat is their main cash crop and rapeseed is a secondary one. A farmer, for example, may have wheat, rapeseed or barley. He may have a cattle, hog, or poultry industry and if he is a large farmer he may have a combination of all of them. So when he comes to make a decision as a rapeseed grower, he is a many-hatted individual. He puts on his hat today and he votes as a rapeseed producer. Tomorrow he might be asked to vote on the Wheat Board, so he puts his wheat hat on. Or he could be in the commodity groups, and each one of them affects the other.

I don't think we should rely only on the rapeseed growers to vote because it has an effect on the wheat producers as well. The barley producer, for example, if he is producing malting barley and for some reason his crop does not meet standards and he cannot sell it as malting barley, he has the opportunity of selling his crop to the Canadian Wheat Board or he can sell it to the feeders.

I feel that this has discriminated against the Peace River in this regard, that they have quite a lot of feed grain there, they have a long haul and most of the feeders are in the centre or the southern part of the province. So the farmers in this area have an opportunity to sell the feed grain, they have an opportunity to sell rapeseed to the crushing plant in Lethbridge with less transportation costs. The farmers in the Peace then, to sell most of their feed grains, are forced to go on the export market which gives them little return when you consider how far they are from the seaboard.

No marketing legislation is fair to everyone. The quota system has been accepted as the fairest. However we have to look on the long haul at whether the quota really does the job that many people think it does.

This is a seller's market and when you have a seller's market really, you don't need marketing boards at all. The only position the Canadian Wheat Board - and it hasn't been in this position for a number of years - the only thing that it is useful for at the moment is the gathering system and whatever quotas we need for regulation and orderly marketing, so that everyone has a chance to deliver his grain.

Quite often, Mr. Speaker, when you talk to farmers the first thing they say is, I wish the government would get out and stay out of our business. I think maybe even government would wish they could get out too.

Quite often, I think, Mr. Speaker, the government either never reacts - maybe as the federal government - or it overreacts to situations as they come up. It's rather surprising, Mr. Speaker, that in the last six months when the price of beef has risen upward so farmers were to get a fair return and when the price of grain is the highest it has been in our history, how quickly it could react to cut back these prices. But how long and how difficult it has been for it to react to the costs that the farmer has had for all the things he has had to buy.

One of the things I think most difficult as far as farm organizations are concerned, and for farmers themselves, is that for political purposes we are constantly changing the ground rules with little regard or consultation with the growers. This has happened, I imagine, in many ways with our oil policy in Alberta in which for political reasons maybe the federal government has decided that it would follow such and such a course. We're left to pick up the pieces.

Quite often farmers are in exactly the same position. You get used to something. This is what we're going to do. Then one government at one level, either provincial or federal, changes the rules, constantly overreacting or underreacting, and we are not too certain in which way we are going to turn.

I would like at this time for a few minutes to spend a little bit of thought on the Alberta Grain Commission. We have spent a great deal of time in the House finding what the Alberta Grain Commission is, who it is. From my point of view, Mr. Speaker, it's a semi-political body on the right arm of the Minister of Agriculture.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. BUCKWELL:

The head of it is a former employee of the Canadian Wheat Board. From the remarks I have heard and seen quoted, he wasn't altogether in favour of where it was going. So if the minister has had a running feud - and his brother, the Hon. Jack Horner, has had a running feud - with the Canadian Wheat Board, in fact this is what's kept them in politics.

[Laughter]

Well, it is kind of a laughing ... It isn't really a laughing matter but it raises a chuckle, every now and again.

I wonder how many farmers have heard of the Alberta Grain Commission? For example, how many people really know today, if you were to take a poll in Calgary or any other place throughout the province and maybe even in the capital City of Edmonton, that the Legislature is in session at this particular moment? Too many of them think we're like Ottawa, that we go on forever. I'll try to be as quick as I can.

Mr. Speaker, the idea I'm trying to get across is, is the Alberta Grain Commission the spokesman for the grains trade within the province or is it merely a spokesman for the Minister of Agriculture? I do not say this facetiously, because I realize the difficulty the minister has at this particular stage in our economy. I don't altogether blame the minister because I feel, Mr. Speaker, that a lack of clear leadership from Unifarm, the Alberta Wheat Pool and even from the grain growers, has maybe caused more trouble for the farmers than the Minister of Agriculture himself.

One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, is because what are they - leaders or followers? To me, Mr. Speaker, they should have come out; they have had the time. This resolution has been on the Order Paper now for almost eight or nine months and I have yet to see where they stand as far as this quota for the crushing mills is concerned. All they are doing, Mr. Speaker, is marking time, seeing where we are going to go, and then overreacting or reacting to statements or the actions of whatever government body is in charge.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in many cases the pools, the grain handling trade, are resigned to the Canadian Wheat Board decisions. They're so apathetic today that they're afraid to make a decision in case they might be wrong.

The other one I would like to speak on deals with the government involvement of paying court costs for those members who had delivered more than their quota. I can see - and I have every sympathy for them - but I think it is a dangerous precedent when government itself becomes involved with the private citizens and the court of law. I can see that the minister - it was, in a sense, an act of kindness. It was something like a mixed reaction because in helping them through an act of kindness he was also furthering the decisions that he would like to follow. So therefore it was necessary - let's give them a hand.

But I think it is a dangerous precedent because there is going to come a time when some private citizen is going to say to the government, will you help me? And we will say, I am sorry, we are not interested in your particular problem for it is not of such magnitude that we have to help you at all.

I think the ones that should have gone to bat for these farmers, and maybe the government backhandedly helping them, should have been Unifarm or the grain trade itself. They are the ones that should have got involved, not the government itself. As I say, it suited the government's purpose.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to look at this position. I agree with the minister that we have to try to develop within our province our own processing plants. It makes work for our people. If logically we are to follow this to its conclusion, then no wheat should leave Alberta except in the milled

state. Maybe it is too late now, but no crude oil should have left Alberta unless it had gone through the refineries here and made work for our people.

I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the government is going ahead unilaterally because it agrees in principle that there should be no quotas on the rapeseed mill. But I would ask this, Mr. Speaker, that we do two things.

First, a poll should be taken after explaining the pros and cons and the government abide by the farmers' decision. I realize this is going to take a long time. This is in some respects what the hon. minister Mr. Lang was looking for. I can't see a poll at this particular time. I can't see that the pros and cons are going to be that easily explained to farmers for them to vote intelligently. Are we going to have the minister and the Alberta Grains Commission have a consultation with the grain trade representing the grain producers? I think this may have already been done.

If the two suggestions get no response, then the minister will, by default, have the right to make the decision. And if he has to make the decision, Mr. Speaker, I say: Hair on him! Because we have had - the grain trade has had - an opportunity to have an input into this important discussion. If they can't make a decision then I would say it is up to the minister. Let him go ahead and make it.

As far as I am concerned personally, I favour as few restrictions as possible in all our dealings, not only in grain but in our livestock.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member close the debate?

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, in closing debate I would just like to make a few comments with regard to some of the changes in the situation since the original motion was placed on the Order Paper. I would first of all like to thank the hon. Member for Macleod for his contribution to the debate.

Since the placing of this resolution on the Order Paper the Canadian Wheat Board has seen fit to relax substantially for this year its initial quotas with regard to the delivery of rapeseed both to crushing plants and to the elevator system. Wherein the fall of 1972 we had an initial quota of some three bushels which was later extended to five and, finally in late January extended further yet, this year we had an initial quota of some 15 bushels per acre which allowed a good many people to make a marketing decision immediately after their crop was harvested and, in fact, market a good percentage of their crop at that time if they so wished. That probably has alleviated some of the concerns that have been expressed with regard to the amount of rapeseed that could come into crushing plants during the beginning of the crop year.

There are some other things, Mr. Speaker, that have occurred since this resolution was placed on the Order Paper. I refer to the announcement last spring by the Hon. Otto Lang that he would be initiating a rapeseed plebiscite or poll among producers this fall. The situation, as I now understand it, is that that poll will still be held sometime this fall. It will probably ask two questions: whether or not the producers favour continuation of the existing rapeseed marketing situation and whether or not they want the entire marketing system for rapeseed taken under the wing of the Canadian Wheat Board.

As some hon. members are no doubt aware, my position on that originally, Mr. Speaker, was that there is not enough information available to producers of rapeseed to make a clear and concise decision at this time as to whether or not the Canadian Wheat Board system of marketing would be better than the situation which exists today - which is basically a free and open market system with prices determined on the Winnipeg Grain Exchange and other exchanges throughout the world.

In my view it would take some months for farmers who produce rapeseed in Alberta to be able to study the implications of the change in the system. I don't believe there is enough time between now and the latter part of this year, when the rapeseed plebiscite might be held, to adequately inform producers of the alternate methods of marketing.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Alberta Grain Commission I recently issued a press release outlining the concerns and situation with regard to what

the Alberta Grain Commission thinks about the change in rapeseed marketing. We have suggested that with the lack of available information about the alternate system that rapeseed remain on the free and open market system as it now is. That is not to say, Mr. Speaker, that we can't have some very definite changes in the system which exists now; changes which would include some redetermination of the street pricing system throughout the prairie provinces and changes which might reflect a fairer price relationship between the prairie delivery points and the ports of Vancouver and Thunder Bay.

Mr. Speaker, I recall when the hon. minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board first announced his intention to carry out a plebiscite this fall among producers, he said that that plebiscite would be arranged for and done by an independent unbiased person. That person, although I don't want to discount his ability, is a former member of a Canadian grain company in western Canada. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board also made a commitment that there would be no interference in the plebiscite by way of trying to convince, [the voters] perhaps by unreasonable means, that the Canadian Wheat Board system is the best.

Might I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have already had some indication of the type of interference that might come from the Canadian Wheat Board with regard to a change in the marketing system. I refer to their recent announcement of the final payment prices for the current crop year on wheat, oats and barley.

Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of the Canadian Wheat Board had they released early in the crop year an estimation of the amount of the final payment that producers might expect to receive on the delivery of grains under the Canadian Wheat Board system. This year they have done that, Mr. Speaker, and in my view in checking out both Canadian, North American and world prices, particularly with regard to No. 1 feed barley, the Canadian Wheat Board has substantially overestimated the payments that might be made to producers at the end of this crop year, given the market conditions that have existed in recent months. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when we come down to the final result, more than a year from now, we will find that the final payment on No. 1 feed barley to producers in this province will be at least 25 to 30 cents less than what the Canadian Wheat Board predicted.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, that action is clearly a means by which the Canadian Wheat Board is trying to show producers how, in fact, they are better able to market their produce than the private system, a direct attempt, in my view, to get rapeseed producers to vote in favour of a change in the system to total Canadian Wheat Board control.

However I think, Mr. Speaker, we will have to leave that to the producers. If only rapeseed producers are allowed to vote on that plebiscite, if the poll is taken in as fair a way as possible I would expect that we, as the Government of the Province of Alberta, would have to give due consideration to abiding by the results of that poll.

I want to say a few words, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the hon. Member for Macleod in his mention of the Alberta Grain Commission. It is no secret whatsoever, Mr. Speaker, that the Chairman of The Alberta Grain Commission, Mr. Channon, did in fact work with the Canadian Wheat Board and has worked in the grains industry for perhaps 25 years in Canada. He has worked in many other areas of it too.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Grain Commission, myself as vice-chairman, and certainly members of the staff of the minister's department here in Alberta have indeed, from time to time, been justifiably critical of certain aspects of the Canadian Wheat Board operation.

I want to draw to your attention, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time the minister in charge of the Canadian Wheat Board, the hon. minister Mr. Lang, has had a great number of meetings and conversations throughout western Canada with regard to his new feed grains policy. The only government he is presently able to talk to, when you consider ministers of agriculture in the three prairie provinces, is the hon. Minister of Agriculture here in Alberta. Mr. Lang, by his own admission in Manitoba not more than two days ago, said that it wasn't possible for him to sit down to talk to the ministers in the other two prairie provinces because of their desire to simply say that the system he was proposing was flatly no good and they had no desire to even talk about it.

What I am saying there, Mr. Speaker, is that although we have been critical of many areas in which the Canadian Wheat Board system operates, we haven't been

critical in a manner which would lead one to believe that we don't want even to sit down to discuss the various areas of concern.

Just by way of expressing, Mr. Speaker, some of the work that has been done, partly by the Grain Commission and certainly with the full cooperation and interest of the Minister of Agriculture, we had a situation which existed in this province for a good number of years where we were paying freight rates to Thunder Bay on barley that was actually shipped to Vancouver. The Alberta Grain Commission was instrumental in changing that situation so that the current situation allows farmers to receive from 4 cents to 6 cents per bushel more for barley.

Last spring hon. members will recall the Minister of Agriculture talking in this very Legislature about the situation with regard to malting barley produced by growers in Alberta and sold to the Canadian Wheat Board at a 5 cent premium when the Canadian Wheat Board was actually collecting a 25 cent premium from the maltsters to whom they sold.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a result of a very intensive study regarding the malting industry as a result of the representations that were made by the Minister of Agriculture through information he received from the Alberta Grain Commission, malting barley producers in Alberta, this crop year, are now receiving 15 cents a bushel additional premium a bushel above barley prices.

I would agree with the hon. Member for Macleod when he says that he wonders where some of the grain companies in Alberta and western Canada were for the last few years on this question. I recall some weeks ago hearing the grain companies advertising that we now are paying a 15 cent premium rather than a 5 cent premium on malting barley. Frankly, I don't think they tried very hard during the last few years to have that thing changed.

Certainly, in my view, those are two items, Mr. Speaker, that would not have been changed were it not for the work that the grain commission has carried out in cooperation with the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just conclude on the question of the grain commission by saying that the terms of reference which initiated the Alberta Grain Commission still hold, and that is to increase the net income position of Alberta farmers. While our main interest some two years ago was to try to improve the price of the off-board feed grain in Alberta, that having been accomplished to a very high degree, we spend much of our time in meetings we have on a monthly and twice-monthly basis, discussing the problems that are faced by livestock feeders, hog producers and others using feed grain in Alberta.

I hope, in concluding, Mr. Speaker, that the members of the Assembly will feel free to vote in favour of the resolution before them. It's a resolution in my view, Mr. Speaker, that allows farmers who, I think, have a very good knowledge of marketing situations, and have a very good marketing ability, to determine their own destiny, and as the hon. Member for Macleod says, with as little government interference as possible.

Thank you.

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would answer a question?

MR. MOORE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WYSE:

Can we have the same kind of commitment from the Alberta Grain Commission and the Alberta government as the federal government gave regarding the plebiscite, that they will not interfere, try to influence the people?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is ... [Inaudible] ... a question asking for any further elucidation of something already mentioned by the last speaker.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I guess it would be safe to say that in issuing a press release last week under my name, that I'm opposed to the Canadian Wheat Board taking over the marketing of rapeseed. You might say that we've already interfered.

[The motion was carried.]

2. Moved by Mr. Benoit, seconded by Mr. Cooper:

Be it resolved that this Legislature request the Department of Education in Alberta to adjust its curriculum so as to provide that equal time and energy be expended in presenting all aspects of controversial subjects presented to Alberta students.

Moved by Mr. King, seconded by Mr. Koziak:

That the Motion be amended by striking out all words after "in Alberta to" and by substituting therefor the words "develop a model policy for use by local school boards with respect to the presentation of controversial subjects".

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I think I had pretty much shot my bolt when last this resolution came to the top of the Order Paper. Whatever I didn't manage to accomplish in fifteen minutes has been accomplished by the Department of Education over the summer, because ...

[Laughter]

I appreciate the recognition. The Department of Education on August 21, 1973 made public a policy re controversial issues in the classroom, which specifically dealt with some of the questions that had been raised in the earlier portion of this debate. Rather than read the policy, which has been prepared and is now supported by the Department of Education, I just summarize its salient points.

The first is that it provides for local autonomy.

The second is that it requires that certain standards be met in the handling of controversial subjects at the local level, and that these standards should relate specifically to the fact that there be no ridicule or embarrassment for either the student, the teacher or the administration in the presentation or the handling of controversial subjects.

Third, that in the handling of any controversial subject alternatives should be presented.

Fourth, that in the handling of any controversial subjects the material and the presentation should be geared to the maturity of the student who is the recipient of the material.

Fifth, that the treatment of controversial subjects should reflect the environment in which the school or the educational process is taking place.

All of these things I think, Mr. Speaker, allow for an intelligent exploration of controversial subjects regardless of the environment, regardless of the age or the maturity of the students. It is an excellent argument for participation by the students, the teachers, the administration and the community in determining what controversial subjects may be designated for the school system, how they are going to be approached, and the alternatives that should be presented in consequence of the treatment of a controversial subject.

Since the Department of Education has made this policy public, since it has been communicated to school jurisdictions, it has, in effect, achieved what I desired to achieve in moving the amendment.

I wouldn't say anything more at this time, Mr. Speaker, other than to urge the adoption of the amendment and the main resolution without unnecessary further debate. There may be necessary further debate, I'm not sure, but I think it could be dealt with expeditiously at this time.

Thank you.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to the amendment if I may just briefly. I appreciate very much not only what the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands but others who have spoken in conjunction with this debate have said. But there are two or three things I would like to say with regard to the amendment.

First of all I want to say that whatever remarks I may make are not intended to be derogatory, except in brief to summon up that the amendment is not really as strong as the motion was intended to be. And for that reason I would like to have the original motion rather than the motion as amended.

I would like to suggest that, for instance, in the remarks that were made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands in his moving of the amendment, in the first instance he made reference to the illustration that I used concerning creation and evolution, a statement, "There is by no stretch of the imagination deductive scientific reasoning as part of the story of creation as it is found in the Bible."

I made no reference to the stories that were found in the Bible. I referred to the creation or origin of the universe as a possible theory, as an alternative to the evolutionary theory. I have noted a number of very reputable scientists have been, for some time now, working on the scientific aspects of the creation theory with a great deal of success.

They have been unable to establish that evolution was any more than a theory scientifically, because primarily their dating processes have broken down as I tried to point out before in debate of the resolution itself. They have been able to discover a lot of scientific data correlating with the creation viewpoint or theory. One of the books being used more and more widely in the school curriculum in biology, written by a number of notable scientists, points out that it definitely has some approaches that can be made very scientifically. In fact they find it in many respects much easier to approach the creation theory scientifically than the evolutionary theory.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out by way of passing, in order to establish the fact that we are not speaking primarily in this debate, at least I wasn't, of the story as it reported in Genesis but rather as a theory or viewpoint of an alternative method of origin of the universe.

I wanted to make another point, Mr. Speaker, with regard to a statement made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands with which I agree quite strongly in part. He pointed out in one of his remarks that he thought;

it was insufficient and it is probably self defeating to base the treatment of controversial issues simply on the expenditure of equal time and energy, because the phrase equal time and energy neglects completely the absolutely essential role that sympathetic treatment plays.

I have to agree with him that the sympathetic treatment of any subject by any teacher is much more appreciated than a simple objective viewpoint. On the other hand, since teachers are human beings they can't be criticized for that, because we all stand in jeopardy in that respect. They are naturally inclined to be biased or prejudiced depending on their background. For that reason I think it would be safe to say that there is barely a subject that ever is approached completely sympathetically by all teachers. The varying viewpoints and biases of the individual are bound to creep into any subject, even such subjects as arithmetic but especially some of the sciences. These are supposed to be approached objectively but it's not possible, because of the nature of the human being. So for that reason I suggest that the finest way we can approach it, the fairest way it can be approached, is to make certain that equal time and energy be given. Those things can be measured, even the equal amount of energy may be questionable. But equal amounts of time and energy are much more easily demanded and measured than the degree of sympathy that can be engendered.

Another point I would like to question with regard to this amendment is the statement:

It is impossible for the provincial Department of Education to create or impose the conditions of the study of controversial issues.

I respectfully submit that the Department of Education is able to do just about anything it wants as far as curriculum is concerned. It is a matter of whether it sees fit to do it or not in the light of what the people require. Many things are included in curriculum at the provincial level that could be introduced at the local level. The one thing that I really appreciate about the

existing School Act is the amount of autonomy it gives at the local level. Very often when it comes to matters of this nature where there is controversy at the local level they would appreciate guidance. It is an easy thing to pass the buck and say this is not in the curriculum, therefore, we will leave it alone. So, I suppose it is a matter of opinion, Mr. Speaker, how much emphasis should be put on at the local level and how much energy will be put forth to implement programs that are permissible at the local level if they are not guided at the provincial level.

Now with regard to the statement that was made today by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands, it was so true, so right, when he said that the government had done what he hadn't been able to previously say completely in the statement from the Department of Education, with respect to controversial issues. Albeit greatly appreciated by many people it is not as strong as we would like but I think that people are grateful for the statement as it has come. Certainly it has included just about everything that the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands said. I am not sure in fact, when I read the statement that came from the Department of Education whether it was someone in the Department of Education or the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands who concocted it. Be that as it may, the two come pretty close together, very close together and so if it were someone from the department they must have read the statements made by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands. It is put forth as a Department of Education policy but it is worded in definitely permissive rather than positive language. I realize that it is an area where it would be probably rather difficult to insist things be done. It says the students in the Alberta classroom should not be ridiculed or embarrassed. I suppose we could have put 'must not be' but it is hard to implement or police that kind of thing.

I think that probably in the previous outline of aims of education, this idea would have been borne out in any case, I hope, but to have it come out in a definite policy statement is very helpful, and hopefully it will be adhered to. In fact all the statements within the policy statement itself are in that same type of permissive language and students and teachers and administrative staff should have a voice in determining it.

This I thought reflected something of what Dr. Worth put in his Choice of Futures where he suggested that some of the policies at the local level should have more input from students, teachers and parents along with the administrative staff.

Now as to the amendment itself, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to read it from the Order Paper for the sake of the discussion. The resolution called for:

... the Department of Education in Alberta to adjust its curriculum so as to provide that equal time and energy be expended ...

and this has been knocked out by the amendment so that it would now read:

... that the Department of Education in Alberta develop a model policy for use by local school boards with respect to the presentation of controversial subjects.

And while it does make provision at the local level, it leaves it rather wide open and neither in the policy statement - unless I have missed something - nor in the amendment, is it suggested strongly that an equal amount of time, consideration and exposure be given to all facets of a controversial subject. So for that reason naturally I would have rather seen the amendment off and stayed with the resolution as it was so that at the provincial curriculum level, we might have been able to establish something concrete with regard to some of the controversial subjects.

I realize it is not easy to deal with and I realize it would probably take some time. In the meantime I am grateful for the department's policy statement on the matter. I would hope that in the future, whether we adopt the resolution as amended or adopt the resolution as it is, that we would continue in this area because there are a number of controversial subjects - and they may multiply in the future - which need some definite guidance, not only from the local level but from the provincial level.

So with those words, Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation I would conclude my remarks with regard to the amendment and ask that consideration be given to not accepting the amendment but the resolution as it was originally moved.

[Mr. Speaker declared the amendment lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung.]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided as follows:

For the amendment:

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

Against the amendment:

Anderson	Cooper	Hinman	Sorenson
Barton	Dixon	Ludwig	Speaker, R.
Benoit	Drain	Mandeville	Strom
Buck	French	Miller, D.	Wilson
Buckwell	Gruenwald	Ruste	Wyse

Totals: Ayes - 44 Noes - 20]

MR. SPEAKER:

I declare the amendment carried, but I should add caution against any inaccurate conclusions concerning the hearing of the Chair when it was voted on the first time.

Is there any debate on the motion as amended?

[The motion as amended was carried.]

3. Moved by Mr. Anderson, seconded by Mr. Strom:

Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta encourage civil servants to retire at age 60 with full earned pension benefits, and further that the Government of Alberta go on record as favouring the lowering of the age of eligibility for old age security benefits, and the integration of other pension schemes with old age security on the basis of retirement at age 60.

DR. HOHOL:

I have read in Hansard the debate on the resolution of Tuesday, April 10, 1973. I read it today, and I recall that it was an excellent debate - of 14 pages - on a very important matter.

The resolution breaks down into these parts. I should like to deal with them briefly, in that order:

First, "... that the Government of Alberta should encourage civil servants to retire at age 60 with full earned pension benefits ..."

Second, "... further that the Government of Alberta go on record as favouring the lowering of the age of eligibility for old age security benefits ...";

Third, "... the integration of other pension schemes with old age security on the basis of retirement at age 60."

In reading Hansard of last spring, Tuesday, April 10, I find that most of the discussion, and it was "exceeding good", was in the area of value judgments with respect to the virtues of retiring early to enjoy the good life thereafter, after age 55; and there was also some discussion with respect to the opening up of jobs as older people retire. The whole debate was of real quality. So it is my purpose then to leave the qualitative and the value judgments that each of us will make with respect to a personal matter, and deal with the three parts of the resolution in terms of the circumstances as they are at the present time with the Government of Alberta and the civil service.

Mr. Speaker, retirement at age 55 is now possible and is being encouraged. I noticed as I read this that the hon. Member for Gold Bar had some difficulty with the word "encouraged", and I have some slight difficulty with it myself. The hon. gentleman pointed out that voluntary persuasion or encouragement is one thing, but if it were the policy, or at least the avowed policy, it could be forceful and this would be something else. So without making too much of the word, I do point out that if it were the voluntary route then that is now possible and is being encouraged by the government since the amount of reduction of pension is approximately one-third of the true actuarial value. The full actuarial reduction is approximately 6 per cent if a civil servant retires at 55 and not at 60. The reduction we make for early retirement is approximately 2 per cent per year if a person retires early. So if he retired at 55 we would deduct approximately 6 per cent, and each additional year made up of 2 per cent each year.

Secondly, where the person's age and service equal 85, he may retire without a reduction of any kind. This is a principle we are using with most of our pensions, and a very significant approach to computing the retirement age as distinct from age 65. If the combination, Mr. Speaker, of service and age equals 85, a civil servant may retire without any reduction in pension whatsoever.

Now this is a matter of record, and I give it in that spirit, that Alberta is more advanced in this area than any other public pension authority in Canada. Where the plan liberalizes its retirement age, it brings pressure upon other pension plans and, in particular, upon other members in the pension plans who, in reality, subsidize persons leaving early. So as well as encouraging people to retire early, we must protect the long-term members of the plan so that the over subsidy by long-term civil servants is not out of balance with the early retirees.

The last point, sir, has to do with old age security. This, of course, is a federal matter. We do, however, provide for coordination of the old age security with the plans administered by us as government. We do this in the following way: by providing the actuarial equivalent of the money to be received at age 65 at the present time. In other words, we provide that in advance, as though the person were 65. This is, in effect, an advance on money only. It does not cost the fund to provide this benefit because, for example, Mr. Speaker, if we were to provide a person who retires at age 63 with \$50 a month, because this is the amount he needs to live - in terms of other pension it would be, if you're retiring at age 65 - when he does reach age 65, and receives the old age pension or the senior citizens pension, that \$50 would be deducted. Therefore the fund is not a source, other than to advance money on a pension that will be received later, in this case at age 65.

Early old age security pensions will result in this pension being stacked on salaries, since many people choose to work beyond 60. This is important information, that if the retirement is officially at 60, then the difference between the old age security pension and the wages is subtracted and stacked. This has the effect of people working for less in terms of direct salary or wage at his place of work. But that money, which is lost in wage or salary, is compensated for by the pension. In any case, the principle of stacking is important to note in the circumstance.

I would then present this to you in the Assembly, sir, as the circumstance with respect to the three items in Resolution No. 3.

MR. DIACHUK:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

4. Moved by Mr. Stromberg, seconded by Mr. Farran:

Be it resolved that the Government of Alberta give consideration to the Alberta Department of Agriculture establishing a separate Horse Industry Department which would coordinate all phases of the horse industry in Alberta.

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression until an hour ago that the mover of the motion was going to ask to have it taken from the Order Paper. I am very grateful he didn't, since this gives me the opportunity to make a few remarks on Resolution No. 4, especially in light of the fact that I would like to have the opportunity later on in my speech, to move an amendment to the motion.

I want to congratulate the government for putting a gentleman in charge of the Alberta Department of Agriculture and setting up a horse industry department and in particular, setting up the personnel as well, to run the department. I think we all agree that the horse industry in Alberta is really a growing industry, contrary to a lot of thoughts to the contrary - in particular, because of areas where our 4H youngsters and also a lot of our urban dwellers are taking more interest in riding.

However, Mr. Speaker, there is not much point in debating the actual part of the resolution. I do plan to move the following amendment and give my reasons. So maybe in order to expedite matters, I could move the following resolution to the Motion No. 4; After the word "Alberta" in the last line of the resolution the following words be added:

and further the Alberta Government give early consideration to protecting the last few remaining wild horses on public lands in Alberta.

Now I hear the hon. member opposite laughing a bit, but I would like to remind him that of all the issues, I think this is one that a lot of people over the last two or three years have taken a real interest in. As a matter of fact I'd like to remind the hon. member that in the western part, I think it's in the Rocky Mountain House area, they had a petition of over 3,500 names from an area where there are just a few remaining wild horses. People are taking it seriously, because I think we'll all admit, hon. members, that the horse was, and still is, a very vital part of our heritage. It helped to open this great country of ours. We have the opportunity to save the last few remaining wild horses in our province.

The United States, to the south of us, has passed legislation doing just what I'm asking for here. They have become concerned over the years and have done something about it. The Senate and the House of Representatives have passed laws and made provisions for the protection, management and control of wild horses.

There are no accurate counts on the number of wild horses in Alberta because that is hard to come by. From my experience interviewing people from different areas of Alberta, plus information I have received from the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests and his department members, it is estimated that there are only about 1,000 wild horses at the most left in Alberta. I would like to point out to the hon. members that if we carry on the present practice of issuing permits we will see before too long there will be no more wild horses left in our province.

I would like to remind hon. members of another point. There is a great demand now for horsemeat. So there will be more pressure than ever placed on the last, few-remaining wild horses in Alberta.

A number of years ago it was argued that they interfered with range cattle and also were in competition for food with wild animals. That may have been true a few years ago when we had about 17,000 in Alberta. That argument will not hold up today when there are only about 1,000 of these animals left.

I'm just going to show the hon. members that the few remaining wild horses will soon disappear unless the government changes its policy.

In 1962 there were 14 permits issued and 73 horses were taken; in 1963, 15 were issued and 142 horses were taken; in 1964, 90 horses - and I won't quote them all but the high year was 1965 when 315 wild horses were taken. It drops down to a little over the 200 figure. In 1969 there were 343 taken; 219 in 1970. The latest figure I have available is for 1971. Maybe the Minister of Lands and Forests will be able to enlighten the House as to the 1972 figures. In 1971, 206 wild horses were rounded up. It won't be very long until this very, very important part of our heritage will disappear.

I could read all sorts of letters from people in all walks of life from school children and teachers right up to elderly citizens. The letters that

concern me most are letters I have received from people who are actually in the areas where these few small bands are still remaining.

It's awfully difficult to find bands much larger than 10 in any one particular spot. Therefore I believe it is essential that we do something, and do it quickly, to preserve that part of our heritage.

Turning now, not only to wild horses, some of which eventually wind up at the slaughter house, but there is also a lot of concern by people on the slaughtering of horses in general in our province at the present time. Alberta has a very large packing plant in Edmonton which is shipping thousands of pounds of horsemeat to Europe at the present time. Over the last year or two other plants have opened up.

We had a very unfortunate case in Calgary with the new horse packing plant that opened there where a mare was sold and they slaughtered the mare and left the colt. A great furor was created by the fact that this had happened and they couldn't understand why they would bring the colt all the way to the slaughter house and leave it there. I don't know what they had in mind to do with it but they should have made arrangements for it at least. These are the kinds of things people feel that we, as legislators, should be looking into to make sure that humane methods are carried out.

Another thing that should be discouraged - and I am sure this government can do its part in this too - is to discourage the shipment of horses for the meat trade to Europe because they face an almost nightmare journey to France and to the other countries to which they are shipped.

I believe federal legislation said that only breeding stock should be shipped, but apparently it isn't breeding stock that is being shipped; thousands of horses are being shipped for the slaughter trade in France. And if this is going to happen to these animals, I think that we as Canadians should be ensured that they are slaughtered by the most humane methods right here in our own country and shipped as carcasses to Europe.

However, my main concern, Mr. Speaker, is to try to preserve the few wild horses that are left. There are a few horses just as close to Calgary as West of Turner Valley, a band of about six. A few wild horses are remaining, a small band in the Suffield area on that big range which the army is presently using, in the Edson area and in the Grande Cache area.

But I do want to emphasize that there is no danger if we enact this amendment to the resolution that I am asking for, because these bands are all small and they are doing no harm at all. As a matter of fact, people more closely associated and living in these different areas tell me that you will often find the elk and deer close to this small horse herd, especially in the winter time because they are wonderful animals for breaking the ice to get to water. They are also wonderful animals when it comes to grazing in inaccessible areas. They are so far back in the country, so far back in the public reserve and what we would consider the wild areas of our province, that they can do very little harm.

But I think if we have any thought at all for our future generations, we should give consideration to saving the last few remaining wild horses within our province.

I have a great deal of material that could refute a lot of arguments by people who claim that damage can be done by these wild horses and that we should get rid of them all once and for all. But I am not going to get into that today. I am only going to try to bring to the attention of this Legislature the interest that has been created and the interest that Albertans are taking in the preservation of the few wild horses that remain.

This is our opportunity to do something about it and I urge all hon. members to give consideration and support to this amendment, Mr. Speaker, because it is my hope that it can be a policy of this government - I don't care who gets the credit for it. I would like to see the government do something about it rather than some private member having to bring in a Private Members Bill. The government has a chance to do something about it; it is a lot easier for them to act and I think that the people in Alberta and future generations will be very grateful for a government that will pass legislation to protect the wild, free-roaming horses from capture, branding, harassment or death on public lands throughout our province.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to second this motion by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican. It is an issue that he brought before the House early in the Seventeenth Legislature. I believe that the minister should move quickly to save the remaining wild horses in Alberta.

The hon. minister was fast becoming the minister most responsible for the removal of our wildlife. I cite the issues of the bears and beavers. I think the action concerning the bears caused many of us to lose our appetite for hunting. I don't blame the honey producers but I do blame the government.

However, some recovery was made recently when he closed the hen pheasant season. I commend him for this action. I hope he will now act on the lead shot issue. It causes the death of millions of birds that are just slightly wounded but die from lead poisoning. Another issue he could concern himself with is the leg-hold trap.

But I think there is a danger in our world today of becoming wildlife bankrupt. The flamingo was one case in point where the feathers were so valuable that they were cleared out. Horses we realize are valuable today because of the meat. If left alone the wild horses of Alberta will be wiped out.

I would like to hear other opinions on this matter. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to hear the two preceding speakers take up the cause of conservation and saving of animals. I believe that once in a while it would do the Legislature good to review the status quo, review the attitude. Perhaps some of the ministers can play an important role in determining which way we go: whether we let the animals die or whether we let them starve or whether we kill them or whether we are going to let them flourish and thrive and, besides good hunting, provide beauty and entertainment for the many people who probably don't hunt.

Generally dealing with conservation and preservation of animals and game management, we have heard so much in the last few years about disturbing ecology and the environment of these animals - ploughing up land or destroying the natural environment of animals we upset the balance of animals in our province and thereby harm those indirectly by perhaps disposing of some directly - this debate has been in this House before and I believe it's time for a review.

I have been in areas where there are wild horses. At times I wondered if there were any purpose in protecting them. But in listening to the hon. members I believe that there is.

These horses become as wild and as wily as wild animals themselves. Letting them thrive, at least assuring that they won't be wiped out, is in the public interest. I agree with the remarks made by my hon. colleague for Calgary Millican that they really don't harm anyone. Our wilderness areas are extensive and they do not displace other game. We should follow the practice of other civilized jurisdictions and not let these animals fall by the wayside.

There is no shortage of programs, articles and people addressing us that certain animals are becoming extinct in other parts of the world. There is no need for that to happen here.

I want to make particular mention of the indiscriminate slaughter of some animals in this province. I take particular issue with the manner in which it was done and also with the person under whose jurisdiction it was done. It is one thing to have some minister who has a callous disregard for game and for the wishes of the people and the wellbeing of animals. But it is a different thing when you have a minister who is appointed particularly to protect these situations.

Sometimes we make mistakes and we have a poor sense of judgement and are influenced by someone who overacts and make mistakes. It's one thing to make a mistake, Mr. Speaker, and another thing to stand up and defend oneself and be proud of it and continue it. That is where we suffer because someone is not big

enough to stand up and say, we erred, it was a hasty decision, we didn't know what to do so we made this decision and we will do it a little more carefully next time.

But that wasn't the kind of responsible attitude that was shown in this Legislature. The truth was that conservation of animals generally was placed in a bad light, and some animals are in jeopardy because of the attitude or disregard of those who have the responsibility of protecting the animals. Much money - millions of dollars - is spent in this province, perhaps not directly but indirectly, to provide wilderness areas in which animals can thrive. This is in the public interest. It is being done and we should not then overreact and minimize the benefits of those previous programs for the protection of animals. I mean all animals, whether they be in the lakes, in the air or on land.

I am going to take the position that I completely disagree with the policy taken by this government, particularly the Minister of Lands and Forests, with regard to the slaughter of bears. I do not believe that was handled in a responsible and mature way. I believe it was overreaction to a situation and perhaps a much better decision could have been made.

I believe I asked the Minister of Lands and Forests what precautions were taken to see that there was no unnecessary suffering or unnecessary death caused by the danger posed to the honey farmers - the beekeepers. I am sure there was a problem and someone had to act on it, but did we make the wisest decision, did we take the precaution that perhaps we would deplete this particular animal in that area for many years to come? How many bears were killed? How many cubs died? How many female bears were killed in the process which perhaps has put the bear population into a decline.

We know that in talking about the conservation of horses, the conservation of elk, the horned animals and the game animals, that the bear is likewise a game animal. We now have areas in Alberta where there is a closed season on bears. We can't hunt bears because there are not enough to hunt.

But somewhere the Minister of Lands and Forests, in conspiracy with other ministers, came upon a situation where the thing to do is open up, and they may as well have been machine gunned from an airplane in the manner they were disposed of. Four hundred and eight bears - many females and cubs - perhaps many more than we can imagine, were left unable to fend for themselves and became victims of other animals or died of starvation. This is a fact we have to look at, and that is how we put certain animals into a decline and become concerned about their survival.

You might feel that black bears are a nuisance. There are lots of them. But I am talking about all bears. There are areas now where grizzly bears are virtually extinct. At least as far as the hunter is concerned, hunting grizzlies is now virtually a thing of the past. It will not take many outbursts or many actions by the hon. minister, as in the case of our bears, to lead to perhaps prohibitions on hunting bears.

I would appreciate if the hon. minister would give us a full explanation of the decision and what steps are being taken to see that this doesn't happen again, and what actual steps ...

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, perhaps the hon. member could give us a full explanation of how he has come to stray so far from the issue at hand, and perhaps he could stray back to the horse facts.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I am talking about conservation of animals which is the main issue. It doesn't matter whether they are bears, horses, cubs or beaver. I believe it is all a related issue and when we debate any issue we are not obliged to talk specifically about any one animal.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The issue under discussion, the resolution, does not deal with bears or conservation of animals. It deals specifically with horses and the amendment read in the same way, unless we need to read the amendment again to be reminded. I think it is only appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that you draw to attention what the amendment is and bring the issue back to its proper area.

AN HON. MEMBER:

The bare facts.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Chair would recognize and urge the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View to try to place his debate on the motion as amended. The Chair appreciates that horses are used in hunting bears, but possibly you were just relating to the amendment. If the speaker does not have a copy of the amendment, the pages can deliver one to the member.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, if I can just add to that point of order we are talking about. The amendment specifically reads, in addition to the resolution as it is, "and further the Alberta Government give early consideration to protecting the last few remaining wild horses on public lands in Alberta."

I see nothing about bears. They are just talking about "bare" facts - "bare".

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I've been at this thing now for about 20 minutes and I suppose with the hon. members who just spoke in objection to my remarks that it is better late than never.

When we talk about conservation, Mr. Speaker, let's get back to the horses. I hope that nothing will develop in the near future that would permit or lead to the kind of action in dealing with our wild horses, than what resulted in a rather callous and perhaps not too civilized attitude in dealing with other types of animals, Mr. Speaker. I hope these horses that my colleague for Calgary Millican speaks about do not wander from their wilderness and end up on someone's land. There might be a posse under our Minister of Agriculture to shoot on sight - don't let any of them get away because they are now a menace and some farmers or ranchers might not like it. I'm sure he must have had complaints about this.

So I'm making the analogy, Mr. Speaker, which is a perfect analogy between what the government has done - and use that as an analogy of something we ought not to do. So the analogy and the debate in what the government has done with other animals compared to horses is very much to the point and I would like to continue to debate on that matter.

I believe that when I make the analogy that beavers could be trapped instead of killed, horses could be moved, perhaps special wilderness areas can be designated to them, let's not get carried away that the best way to solve a problem is to use a machine gun or a rifle or a hand grenade ...

MR. FARRAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the point is this, that I don't believe it is proper in an amendment that deals with horses to go into the back history of former governments who slaughtered hundreds if not thousands of horses and bears during its period in office.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the hon. minister speak last night. He virtually gassed everybody in this place and I didn't object to him. So I suppose he could sit quiet. If he feels that my remarks about conservation of horses are badly taken, then he should get up and debate against it.

I believe the analogy made to other animals is on point and there is nothing, as far as the hon. minister is concerned, as an interruption. I am sure he rides horses - although badly. He not only rides badly, he looks bad on one.

MR. FARRAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is it proper for the member to cast personal remarks about the horse-riding capabilities of another member of this Assembly? If it is proper, Mr. Speaker, then I can presumably refer to the hon.

member in terms of a portion of a horse's anatomy, which would be very appropriate.

[Laughter]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The Chair would beg the two hon. members - and urge the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View - to continue with his debate. The Chair will take that point of order under consideration.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I know the hon. minister who just spoke has to make his worthwhile contributions. I think if I were going to refer to him with regard to any particular anatomy of a horse, I wouldn't be afraid to use the proper words. But since it is unparliamentary, I'll reserve that privilege to some future date out of the House, Mr. Speaker, perhaps because that appears to be the thing that he appreciates most.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that that kind of a reference, with regard to the remarks I made, would be an indication that when I saw the hon. minister riding a horse, somebody standing beside me said, "Mr. Ludwig, I see someone backing a horse up in the parade." This was somebody from Toronto. I looked and said, "That isn't somebody backing up a horse in the parade. That is Mr. Farran riding forward." Yes. When I talked to the hon. minister about riding a horse, he told me he had fallen off five times. So my remarks are at least true - he does a poor job of straddling a horse.

Let's get back to the wild horses now and forget about which way they are facing in the wind - and let's get some assurance ...

MR. FARRAN:

On a point of order. On a point of privilege then, Mr. Speaker. I think the hon. member is now dealing with some other product that comes from a horse which is about his level.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I believe I ought to treat that remark with the contempt it deserves. When he talks about the by-product of politics and the by-product of raising horses, the finest example in this House has to be the Premier's speech and some of the support he got. So let's get down to specifics, Mr. Speaker, an interruption of that nature is not permitted, but we have to treat that remark with regard to where it comes from. I believe it is a shining example of the brilliance of one who recently got moved to the rank of minister. All I would like to tell the hon. Premier is he ought to move the hon. Mr. Farran into the front bench where we can get our hands on him, instead of throwing snowballs from behind a wooden fence.

Now to get back to the topic ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Good idea.

MR. LUDWIG:

Now we find out, Mr. Speaker, that it's a wide open debate. There should not be any doubt the conservation of animals is the main issue in this amendment.

I would like to invite the hon. minister, Dr. Warrack, to tell us whether there has been any change in plans to slaughter animals which may become a nuisance, whether he is considering increasing hunting seasons on some of the animals if they become too plentiful. In which areas have we run into a shortage of animals? Is elk management continuing as it used to, with fairly good hunting? But in particular, the minister ought to tell us whether he has now decided there will be no more indiscriminate slaughter of animals in this province, regardless of the reason.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Deputy Premier.

DR. HORNER:

I would like to make some remarks. Initially, I would like to suggest in my view the amendment is completely out of order. It enters an entirely new area in relation to the original resolution.

The original resolution had to do with the setting up of a horse industry department within the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, in case the hon. gentlemen are unaware of it, that has been done with an advisory committee from various people and the horse industry throughout Alberta.

The one particular area we haven't included in that particular advisory committee, Mr. Speaker - and perhaps after listening to the real gibberish we have just listened to, we should add that - is a representative from the jackass community. Certainly in my view the kind of speech we just heard lowers the calibre and the nature of this Legislative Assembly in that ...

MR. LUDWIG:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. When the Deputy Premier states that I have lowered the calibre of debate in this House, I must insist that I could have done much worse. I could have gone down right to his level.

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, of course again the hon. member does not have a point of order. He continues to flaunt the rules of this Legislature, hoping that through this kind of activity he will get some political recognition as some kind of great fighter for somebody or another. Mr. Speaker, what he doesn't appreciate is that people generally, in Alberta, are aware of his motives, aware of what he is trying to do and extremely aware of his lack of knowledge about things of which he is talking.

Let me for a moment, Mr. Speaker, talk about the horse industry in Alberta as a major factor in expanding agriculture. I believe that anybody who is extremely interested in this particular issue should have some consideration for the various factors that, in fact, are present in the horse industry situation in Alberta. We have a variety of people who are involved, Mr. Speaker. Let's start with talking about the draft horse industry which is pretty well confined, if you like, to hobby horses and for commercial displays. But for hon. members to have some sort of appreciation ...

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The hon. Deputy Premier is debating the motion that was amended. We're talking about the amendment now, dealing with wild horses, and he's now talking about hobbyhorses and sawhorses and what have you. I'm stating that he's completely out of order and far beyond the range of the scope of the amendment, to use his own words, so he should be requested to deal with the conservation of wild horses, period, Mr. Speaker.

DR. HORNER:

Well then, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to rule on the question, in fact, whether or not the amendment is in order. In my view the amendment clearly is a separate and substitute motion and deals with an entirely different matter from the original resolution. Therefore, my submission is - and we listened, Mr. Speaker, while you were not in the Chair, to the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View who talked about the slaughter of bears; the conservation in general. Surely that is an entirely new resolution.

I appreciate that he is trying to usurp the time of the House as usual for his nonsensical remarks but in my view, Mr. Speaker, if I'm not going to be allowed to speak to the motion and the amendment and if the hon. member would have just kept quiet for a moment, I would have got to the amendment. But he is not interested, of course, in listening, except to himself.

MR. LUDWIG:

... [Inaudible] ... the Deputy Premier is becoming abusive again and so I would appreciate a ruling on the point of order I raised.

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. SPEAKER:

The amendment, I take it, has not been adopted and it introduces the preservation of wild horses into a resolution which deals with the horse industry. It would seem, with respect, that this is a different topic. Although it relates to horses in both cases, the horse industry presumably relates to domestic horses. If there are any further views by hon. members with regard to the propriety of the amendment perhaps we could hear them now.

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of order. This amendment, in my opinion, has nothing to do with the original amendment. The original amendment has been enacted by the government and an Alberta horse advisory committee has been set up. Some of their terms of references are wild horses.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the point of order, the hon. members will notice in Resolution No. 4 where it says, "coordinate all phases of the horse industry in Alberta".

In supporting my amendment, Mr. Speaker, I think if hon. members will just think for a moment they will realize that once these horses are captured and either broken, taken to farms or riding clubs, or wherever they end up - or whether they end up in a slaughter house - they are still part of the horse industry in Alberta.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order under consideration, the hon. member from Calgary who just spoke made considerable issue during the last year or two out of asking questions of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests with regard to wild horses. It would seem to me that very properly wild horses, if you use the strictest sense of interpretation when you're talking about wild horses, is a matter which would fall under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Lands and Forests and that department and would have nothing whatsoever to do with the establishment of a horse industry department under the Department of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture.

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, it's certainly within the realm of possibility that the horses that are so-called wild horses can be captured, trained and used as bucking horses in rodeos and so on. This is part of the horse industry.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order. The hon. Member for Camrose has mentioned in his own words that the new branch or division of the horse industry includes wild horses, and therefore I would have to conclude from that, in itself, that it would be right to include wild horses in this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I agree if we accepted the proposition of the Member for Smoky River that would make a two-horse outfit out of the government. But I came in late in the debate and as I read the motion on the amendment I can't see where it specifically says it is strictly draft horses or domestic horses the original motion refers to.

I think clearly the concern of the parties moving the amendment is that the wild horse business has become an industry by virtue of the fact the animals have been captured and slaughtered. And that is an industry. So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, with all propriety, that the amendment is in order regardless of whether members on either side of the House like it or not.

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, I think you could relate this to the sheep industry of the Province of Alberta. If you related it to that, you certainly wouldn't be discussing here the problems of the wild sheep in the mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, if I could in all fairness answer the last remarks. The last remarks are altogether different. A wild sheep is shot by sportsmen and others; it is not captured to be hauled to a plant or shipped thousands of miles to France to be slaughtered. It is a different type of thing altogether.

But once the horse is captured and brought into the market in Alberta he becomes part of what I consider the horse industry in Alberta, because I am sure the hon. minister and Deputy Premier would be the first one to say that if 40 horses were shipped to France or to Eastern Canada for shipment, he wouldn't make a difference between the two wild horses that might be in with the other 40. It is all part of the same deal. They are, in fact, really treated as domestic horses once they reach the market and they suffer the same fate.

MR. SPEAKER:

I should like to thank hon. members for their contribution to dealing with this rather difficult point of order. It would seem that in the case of doubt the doubt should be resolved against being restrictive, and I would therefore rule that the amendment is in order.

DR. HORNER:

I appreciate your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and accept it for what it is. If I could talk for a moment with regard to the various facets of the horse industry connected to the question of wild horses - as my hon. friend from Calgary Millican knows, because we gave him some statistics a year ago and are quite willing to update those statistics at any time he would like to put a motion on the Order Paper - the question of the slaughtering of horses in Alberta is an interesting one particularly if one appreciates where they come from.

Most of the horses slaughtered in Alberta, in fact, come from outside of the province. Whether or not any of those are wild, or whether the hon. member can inform us as to how many of the wild horses south of our border in the same kind of mountainous area that we have here in Alberta in fact are being imported, some of the horses are coming from Montana, Idaho, and Oregon, which is a major source of supply for the packing plants in Edmonton and now in Calgary.

The question of the provision for the protection of wild horses is also adequately stated and outlined in pretty great detail by my colleague in Lands and Forests.

Insofar as my hon. friend from Clover Bar has astute observations that in fact some of these wild horses become bucking horses, he really knows better, Mr. Speaker, but as usual he is talking anyway. He would know that the people in the rodeo business who have bucking horse strains develop these horses and, in fact, these bucking horses are bred to do just that and the strain is carried on. Whether or not I would venture to suggest, as a matter of fact, that none of the wild horses in the past number of years have been taken by rodeo operators for bucking horse strains, the ...

MR. CLARK:

You will have to come out west and I will show you some.

DR. HORNER:

I beg your pardon?

MR. CLARK:

You will have to come out west and I will show you some.

DR. HORNER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury is again talking about the ranch in the Sundre area and he is now suggesting that the horses there are wild horses. What I'm saying is that these ranches that are developing bucking horses are in fact breeding them. The Stampede Ranch in the constituency of my hon. friend from Drumheller is, in fact, where they keep their horses and develop their bucking strings. Most of the other good bucking horses come from private ranches that develop a good buckler, and if he or she performs they can sell them to the rodeo operators for a pretty substantial gain.

The other area that is rather important, when my honourable friends start to talk about wild horse protection, is the area of the guide and outfitter, particularly in areas adjacent to both Jasper and Banff National Parks. A lot of horses my honourable friends see running loose along the roads out there are, in fact, not wild horses at all, but are being grazed in the usual early methods without fences. I would caution my honourable friends that unless they know what a wild horse looks like they should be very, very careful about designating some of the horses they see along the highways in the national parks or just outside of them as wild horses because in fact they are not. They are just being pastured or kept in the usual manner.

Mr. Speaker, just before I adjourn debate I would like to further get your ruling that in discussing this resolution I would be restricted to the strict terms of the amendment, which in fact takes away from the main body of the resolution. I leave that for your consideration and beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Following the kindness of the hon. Deputy Premier, do you all agree that the debate be adjourned?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, tonight we move to Government Motion No. 2 on the Order Paper.

At this time I would like to ask leave of the House to revert to Presenting Reports by Select Committees so the Acting Chairman, on rules of the Assembly, can table the committee's report.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

Select Committee on
Rules, Orders and Forms of the Legislative Assembly

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, as instructed by this Assembly on October 19 I am tabling the report of the Select Committee on House Rules.

Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House, I should like to advise the members how they can obtain a facsimile of that report, a report which will be comparable in content to the report which I am now tabling.

Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee has prepared some corrected pages which, if hon. members will follow the instructions attached thereto, will provide them with a very close facsimile to this report.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until 8:00 p.m. this evening.

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