

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, May 21, 1974

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 61 The Department of Public Works Amendment Act, 1974

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, Bill No. 61, The Department of Public Works Amendment Act, 1974. There are a few amendments in this act, but the major one would be to increase the [period of] time lost articles are kept from three months, at present, to one year.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 61 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 61, The Department of Public Works Amendment Act, 1974 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure today in introducing a class of 30 Grade 6 students from the Allendale Elementary and Junior High School in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Jesten. They have had their tour of the Legislature Building and are looking forward to watching the House in business this afternoon. I would like to introduce them, Mr. Speaker, and ask them to rise and be recognized by the House.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and through you to the members, a class of 15 Social 30 students from the Grand Trunk High School in Evansburg, in my constituency. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. David Allison. This is the third year in a row that Mr. Allison has brought the students to the Legislature Building to watch the proceedings and I commend him for this. I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the House.

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege this afternoon to introduce to you and to the members of the Assembly, 37 Grade 9 students from Mannville in the constituency of Vermilion-Viking. Mr. Speaker, this is the fifteenth consecutive year during which I have had the privilege to introduce Mannville students to this Assembly. They are accompanied by their

teachers, Mr. Dirsa, Mr. Svrcek and their bus driver, Mr. Swanson. They are seated in the public gallery and I would ask them to stand and be welcomed.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you and to the members of the House a class of Grade 6 students from St. Rita School in my constituency. Mr. Speaker, I may say that I spent a very enjoyable hour with them last week and I commend them for their interest in government. I can assure you they are well on their way to becoming very good citizens. I would ask that they rise and be recognized.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Assembly, a class of Grade 9 students from Sacred Heart School in Highlands constituency. Sacred Heart is the heart of Highlands constituency. They are seated in the members gallery with their teacher, Mrs. Hall. I would ask that they rise and be recognized.

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a supplementary reply to Question No. 120, requested by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the reply to Question No. 137 by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Gasoline Prices - - Monitoring

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the first question to the Provincial Treasurer and ask what form the monitoring of gasoline prices, which your department is involved in, take?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, the actual detailed information which is garnered by the Alberta Bureau of Statistics - I would have to obtain and bring back for the information of the hon. Leader.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Have discrepancies as large as 15 to 19 cents been reported to the Provincial Treasurer's department as a result of the monitoring which the department carries on?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, no such discrepancy has been reported to me. The information has been prepared on a consistent basis for some several months now. As I say, to get the detail of the actual statistical inquiry which is made, I would have to check and report back.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary question to the minister. Has the Provincial Treasurer's department or the government taken any immediate steps to do monitoring at this time in light of the price increases which were just announced at the end of last week? Is anything done, in addition to the ordinary monitoring which you do through the bureau?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, hon. members are aware when the government reduced the fuel oil tax 5 cents, special additional procedures were undertaken. With respect to the recent increase, normal monitoring has been continuing. As for any special monitoring, that is a matter which I would have to consider.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary question to the minister. Have any meetings been held or has a meeting been held between officials of your department or the government and the large petroleum companies in the province, dealing with the question of size of the increase which is being passed on to the consumer?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, meetings have been held by my department on a continuous basis particularly since the reduction again in the fuel oil tax by the province. There have been several consultations. I have had some discussions with the oil companies, as I believe have other ministers.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary question to the minister. Have there been any discussions between yourself and representatives of the companies involved since the majors announced the increase to Alberta consumers, the middle of last week?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, discussions with the oil companies have been on a wide variety of matters including, of course, the matter of the passing off of the fuel oil tax reduction and the matter of increases in gasoline prices at the pump across Canada.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary question. Perhaps I didn't make myself clear. Have you had any meetings on this specific ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please address the Chair.

MR. CLARK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. To make my question abundantly clear, has the Provincial Treasurer had any meetings with the companies since they made their announcement of increases last week? Has he had any meetings on this specific topic?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I thought I was clear. We are in consultation with the oil companies, sometimes in the form of meetings on a variety of subjects, sometimes by telephone discussion. I think the hon. Leader should be aware that I have had discussions by telephone with some companies.

Consumer Protection Legislation

MR. CLARK:

I'd like to direct a second question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Following the consumer affairs conference in Banff that was held last week, is the Alberta Minister of Consumer Affairs planning to introduce any legislation at this spring session?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, the meeting was not held in Banff, although I would have enjoyed a period there. It was held in Jasper. It was very fruitful. It indicated to us that we are well advanced in cushioning the effects of inflation in Alberta.

We also have some plans, Mr. Speaker, as a result of our meetings, for further discussions with Dr. Ziegel and Dr. Dole who were responsible for some of the major legislation of a consumer protection nature that has been introduced in the United States and has been proposed and introduced for first reading in some provinces in Canada.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Following the meeting - at Jasper - is the minister going to introduce any consumer protection legislation at this spring session of the Legislature?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, we do not intend to introduce any at the spring session. We want to make certain that when that legislation is introduced, if it is, that it does what we want it to do, and that is to protect the consumer and the legitimate businessman against those who are fraudulent.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question. At what stage are the long-awaited regulations to protect Alberta home purchasers from the loss of down payments?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, we did discuss that matter at our conference in Jasper and there was a paper of some consequence presented by the Ontario delegation, I believe. In any case, all provinces had an opportunity to discuss it.

The situation now is in this stage, that we are to return to our provincial jurisdictions, discuss further with the HUDAC people, the construction industry and the consumers association in order that we might eventually come to a uniform standard of warranty for houses which, in fact, protects the consumer against a down payment which is lost.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary. At what time may Alberta consumers expect regulations that will protect them from the loss of their down payments? They've been waiting for it for two years.

MR. DOWLING:

They've been waiting a considerable period longer. They didn't have it, I understand, under the former government, Mr. Speaker. However, we are making some considerable progress at the moment. The legitimate construction people involved in house building offer a ten-year warranty against major defects and fraudulent practices.

MR. CLARK:

One last supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Has the government proclaimed the legislation that was passed in the fall session a year ago that would make it possible to pass regulations to protect people against the loss of their down payments for homes?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member what act in particular he is referring to.

MR. CLARK:

The legislation that was passed by this Assembly at the fall session last year, dealing with the licensing of businesses.

MR. DOWLING:

That was dealt with at length at the conference in Jasper. We are now ready to proceed with the matter of licensing of the construction industry and also of the people who sell automobiles.

Pheasant Season

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Has the assessment been completed of the pheasant and sharp-tailed grouse populations in the province?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, no, it hasn't. As a matter of fact, I checked on that very point this morning and we do not have the information on hand as yet - that is, the information I had referred to when an earlier question was asked in this regard.

MR. FRENCH:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When would the minister expect a decision to be made as to whether or not there will be a hunting season on pheasant and also sharp-tailed grouse for this year?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, it's fairly difficult to say, inasmuch as there is not only additional information needed, but the entire question of yearly game regulations is very complex and requires considerable time. Certainly it appears that we'll be in the Legislature for some time yet, and as soon as this is completed that will be one of the first orders of business.

MR. FRENCH:

A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. When are the normal regulations published and made available to the people?

DR. WARRACK:

Normally, Mr. Speaker, in mid-June.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican followed by the hon. Member for St. Paul.

Petrochemical Plant Proposals

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question today to the hon. the Premier. It's in relation, Mr. Speaker, to the meeting held last week between federal and provincial authorities relating to the proposals of Dow-Dome and Petrosar Ltd. to process Alberta crude oil into ethylene and other derivatives.

My question is, what were some of the final decisions, or were there any final decisions, made at those meetings, Mr. Speaker, as to the future of the plants?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, there were no final decisions made. It was essentially an exploratory meeting with different views being discussed. I don't think there is anything at the moment that we can usefully contribute to the Legislature on the matter.

MR. DIXON:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the Premier. Have any further commitments by the province been given or suggested to any of the companies, that if they change some of their rules, you may look more favourably upon their projects?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think because of the nature of the situation, even if there were any I would not think it would be in the public interest to deal with that matter until we had something of a final nature that we could express to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. DIXON:

One final supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Has the Dow-Dome syndicate, Mr. Speaker, informed the Alberta government that they may look elsewhere for locations if a decision is not arrived at soon?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that possibility always exists and always has existed, at least with regard to the Dow project. It is a matter of making an evaluation in terms of the interests of Albertans. If the hon. member is suggesting that we continue with former government policy of merely shipping out unrefined products and having a limited amount of upgrading in Alberta, that's a factor we are not prepared to accept. We believe it is important to look into the longer term situation in the province.

That risk is always there; however, there may be alternates which occur. If one wants to accept the existing situation and accept it without a whimper - that may be the view of the hon. member, it is not ours.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the hon. Premier's remarks, I was wondering if the Premier is going to make representation to the federal government complaining that they are going to use crude oil at a higher price than Canadian crude oil which can be purchased here? Why couldn't we get the higher price rather than locate the plant in Nova Scotia where crude oil is a lot higher than what we are getting for it in our province?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think those representations have been made on a number of occasions. They will continue to be made. It would be interesting to speculate, which I gather is what the hon. member is considering, that as the degree of exports declines in the aggregate amount and the federal Treasury is involved with a commitment for accelerated subsidy by way of constructing way station petrochemical plants or refineries using foreign crude in the eastern provinces, one would have to examine not only the logic - well, it would go beyond logic - of a federal government move in that direction.

Student Walkout - St. Paul

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for St. Paul followed by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

MR. FLUKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. Could the minister advise the House if the problem which caused the student walkout at the regional school in St. Paul has been resolved?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I had a very informative visit to St. Paul about a week and a half ago with the assistance of the MLA for St. Paul. They have, in effect, turned a problem into an opportunity. I understand that rather than having to let two teachers go, by virtue of a deficit and a drop in student enrollments, the whole community led by the school board, the trustees, the teachers and the students are now involved in an 'Operation Back-to-School', in order to get 100 or more students and make the situation viable. I think that the St. Paul people who have been involved - and I hope the whole community will be involved - are to be complimented on a fine example of positive thinking in this area.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

No. 3 Highway - Wildlife Signs

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, this question is to the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport. It is occasioned by the 34 deer, 2 elk and 1 mountain sheep that have been killed on a four mile stretch of No. 3 highway, with the resulting property damage. The question is, would the minister consider more sophisticated and larger signing to advise the public of the hazard which does exist in that area?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, we would consider more adequate signing if it is creating a problem in that area, and I guess it is according to the member.

DR. BUCK:

Possibly the animals can't read, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

River Pollution

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of the Environment. Is there any legislation aimed at the prevention of pollution of waters in small rivers such as the Vermilion River?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the legislation of the Province of Alberta, under The Clean Water Act, applies to all rivers in Alberta including the Vermilion River.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What are they going to do about it?

MR. COOPER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are tests of such rivers carried out on a regular basis?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the major rivers in the province are, in fact, monitored every year at a number of different places. Reports are issued annually in regard to the conditions of the major rivers. Special studies are conducted on some of the minor ones as required or, in fact, special examination would be held if a new installation is coming on.

The Vermilion River, of course, is being given special attention. We have a major study under way with regard to the quality of water as well as the quantity, flooding and so forth, of the Vermilion River.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Gas Price Increase

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. With reference to the increase in the retail price of gasoline, is the government giving any consideration to setting a maximum cent per gallon increase, as has been done in British Columbia?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member's question involves some degree of assumption since the only report we have is that perhaps the government has made a request of that. Whether or not the industry complies with that request is still a subject that has not been determined.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary. Since only a handful of stations, according to The [Vancouver] Province this morning, raised their price above the 8.8 cent suggested price by the British Columbia government, is there some reason why prices in Alberta are increasing as high as, I've been told, 19 cents per gallon?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking a question which involves the statement of an opinion by the hon. minister.

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

Historical Research Funds

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. Could the minister advise if the federal government has withdrawn financial support for historic and prehistoric research in Alberta?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that fact. In fact, only today the committee for historic sites and monuments from Ottawa is here in Alberta. They are looking at the first settlement in Alberta, Fort Chipewyan. We have the pleasure of hosting them for dinner tonight in the Edmonton Club.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who's paying for it?

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Would the minister advise if private sector support of historic and prehistoric research has increased or decreased since the passage of The Alberta Heritage Act?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister's official duties could scarcely extend to that kind of information.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

DR. BUCK:

He might know.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I can easily state, of course, that the interest the people of Alberta have taken in the preservation of historical and archeological sites has definitely increased since the ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Would the minister advise if the government is planning to introduce amendments to The Alberta Heritage Act this year?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, we have had a number of recommendations and if the priorities of this government permit, of course there will be some amendments to The Alberta Heritage Act, as promised when the Act was passed.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the nature of the amendments be making the Act more stringent rather than less stringent?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, of course, that is up to the interpretation of the individual. Whether or not something is more or less stringent depends on what interpretation is put on the Act.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Flood Damage - Payments

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if the minister can inform the Legislature just how soon farmers can expect to start receiving cheques for the crop damage and the crop loss?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the situation, as I'm sure my honourable friend is aware, is that there have been delays in the past two weeks because of further inclement weather. The assessment of the damage will take some time. Certainly farmers should not expect to receive cheques until well into June at the earliest.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood.

Highwood School Board - Innovative Project

MR. BENOIT:

My question is to the Minister of Education. I would ask the Minister of Education if he is prepared to give the House a result of the evaluation of the innovative project, known as the Glasser theory or Glasser principle, that is being practised in the province. If he is not, would he be prepared to give us a report of that during the study of the estimates in his department?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on the initiative of the local school board in the area which the honourable gentleman represents, such a project is proceeding.

I don't know whether the board has made any evaluation as yet, but if I could receive a statement as to the specific questions in which he is interested, I would be happy to try to get as much information as I can for the estimates and we could discuss it in greater detail at that time.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Election Act

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Government House Leader, and ask him if it's the government's intention to bring in legislation at the fall session dealing with the recommendations of the special committee of the Legislature established to review The Election Act?

MR. HYNDMAN:

I would say, Mr. Speaker, yes. There is certainly somewhere between a possibility and a probability that that would occur.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Fall Sitting - Opening Date

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. House Leader. Could the hon. House Leader indicate to the House if the government has decided on a day for the opening of the fall sitting, or will it depend on the outcome of the federal election?

AN HON. MEMBER:

The question is hypothetical.

MR. HYNDMAN:

We'll probably have some information on that before too long - within a couple of weeks, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

NOTICNS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

Be it resolved that this Legislature urge the government to introduce legislation to amend The Election Act in order to:

1. Limit election expenditures by, and on behalf of, political parties and candidates
2. Call for disclosure of all contributions made to parties and candidates over \$100
3. Permit contributions to political candidates and parties to be deducted from taxable income for the purpose of calculating provincial income tax.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have the opportunity to move Motion No. 1 on the Order Paper today.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I am going this particular route in introducing this legislation rather than the route of a private bill, is rather frankly, that when you look at the possibility of private bills being successful in this Assembly, it seems to me there's a far greater possibility that a resolution such as this may, in fact, carry the judgment of the members of the Assembly.

And so I would like, in the course of my rather brief comments this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to point out to all hon. members in the Assembly, regardless of where they may sit, why I think this would be a very appropriate time for us to be moving in the direction that this resolution indicates.

In the question period today I asked the Government House Leader if it was the intention of the government to bring forward legislation at the fall session dealing with the report of the special committee of the Legislature established to review The Election Act. The committee reported some time ago and I'm extremely hopeful that at the fall session this year, or, if not then, at the spring session next year - if we haven't had an election by that time - that in fact we do deal with the report of the special committee that was set up to review The Election Act.

I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that a great deal of work went into this report, and by and large the committee, I think, did a good job. It's for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I think the approach of a resolution such as this that we're debating here this afternoon, certainly has some possibility of tying in with these amendments when they are discussed in the Assembly either this fall or next spring.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, what we're really talking about here are three very basic points. First of all, to limit election expenditures by candidates themselves and by the political parties involved. Second, to call for the disclosure of contributions made to candidates or to political parties in excess of \$100. Third, to permit individuals and organizations which make contributions to political candidates and/or

political parties to get some consideration as far as the provincial portion of the income tax is concerned.

I would like to make one further suggestion, Mr. Speaker. That would be this: what we're really talking about here is making it possible for more Albertans to have that unique opportunity to, in fact, sit in this particular Legislature. I know there have been comments during this session by members on both sides of the House regarding the desirability and feasibility of going some distance towards making public funds available to pick up a portion of a candidate's election expenses, and I'll deal with that in a few minutes in the course of my remarks. But suffice for me to say that what we're really dealing with here is guaranteeing the opportunity to Albertans who wish in the future to, in fact, express their point of view, their political outlook as it comes to provincial elections. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, this is a very appropriate opportunity for us to be considering this kind of legislation.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, because I'd like to try to make two points in the course of my comments. I'd like to point out first of all that in Canada to date, a great portion of the electoral reform has happened as a result of crises which have taken place in Canada on a federal level, also on provincial levels. I want to say very frankly that - and this I'm sure will please my colleagues across the way - I don't see any real crisis from the standpoint of The Election Act, or from the standpoint of scandals and so on, which could be raised at this particular time. So it seems to me to be a rather appropriate time to be bringing this kind of a proposal before the Assembly.

The second point I hope to make in the course of my remarks this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, is that there would be considerable merit, I think, in having a committee of members of this Assembly look at the question of election expenses, the limiting of amounts which could be spent, the possibility of full public disclosure - which I think is important - and the question of some sort of taxation considerations for contributions. The best route for us to do that would be to re-establish the old committee which I referred to earlier, the committee which did the work on the review of The Election Act. Either we re-establish this committee or, in fact, establish another committee with the view in mind of having that committee report back to the fall session this year. We would then be in a situation, if the "possibility" and the "probability" which the Government House Leader talked about, as far as bringing legislation forward - we could deal with a rather extensive bundle then as far as The Election Act itself is concerned. That's the proposition I would like to put before the members of the Assembly.

I think it's fair to say when you look back at electoral reform across Canada that this reform has really taken place on two particular occasions. First of all, during the 1870s and what's commonly referred to as the Pacific Scandal. During a period of about five years there were some very major electoral reforms as far as Canada was concerned. The mid and late 1960s and 1970s has really been the other period for major electoral reform across Canada.

I'd like to refer to the 1870s for a few moments and point out to the hon. members that it was as a result of the Pacific Scandal that in 1873 the Prime Minister at that time, Alexander Mackenzie, brought forward two major pieces of legislation which have really stood this country in extremely good stead as far as election apparatus or election machinery is concerned.

The first major piece of legislation transferred the electoral system from the jurisdiction of the province to the federal government, as far as federal legislation is concerned. Canada was in the odd situation during the 1870s of having federal elections which, in fact, were operated and regulated within the various provinces of Canada at that time. One of the things the major legislation in 1873 did was transfer the jurisdiction, as far as federal elections were concerned, solely to the federal government.

The other major change that took place in 1873 dealt with the question of creating rather comprehensive guidelines for dealing with corrupt election practices. Up until that time there was virtually nothing to deal with corrupt practices in Canada other than to have controverted elections referred to the House of Commons. One of the very significant portions of that legislation in 1873 was to, in fact, shift the responsibilities for decisions on controverted elections from the House of Commons to courts of the land. This legislation, passed in 1873, also established a single day for elections with the exception of a few very far-flung ridings. It also set out the procedure we still use to this day in the nomination of candidates by petition. That legislation in 1873 also made it mandatory that we vote in Canada by that rather accustomed procedure of a secret ballot.

Perhaps I might just make one other comment and say that the same House of Commons that passed that legislation in 1873 also hung around long enough, if I might use that term, to pass legislation in 1878 establishing Canada's Auditor General. If you were to look back at the contributions made by Houses of Commons in dealing with electoral reform in Canada, certainly the House of Commons that went from 1873 to [1878] made a very marked contribution.

We in Canada have been, I think, very fortunate that we haven't had a great many problems, many of the pitfalls that other burgeoning democracies have faced during the last hundred years. That doesn't say that we haven't had some problems, it doesn't say we're going to continue to have some problems. It doesn't say, if the members of the Assembly this afternoon approve this resolution and we do move in the direction of election expenses and full disclosure over \$100, we're not going to have problems if we pass this legislation or legislation in the fall. We can very possibly have problems in the elections that may follow. But the fact remains that we'll be taking what I consider a very substantive step in the direction of hopefully preventing some of those problems.

I indicated that in Canada we've had perhaps a minimum of problems like this and that's likely thanks to two groups. One is a rather receptive House of Commons committee that has looked at election acts from time to time and has been prepared to make changes when they were needed. Secondly, Canada has been blessed with a number of very gifted electoral officers. I'm sure it goes without saying that since Confederation and since this legislation I referred to was passed in 1873, political parties have grown, they've become not only greater spenders of money for their particular points of view, but also greater raisers of money. Technology itself has produced a much more expensive means of campaigning, a much more expensive means of communicating to the public, regardless of the political parties involved.

So we're in the situation today, as far as the basic skeleton of the electoral system is concerned in Canada, of having the same skeleton which was set out in the 1870s. I go back and would like to emphasize this point to the members once again. In all likelihood that kind of legislation would not have come forward in the form it did, nor in the time it did, had it not been for the Pacific Scandal and the pressure that developed immediately following that. That's one of the points I would hope hon. members on both sides of the House would keep in mind in looking at this legislation.

We're fortunate in Alberta that at this particular time we don't have that kind of crisis situation. When we're looking at election legislation I don't believe we should be looking at it from a standpoint of crisis management.

After giving due credit to the federal House of Commons for the initiatives they showed back in the 1870s, it's fair to say that the other field of election reform that has taken place in Canada has been in the late 1960s and 1970s. That's basically been on the initiative of the provinces. I can recall myself being a member of this particular Assembly where I don't think we have had a substantive election reform in the period of 14 years that I've been here. On several occasions The Election Act has been changed and I think generally, wisely.

I mentioned the review of The Election Act which was done by the legislative committee and I think that they have done a good job. I do know that, since I have been a member, in 1962, we had the redistribution in this province and on that occasion the redistribution was done by a committee of members of the Assembly. I believe a substantive step forward was taken in 1972 when the committee was set up to look at redistribution once again. On that particular occasion redistribution was handled by members of the Assembly, plus some people from outside the Assembly. I think that was a substantive step forward.

But when we look at election reform in the last number of years, it has basically come from the provinces, at least the initiative has; and secondly, it has basically been in the area of some moves towards coming to grips with the ever-increasing costs of campaigning and the basic question of retaining the possibility - in fact more than the possibility - retaining the opportunity for people, regardless of their walk of life, to have a chance to really participate and have the genuine opportunity of being a member of a Legislature or a member of the House of Commons.

Strangely enough, the emphasis - perhaps not the emphasis, but the first move in this particular direction - came in the Province of Quebec. It was, I think, in 1963 that the Province of Quebec moved in the direction of passing legislation dealing with campaign expenditures and disclosure. I am sure it comes as no surprise to any members when I remind them at the very least of the number of allegations which were made about the former Union Nationale government. When you look at the hiring practices of that particular government as far as the department of highways was concerned and in a number of other areas, it became very obvious that something had to be done in that province. So in 1963 the Legislature of the Province of Quebec did pass legislation.

That legislation was really spearheaded by the late Pierre Laporte in the course of his writing and activity in the provincial Liberal government of that day. The legislation basically limited the amount of money a political party could spend on election campaigning in the province. Secondly, it also went some distance toward remunerating a portion of the legitimate expenses of candidates who received more than 20 per cent of the popular vote.

I would make the point again; this kind of legislation in the Province of Quebec came forth as a result of a crisis situation, in fact, as a result of a scandal, which took place in that province at that particular time.

In 1968 and 1969, the Province of Nova Scotia passed legislation dealing with election expenses. They did this through a royal commission approach rather than through the legislative committee approach I would like to recommend to the members here. That initiative in the provincial field, in the provinces of Quebec and Nova Scotia, really started the ball rolling, across Canada, as far as the provinces are concerned.

I should perhaps take just a moment and say to the hon. members of the Assembly that the federal government did not move in this area, or show much interest in the election expenses legislation until 1964 when an advisory committee on election expenses was established. I would have to say, as one member of the Legislature in Alberta, I get the impression the interest by the federal government was more the result of another crisis situation rather than the result of any kind of genuine interest and concern by the government of the day.

I am sure all hon. members will recall - I believe it was in October of 1964 - that Hal Banks and Lucien Rivard made their escapes from federal government institutions. There were all sorts of stories and rumours going around, some very serious, which indicated there had been all sorts of pay-offs, and that there had been contributions made to certain members of parliament, in fact, one cabinet minister was involved - more than one cabinet minister. It was just about this time the federal government in the House of Commons got much more interested in this question of election expenses once again and an advisory committee was established.

This advisory committee obviously must have done some work, because here are the two volumes of their report. But, as so often happens when you get an advisory committee without members of the Legislature on it, not a great deal happened, other than writing the report. The report was tabled in 1966 and really very little was done with it. But I go back and make the point once again that the real impetus for the push towards looking at election expenses came as a result, I feel, of Hal Banks and Rivard getting out, and all the problems that developed as a result of that.

The advisory committee I referred to, which was established by the federal government, was made up of two former MPs, a former Progressive Conservative MP and another former MP who was the leader of the CCF party at that time, and then two - I think the right term would be - behind-the-scenes Liberals and a university professor.

What the committee did, in fairness to them, was to make recommendations dealing with participation and to make it more available for those people who were inhibited in becoming involved as candidates primarily because of the cost of campaigning involved. The committee, in fairness, recommended shorter campaigns and limited media expenditures. It also recommended that there be disclosure by the candidates and the parties of their income and their expenditures. This was by the federal advisory committee on election expenses which was appointed in 1964 and reported in 1966. At that time it recommended disclosure by candidates and by parties of the income and expenditures.

But as quite often happens when you have royal commissions or advisory committees, the two following federal governments showed very little interest in following this particular matter up, and it wasn't until October 28, 1970 that a House of Commons committee was established to look at this question of election expenses. Within eight months, in 1971, they had a report back to the House of Commons, which is really the bare bones of the election expenses legislation that was passed by the House of Commons not many months ago.

Its general purposes are, really, to amend the Canada Elections Act, the Broadcasting Act and the Income Tax Act which established limits on election expenditure, requires a breakdown and disclosure of contributions over \$100, requires control and reporting mechanisms of the parties, provides for subsidization of election expenses, limits the time period for media and all forms of campaigning, and allows scaled income tax reduction for campaign contributions. As far as election expenses are concerned, this really deals with amounts paid, liabilities incurred and the real commercial value of donated goods and services associated with the election campaign.

This may be a good place for me to stop and say that I'm sure some members, perhaps on both sides of the House, will make the point that this kind of legislation will remove the role of the volunteer in elections. If you'll pardon the expression, Mr. Speaker, God help us if that ever happens. That would be a very, very serious step in the wrong direction. That is not the intention of this resolution in any way, shape or form, because the volunteer has in the past and must in the future continue to play a very, very vital role if any political party, regardless of its stripe, is to make a significant and worth-while contribution to the fabric of a province or a country.

Dealing with the election expenses of parties, they are limited in this federal legislation to 30 cents per elector for each officially contested electoral district. The

fine on summary conviction may amount to \$25,000. As far as the election expenses of candidates are concerned, they are limited to \$1 for each of the first 15,000 names, 50 cents for each name between 15,000 and 25,000, and 35 cents per name after that. As far as disclosure is concerned, all parties and candidates must report contributions or gifts exceeding \$100, including the donor's name.

As far as income tax reductions are concerned, and once again this is the federal legislation, contributions to registered parties or candidates are deductible from income tax in the following scale: 75 per cent of amounts under \$100, \$75 plus 50 per cent of amounts from \$100 to \$550, and the lesser of either \$300 or one-third of the amount exceeding \$550, or a straight amount of \$550.

In fairness to the federal legislation, I should say also that they do have a provision in their legislation, one which I rather like, which deals with the reimbursement of a candidate's expenditures. Particularly, reimbursement is provided for elected candidates or those who obtain at least 20 per cent of the votes cast to the extent of the lesser or actual expense, or 16 cents for each name up to 25,000 on the voters' list. Those are the bare bones of the federal act which was approved.

Regrettably for the federal election campaign which we are just now gearing up to, this legislation will not be operational. The federal legislation cannot be in place to operate, I'm told, until July 1 so the result is that the request has been made to the parties involved to live with the intent of this particular kind of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in drawing this together the two points which I am trying to make to members of the Assembly are basically these. Canada really has had two periods of major electoral reform, one in the 1870s and another period now in the 1960s and the 1970s. The nub of electoral reform in Canada during the 1960s and the 1970s deals with the question of election expenses. Members can say that legislation should have been passed by the former government in this province. That would be a very, very legitimate thing to say. I would hope that if I were on the other side of the House, I would stand in my place and say the same things I'm saying today.

[Interjections]

... we'll get to that in just a moment.

Following along with the question of whether this legislation should be dealt with at this particular time, let me simply say this. This is the second point I tried to make in the course of my remarks. Very often in Canada, and in fact in other areas, democracies of the world, electoral reform happens as a result of a crisis situation which develops. We are in the situation here in Alberta that this is not the situation at this particular time. We are also in a situation here in the province of Alberta that regardless of who forms the government, whether it is the present government, the former government or other political parties in the province of Alberta, in fact there is going to be tremendous economic development in Alberta during the last portion of this particular century.

I believe it would stand us in good stead to have this type of guideline available to members of the Legislature and to people who are active in political parties so, in fact, they would have at least one more indicator, legislatively, as to where they stand on the question of raising funds. All members of this Assembly have gone through more than one election campaign. In most cases members have been involved in a variety of capacities in many campaigns. We recognize that costs are going up considerably, not only election expense costs are going up, all other expenses, all other costs are too. But election expense costs are going up. We are at a period in our development where it is going to be, I think, appropriate to have this kind of legislation on our books during the period of time which lies ahead.

We are also living in a period of time when, whether we want to admit it or not, the side effects of the Watergate affair spill over and hit all politicians, all people in public life. I'm not suggesting for one moment that had the Americans had this kind of legislation or any legislation possible, that would not have happened. You can't legislate common sense. You can't legislate morality as far as people are concerned, not only in politics but in all lines of endeavour. The fact is that if this Legislature were to move this fall or next spring on this kind of legislation, I think it would be a firm indicator to the people of this province that we are, in fact, genuinely interested and concerned about the democratic process.

I think also it would be a substantive step in the area of making it possible, continuing to make it possible, and then making it more possible in the future, for Albertans who don't have considerable means or a second source of income to become more active in seeking a seat in the provincial Legislature. Regardless of which party these people choose to become involved with, I think this would be a healthy situation as Alberta goes into the last portion of this particular decade.

So with these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. members to keep in mind that when we are looking at this particular matter we are really saying to the members of the Legislature that we look at the question of limiting election expenses both by party and by candidate. We are asking for full disclosure of contributions in excess of \$100 made to parties and candidates, and we are also asking that contributions made to candidates and parties [warrant] a deduction as far as provincial income tax is concerned.

In conclusion, I just remind the hon. members that we can look back to situations in Canada where we have had election reform too often. In fact, on the major occasions these reforms have been the result of unfortunate situations happening in the political process - the Unione Nationale and their rather corrupt situation in the province of Quebec, the Pacific Scandal in the 1870s, the Rivard and the Hal Banks situation during 1964, which at least moved the federal government to move in the direction that some provinces had moved earlier.

I am under no illusion, Mr. Speaker. The government can adjourn this debate this afternoon or we can talk the matter out. If either one of these approaches is taken by the government, then I think it would be very difficult to establish a legislative committee unless a committee is established at this session to report back to the fall session so we could have legislation on the books and ready for action should there be an election next June, as some people are speculating.

If it's the government's choice not to go the route of a legislative committee but simply to bring in legislation in the fall session, I would certainly welcome that. The reason I think there is some advantage to a legislative committee being struck and reporting back during the first week of the fall session would be that legislative committees, in the course of time that I have been a member of the Assembly, have been able to deal, generally speaking, with rather ticklish situations and make, in most cases, unanimous recommendations. It seems to me that that would be a good way to handle what I consider to be an important portion of the electoral process in the province of Alberta.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to address a few brief remarks on this particular subject. First of all, let me say that I enjoyed a great many of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition. I agreed particularly with those remarks dealing with the question of involving as many people as possible, not only in their political roles as candidates, but also the importance of people-involvement, for the best of motivations, on a voluntary basis in the political process itself, which involves every facet of organization, of campaign work, of follow-up, that everyone here will certainly be familiar with. If they weren't, Mr. Speaker, I suspect they would not have been successful in being elected to the Alberta Legislature. In that way I think there is no doubt about the importance of those comments. Also, the matter of voluntary service generally - I would like to come back to that point just a bit later in the brief remarks I plan to make.

What I want to say, though, Mr. Speaker, is that while I agree with all of those points - and there is some cursory appeal in the individual items listed under Motion No. 1 - I really do not think that that approach is the real problem.

I suppose I might admit, Mr. Speaker, that I feel some particular sensitivity, and even perhaps a slight bit of offence, at any suggestion that, for example in my own circumstances, dollars had anything at all to do with the fact that I have the opportunity to stand here in my place in the Alberta Legislature and speak on any item including this one. As a matter of fact, I really do not find myself persuaded that dollars are at all at the centre of political success, and especially even to the extent they might be involved, that necessarily the items proposed here would deal with it. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think from the viewpoint of the incumbent individual or the individual challenger, and certainly insofar as the leadership of any political party is concerned, there is a great danger of delusion that dollars might have been an overly important aspect as to who was successful and who was not, on an individual basis or on a party basis. In some sense, though it might be comforting to do so, I suspect there may be some comfortable but incorrect rationalization of failure with respect to political elections either on an individual basis or collectively as a party.

I couldn't help but be just a little amused, and I suppose it relates to the fact that the previous government came into office about the time I was born, which means that throughout my lifetime they never did bring forward legislation such as is now being urged in the first Legislative session after the election.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How about Ottawa?

DR. WARRACK:

Even more, Mr. Speaker, I wondered about the comment early in the Opposition leader's remarks regarding private bills, suggesting that private bills had very little chance to be passed in the Alberta Legislature and therefore the route chosen was not to bring forward a private bill, but to offer a resolution instead. I ask the question, Mr. Speaker, when, under the prior government, did private bills even have a full and proper opportunity to be aired in the Legislature, let alone the opportunity to be passed? It's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that indeed the opportunity for private bills to be aired and brought forward as responsible legislation exists now as it did not exist before.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the question of opportunity is a central one and I suppose second to that, the question of whether dollars have much to do with the opportunity to be involved on a voluntary basis within the organization framework of any particular constituency or a particular party also, and more importantly perhaps, the question of the opportunity to be a candidate and to have a reasonably fair and equitable chance to win. I'd like to say also, Mr. Speaker, every person who enters a public election, be it to federal, provincial or local government - including both municipal councils of one sort or other and school trustee elections - whether they happen to get the largest number of votes and therefore sit as an elected member or not, I think some congratulation is due those who tried and did not succeed. In fact, almost as much credit is due them for having brought themselves into the fray, for having put their considerations and beliefs on the table, before the public for scrutiny, sometimes very harsh and abusive scrutiny, and in that way having put themselves forward. That strikes me, win or lose, as probably the central kind of a thing to warrant respect from the members of the public generally, including all members of the Legislature.

I think it's quite interesting to look at this question of the opportunity not only to be a candidate but the opportunity to be successful in an election as a candidate. It strikes me as a rather incongruous time to be contending that it's extremely difficult for a new person to have the opportunity to be a member of the Legislature in Alberta, because there are so many new faces in the Legislature as of the very last election. There are a lot of new faces on the other side as well as on this side.

So I'd be inclined to temper the degree to which I'm persuaded by that argument just by the sort of empirical observation that there is a very high percentage of new faces in this Legislature and that this came about despite whatever difficulties and problems related to dollars, as the motion would put it - they're here anyway. And that, I think, is a fair observation to make, looking at both sides of the House.

Further, with respect to the matter of the opportunity for the person who has essentially no personal wealth - that point was mentioned and is a very valid one. Suppose you imagine situation X where the challenger might have no personal wealth to speak of. The challenger might be running against a very strong tradition in the opposite direction to his or her particular commitment. The person could also be running against an incumbent who, on top of this, might, in fact, be a cabinet minister. This strikes me as a construction of a pretty inopportune situation for a challenger to have some hope - or again, to use the word opportunity - to have some hope or opportunity to be successful.

I have some knowledge of how difficult it is to try to contest, as one's opportunity to put oneself forward, a situation that has those kinds of factors and those kinds of dimensions about it with respect to the kind of situation where everyone thinks it's impossible, but you don't know any better so you do it anyway. As a matter of fact, a great deal of the progress in our whole civilization has been made that way, including much of the technological progress. For example, the use of dynamite - the best kind of advice, or even perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the worst kind of advice would have led a person to stay away from it absolutely; but not knowing any better, you tend, as people do, to go ahead and do it anyway.

As I look at the motion, I ask myself some questions. First of all, what do people vote for? And in the parliamentary system, I guess it's pretty clear that people vote - and you hear people saying this to you over and over again as you meet them in the barnyard, or across the kitchen table in a farm home - people say they vote for the individual candidate. Above all, number one, they vote for the individual candidate. Secondly, they want to know what people stand for. Every party that puts itself forward, I suppose, has a platform. This is the policy on which I, for example, along with my colleagues on this side - and some who were not successful against members on that side - ran as to, what do you stand for? And there it is, the policy platform. So people vote for or against that, obviously. Certainly, of course, Mr. Speaker, - and I'm listing these in no particular order, other than how I believe people make up their minds - there is the question of who represents Alberta in the sense of the leadership of Alberta.

It seems to me those are the kinds of considerations that people look at as they decide whether they're going to vote this way or that way. These three seem primary to

me. And in each instance, when I ask what dollars have to do with any of the three, I really don't get much of an answer, Mr. Speaker, because when you ask the next question in light of those relevant observations, perhaps, after asking the question what do people vote for you ask, what does it take for the individual candidate to have an equitable chance to win, as well as simply to put himself forward?

It seems to me that dollars are not the central matter at all. It's a matter of work and sacrifice. It's a matter of, if you like, sweat on the brow and leather off the shoes. It's a matter of sacrificed weekends for weeks and months on end and sacrificed personal holidays over an extended period of time - in my own close situation, two years of it, neither having anything to do with dollars.

In addition to the work and sacrifice, there is the matter of voluntary help. Here's a point. I have a tremendous amount of very strong agreement with the last speaker on this question, because I think, as he put it, heaven help us if the voluntary service aspect of political activity and involvement is ever lost here or elsewhere in the democratic traditions we all respect and are prepared to fight to maintain.

As a matter of fact, if one were to put some sort of price tag on voluntary help - which seems like something none of us would really want to do - to put a kind of price tag on those invaluable people who put themselves forward for no other reason than the fact that they feel it's necessary that the electoral process go forward and that someone has to do the work it takes for the process to occur.

That's really where the untold value is, the untold value that could be calculated in dollars, Mr. Speaker, but I think it would be the kind of calculation that I would not want to undertake. In fact, I guess all of us might share the view that we would hate even to know the calculated value as distinct from sort of crude dollar figures; the calculated value of the time, effort and sacrifice that people made on behalf of those people who now sit as 75 members of the Legislature. Certainly this is so also with respect to the more than 100 others who made an effort, many of them very major efforts - voluntary efforts were made on their behalf. That's really where it's at, as the young people would say today, I think, Mr. Speaker, in terms of value.

Nonetheless, in the question of voluntary help, does this involve dollars? It really doesn't. It really doesn't fit the picture, it really does not stand as a barrier. As a matter of fact, I suspect that those members of the Legislature who are not personally wealthy might perhaps have had a favour done them by the fate of history, in that they weren't personally wealthy and did not have that dangling kind of temptation to trade off [against] sheer work, sheer sacrifice and the recruiting of voluntary assistance from people and try to substitute money [for them]. That being done I suspect that one would in fact lose, as one should. As a matter of fact I'm not sure that I couldn't think of a couple of instances of exactly that in Edmonton in the last election.

It does not take dollars as a central need in order to have the opportunity to be elected, wherever a person might run and whatever party one might run as a member of and as a standard bearer for - certainly in my own judgment at least, and we all relate to our personal situations, because running for election, and I'm sure there is agreement among every one on this, is a very personal thing. Only the person who goes through it really knows what it's like. I really suspect that all of us would make the assessment that if they had ten times the amount of money to spend, when they ran in their election, it really wouldn't have made any difference.

No matter what side of the House we might be on in this Legislature, I suspect that those who were successful in the electoral process were successful because they worked hardest and had the most voluntary help working hardest with them. In a rare, imaginable instance can anyone accurately, with no delusion, suggest that he lost because of a matter of mismatched but financial capability? I suspect that those on both sides, entirely as a non-partisan observation, would really count down to the point of ascertaining whether they worked the hardest or whether they didn't, and that accounts for whether they did or did not find themselves in a successful position to stand in their place in this Legislature in Alberta.

I think, and perhaps I even suggest, as a still amateur politician - but sometimes advice comes from the strangest places - for a challenging individual, a challenging candidate or a challenging party for that matter, and that's sneaking right up to my point, it might be a mistake, no matter how comforting it might be, to rationalize political failure or success on the basis of dollars. This, I would contend, is a delusion, [as is], on the other hand, to assert that it was because the other guy had all the dollars that he won or that she won.

I'd like to rejoin, because I think it's so important, the point made by the Leader of the Opposition on the question of the voluntary service aspect of political work, organization, activity, and indeed, the putting of oneself forward in an election. To take it away from strictly politics, I'd like to suggest that it fits within the terms and concept that it is the voluntary service by citizens, for no other reason than they think

it's good for the public and in the best public interest, that really separates the civilized from the other unfortunate kinds of situations in the world we have today which most people in the world have the misfortune to live in. Be it in community services, and we can all think of many excellent examples of community services, of service clubs serving locally elected people, 4-H clubs and councils, the list is very long, many examples come to mind for all of us.

I think the question of voluntary service is perhaps the major, central trigger that we ought to have in our minds as we address ourselves to the question of whether the situation would be better or not with the motion we have before us. I suggest that within the terms of that voluntary service which really separates the civilized, the well-organized, the considerate kind of society we all try to be individual participants in - and I think, in aggregate, all of us can claim some credit for, largely, I suppose, due to our ancestors - but that as an example along with the service clubs, the 4-H movement and many other examples all of us can think of, is that question of voluntary service within the terms of the political process on an ongoing and electoral basis. I suggest that is the most important consideration by far, and although certainly even postage costs money and there are lots of examples of where there are dollars that need to be found, for example, to run a campaign, on the other hand it is the case that you are far stronger with a lot of small donations than large donations. A large amount from a few donors is a losing situation, compared to a lot of individual participants on a small basis. That is certainly not really anything that needs to be legislated. But in terms of just the practical fact of what is a solid organization and base to have the opportunity to win, that's a key, and that it be especially key is part of the voluntary service concept for the public good, that is the highest calling you can ask someone to take a part in, and the most important question perhaps that one, as a candidate, needs to ask many times of potential supporters, potential workers, as a matter of voluntary service. Because it's got to be done and it's got to be done honestly and completely for no other motivation than that of the public interest.

I suggest then, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the central issue is not dollars. It is certainly recognized that an argument can indeed, as has been done, be made in favour of limiting election expenditures. I suspect we would largely be limiting election expenditures by those who are going to lose anyway.

With respect to the question of some maximum figure - be it \$100, \$50 or some other figure - in terms of the involvement of the maximum number of people and the greatest opportunity to be successful in the electoral process, the question of such a limit is just not the relevant question.

I guess, like anyone else, I wouldn't mind having an additional income tax deduction but, as a matter of principle, Mr. Speaker, I'm just not sure that it's either necessary or even desirable for the income tax deduction, but, in fact, for people to give dollars voluntarily wholesome participation in the political and election process.

As a matter of principle, I would tend to say that, in my own personal view, it is far more important to have that opportunity set forward for people so they have an equal opportunity with others who may not have quite as high a tax percentage bracket to give to the process because the public interest demands it and because it is part of the integral, voluntary service consideration which more than anything else - and certainly more than any amount of dollars has to do with whether we have the kind of political system we want to live within.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that the dollar question is not the central question. The explanation with respect to the electoral process is nearly complete without getting to the factor of dollars, but with the questions of work and sacrifice by individuals centrally involved, and by volunteers who, for no other reason than that it is in the public interest, put themselves forward to work very hard as well.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Cardston followed by the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, when we are dealing with an issue which really is important, sometimes it seems we get most irrational. The hon. member who has just spoken seems to think one of the arguments against this resolution is that in the old days we didn't permit private bills. In those days the Opposition didn't put forth private bills; the government was doing all the good things.

DR. WARRACK:

I said when you discuss ... [Inaudible]

MR. HINMAN:

But to continue, his next argument was, why didn't we do this before? We had 35 years to do it. Well, as I recall, we had some Conservatives in the House all of those years and all the good things the present government is doing were never even mentioned by those people in those days.

Maybe we should have just a little amusement out of all this, too, because I am probably one who can remember the electioneering of the past better than anybody else. And you didn't need very much money. Whiskey was cheap and that was one of the chief ways of getting votes. Baby kissing was pretty popular. Handshaking was a wonderful device and public meetings - you just should have attended them.

I couldn't help but think of one I attended when [two] speakers spoke the same night. The first speaker had a wonderful voice. You could have heard him clear to Ottawa. When the other fellow got up, he said, well, my honourable opponent's speech reminds me of a Negro who was caught in a very bad storm out in the forest. Lightning was flashing, thunder was roaring and rain was pouring. When the lightning flashed, he rushed ahead and usually ran into a tree. Finally he became so confused that he just knelt down by the tree and said, Lord, if you love this nigger, just send some more light and not so much noise.

That could apply in our Legislature many times. What I am pointing out to you is that it was different. You had a divided press. Nobody needed to put in many advertisements because each paper was Conservative or Liberal and they used all the shenanigans at their disposal to elect their party. Radio didn't cost very much money and it was one of the early tools. There was no TV. These are the things which take a lot of money.

The hon. member said that what you need is voluntary service and he even said that he doesn't think money would have made any difference. Well if it doesn't, then there are no arguments against this particular resolution at all, if money doesn't make a difference. But money does make a difference. What do we do now? Each party selects a publicity firm and hopes it will get a good one. Each publicity firm prepares a campaign system. They devise the bulletins, they devise the type of TV and radio. And they cost money. So money does count.

Now to get back to some of the specifics about which we ought to be concerned. Elections are not what they once were, but even in the old days salesmanship was pretty important.

In the first place I think I need to say that there are two kinds of candidates. There are those who seek election, and of course those who seek election are of two kinds. One is the kind who wants to have good government and he thinks he can do something about it. The other is the kind who wants to be in the public eye and he is going to run for election and he is going to help all his friends. Well, maybe that's all right. I point out again that in the old days people stood for election, now they run for it. And running costs money, as usual.

But what happened? Elections over the years have grown into real confidence games. Our province particularly is probably freer of it than anywhere else in the democratic countries today. But what do they do when they get all this money? Well, they revive scandals. They subtly use religious motives. They belittle the other candidates and the other parties. I always think of it when I hear somebody get up in the House and say "funny money" when he hasn't any idea what he is talking about. They start whisper campaigns. Now largely it has become, who is the most attractive candidate, not who is going to be the best candidate. And believe me, money counts when you do that. In my few experiences in the TV station, some girl comes up with a box and says, let me fix you up a bit, and she wants to fix my lips and put some shadow here and there. I just wonder whether I have anything to say or whether I am just going to have a show. Certainly it works. People with charisma can get elected if they don't have any brains, especially if they have money.

Candidates are sponsored. I said some stand and some are sponsored. Why are they sponsored? By whom are they sponsored? We do have some organizations once in a while which go right out to get a good candidate who can be persuaded to accomplish what they want for the public good. But many times these are sponsored by people of whom we have no idea. They seek a man they can handle. It's well known they do that. They seek somebody they can persuade, especially with dollars. That isn't exactly what we want.

Now what do we want? I am not going to speak a long time this afternoon, but I want to clear up a few points. What do we want in our electoral system? Well, we want an informed electorate first. We don't want people voting emotionally and on whims. When we get rid of that, we won't need so much money.

What do we want them informed about? We want them informed about party policies, and party policies are very different from government management. When I talk to people who

tell me they are Conservative or Liberal or Social Credit or something else, and I say to them, well, what is the policy of your particular party, you'd be surprised how seldom they can even give me two examples of policy. There are men on your side today - if we could just split you up and do the same over here, we'd ask each group what's your party's policy, and when we brought the answers together, you'd be shocked at how little we know about our parties' policies. But that's what we ought to be telling the people. That's what we ought to be telling the candidates.

Then we want to know, what are your party's plans? How are you going to carry out, how do you propose to carry out some of these policies? That doesn't take a lot of money and the best way to get it out, of course, would be with just perhaps radio - where you can't see the candidate - plain sections of papers during elections which are devoted to it so everybody knows he can go look at what the party's platform and plans are.

They ought to know the real qualifications of a candidate. The man who has had money all the time and who is trained to speak publicly and who has taken some lessons that cost money, does have an advantage. That's how we get so darn many lawyers in government, and some of them are good people too. If you could select them, I would have no objection. In fact, they are pretty essential because they do have some ability to put down in plain English what our policies are. But these are the things you want. In the end you want an elected Legislature without commitments, except to the policy and plans which have been previously declared.

Watergate, I hope, won't happen here. But I'm just as aware as you people are, that everybody who puts \$10 in a campaign fund does it for one of a few reasons. He might be your friend and he wants to help you out. He might actually be a firm, party stalwart who wants to get his party in. But I would suggest that behind it all, with rare exceptions, there is a little hope that being a friend to the guy who might be elected will be, in some way, advantageous.

In our province, in the past, many of our big firms have donated to both parties, all parties. When I ask them why, they first tell me: well, we don't want to be political. Then I say: well, why don't you refuse to give any to anybody then? Well, you know, whoever gets in, we kind of want to be on good terms. That's exactly what happens. That's where the money counts. If you want to do what we need to do, you're going to say that we will eliminate money.

There are two things a government can do to get good government. One is to eliminate the power of a lot of money. The hon. members who spoke talked about voluntary service, and that's the best kind when you get these people involved. I'm all for it. But the first proposal here is that you limit the amount of money.

He made a remark that the people whose money is wasted are usually those who lose. It's very true that you cannot always win by spending a lot of money because people do have some common sense and they do evaluate some other things. But it calls for limitation. Now, what harm could there be to limiting election expenses? You could provide all the money needed to get your platform, your plans and your policies before the people. If you have personal qualifications you can make them known, and usually they consist of just two things, your intelligence, if you have any, your education and what you have previously done to demonstrate that you have ability. All this can be disclosed without money.

The second thing it proposes is full disclosure. I'm saying to you that only the dishonest can object to full disclosure. I don't care if you take it down to \$2. Keep a record of it. Let's make people put money where their faces are, right out publicly. You couldn't hurt it. You would get more honesty in government that way than you can talk about.

The third thing that is suggested is simply accountability. Let the candidates say what they did with the money. What's wrong with that?

The fourth one, of course, asks for a little tax discount. That's one with which I have no quarrel, but neither do I think it's a wonderful thing. I think if you spend money for elections, you should pay taxes for them just as you do for entertainment. I don't think it would really matter. But if you do the other things, if you stop the big corporate people from seeking any big advantage by limiting expenses, by making them declare, you are going to get down to the point where you may have a lot more donations, but they will have a lot less to do with income tax.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is a good one. If it's followed, if the government takes it seriously - and I don't think they will probably do it this year or next year, but some day it will come simply because the abuses will grow to the point where everybody recognizes them - but if the government were to follow this, it couldn't do any harm. It would equalize the opportunity of the elector to evaluate those who stand for election without necessarily limiting the opportunity of the candidate, and that's what we want. So I submit that the resolution is a good one, that it ought to be taken seriously and,

with the exception of all of us asking the government to pay the bills without taking any of our money in taxation, I think it's worthy of a lot more consideration than it's had.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DRAIN:

Referring to this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I think it should make us pause for thought. It has merit. The contributions made by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury, the Member for Three Hills and the Member for Cardston are excellent and have covered a considerable amount of material which I do not propose to cover again.

The time-honoured method of delivering the word of democracy in the past, of course, was a public meeting where the silver-tongued orators were the men who prevailed. I remember being very much impressed by reading an account of a meeting that was held by William Jennings Bryant. A man was ploughing one mile away from where he was talking and when he stopped ploughing he could hear what this great speaker was saying. This was long before television or radio or anything else.

We look at the situation in Alberta and no one could say that there is a crisis or that there is abuse at this present time or that there have been any major, formidable expenses that were necessary to achieve office in the province of Alberta thus far. However, times change and elections have sort of become old hat in Canada now, where we have had eight federal elections in 17 years. We just wonder what's going on. I think that people will reject elections as such. They are affronted by the television time [taken] from the programs they would like to have. It's now destroyed by politicians. I think there is going to be a considerable amount of credibility destroyed by this particular theme.

One area of reform that I think should be looked at is the time factor. Thirty-nine days were hardly enough when you travelled by saddle horse, wagon or democrat from place to place, but right now this doesn't apply. There is instantaneous communication, a saturation, I think. Time cut down to 30 days or 25 days would still give the opportunity for saturation of public interest. The hon. Member for Three Hills talked about the shoe leather approach to politics which is very economical, just requiring a couple of pairs of shoes, but even this, if there are four or five candidates running - and there was - this was the case in my constituency, I came in after a by-election which was a year later - considerable resentment by the public at people pounding on their doors and coming to 'repound' and saying, well, vote for me and if not, why not? Finally people closed their doors to the politicians and said, a plague on your houses. We've had enough of this.

Nevertheless, in order to maintain the democratic system the message must be brought through. How can this be best achieved? Probably by the sophisticated processes we have like television, radio, newspaper advertising, person-to-person calling - and here again lies the problem. As this expands, the costs accelerate although the costs as such, as ably pointed out by the Member for Three Hills, are not the criteria of success. You could talk to Steven Roman and wonder why he didn't get a seat in the House of Commons in spite of the \$100,000 he spent in the last campaign. He's coming back again and I guess he has a few more bucks, but not every aspirant for public office has a uranium mine to back him up.

In looking at this particular resolution I think there are several things that could be considered if, as the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury said, a legislative review committee could arrive at an endorsement of this particular resolution, Mr. Speaker. You could look in the areas of the limitations of the amount of time, having regard for the accelerated pace of communications. I wonder at and do question the value of posters. I think the big value is the pollution value more than anything else. After an election campaign, to travel through a well-plastered constituency and see these things blown ...

[Interjections]

Metaphorically speaking, hon. member. This is just verbal licence, that's all.

Nevertheless, they may or may not be of value, but if the posters, as such, were eliminated I don't think the message of democracy would be eliminated thereby. So here's something to look at.

This committee could think in terms of limiting radio and television time, thereby establishing a direct control on the expenses by these particular steps: one, by a reduction in the length of time of the campaign, and two, by a reduction in the amount of time allocated for radio and television.

In looking at the source of campaign funds in point two, although this is very worth while, I would foresee some difficulty in being able to enforce this particular thing. In evaluating the contributions there could be others which would not necessarily relate to monetary reasons. There could be a supply of services, personnel, or transportation, all

of those things which in reality do mean money. Justifiably I suppose the deductions from taxable income for the purpose of calculating provincial tax could be something worth while.

I think this is a very forward-looking resolution in that it brings before the Legislature what could develop into what might well become the seamy side of politics, which we have seen so very well in the disclosures that have occurred in the Watergate affair in the United States. I don't think that Spiro Agnew - in looking at his background and the political environment in which he developed, I think he would have great difficulty in feeling that he was, in fact, a genuine criminal, because he was forced by the establishment and the status quo to carry on in the manner in which he did. This is how things were done, but they were always under wraps and it took a Watergate to bring them out in the open.

So this resolution - not because of what has happened or because there is an inordinate amount of expenditure necessary to be a candidate at the present time in the province of Alberta. Nevertheless, the situation could develop and it would be a very worth-while thing to have the intent of this resolution and the recommendation of the Member for Olds-Didsbury followed up, that is, to have a legislative review committee evaluate and set some limits on the future expenditures of politicians in the province of Alberta, thereby giving democracy its full scope and permitting the privilege of running for elected office not to be that of those who are wealthy, but something which can attract a broad spectrum of all of the people of the province of Alberta. Everyone, no matter from whence they come, can make a worth-while contribution to the democratic process.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, I really welcome the opportunity this afternoon to say a few words about this resolution, because it is a topic which has interested me for some time. It interested me as a student when I was in university. It interested me as I was preparing for the last election, and it has continued to interest me since the last election. I have tried to do a considerable amount of reading on the topic of the practices and considerations in other jurisdictions.

I would like to begin by saying, Mr. Speaker, that I have a good deal of sympathy with the intent of the resolution, but I'm sorry the hon. member opposite, when he introduced the resolution, did not address more of his attention to the very real, and I think significant problems which have to be dealt with if you are going to attempt any of the things he contemplates in his resolution.

A resolution like this raises a good many critical questions, the successful answers to which are going to do a good deal to determine how well or how poorly our political system works in the years to come.

I'm interested in the precedents which have been established both in the Government of Quebec and in the federal legislation. Yet at the same time all of us have to appreciate that the federal legislation has never in actuality been tested. The Quebec legislation has been tested once, and they were so concerned about its implications that they established a commission to study the operation of their legislation during the last election and to bring in a report on whether or not it is, on the whole, desirable legislation or is likely to cause them problems in the future.

The resolution suggests three courses of action. I would like to deal with them, if I could, one at a time. The first is the limit on expenditures. I'm sorry the hon. member who introduced the resolution isn't present, maybe he could pick up some of this from Hansard because I do have a number of questions I really would like him to be able to reply to when he closes debate.

It concerns me that the resolution is worded in terms of election expenses and not the expenses of parties and political organizations between elections. I'm not sure an annual accounting of expenses would be necessary, or would be desirable, rather than an accounting of expenses which are related only to the election. But I think it is something the hon. member should have considered and dealt with, even if only briefly, during his remarks. It is hypothetically possible for a political organization, particularly the central, provincial, or federal organization, to expend money in such ways between elections so as to develop a very, very substantial foundation which requires, apparently, the expenditure of very little money during the 39 days of the election campaign.

Now whether you want to require this limitation on expenditures solely in relation to the campaign or on an ongoing annual basis, you still raise major questions of the eligibility and/or the registration of parties. When we refer to a political party, do we mean the Progressive Conservative Association of Alberta, or do we mean the Social Credit League of Pincher Creek-Crowsnest? Do we mean the central organization or the

constituency organization? Do we mean one or the other? Do we mean both of them together? If so, what is going to be their relationship?

How do you deal with new parties? Hypothetically you could have a situation where a loose organization, non-partisan in nature, raises money over 12 or 18 months and only declares itself to be a party on the day the election is called. How do you control all the expenditure that has taken place on their behalf to that point? Can you control it?

Related to this is the question of the special interest groups or the lobbies. We have had a couple of excellent examples very recently and very close at hand where, in Manitoba, in the last provincial general election, an ad hoc organization was created which raised money, placed advertising and endorsed candidates - but not just Liberal candidates; they endorsed Liberal candidates in some constituencies, Conservative candidates in other constituencies, and even Social Credit candidates.

AN HON. MEMBER:

... [Inaudible] ...

MR. KING:

No, they did. I might say, whether it was for that or for other reasons, they were notably unsuccessful.

Something of the same kind of thing happened in the last provincial general election in British Columbia. In both cases, the organizations involved maintained staunchly, and I think sincerely, that they were non-political, non-partisan organizations. And yet, if one of them bought a full page ad in the *Beverly Page* and said they were supporting me or, alternately, that they were supporting one of my opponents, is that an expense which I have incurred? And does the fact that \$1,500 was spent by them mean that I am precluded from spending \$1,500 in my constituency or that the provincial organization is precluded from doing it across the province? It's a mechanical point which, I think, has serious ramifications.

Another point which was dealt with briefly by two of the previous speakers has been the question of contribution of goods and services. Probably the most frequently cited and, I would say, the most valid example, is the time of the volunteer. What is the time of a school teacher worth who works full-time on your election, as manager, during the summer months of July and August? Is the time of a dentist who goes door-to-door with you through his neighbourhood worth more than the time of the university student who goes door-to-door with you through his neighbourhood? If ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

... [Inaudible] ...

MR. KING:

... well, not as much as a plumber's.

If you get work done by the New Democratic Youth on campus who silk-screen all your posters, and the posters come to you at cost, should you account for them in your expenditure as though you had paid the sales tax on them, and as though you had paid the overhead of a commercial firm to whom you would have had to go had the New Democratic Youth not had a silk-screen in their basement?

The questions of the value you are going to place on the contributions of goods and services are extremely important. As the hon. Member for Cardston indicated, the area in which this is becoming increasingly significant is in contributed space in the media, whether newspapers, radio or television.

I was interested in the comment from the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. But with respect to radio and television, you have to be advised that those are beyond the control of the provincial government. They are regulated by the CRTC. And indeed, what is increasingly available in Alberta is the electronic media which is beyond the control of even the federal government. We've got American television stations coming into our most populous centres by cable. The advertising content on those American stations is beyond the control of the province and it is beyond the control of the federal government.

It is entirely possible - and I would suggest to this Assembly that in the not too distant future it is likely - that the political parties in this and other Canadian jurisdictions will be going increasingly to the American networks and the American stations to advertise in Spokane with material that will come back into Alberta and British Columbia. And if the people of Spokane, 186,000 of them, don't know what the Progressive Conservative Party is, or the Social Credit League is, it doesn't matter, because in point of fact, the market for the Spokane television stations is now larger in

Canada than it is in the United States, and completely beyond the control of any Canadian government.

Now related to the question of the use of the media is the fact that, in my experience, any suggestion that expenditures should be limited has been carried one step further to the suggestion that there should be classes of expenditures within the overall global budget which are also limited. If you can spend X dollars on a campaign then, further, you can only spend some smaller proportion of that on radio, some proportion of it on television or on newspaper or whatever.

You've got problems, certainly, in Canada, and I would suggest even in Alberta, with the differences between constituencies. It is unrealistic to apportion the same percentage of budgeted expenditure for television in the urban constituency of Edmonton Highlands as for the rural constituency of Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche. It's completely unrealistic to suggest that in my budget there should be some apportionment for air travel. It's unrealistic to suggest that there would be no apportionment for air travel in the constituency of Fort McMurray-Lac La Biche or some of the other northern constituencies.

What do you do about an apportionment for television if the party happens to believe that their leader isn't marketable on television or that television is a dishonest or superficial way of reaching the electorate and they don't want to use it? What if they decide that they would rather use the money designated for television for posters - even though my honourable friend opposite may not like them - or to get squads of people out into the streets delivering brochures door-to-door? Whatever method you develop, it would have to recognize, in quite a sophisticated way, the differences that exist between constituencies, not only in terms of geography, but also in terms of campaign priority and in terms of the disposition which one party or one candidate might have of different kinds of media.

One of the things that I think has never been considered and merits careful consideration is whether or not legislation such as this today will presuppose governmental control of the internal organizations of parties tomorrow. We can cite, without end, examples of situations in which to win the nomination of a particular party has been tantamount to winning the election. I can cite examples where people would spend thousands of dollars to win the nomination for the Union Nationale in Quebec in the early '50s and spend \$200 on their election thereafter. The same might have been said - I don't know - for Social Credit in Alberta during the years in which it was the government and very powerful, or for the Liberal organization in Saskatchewan when Mr. Gardiner was premier, or the Liberal organization in Nova Scotia when Mr. Macdonald was premier. There have been, there are now, and there are going to continue to be cases where people will spend much more within the party organization to secure a nomination than they would ever dream of spending on election thereafter because the nomination presupposes the election.

With respect to this particular aspect of the resolution, I would only return to the comments that were made by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, that money doesn't win elections. There are examples of that. I think some of them are indicated right here in the Legislature. I know of a man who ran in an Edmonton constituency in the last provincial general election, and I will remain convinced to my dying day that he lost the election because of the money he spent; that he would have had a better chance of winning if he had spent a third as much.

AN HON. MEMBER:

... [Inaudible] ...

MR. KING:

Right. I wouldn't have said that he stood a good chance of winning, but he would certainly have stood a better chance of winning had he spent a third as much money as he did.

The second section of the resolution deals with the disclosure of contributions, and again, while I would favour this in the abstract or the ideal, I have a number of questions about it. It's not clear from the resolution whether or not you mean that the name of the donor should be disclosed as well as the amount. I know that in some jurisdictions they simply require that you list each individual contribution so that it can be seen whether or not you're getting any significant sum of money from one person or another. There's also a real question about how you would disclose this, whether or not disclosure would be constituted by filing it with the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly or whether or not by disclosure we mean that it would have to be advertised in some public way.

There are questions of 'laundering' money and I know that laundering has been done on many, many occasions. There were rumours in the last provincial general election that

people were contributing money to a registered charitable organization that had a tax-exempt number from the Department of National Revenue and that that registered charitable organization was in turn contributing the money to a political party operating here in the province. The effect of it was that donors to one of the parties in Alberta last election did in fact have a tax-exempt contribution. Cases were also admitted of corporations having given money to their executive officers with the directive that they should contribute to one party or another.

One of the things that concerns me - I must say, now that I am a member of the government party it doesn't concern me as much as it used to when I was in the Opposition ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Ho. Ho.

MR. KING:

... but one of the things that does concern me is that the disclosure of contributions might discourage what is referred to as the split, 55-45, or 60-40 or whatever it is. There are possibly some people who would find themselves in an untenable position if they were listed as having given \$60 to the Progressive Conservative Party of Alberta and \$40 to the Social Credit League. I don't know to what extent they would simply decide to give \$60 to us and none to the opposition or, even preferably, to give all \$40 to the government side. That's not simply a facetious comment because I personally believe that support of the opposition, whoever you may designate them to be, is really in terms of this system as important as is support to the government. I would ask in all seriousness whether or not the hon. Leader of the Opposition has considered the implications of this in terms of the people who do make contributions to both parties and might not like that fact to be known?

One of the things which isn't dealt with, perhaps because our current legislation makes some attempt to deal with it, is disclosing the disposition of funds. But I think, really, that's an area which deserves very careful consideration and might as well have been put in the resolution because I don't think it's been adequately dealt with up to this time. It is as likely that Watergate would have been exposed had there been an accurate and comprehensive way of dealing with the disposition of funds as was its eventual disclosure through following up on the contributions themselves.

One of the alternatives, and this is the alternative that Quebec is starting to move towards although, as I mentioned, they appear to have had second thoughts about it as the result of their last provincial general election, is the public funding of elections. Quebec does it in part and the alternative would be to do it completely. But in suggesting the alternative, it raises a number of questions as well, particularly about the eligibility or the validity of minor parties. Is a person entitled to the support of the general revenue fund of the province simply because he says he is going to run in a campaign and that his policy, his platform, whatever it is, merits attention?

An area that has really concerned me is the question of enforcement of whatever legislation might be enacted because in politics you are dealing with very, very complex relationships between individuals and organizations - groups of individuals. You have to consider very carefully what the penalties will be against the individual and against the organization, whether they are fines or jail, or, in the terms of the organizations, 'deregistration'. Is the candidate or his agent liable for offences that are committed within his area of responsibility? Is it the leader of the party which is the political wing, or is it the president of the party, the organizational wing, who is responsible for offences committed within that jurisdiction?

I would like to close, if I could, with one reply to the hon. Member for Cardston, and a couple of comments. He referred to the charismatic leader who I think he said could be elected without any qualities except charisma. I would really have to say that I think that's simplistic and cannot be justified by any example. I would cite the period of 1946-'52 with the introduction of television. I honestly do not believe - and I would welcome a reply from any hon. member - you can cite to me a leader who was elected on the basis of charisma only and who, once elected, proved himself totally incompetent in leadership, totally without ideas and immoral or amoral.

I know that I have often expressed the view that somebody was elected because of his charisma and I thought that wasn't sufficient reason to elect him, but I can't honestly say that, having been elected, he proved himself to be as bad as I thought he was going to be when he was standing for election. And if I can make a personal comment I would suggest that not even the most recent, the 1972 election in the United States, could be a demonstration of the argument being made because I don't think that was so much a matter of a man being elected through the use of the media as of one being defeated through the use of the media.

I have an article by a professor of political science at The University of Saskatchewan, Dr. Ward, who was on the Barbeau Commission investigating election expenses for the federal government. One of the things he cites in his article is that, in fact, the average cost of election in the constituency is less today per capita - taking inflation into account - than was the case at any three time frames in the past. He chose and checked twenty years ago - that was 1950 - 50 years ago, and 100 years ago. He concludes on the basis of his examination of present election costs and at those three time periods in the past that the average per capita cost of an election today is less than at any of those three times in the past. The most extreme example that he uses, which I agree with you is extreme beyond our need for concern, was an election in the British constituency of Oxford where they had 1,900 voters and spent \$150,000. He thought that was an unnecessarily high per capita expense.

The parliamentary system reduces the impact of centralized spending because the success of the executive, the success of the premier or the executive council, is inextricably bound to the success of every individual member of the party who seeks election to the Legislature. I think that is a significant difference between our system and the American system where there is a good deal of concern.

I think the questions I have tried to raise and the questions that have been raised by others here merit very careful attention before we enact legislation, because what we are doing is determining in a very comprehensive way who will have access to the political process, how broadly they're going to have access to the political process, and to whom the political process is going to respond.

I will be perfectly frank, Mr. Speaker, and say to you that I would not like to vote in favour of this resolution and I would not like to vote against this resolution at the present time, because the point that is being raised, the issue that is being raised, is a serious one that deserves our serious consideration, and I can't in all honesty say that it has received the consideration it deserves, or that in a debate like this it would receive the consideration it deserves. I would like to see it dealt with in such a way as to preclude final decision, in such a way as to allow us to receive the experience of other jurisdictions and to evaluate them in terms of our own needs.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say a few words in connection with this resolution. I'd like to speak in favour of the resolution although some of the comments I may make will raise some questions, as have some of the other speakers, with regard to some of the details. Probably, I could start at that particular point, since the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands did raise a number of questions that had to do with political parties, candidates and things of that nature, and say that in the short time that is allotted us for discussions of resolutions it is hardly possible to answer all the questions that could be raised. And that would be the justifiable reason for following the suggestion made by the mover of the resolution to the effect that a committee probably needs to be struck to handle the details and to present the matter as a report, to be considered by the Legislature and then debated after all the points have been taken into consideration.

Just as a passing matter and not as facetiously as it may sound, if we were raising the question with regard to political parties and didn't know whether these needed to be taken into consideration and dealt with as the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands suggested, we could do away with the political parties and just have candidates. Part of his questions would be answered, we might be seeking a better quality of candidate and we wouldn't have to worry about dealing with the political party aspect.

I'd like to talk about the resolution point by point, as it is presented here. On the first point, talking about limiting the election expenditures, I think one of the things that is difficult to do is to determine what the election expenditures would be, because of the various aspects of the expenditures. Even if they could be determined, having once been determined, this would not be easy to police. But like all other legislation which leaves itself open to many loopholes, it is not impossible to put in certain checks and double-checks that might assist in limiting election expenditures. One of the reasons for not attracting good quality candidates is that election expenditures haven't been checked. Some candidates with good qualities haven't been able to get adequate support, so they have not been able to run in the election or present themselves as possible candidates.

Now, I appreciated very much what the hon. Member for Three Hills pointed out with regard to this matter. I think I have to agree with much of what he said. While money does have quite a bit to do with some, what money can do affects some more than others. But probably not as many as some people think. As somebody pointed out, no matter how much money they have, some people couldn't be elected because all the money in the world wouldn't put them in. Because some people are not voting for the candidate, they're not voting for the particular person; they're voting for the party he represents. If he doesn't represent the right party at the right time and in proper circumstances, he's not

going to get elected anyway. People have a variety of ways of looking at these things. And I want to mention that a little later.

I like to believe that I, myself, would be a classic example of what can happen to one who has no personal wealth. It doesn't take a lot of money in some circumstances to elect a candidate. But the circumstances vary a great deal. It would probably be pretty difficult these days, when television and radio play such a large part in elections, to elect a candidate in an urban constituency without, at least, a certain amount of money being spent. The rural candidates do not have that problem to the same extent as the urban candidates. Therefore, it's incumbent upon us that we still have freedom in the country in which we live to present candidates who don't have much money behind them and see them elected. This indicates that people still have the ability, in spite of all the fog and haze that's put around the election campaign, to pick out for themselves those they think will do the job that they want them to do in the position in which they hope.

With regard to point No. 2: "Call for disclosure of all contributions made to parties and candidates over \$100", this isn't a new idea, as has been pointed out. Of course, if such legislation were put in, there would be ways around it as there are around most. The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands already pointed out that contributions sometimes get to the candidate by devious channels and the amounts, whether people want them disclosed or not, are determined by themselves in the way that they make the contribution.

I think it's a question of wisdom to publicly assist only those who receive 20 per cent or more of the votes cast. This is one part of the legislation in one province. Personally, I think that everyone who runs and makes expenditures should have the privilege of sharing in the assistance that is provided.

This brings me to the next point which, I think, referred to public assistance. This really isn't part of the motion but it has been talked about quite extensively in most discussions with regard to electoral expenses - that the public should provide some of the monetary assistance for elections. Public assistance may be justifiable, to a point, if good government is what we're interested in, rather than putting parties into the seat of government. If public assistance is provided to the candidate individually, not on a party but on a candidate basis, then every candidate would have a more equal opportunity so far as his publicity and campaign were concerned.

I believe that a disclosure of contributions is a good idea. It gives us not only a picture of what the party and the candidate are doing, it also gives us a idea of what the people are thinking and what they're willing to do and who is making the contributions. This enters into the realm of privacy which has been a matter of great consideration in these days in which we live. Many people don't want their private affairs revealed publicly. But I believe the time is coming in our history, whether we like it or not, when nothing will be private. And it will be incumbent upon all people to conduct themselves in such a way that if they don't want it revealed, then they must not let it happen, whatever it might be. I don't think anybody is very much shocked any more by what anyone does. And that, maybe, is a little unfortunate because our society has got to the point where, no matter how bad or extensive a person's actions are, people just aren't excited or extremely shocked about it. But that's a matter of history. That's a case or circumstance under which we live.

Finally, in the third point of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, permitting contributions to political candidates and parties to be deducted from taxable income is, I think, an encouragement to make contributions. Maybe No. 1 and No. 3 conflict somewhat because if you are going to encourage contributions on the one hand by making them tax exempt, and then on the other hand you want to limit election expenditures, you may have a conflict there. That is something that needs to be looked into a little more carefully. Certainly it is a legitimate point.

Mr. Speaker, in summarizing my thoughts I would like to say that people tend to elect candidates for all kinds of reasons, as the hon. Member for Cardston so ably pointed out. No matter how much or how little money is involved, there will be candidates elected. Unfortunately, it is not always the best-equipped person who wins the election. Some people are voting for a party and they will vote for any kind of person who runs for that party. Some people vote for such things as even the appearance of the candidate, some for the age of the candidate, some for the experience the candidate has, and - yes, some even vote for the sex of the candidate depending on whom they like. However frivolous these reasons for voting may seem to some, they are important to others. So no matter how much money is involved, some people will not be moved. They are not so interested lots of times in knowing who the candidate is or what his qualifications are, as in how they feel about a certain attribute or aspect of that candidate.

So there is merit in each point of this resolution. I'm prepared to vote in favour of the resolution, particularly if the government, giving consideration to the matter, is prepared to give it some study and to present the results of the study to the Legislature for further debate at a later date.

I think it's more important to guard against the fraud and the corruptness that may come into the picture than it is to put in some of these types of legislation. But whichever way we look at it, I am primarily interested in equalizing the opportunity for all candidates as much as is possible so a candidate stands on his own merit, and that as far as possible he may have equal opportunity with all other candidates. That goes for new candidates, for candidates who are running for the first time as well as for those who are in office or those who have run a number of times and have considerable experience. This is one way we can help equalize the opportunities of all candidates, that is by limiting election expenses, calling for disclosure of the contributions and permitting the contributions to become tax exempt at the provincial level.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Aw, come on!

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

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

For the motion:

Appleby	Poster	King	Purdy
Chambers	Getty	Koziak	Russell
Chichak	Hansen	Lee	Schmid
Cookson	Harle	Leitch	Stromberg
Copithorne	Hohol	McCrimmon	Topolnisky
Crawford	Horner	Miller, J.	Trynchy
Dickie	Hunley	Miniely	Warrack
Dowling	Hyndman	Paproski	Young
Farran	Jamison	Peacock	Zander

Against the motion:

Anderson	Clark	Hinman	Ruste
Barton	Cooper	Ludwig	Sorenson
Benoit	Dixon	Mandeville	Taylor
Buck	Drain	Miller, D.	Wilson
Buckwell	French		

Totals: Ayes - 36 Noes - 18]

2. Moved by Mr. Young:

Be it resolved that the government of Alberta consider establishment of an agency which would be responsible:

- (a) to provide, directly or indirectly, public transportation between municipalities,
- (b) to research, evaluate, and assist in planning new modes of public transportation,
- (c) subject to agreement with the respective municipalities, participate in the operation of public transportation systems.

To which the following amendment was moved by Mr. Ludwig:

That the motion be amended by striking out all words following the word "Alberta" and by substituting the following words therefor:

"give consideration to conducting a study to determine the feasibility of government involvement in the provisions of inter-municipal and intra-municipal transportation systems in Alberta".

[Adjourned debate on amendment: Mr. Benoit]

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, the subject of public transportation is not an idea which is new. Getting on the track and going somewhere is new, but not the idea itself. What we are now discussing here in the amendment is the matter of getting on the track and getting on with the job.

The question is not so much the need for public transportation; I don't think anybody argues that point. The question is when is the time ripe to get it implemented, put it into effect and get it on the road? Someone has mentioned somewhere in the course of this debate, when we were involved in it some time ago, that it would be a \$750 million enterprise to get some public transportation between the municipalities in the province of Alberta.

Now that could be done this year, Mr. Speaker, if the circumstances were right and if we wanted to do it? We have the money. It is not a case of getting the money, it is a case of when and how we are going to do it.

In the course of the debate, some hon. members made reference to the satellite towns around the larger urban centres. They made reference to them as bedroom towns, I believe. Some people said, well, we don't like to have bedroom towns because the people just go there at night and go back to the city in the day, and I agree. Mr. Speaker, if you are going to be technical about the matter, they ought to be called something a little bit more sophisticated than bedroom towns. But if we are going to have a public system of transportation somewhere in the near future - and I believe it is imperative we do - we need to have one established which will take us from the big cities to what I choose to call satellite cities or satellite towns depending on their size - and it would be better terminology.

Mr. Speaker, in talking about transportation of people from large cities to smaller centres and within the larger cities within each municipality, I think we need to give consideration to the adequacy of the thing and whether or not the proper development of the satellite communities will come as a result of available transportation or whether we are going to wait for the satellite communities to develop and then put in the transportation system.

I have no doubt that, as has been suggested, this matter needs to be investigated and some decisions made. We have been doing some considerable investigation about transportation, but we have not done it very seriously, partly because of the cost involved and partly because we don't consider it is quite necessary at this time.

In a few moments I want to give several reasons why I think we need this kind of transportation and [why] it needs to be started immediately with plans for the future outlined when we begin the project.

We have adequate transportation now, if we are going to stay the size we are. But my concern is for some method of rapid transit between the major cities and satellite cities or towns of the future. The satellite towns are growing now and it won't be long before they will expand to become cities in their own right. When we talk about the cities themselves, that is, the existing larger cities themselves, both Calgary and Edmonton and some of the others like Red Deer and Lethbridge are located on rivers. These were located this way many years ago when they were only forts or small stopping-off places because of the convenience of getting water, transportation and so on.

But within the cities themselves, as I have mentioned before, the transportation system needs to be improved. We seem to think we can improve our transportation within a city by making a freeway. Once a freeway has been developed and a bridge has been put across the river, everyone in a hurry to get to some other part of the city heads for the freeway. The result is the freeway, particularly during rush hours when it would be of great advantage, is clogged with people running back and forth. Whenever there is an accident the entire system breaks down and bogs down.

I have expressed before and I want to repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that I think transportation within the larger cities which are built on rivers could be greatly expedited without increasing the width of the existing corridors or in any way widening the bridges which exist, by simply putting more bridges over the rivers, utilizing the existing corridors of transportation and making more accesses over the river. Now it costs quite a bit of money to build a bridge, but it also costs a lot of money to put in a freeway, so I think we could just use the existing streets, put more bridges across the river and we could increase transportation within the municipalities as they presently exist.

The amendment says we need to:

"give consideration to conducting a study to determine the feasibility of government involvement in the provisions of inter-municipal and intra-municipal transportation systems in Alberta".

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that governments have to become involved because when it comes to the transportation system - in this day when we have so much pollution and we have so many privately owned vehicles one of the major things necessary is that we have some kind of public transportation system which will take us quickly, efficiently and cleanly to our destination at a comparably low cost. If there are private individuals who can come up with this kind of transportation system, well and fine. But it is my opinion that because it involves some kind of channel either on the ground or above ground on overhead rail, it is going to take up the kind of space which no private operators could possibly afford nor have the privilege of acquiring. Therefore it becomes a matter for the government - whether it is the provincial government or the municipal government or even, in some extenuating circumstances, the federal government, depending on how far or how extensive this transportation system is going to be.

Why do we need an adequate rapid transportation system? I say rapid transportation system because that is what is necessary today to improve the existing transportation system. As I said before, we have adequate transportation now. It's a case of becoming more sophisticated in our transportation. We need to reduce pollution. There is only one way we can reduce it and that is to carry far more passengers than we presently carry in a single vehicle. The more passengers we can carry per motor involved, the less pollution we are going to have.

We have to reduce the excessive and unnecessary use of energy in order to curtail the use of our energy and to reserve our energy. As we are being told every day now, we are using far more energy than we need for the small population we have. Therefore a public system which will reduce excessive and unnecessary use of energy is necessary. That is why we need to improve our transportation system.

We need to slow down the geographic expansion of the large cities. One of the finest ways to do that is to build the satellite cities beyond the green area of a large city and have a transportation system that will quickly, efficiently and cleanly carry the people from the satellite towns and cities to the industrial areas of the larger cities so that the larger cities will not be caused to expand their residential areas.

We need to conserve all the good, arable land that we possibly can for agricultural purposes. When I travel the road between Edmonton and Calgary and see the amount of land that is being utilized just for the one highway which connects these two cities and consider how many large multiple-passenger vehicles could be carried on such a road, I realize that we could use far less land than we do for highways if we had different types of transportation systems.

We are living in a very affluent society and in a very affluent age in history, so that everybody wants his own vehicle and some want three or four vehicles. Somehow we have to improve the transportation system between the municipalities and within the municipalities so they will become attractive enough that people will be content and happy to use the multiple-person transportation vehicle and leave these two, three and four cars per family at home; so that they won't be using them all the time during the week when other methods of transportation would be more efficient and quicker.

Mr. Speaker, I favour this amendment that is before us with regard to the necessity for giving consideration to conducting a study to determine the feasibility of government involvement in the provisions of all kinds of transportation. But I am particularly interested in some kind of rapid transit system, whether it's on the ground or above the ground, whether it's on the highway or by rail, or even if it's by air - something that will get us from place to place, from point to point, rapidly, cleanly and efficiently and conserve the energy we need so badly in our society today.

Mr. Speaker, I'm in favour of the amendment.

DR. MCCRIMMON:

Mr. Speaker, regarding the amendment, there has been and is at present considered government involvement in future rapid transit systems in the major cities in Alberta, Calgary and Edmonton. I think this was announced in the budget when it was brought down.

The amendment reads "inter-municipal and intra-municipal transportation systems in Alberta." With regard to the other systems outside the major cities, these are the types of transportation I'm particularly interested in. There are basically three forms that these take and, of course, they are rail, road and air. My personal concern here is with the rail area. This is a type of, I suppose you could call it rapid transportation we have had established for many years in Alberta, and that is the CPR line between Calgary and Edmonton on which there is some element of service. The train goes up and down, I

believe, once a day as far as passenger transportation is concerned and stops at about every fourth town.

In this resolution it is the government involvement in this rapid transportation - but what particularly bothers me is the fact that the CPR, as I recall, made an agreement when they came out here to run service in perpetuity for certain concessions which they received. Those concessions were considerable, as has been proved over the last number of years. They involved, I believe, several million acres of land with the oil, gas and mineral rights on that land. They also took in a considerable amount of real estate in the centre of every city, town and village along that railway line.

Every time the question is brought up, what about the service that the CPR should provide to these towns, the question comes up, we're losing money. I believe that probably they are, as far as this particular service is concerned. But at the same time there is no question that there are certain other aspects of the same deal which are making money. In other words, I'm speaking of those hundreds of thousands of acres of land which are under lease and are in production as far as oil and gas is concerned, timber rights and so on, also the real estate picture where in the centre of every town, and Calgary is probably the best example - I think the real estate values in the city of Calgary owned by the Canadian Pacific Railway would run into several hundreds of millions of dollars.

When this subject is brought up, they say, well, that doesn't count, that's a separate company. Every time they get a company situation that is a prosperous enterprise, such as the oil and gas rights in the real estate section, they moved it aside to a separate company. So always the company that is losing money is the actual passenger transportation system. I think that that's probably one of the biggest faults we have to find with them.

When you consider the overall money picture, why should the government take over what the CPR is responsible for? Their deal with western Canada is that they would provide this service in perpetuity. Why should the government let them off on this deal? They haven't made too good a follow-up with what they have committed themselves to. And my own town is a prize example, I believe. We have the dayliner going up and down between Calgary and Edmonton. First it stopped at every town, then it stopped at every second or third town, and now I think it stops at about four places between Calgary and Edmonton. We used to have a station. Now they've taken the station away. So if I want to get on that train in the town I live in, there is just no way I can get on it without going either north or south for a good distance. I think they have a commitment there because there is the provincial mental hospital; there is considerable requirement for travellers to come and visit people who are in there. It is a good-sized town and yet they have abrogated their commitment to what they really have been well paid to do.

According to this amendment the government should take this over. There is a little hesitancy on my part to go along with this type of amendment that lets the CPR off the commitment they have made to the people of Alberta.

With regard to the road system, I think we have a pretty good road system between Calgary and Edmonton. Over the years a good four-lane highway has been developed. It's fine to the edge of the cities and this, of course, is where the rapid transit system comes into being. There is work being done on that. There has been a commitment by the provincial government. I think it's within the jurisdiction of the municipality - in the case of Calgary and Edmonton it is more or less their responsibility, I feel, to say when, how and in what form this type of rapid transit should take place. The commitment by the government to go along with whatever method it feels is best for its particular type of terrain and dispersion of population, I think, has been a reasonably fair method.

It has been brought up, I think by the hon. Member for Highwood, that this springing up of towns within a 20-mile radius of the major centres was particularly true in Edmonton here - much more so than in Calgary - with Leduc, St. Albert and Sherwood Park.

I think perhaps, rather than the CPR, the government in this type of thing may well have some responsibility because it comes outside the scope of those towns that are on the main corridor between Calgary and Edmonton. This is a subject which probably needs a good deal of consideration. The fact that they must tie in directly with any type or form of rapid transit within the city, I don't think anybody can deny, because it is a trend. It's been developed, it's known in every major city, particularly in the United States where people live 20 to 50 miles outside the boundaries of the city and come to work by the rapid transit system, whether it be mostly by rail. But this can well be what's going to happen in Edmonton over the years, perhaps in Calgary too. I think it's something that's coming, but how much the government should be involved in this is a question that undoubtedly does require some study.

The third factor I'd like to speak about is air transportation in the form of rapid transit between cities and the outlying areas. For example, we have now the airbus between Calgary and Edmonton. I think probably everybody in this room has used that

method of transportation over the last few years. It's good. It's just the first step, I feel, of what is going to come in the future.

I think we are going to have a much more sophisticated method of air transportation between major cities. We are going to have the helicopter come into the picture much more so than it does now. I believe your towns along the main routes are going to have airport requirements probably more sophisticated than they have now. These factors all come into an overall picture as far as transportation between intra-municipal - infra-municipal, I believe, is the way it is in the amendment - so that the scope of this is just immense.

I don't think we are going to solve it without a great deal of consideration from both municipalities and government on all levels, because the federal government is involved in this as well. The Department of Transport has certain responsibilities for the transportation system as far as aircraft are concerned, as well as highways - trans-Canada highways, trans-continental highways. We have one now. I think there should be more and in the future there will be more.

I was interested in, and I'm looking forward to seeing, a study of transportation in western Canada which has just been brought forth in the last few days. This was done by the federal government and announcements have been made of how it is going to revolutionize methods of transportation, highway routes, rail routes and so on, in western Canada. Due to the fact that none of us has any information on that study, I believe that to make any firm decisions until we have a good look at it would be a little premature.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, tonight we will proceed to Committee of Supply initially with continuation of the estimates of the Department of Advanced Education, and then the Department of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:28 o'clock.]