

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Thursday, December 4, 1975

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

PPAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, two members of the Olds Municipal Hospital Board, Mr. Neil Leatherdale and Mr. Wayne Notley. They're in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask them to rise at this time and receive the recognition of the Assembly.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to introduce two residents of the town of Vauxhall: Jim Lynn, the mayor of the town, and Ralph Ringdahl, who is on the Vauxhall recreation board. Today they are in the city meeting various government officials and ministers with regard to a recreation complex and the replacement of a complex that burned just a few weeks ago in their city. I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you, and through you to the hon. members of the Legislature, a prominent citizen from the Rowley district, Mr. Larry McKee, who is in the public gallery. Mr. McKee is very active in community hall associations and in farming activities in that area. I would ask Mr. McKee to rise and be recognized.

DR. WARRACK: It's a great pleasure for me to introduce today 16 Grades 11 and 12 students in French 30 from 'Tro-Val' high school in Trochu. They came on difficult roads to be here today. They're staying over in Edmonton after the Legislature, and then on tomorrow to an interesting weekend

beginning at Legal, where they will meet and billet with French families in that area, try out their French, and play against them in volleyball.

I'd like to ask the Legislature to welcome their teacher, Mr. Paul Gaboury, and these students, and join me in wishing them bienvenue.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me very great pleasure today to be able to introduce the national president of the National Farmers Union, Mr. Roy Atkinson, who is seated in your gallery.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Legislature, 38 Grade 7 students from the Lloydminster school. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Butcher, and Mr. Issac. I would ask that they stand and be recognized.

MP. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and to members of this Assembly a very prominent member of the Taber town council and business community, Mrs. Helen Wentz.

TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report of the former Highways and Transport Department for 1974-75.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the return to Question No. 185.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the report of the Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission.

MP. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the response to Motion for a Return No. 196, ordered by the House.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask for unanimous leave of the House once Motion No. 1 is called [under] Motions Other Than Government Motions, dealing with the cow-calf industry, to allow the House to debate that motion for the entire afternoon, rather than proceed with the routine order of business.

MR. CLARK: We'd be pleased to agree to that suggestion. We advised the Government House Leader about 1 o'clock this afternoon

that we planned to ask for that kind of agreement. So certainly we're pleased to do that. We're pleased the Attorney General is ahead of time once. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Does the proposal by the hon. Attorney General have the unanimous consent of the Assembly?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Business Interest of Minister

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my first question to the Attorney General. It flows from an announcement in Red Deer with regard to a development the Attorney General is involved in, I believe a 9.23-acre hotel/business complex.

I'd like to ask the Attorney General very frankly, does he see any conflict of interest between his position as Attorney General and his major involvement in this development in Red Deer?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I would never have embarked upon any course of conduct involving my private life if I felt there was any possible conflict of interest, and I did not do so here. I should make it very clear that the proposal for Red Deer is an initiative taken by myself and an alderman from the city of Edmonton. We do not own any land in that city at all, in this area, nor do we have any proposals to develop any other area. We were simply approaching the city council to inquire as to whether it would be willing to accept our submission. In fact, the city council responded by approving not only our submission, but a second hotel as well. Now there is some doubt as to whether either, frankly, will proceed.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I have grave misgivings concerning this line of questioning. As the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, questions to ministers must be confined to their official duties as ministers. If there is any kind of question that any hon. member has about the private life of a minister, or whether there may be a conflict of interest or something of that kind, any such allegation or implication would, of course, be quite serious. The member making it would have to take full responsibility for it, which might include some jeopardy to him. Also, it would be more properly brought before the Assembly by way of a proper motion on notice to which the minister would then have an opportunity, in fairness, to prepare a position or reply.

Lamb Processing Plant

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a second question, to the Minister of Agriculture. I'd like to ask if he or senior officials of the department had discussions with officials of the lamb processing plant at Innisfail prior to the removal of the general manager.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I did not have any discussions with the board of directors of the co-op prior to that action.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Did he ask any of his officials in the department to discuss the matter with the lamb processing co-op prior to the removal of the general manager?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, for some months now, a number of officials from the Department of Agriculture have been working very closely with the board of directors as well as the management of the Lamb Processors' Co-op in Innisfail. I would not be aware of what all their discussions involved.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the minister. In the course of those discussions with either the people at Innisfail or his own departmental officials, would the minister be in a position to indicate whether the question of the removal of the general manager was a matter of discussion?

MR. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to indicate whether that was discussed or not.

MR. CLARK: One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Has he had discussions with the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation as to why it took the corporation such a long period of time to get the \$300,000 advance from the its office in Camrose to the plant at Innisfail?

MR. MOORE: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, having dealt directly with the chairman of the board of directors of the Ag. Development Corporation, my understanding is that the corporation, in view of the circumstances surrounding the loan application and so on, did act in an appropriate manner and dealt with the matter as quickly as possible.

MR. CLARK: One last supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is it fair then to assume from what the minister says that he feels the Ag. Development Corporation handled the request from the Innisfail plant properly? You're satisfied with the way it was handled?

MR. MOORE: Yes, indeed, Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied with the manner in which the Ag. Development Corporation handled the loan request. There are, however, a number of other areas with respect to a grant from the Alberta-Canada nutritive processing

agreement and some other things that I'm not very happy or satisfied about with respect to the manner in which the plant has operated.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Has the federal grant for the lamb processing plant arrived yet?

MR. MOORE: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that a federal grant has not yet arrived. Indeed, we're having difficulties as well in applying a grant to the Lamb Processors' Co-op from the Canada-Alberta nutritive processing agreement, which requires approval from the federal side as well.

Camrose Area Expansion

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources could explain the actions of the Energy Resources Conservation Board in its recommendation to Battle River Planning [Commission] at Wetaskiwin not to accept any more applications for future growth in Camrose and surrounding villages, such as Ferintosh and New Norway, because they are situated near or over sour gas fields.

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STROMBERG: Would the minister check into the rather strange actions of the ERC Board?

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STROMBERG: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would he report back to the House?

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Tar Sands Development

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Energy as well. It doesn't concern the rink on the stadium, Mr. Minister.

I'd like the minister to advise the House, if he would, what the status is of the proposed \$150 million Shell experimental plant in the Peace River oil sands near the town of Peace River.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the Shell proposal is one of 21 the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority has under consideration. My discussions with the chairman indicate that they will be assessing those 21 applications, then making a decision as to which ones should be proceeded with, and in what manner.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly as to the nature of the Shell proposal as it pertains to funding under the Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority?

MR. GETTY: Not in complete detail, Mr. Speaker, although if it has not been requested by Shell that it be treated confidentially, I would be pleased to get the detailed information for the hon. member. My recollection of my discussion with the chairman of the Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority is that the 21 applications would involve something in the order of \$750 million, and they would essentially be proposing a 50-50 split; but I'm not sure whether the details of the Shell one actually call for that kind of split.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can he report to the House when he anticipates a response from the Authority as to these 21 particular proposals, and when they will be dealt with either by cabinet or subsequently in the Legislature?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the figures I just mentioned and the seriousness of the need for coming up with a successful method of developing the huge amount of the oil sands that cannot now be developed and produced through known methods, I would expect that the Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority will do everything possible to assist us with an evaluation and recommendations with these applications, but that they would have to take all the time necessary to feel confident that they were assessing them correctly and making the right decision. I can't imagine the time that will require, but I would certainly say it would be as quickly as they possibly can do it efficiently.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Will the process of assessing the applications, once completed, be referred to the cabinet for final approval, or will the authority have the option of making the funding decision on its own?

While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, is the government giving any consideration to increasing the funding available for the Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority?

MR. GETTY: That would depend on the requirements of the Authority, after it has had an opportunity to review these applications. The hon. member will recall, the applications were only received in total, I believe, during the last month. There even may have been notification of applications while the application itself was held up in the mail because of the strike. So it will depend on the technology authority's recommendations to the government.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question for clarification. I take it from the minister's answer that the Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority will make recommendations, but it's finally the cabinet which will review and determine those recommendations.

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker. I was referring to the need for consideration of

additional funds. Matters having to do with research in the act which creates the Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority allow it to participate in research projects on its own initiative.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Do any of the applications involve nuclear blasting below the surface?

MR. GETTY: I am advised, Mr. Speaker, one of them does involve nuclear fission. I'm not sure whether it would involve nuclear blasting, because I'm not really familiar with the technicalities of that proposal. But because it was raised in the House by one of the hon. members, I obtained that information and advised him -- I should have advised the whole House -- that one of them does.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a final, final supplementary question. In his discussions with the chairman of the Authority, did the hon. minister relay the, I think, very valid opinion expressed by the now Minister of Housing that any development of fission in the oil sands would be, I believe the quote was, "utter madness"?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sheer madness.

MR. GETTY: The quote was "sheer madness", as I recall. However, from my discussions with the chairman of the technology authority, Mr. Speaker, I think he was well aware of the views of the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar.

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary to the hon. minister. Did they not say Edison was exhibiting sheer madness when he invented the telephone?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, some people don't even want to put roofs on stadiums.
[laughter]

By-law Enforcement

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General. What procedures are available to local municipalities, specifically towns, to enforce local by-laws not enforced by the RCMP, such as truck routes through the town, snow removal, and a number of others?

MR. FARRAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the functions of by-law enforcement officers are those allotted them by the local government authority. In my office we are prepared, in circumstances that warrant it, to swear them in as special constables to enforce provincial statutes such as The Highway Traffic Act and The Liquor Control Act.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Are grants or special cost-sharing arrangements between provincial and municipal governments available to towns to share in the costs of that special constable?

MR. FARRAN: Law enforcement grants for urban centres over 1,500 in population were announced last spring. They are pretty substantial. They amounted to something like 50 per cent of the equivalent mounted police policing cost. Grants are not available to municipal districts and counties. They have no policing costs, unlike the rest of Alberta, because they are policed by the RCMP at provincial cost.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister for clarification. Is there no grant available to towns of, say, 1,000 population?

MR. FARRAN: No, there is not, Mr. Speaker. As a town reaches a 1,500 level, there is a formula for some phase-in assistance. If you'd like to put the question on the Order Paper, I could give it to you. I haven't got it exactly at my fingertips.

Civil Service Personnel Policy

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Provincial Treasurer and arises out of Motion for a Return No. 133. In light of the fact that government statistics in this return indicate female members of the civil service receive at least \$3,000 per year less than their male counterparts, I'd like to know what the provincial government is going to do about changing this inequity.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, in his question, the hon. member implies an inequity with which I do not agree. The salary levels to which he refers have nothing to do with whether they are paid to men or women. They relate solely to the position.

I know the hon. member is interested in this area, Mr. Speaker, and I might take this opportunity to advise him that the government's policy is equal opportunity for both men and women. I appreciate it's not enough merely to have that policy. One needs to check to make sure it's being carried out. I recently did that by making an inquiry of the Public Service Commissioner's office as to the number of applicants and the number of successful applicants for management positions within the provincial government. I learned -- and I say this, Mr. Speaker, with some hesitation -- that on a percentage basis, women applicants were somewhat more successful than men. I say "with some hesitation" because that may be grounds for the men to complain.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands followed by the hon. Member for Bow Valley.

AN HON. MEMBER: Wake up, Dave.

MR. NOTLEY: Ah, there he is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Late again.

Commonwealth Games Stadium

MR. KING: Thank you. [interjections] Someone has just said that I'm late again.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. I would like to ask him if it is correct, on the basis of developments to this date, that the provincial government could reach a decision by December 23 respecting possible financial assistance to the city of Edmonton for covering the proposed city stadium.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I assume you are reading from an article that was printed in one of the papers in the city.
[laughter]

AN HON. MEMBER: The other is the St. Albert Gazette.

MR. ADAIR: I believe the key word is endeavor, subject to an agreement being reached by the Eskimo organization and the city of Edmonton.

MR. KING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. It is not then unqualifiedly certain that the provincial government could reach a decision by December 23?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I would say that if the broadest term of endeavor -- we will make every effort, if we are approached before that date, to try to come up with an answer for them. Again, the word endeavor means subject to concurrence between the organization applying and the city of Edmonton.

DR. BUCK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I presume the cabinet has had some discussion about this matter. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know if any outside limits have been placed on the amount of money that would be available to the city of Edmonton or the Edmonton Eskimo Football Club.

MR. ADAIR: As a matter of fact, to my knowledge there have not been any discussions with the cabinet. Members of the Commonwealth Games committee have met with the Edmonton Eskimo organization, and they really just acquainted us with the proposal they were going to be making to the city. No dollars were discussed at any stage in that particular discussion we had with them. Contingent on that, of course, is concurrence being reached between the Edmonton Eskimo organization and the city of Edmonton.

MR. NOTLEY: Supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of all the discussion we've heard about living within guidelines and constraints, is the government not of the view that such an expenditure would be outside the terms of the guidelines on capital expenditures?

AN HON. MEMBER: That's hypothetical.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the hypothetical part of that question is, as I said a moment ago, [that] no dollar figures were discussed, so I can't really comment.

Farm Implement Amendment Act

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Will Bill 63, The Farm Implement Amendment Act, 1975, be brought up for second reading in this fall session of the Legislature?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, no. It is not our intention to proceed any further with Bill 63, but rather to let it die on the Order Paper. I expect to be introducing it again in the spring session of the Legislature. We've had a number of representations with regard to its contents, and I expect it may be possible we will be making some changes.

Cheque Cashing

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, a very short explanation is necessary before I ask the question, which is directed to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. A government employee tried to cash his October cheque in a Treasury Branch and was refused. He walked down the street to the Bank of Nova Scotia with the same identification; they cashed his cheque immediately.

My question is, does the Treasury Branch know something about Alberta's cash position that the chartered banks don't know?

[laughter]

MR. LEITCH: Yes, but I'm sure it had no bearing on that incident.

Canmore Mines

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Can he indicate to the Legislature if he's had the opportunity to find out if there have been any negotiations between the provincial government and Canmore Mines -- the question I asked last week.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I have found out that preliminary discussions are being carried out, but they are between the Department of Environment and Canmore.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Environment. Can he indicate to the Legislature if the Department of Environment or the government is contemplating buying Canmore Mines?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps where the misunderstanding has occurred is that the Dillingham Corporation has offered some of its land for sale, and of course it's the parent corporation under which

Canmore Mines operates. The Department of Environment has been looking at the possibility of buying some of the land that has been offered for sale.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the hon. minister indicate if it is the mining facility the department is looking at, or is it surface rights, or the potential ski facilities? Can the minister indicate to us in what aspect they are dealing with the corporation?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to give a qualified answer. I don't believe the land contains any of the mining facilities as they now exist, nor any of the land that Dillingham has indicated it wants to keep for future development. Other than that broad definition I'd have to go back and look in the file to get the exact description. But I don't believe it includes those facilities.

DR. BUCK: My final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Then can I assume, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is saying the provincial government is not contemplating buying Canmore Mines?

MR. RUSSELL: That's correct, Mr. Speaker. The department is considering buying land that Dillingham deemed to be in excess of its needs for its mining activities up there. Because it's in the eastern slopes and in the Canmore corridor it seemed like a good idea to acquire it if we were able to negotiate a suitable price.

Government Buildings -- Security

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General. It's the feeling of some farmers that dogs were used to help escort the farmers out of the Agriculture Building last Monday.

Can the hon. minister advise if this is indeed the truth?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, the circumstances were these. My understanding is that specific instructions were issued that dogs were not to be used. However, policemen were to be used. They were short of men, and two of the available policemen happened to be dog-handlers.

DR. BUCK: Happened to be?

MR. FARRAN: Yes, they're policemen as well as dog-handlers. They're not handling dogs all the time. Their pets happened to be in the back of the car, which was parked some distance from the building. The dogs were never used. They were just left in the back of the car where they normally travel with these two policemen. The policemen themselves, however, went into the building on their flat feet.

Priority Employment Program

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, with respect to the priority employment program. Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the minister could give some indication of how many positions may have been applied for to date, or whether he has any information on that yet.

MR. SPEAKER: That is a question of some particularity which I think would ordinarily be on the Order Paper, especially if it were not of extreme urgency. If the minister happens to have the answer and is able to answer briefly, perhaps we might proceed with it.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, on the same subject then. Could the minister indicate the provision for funds being set aside for the employment portion -- and give some indication of the expected unemployment that may generate?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, a million dollars has been set aside by the Executive Council for direct employment programs under the priority employment program for 1976-77, and half a million dollars has been allocated to training programs which include training, upgrading, and retraining. Depending on the circumstances with respect to the labor force statistics in the months to come, I have some understanding with the Executive Council that I can return with the evidence that we may or may not need additional resources for both the training and employment elements of the priority employment program.

Addressing myself, sir, to the first question: it is too early to say, but six departments of government, several Crown boards and agencies, in particular auxiliary hospitals, and other agencies are in the process of moving their applications through the procedure and approval programs. It will be some time, possibly six weeks, before we can make an initial estimate of the number of people in direct employment programs and the anticipated number in the training programs beginning on January 1.

Advanced Education Legislation

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Would he very briefly outline to the Assembly the present status of the adult education act.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, it would be very difficult to do it very briefly, but I shall try. It is this. On approximately August 15, the draft was sent out by the department to the various concerned institutions and to anyone who asked for it, with the deadline set for December 1. That deadline has passed, and a great number of submissions have been received and are

being read and summarized at the present time. Some groups have asked for the deadline to be extended, and I said we would of course read, study, and consider any submissions after that deadline.

The results and conclusions of the submissions will be significant in terms of the nature of the work that will ensue following the review of those submissions, their recommendations, their criticisms.

I might say as a proper part of the response, Mr. Speaker, that I have met with practically every constituent group in advanced education whether they are colleges, universities, or provincially administered institutions -- within institutions, and across them -- personally to review their positions, requests, criticisms, and recommendations with respect to this particular draft legislation of the department.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is it the minister's intention then to introduce this ill-conceived legislation in the spring session?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

DR. HOHOL: As all members know, Mr. Speaker, the list of intended legislation for any session is put together some months in advance. It's the intention at the present time that that be the case. In other words, the legislation with respect to this draft is on the list for the spring session.

The final determination by myself, and the recommendations I might make thereafter to Executive Council, will depend in large measure on the extent and nature of recommendations that are divergent or are somewhat consistent with the content and the intent of the draft legislation as it exists in its present form.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary to the minister. Once the legislation is introduced in the spring session, has he given any consideration to letting it sit on the Order Paper, and then be dealt with next fall?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, this anticipates the conclusions we may draw when a full and complete assessment is made of the submissions from the colleges, universities, interested groups, and individual Albertans. That's one of the options. It's one of four, five, or half a dozen options open to us once we conclude our study of the submissions, and probably put together a minister's draft in contrast to the department draft. So it is one indeed, but one of about half a dozen alternatives from which we can choose.

MR. CLARK: One last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is it the intention of the minister to carry forward the reorganization of the department now being done in line with the act that was released earlier, or is it the minister's intention to stop the reorganization of the department till the Leg-

islature has had a chance to debate the legislation?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, for the record, there has not been a major reorganization of the department, nor has there been an intent to reorganize the department in a major way. There have been some adjustments to the department's structure in terms of function, but none of them particularly related to the intended or existing legislation, but were intended entirely in terms of the department's capability to meet its mandate in terms of its function with respect to advanced education and manpower.

Alaska Highway

MR. SHABEN: My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Transportation. I'd like to know if he is aware that the United States government intends to spend well over \$100 million on highway construction to serve Alaska through the Yukon, and to connect with British Columbia.

DR. HORNER: So far, Mr. Speaker, only through what I've also read in the press. As far as I'm aware, I think the matter is at the first stage in the legislative process in the Congress of the United States.

MR. SHABEN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister comment as to what effect such action, if it proceeds, would have on Alberta's position as far as serving the western Arctic is concerned?

MR. NOTLEY: Finish Highway 49.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, a variety of roads reach the Arctic. Our priority is the Mackenzie Highway to service the western Arctic. We are, however, aware that improvements on the Alaska Highway will give additional benefits to Alberta suppliers, and we have no concern with that.

New Home Warranty

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might supplement an answer I gave yesterday in response to a question by the hon. Member for Drumheller with regard to house warranties. The Alberta new home certification program is in place through the Housing and Urban Development Association of Canada. At the present time, about 98 per cent of the members of that organization participate in the program. In addition, several builders who are not members of HUDAC also participate. As a result, of the monthly production of houses, which at the present time is running about 1,000 homes per month, over 90 per cent are covered by the home warranty.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MCTIONS FOR RETURNS

209. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:
A list of all cheques issued and/or accounts outstanding as a direct consequence of the European mission showing, in each case, the person or agency involved and the purpose for the payment.

MR. HYNEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move an amendment to this motion, in respect of which we've had consultation with the member who moved the motion.

I move that Motion for a Return No. 109 be amended by striking out all the words after the word "showing" in the second line and substituting the following:

A list of all cheques issued and/or outstanding to complete payment of accounts in total with respect to the Alberta mission to Europe, naming the persons or corporate entities to whom cheques were or will be made payable under general headings, such as transportation, hotel lodging, receptions, embassies, printing, communications, and administration.

[Motion as amended carried]

211. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:
Names and addresses of all waterwell drillers that received journeyman certification between January 1, 1975 and November 1, 1975.

[Motion carried]

212. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:
A copy of all studies dealing with the development of new and existing townsites in the coal branch area southwest of Edson, particularly regarding the viability of the present Cadomin townsite.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I request that Motion for a Return 212 stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the request of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs acceptable to the Assembly?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion will stand.

213. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) An itemized list of all goods and services supplied to Sunburst Ceramics Ltd., of Lethbridge by the Alberta Research Council as of 31 October, 1975, showing the cost of each item or its estimated market value;
- (2) a list of all grants, loans, or loan guarantees issued to Sunburst Ceramics Ltd. by any other branch or agency of the Alberta government prior to 31 October, 1975;
- (3) a full account of the arrangements, if any, which have been made to recover the items listed in (1) and (2) above since Sunburst Ceramics Ltd. has gone into receivership and/or declared bankruptcy.

[Motion carried]

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a reply to Motion for a Return No. 213.

214. Mr. Taylor proposed the following motion to the Assembly:
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) How many coal leases larger than one section have been granted during
 - (a) 1973,
 - (b) 1974,
 - (c) 1975 to October 31;
- (2) the names of the companies to whom these leases were granted;
- (3) the expiry date of each lease.

[Motion carried]

215. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:
That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

- (1) A copy of all studies done by the department of manpower and labour and/or the Department of Advanced Education and Manpower on the use or potential for use in Alberta of temporary imported labor under an 11-42 category of visa or similar arrangement since January 1, 1972;
- (2) a copy of all studies relating to the flow of immigrants into the province in terms of the demand for immigrant labor, the effect on wages in Alberta, and the supply of immigrant labor in relation to demand since January 1, 1972.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I would request that Motion 215 stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the request of the hon. minister acceptable to the Assembly?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion will stand.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:
Be it resolved that, the Legislative Assembly urge the Government of Alberta to provide immediate direct assistance to the cow-calf industry in the form of cash grants of \$100 per calf, up to a maximum of 75 head.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to move Motion No. 1 on the Order Paper. I would just advise hon. members that there is a slight typographical error in that at the end of "75 head" there should be "per producer". That's a fairly straightforward clarification, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It would appear the suggestion made by the hon. member is a mere amendment in text, without really changing the substance of the motion. Is it acceptable to the Assembly?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the issue we have before us today is probably the single most important economic problem we have in an otherwise relatively prosperous province. That being the case, I appreciate the fact that the government has agreed, and the official opposition as well, that we spend the entire afternoon quite properly debating this issue.

Mr. Speaker, there is really no doubt that for a number of years, both in the late 1960s and early 1970s, there was a concerted effort, not only by the present government but indeed by the former government, not only in the Province of Alberta but for that matter throughout western Canada, to encourage younger people especially to get into the cattle business.

Hon. members will recall that in the late '60s and early '70s grain prices had reached a very low level. So we heard from government experts and people in the beef industry, the general consensus of opinion that the markets would remain strong, prices would remain relatively high, and that people should be encouraged to go into the cattle business. As a consequence, a broad array of loan programs was developed, as I say, not only in this province but in other provinces as well. Mr. Speaker, we now know, of course, that the price of cattle has dropped drastically.

But I want to just cite, for the record, Mr. Speaker, a statement made on April 6, 1972, by the then Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Horner. He says, and I quote page 2357 of Hansard, April 6, 1972:

However, it is important that we

do develop our industry, but that we don't develop it too fast so that we start a surplus situation and force prices to a drastically low level.

A common-sense proposal, indeed. Then he goes on to say:

I accept the responsibility, as the minister, to try and juggle this thing, and I guess that is part of the responsibility of the job.

Well, Mr. Speaker, a very clear statement by the minister at that time that he accepts responsibility for programs and the effect of those programs on the people who take part in them.

Mr. Speaker, I hardly need spend much time talking about the present situation, because hon. members know the situation is really pretty desperate for producers in the province. Larger producers who have been in the business for many years are perhaps in a position where they can withstand the valleys, because they've had some of the peaks. But the younger people who got into the cattle business just as prices began to slide down are the people in most serious trouble at present.

I could cite many examples, but perhaps just one or two for the purpose of the discussion today, Mr. Speaker. A constituent of mine, a very active member of the Peace River Stock Growers Association, took two liner loads of cattle -- some 55,000 pounds of beef -- and came out with a net of \$11,900, or approximately 22 cents a pound. Well, that's a rather good case, because there are many, many more serious problems than that. At auction marts around the province, we have cases where cows are going for 10 or 12 cents a pound, calves often for less than that. So, Mr. Speaker, it is undisputed that we have a very serious problem in the industry at the moment and, of course, the cow-calf operator is receiving the brunt of the problem.

Even the highest grades of cattle, A-1 and A-2 slaughter steers, 42 to 44 cents a pound -- that's substantially under the cost of production. But I think we have to keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that very few of the cattle marketed are actually in that top category. So the vast majority of the cattle taken to market are in the lower price category, which is drastically below the cost of production. There is no way, no matter how skilful the farmer may be, that you can long maintain a business if you are producing at less than it costs to produce whatever article it is -- cattle, oil, automobiles, or whatever the case may be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at some of the proposals that have been advanced to deal with the emergency situation. The resolution we have before us today has been proposed by the National Farmers Union. It is not a long-term proposal. As a matter of fact, a little later in my remarks I want to go into some of the longer term proposals made by this particular organization. The National Farmers Union has suggested \$100 a calf to a maximum of 75 calves per producer.

Shortly before the Legislature opened, a meeting was held in the Peace River country by the Peace River Stock Growers Association. While the meeting did not formally set policies for the organization, the members attended and proposed to the government a wintering bonus of \$100 a cow to a maximum of 75 head. So we have both the formal or official proposal of the National Farmers Union, as well as an unofficial proposal advanced by the Peace River Stock Growers Association.

Now, I recognize that the Canadian Cattlemen's Association and the Western Stock Growers' Association are not in favor of a program of direct cash grants. I can appreciate their right to take that position. However, I don't agree with it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the argument we have heard most often in the Province of Alberta about this issue, and for a while advanced quite persuasively by the Minister of Agriculture, was the simple proposition that it is better to have a federal stabilization plan, and that Alberta should not act unilaterally but should wait until the federal government has a plan in place. Well, I don't think anyone really argues the point, Mr. Speaker, that it would be better and more desirable to see leadership by the federal government in this area. But the issue is, what are we going to do in the interim? Do we not have a responsibility as a provincial government to fill in the gap before the farmers find themselves on the verge of bankruptcy? It's fine to say, wait for Ottawa, but how long are we going to wait?

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note in the September 19 edition of the Edmonton Journal, a headline saying Cow-Calf Plan Two Weeks Away. The writer, in his article, points out that Mr. Whelan is expected to make a statement on the cow-calf stabilization plan early in October. Well, early October came, and it passed. In early October we had the federal announcement of the wage and price freeze.

It's pretty obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the whole concept of federal stabilization in this area became a victim of Ottawa's current battle against inflation, although I find it a little difficult to see the argument against government spending in an area where you have depressed pricing. There may be some argument that government spending in a highly inflationary area can only increase the rate of inflation; but when you've got the depressed prices our cow-calf operators are receiving today, the suggestion that a stabilization plan is going to lead to inflation, in my view, is just absolute nonsense and bears no validity at all from an economic standpoint. So I think that I have to express very strong disappointment that Ottawa has not seen fit to provide the leadership the people of Canada should expect.

But having said that, Mr. Speaker, the question then arises, what do we do in the interim? Well, quite clearly we have to ask ourselves, should the Legislative Assembly of Alberta not consider doing something itself? I believe very strongly that we should. In order to address ourselves

to this question, Mr. Speaker, let's just take a moment and analyse what other provincial governments are doing. I think it's important for us to recognize that other provinces are moving with schemes.

Let's just take a look at these schemes. In the Province of Quebec, a wintering subsidy was paid over the 1974-75 year according to the following schedule: 20-30 animal units, \$45 a head; for animal units of 74 and over, that goes progressively down to \$20 a head, but there is a further payment of 13 cents a pound when the animals are marketed. A substantially similar program is in place for 1975-76. Mr. Speaker, that is a program in place in the Province of Quebec.

Let's take a look at Tory Ontario, a government which at present has to look for a little bit of assistance. As a matter of fact, it's rather intriguing, Mr. Speaker, that they're looking to the official opposition for assistance. That's an unhealthy position for the Leader of the Official Opposition to take in Ontario I might add. Nevertheless, that's his business. In any event, let's take a quick look at what plan Ontario has. I find that in practice they have a plan which works out to a cash grant of approximately \$90 a calf. Well, that's Ontario.

Let's go to the Province of Manitoba. The Province of Manitoba has a scheme which in practice -- and I could go into the details -- works out to a cash grant of \$108 a calf for a maximum of 50 calves. The Province of Saskatchewan does not have a formal cash program, but it does have interest-free loans, and it's my understanding that as a government they are now considering whether they should move into the area of cash grants.

Hon. members will know from discussion that has taken place on occasion in this Legislature that the British Columbia government has introduced an income assurance program which has been worked out between the beef producers of that province and the B.C. government. I find it rather interesting to look at the history of that program, Mr. Speaker, because the Canadian Cattlemen's Association is so strongly opposed to any kind of government interference. They had a meeting last spring in Kamloops. The president of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association was there and a large number of the producers, some 300, were present. They were discussing whether the cattlemen in the Province of British Columbia should join in the assured income program. Well, there was quite a debate, and the arguments against joining in the program were advanced articulately, strongly, and forceably by the president of the Canadian Cattlemen's Association. But when the vote was taken, by a vote of approximately 200 to 100, by 2 to 1 the producers decided to opt into the assured income program on a voluntary basis.

What I find interesting to learn, Mr. Speaker, is that something in the neighborhood of 90 per cent of these independent cattlemen have voluntarily opted into the B.C. program. As well they would, because when you look at the program, you find

there is a support price of approximately 35 cents a pound for calves, less one-third which the producer has to put up, and 19 cents for yearlings, less one-third which the producer has to put up. A rather good program, Mr. Speaker, in sharp contrast to actions in this province.

Mr. Speaker, when you review the provinces in Canada that have substantial numbers of cattle, almost every province -- certainly all the provinces of significance in the cattle business -- has a program, except the Province of Alberta. The best we can do is come up with a scheme of 7 per cent loans. That stands in contrast to the interest-free program in place last year.

Mr. Speaker, let me just take a moment to examine the question, should we undertake unilateral action as a province. I remember listening on several occasions to the Minister of Agriculture saying in interviews that he didn't feel Alberta could take part in this program because we produce approximately 40 per cent of the beef in this country and a large amount of it is shipped to other parts of the country. If we were to use Alberta taxpayers' money to subsidize the cow-calf operator, we would in effect be using Alberta money to subsidize other Canadians.

There may be some logic to that argument, Mr. Speaker. But I suggest that it is far worse that our cattlemen in Alberta should have to pay the price of that subsidy. I suggest, too, Mr. Speaker, there is an interesting contrast between the government's attitude to the cattle business on one hand, and its approach to the oil business on the other. If it is true, as the hon. Minister of Agriculture says, that we produce 40 per cent of the cattle -- and it certainly is -- then there should be no assistance to the oil industry, because we produce 85 per cent of the oil. If by helping the cattle industry we are subsidizing other Canadians, then helping the oil industry is even more of a subsidy to other Canadians. But that didn't stop this government, Mr. Speaker, from bringing in the ALFEP plan on December 11, 1974. That didn't stop the government from introducing a scheme which, in its various facets, will return between \$500 and \$600 million cash flow to the oil industry.

The argument I'm making is clearly this: I think this government will have a lot of talking to do in order to answer to the farmers of the Province of Alberta. If that kind of massive assistance can be made available to the oil industry when most of the oil is exported from the Province of Alberta, why is it not equally sound that some kind of assistance be made to cattlemen at this time, when they are in the most desperate economic circumstances?

Mr. Speaker, we had discussion yesterday in the Legislature about the impact of Alberta moving unilaterally on Bill C-50. I suggest that rather than causing difficulties, quite the reverse would be the case. If we're going to extract the kind of commitment to a sensible stabilization plan that is required from Ottawa, we have to show provincial leadership.

Let's look at some of the cost-sharing programs we have in place right now, whether it's the hospitalization scheme, medicare, or what have you. These schemes have not originated by federal leadership. They have originated as a result of provincial initiative. Once the provinces have established these programs, Ottawa has followed through with cost-sharing.

I say to members of this Assembly that bringing in direct assistance in the short run is not going to act as a barrier to long-term stabilization. In my view, it will put the federal government clearly on the spot so it has to move on this issue. I say to you that if Alberta, along with Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and British Columbia, says clearly, we want cost-sharing on stabilization, it will indeed be a very reluctant federal government that will continue to procrastinate and postpone action. So I say that Alberta's moving on this issue is not inconsistent with federal participation, but is indeed a very important prelude to achieving it.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to make a few brief observations about the long term. I would be the first person to admit that the resolution I have placed on the Order Paper is no long-term solution. You know, no one in this Legislature would suggest that \$100 a calf for 75 calves is going to solve all the problems of the beef industry. But, Mr. Speaker, what we are looking at is a large number of younger farmers who are facing an emergency situation and need some interim help. Over the long run, stabilization is obviously required.

In October or November last year, the NFU had a demonstration in front of this Legislature and recommended four major points: the \$100 per calf grant, a federal government emergency aid program buying up lower grades of cattle at prices no less than the 1973 average and using them for foreign aid, the stabilization program, and a national meat authority.

I want to say a word or two about the last. I know most members of this Legislature would probably be opposed to the concept of a national meat authority, but I believe that if we're going to ensure an opportunity for the smaller producers in this country, we have to move toward orderly marketing in beef products. I know that may be an anathema to many of the long-established cattlemen in this province, but I make no apology for saying orderly marketing is a prerequisite in the cattle business, just as it is in any other type of agricultural production. As a matter of fact, we had a debate that lasted several days in the 1974 session of the Legislature about the government's repeal of the coarse grains act in this province, and the impact I felt that move had on the position of the Wheat Board in orderly marketing of feed grain. Mr. Speaker, just as a matter of personal philosophy, I believe that orderly marketing is the only way we're going to be able to make a sensible stabilization scheme work so the smaller producers can stay in business.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I conclude my remarks I want to say a word or two about

the government's overreaction to the demonstration of the last few days. Quite frankly, yesterday one would have thought the government had proclaimed the War Measures Act, there were so many policemen in this building.

[interjections]

Oh, some of the members may not like to hear that, but the fact of the matter is that there were more security people than farmers here yesterday. I can't imagine what they were afraid of.

It disturbs me, Mr. Speaker, when I read Hansard from yesterday -- perhaps it was a slip of the tongue of the hon. Minister of Government Services, but I just want to refer to Dr. Buck's question and the hon. minister's answer.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Has this been a direction from the hon. minister's office, and on what grounds were they asked to remove this from public property?

Some hon. members interrupted, and then Dr. Buck said, "On what basis, Mr. Speaker?" The hon. minister replied:

Mr. Speaker, the occupants, who are members of the NFU of Alberta, are trespassing on government property.

"Trespassing on government property" -- well, Mr. Speaker, technically that may be correct, but if there is any building in this province that belongs to all the people it is the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Alberta.

AN HON. MEMBER: One would think so.

MR. NOTLEY: I find it rather strange that we have this kind of overreaction on the part of the government to a very small number of people in a tent outside the door.

No, Mr. Speaker, I suggest a better approach would be for the Premier to call a meeting of the cabinet and meet with the National Farmers Union. It's not an unreasonable proposition that groups in this province should be able to meet with the entire cabinet. The people in question have met on a number of occasions. I give the Minister of Agriculture credit for meeting with them. They have met him on a number of occasions to advance their ideas. He has made it clear, as he must, that he is only one member of the cabinet and that he has to convince his colleagues. That's a fair enough statement. But the corollary of that statement, Mr. Speaker, is that the group has the right to make its submission to the cabinet as a whole. Somehow to suggest that this is unreasonable, Mr. Speaker, is just in my view an unreasonable view in itself. No, Mr. Speaker, the farmers in question have made the case for a meeting with the cabinet, and I would call upon the Premier of this province to set up that meeting at the earliest possible opportunity.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the resolution I present to the Legislature today is an effort not to deal with a long-term

solution but to try to rectify a short-term, almost emergency situation, which developed as much as anything because people took the advice of government. One of the most effective presentations at the meeting the other day in the Capilano hotel was a young farmer from Warburg, I believe, who just got up and explained what had happened to him. He had worked on the rigs to gather the initial capital to acquire some land, then he worked through the ADC. He did all the things he was supposed to do: he went to his district agriculturist and sought advice, he went to farm management school. He did everything a prudent young man would do, and he got into cattle because that was the advice he received. Now he has a tough time dodging the sheriff.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think governments have a responsibility at some point to the people we govern, not only for the successes of policy but to help try to rectify the problems of policies that haven't worked out as well as they should. I say to the members of this Legislature that the proposal we have before us today is not the total answer by any means, but a small step towards at least rectifying some of the legitimate concerns and grievances of many people in this province.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to take part in this debate this afternoon to discuss some of our ideas, some of the things we've been doing with respect to the beef cattle industry, marketing and marketing development, and some of the problems in this industry today.

I wanted to begin by talking about marketing and stabilization programs, and the kind of meetings and discussions we've been having with other provinces and indeed the federal government. However, Mr. Speaker, in view of some of the remarks by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, when he was talking about things being done in other provinces, it might be a good idea if I spent a little bit of time talking about some 15 other things he didn't mention that have been done in Canada with respect to the beef industry. All of those, Mr. Speaker, have occurred over the course of the last four years in the Province of Alberta. I think it would be a good idea to review the concern and interest shown since 1971 by my previous colleague, Dr. Horner, and this government with respect to the beef cattle industry.

Mr. Speaker, I have a total of those expenditures in at least 15 different programs during that time, and it's well in excess of \$50 million. I might mention the first one, being the livestock water supply program, which has been in effect for the last three years and this year is being made available to farmers across the province at a cost of more than \$2.9 million.

I might mention the Province of Saskatchewan as well, as my hon. colleague friend did. Not more than three months ago we passed a special warrant in cabinet to the extent of \$1.8 million to assist in the development of the Veterinary Infectious Diseases Organization in the Province of Saskatchewan.

wan. Mr. Speaker, the Government of Alberta made the largest contribution of any government in Canada to that particular facility located at the veterinary college in Saskatoon. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, over the last four years we provided more than a dozen beef cattle organizations in this province with some very extensive grants so that they might develop a marketing concept of their own, and move beef breeding cattle into many other countries of the world.

Most recently we provided funds to the Alberta Cattle Commission to assist in developing markets in the western United States. We provided, as well, funds to the Alberta Cattle Commission which went to the formation of the Canada Beef Council -- a council designed to try to remove some of the gap and some of the concern between producer and consumer, and to have a better understanding between those two groups.

Two and a half years ago a provincial Meat Inspection Act was introduced into this Legislature. Some of the members of this Assembly and others might not know why. The reason, Mr. Speaker, was that we wanted many of our small abattoirs across this province, which are slaughtering meat, to be able to come under a provincial meat inspection act, so they could upgrade their facilities and sell meat to many more people than they presently were. That's necessary, Mr. Speaker, because one of the problems in the industry is that we need to narrow the gap between producer and consumer. We need to be sure there are not too many people in there taking part of the producer's income and pushing up prices to the consumer. Surely it's pretty important to have 50 or 60 abattoirs in the Province of Alberta which can slaughter meat and sell it directly to the consumer. Mr. Speaker, from one end of Alberta to the other, they've been assisted by some direct loans from the Ag. Development Corporation.

We were involved in building four veterinary clinics across this province at a cost of about \$150,000 each.

We have at least four different programs, Mr. Speaker, with respect to grazing reserve. That's in addition to the kind of protection we've been able to apply to grazing land in Alberta, and the kind of protection we've been able to apply to grazing prices on grazing land in Alberta.

There's a native range improvement program, introduced some two years ago, where interest is paid fully on some \$4,000 used to clear native brush and to seed tame pasture. Last winter we spent a number of dollars, largely in northern Alberta, out of PEP funds, to clear land on community pastures and grazing reserves. The lands division, in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, has been involved in paying part of the costs of clearing and seeding on community pastures and grazing leases.

Hon. members should be aware of what was spent in 1974 in the livestock facility program: over \$5 million in grants directly to beef producers in this province. I am sure all of them are aware of the predator loss program instituted by this

government, and the livestock disaster indemnity program. I am sure they are aware that I had to pass another special warrant for something like \$2 million this year to take care of the slightly more than \$3 million spent on the summer farm employment program. Sixty-five per cent of those summer students were working on farms that have livestock on them.

I think they are aware as well that through the Ag. Development Corporation, as I pointed out in the Legislature some time ago, we've made some very extensive loans at low interest rates and guaranteed a lot of loans to beef producers: \$2.5 million in specific guarantees, more than \$23 million under our \$50,000 guarantee program. I don't know of another province which has that kind of lending program. I've talked to people in other provinces who say that in difficult times such as this, they're forced to go to lending institutions and pay 14 or 15 per cent interest.

In addition to that, in 1975 we reintroduced the cow-calf advance program -- at 7 per cent, yes. But the important feature there is that some \$47 million of credit would have been withdrawn from the industry had we not reintroduced that program -- \$47 million of credit that many individuals couldn't obtain without the government guarantee.

I want to point out again, Mr. Speaker, as I said last week and the week before in the Legislature, that we've instructed the Ag. Development Corporation board of directors and staff to look at people having difficulties in the beef industry in a different manner than they might have before; to take some additional risk by way of direct loans, guaranteed loans, and by way of the extension of those loan repayments, both principal and interest.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pretty confident that a lot of individuals who are having some difficulty can be helped by the Agricultural Development Corporation, providing they have the management ability and the desire to carry on.

Mr. Speaker, having reviewed some of the things which have happened in Alberta over these past few years, I wanted to talk about what we've been doing in what is clearly a national and an international problem -- one that certainly can't be resolved in total over the long term by the application of grants. I want to talk about the United States border. It was closed to the movement of beef some time ago. I discussed that matter with the federal Minister of Agriculture in April, and I discussed it with him a number of times over the course of the next several weeks. The discussions arose out of a concern by the federal government that we needed to close another border to another product, and that was eggs.

I said to the federal Minister of Agriculture I couldn't see how a province like Alberta, which is so dependent for its agricultural livelihood on export markets in other parts of Canada, United States, and across the world, could be involved in agreeing to unilaterally closed borders. I

didn't agree to the closure of the border with respect to the movement of eggs into Canada from the United States until early August of this year when we had some assurances that the United States border was going to be open to the movement of beef.

Mr. Speaker, members of this Assembly should think, and be aware and concerned about the kind of unilateral action that is sometimes taken in Canada with respect to border closures, and about the kind of effect that has on the agricultural industry in Alberta. It's great if you're from Ontario or Quebec where your agricultural production is less than the number of people you have to feed.

But if we're going to have an industry in this province, if we're going to continue to produce far in excess of the number of people we have to feed, then we have to start thinking about trade, non-tariff barriers, and tariff barriers to other countries, and we have to do something about them. We've been doing that. We've been talking to the Government of Canada in a variety of ways at meetings at the ministers' level and the official level, with regard to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

I wanted to talk about that for a little while. Many of you know the kind of meat coming here from Australia and other countries with which we don't trade in agricultural products. I think it's pretty sad that four or five years ago, when this country was last involved in GATT negotiations, we literally sold out the agricultural industry in return for industrial jobs in eastern Canada.

It's not very good when I read from the Canadian Dairy Commission and people interested in the dairy business that just last week the federal government has once again pulled the rug out from the dairy industry by allowing a doubling of cheese imports into Canada, the largest importation that's ever been allowed into this country, at a time when we actually have a surplus of manufactured milk.

It would be pretty nice if some of the people involved in demonstrations and that kind of thing would take the time to sit down with me and others, and talk about those kinds of things which could be of a long-term, positive benefit to our industry.

I wanted to talk about stabilization. Mr. Speaker, I have met a number of times with the federal Minister of Agriculture to discuss stabilization in the cow-calf industry. The representations we made, not after the fact, but before the fat cattle program was announced a few weeks ago, were to the effect that the fat cattle program as it applied last year, and the formula used with respect to arriving at a cost-of-production formula, did not take into account the price of raising a calf. Rather it took into account what that calf or feeder was selling for in the market.

We said, therefore, we think there should be a cow-calf stabilization program on a national basis. We were the only province in Canada which took the time to

supply figures to Ottawa with respect to what we thought the cost of production was, or which took the time to show to the Government of Canada how that plan would work. I think if efforts of other provinces and farm organizations had been united in an effort to make a national stabilization program come about, as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview said, it would have come about.

Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat again that in an industry like beef, a national commodity, I don't think this country can continue to have 9 or 10 different plans that tend to shift production from one area to another, like the one in Manitoba where the farmer winds up working for the government, and selling his cattle to it. Frankly, I don't think farmers in this province would accept that kind of plan.

I wanted to talk a little about market development. A \$41 million sale of hogs to Japan was announced in this Legislature two weeks ago. That's the positive kind of thing that our farmers and farm organizations in the beef business should be thinking and talking about. It took us a while to develop it. But it's a very worthwhile objective for anybody in the meat industry in Alberta, or elsewhere in western Canada, to be talking about and to be involved in that kind of thing.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk as well about the idea of a national meat authority. For more than a year, we've had people coming to us from various areas and saying, we should have a national meat authority. For more than a year we've had a federal commission, established at the request of ministers from western Canada, inquiring into the marketing of beef. Dr. Hu Harries from Edmonton, a member of that commission, tells me they expect the final report early in 1976. That commission was established to determine if, in fact, there are areas between producer and consumer where somebody is taking too much money. It was established to try to determine if, in fact, there is need for a national marketing board, a meat authority, or some kind of different authority to control imports and exports of meat products from Canada.

I don't know what is meant by a national meat authority. To this point, it's been a one-liner. I would like to think somebody could put a little meat on it, somebody interested in having a national meat authority. What does it pretend to do? Would a national meat authority take over the functions of the Alberta Hog Producers' Marketing Board, which has shown leadership that hasn't been shown anywhere else in Canada in terms of marketing? Would a national meat authority be operated by the federal government without any reference to provinces or producers, as is the case now with the Canadian Egg Marketing Agency? Or would a national meat authority allow producers to make some decisions? I'm not sure what it would do. If, in fact, the concept of a national meat authority is to give decisions we make in marketing in Alberta and western Canada to the Government of Canada, the bureaucrats

in Ottawa, I don't think I want any part of it. Surely we have the kind of beef producers, the kind of people in Alberta, who are qualified to make those decisions. We don't have to ask the Government of Canada to run all our business.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I wanted to talk as well about the demonstrations carried on by the National Farmers Union around this building and in the Agriculture Building during the last while. It became very apparent to me, Mr. Speaker, that the leadership of the National Farmers Union has a very callous disregard for farmers in this province. It appears they're only interested in confrontation, and not consultation.

Three times, Mr. Speaker, in the last two weeks -- once on Friday, November 14, once on Friday, November 28, and once on Monday, December 1 -- I've made an attempt to sit down with the leadership of that organization, with a representative group of people, to discuss the proposals they wanted to put forward and their recommended solutions. On Friday, November 14, the answer was, we didn't come to talk about beef cattle problems, we came to talk about our banquet at our annual convention in Edmonton. Mr. Speaker, I can think of better things to talk about than a banquet, when we've got problems like we have in beef marketing and production in Alberta today. On November 28, with some notice, there was no show. Finally, on Monday, December 1, we did attend a meeting, together with a number of other ministers, Mr. Speaker. Once again, they said the instructions from the membership were, they were not allowed to talk about the problems.

Mr. Speaker, that evening, on Monday, December 1, I attended at the Agriculture Building at the request of a number sitting there, and asked them to leave the building. I again offered to talk about some of their problems. The following evening, on Tuesday, December 2, I attended at the 12th floor of the Agriculture Building and said, I'm here now, and I'm willing to sit down for however long it takes and discuss the problems in the beef industry. Well, Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a telegram wanting to know if I would come once again to a meeting -- not a meeting that's going to resolve anything with respect to how we approach the problems of farmers in this province, but a meeting designed to determine whether I'd go back and ask if the entire cabinet of this government would attend a rally of 700 or 800 people somewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to respond again to any calls for meetings of the National Farmers Union until the leadership of that organization can show that it has some concern about farmers in Alberta, that it wants to sit down with me and other members of cabinet and discuss in a rational sort of way how we will resolve those problems.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's pretty sad the representation that has been made by the leadership of that organization shows such disregard for a lot of very respect-

able, hard-working farmers in Alberta.

I wanted to say, as well, Mr. Speaker, that during the course of these last two weeks, I've talked with a good many members of locals of the National Farmers Union across Alberta. I intend to continue to do that. I've had literally dozens of them phoning me saying, they'd like to come in, or they'd like me to attend somewhere for some meaningful discussions.

I want to say, as well, that during the last two weeks I have had discussions with the Canadian Cattlemen's Association, Western Stock Growers' Association, and Unifarm. Next week I'll be discussing at length with the Unifarm organization the kind of approaches we might make in a positive way to Ottawa and other provinces to try to resolve some of our difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, the job of trying to create a good situation in marketing and beef production in this province, elsewhere in Canada, and around the world, is a difficult one. But it's one we can win if we approach it on the basis of consultation; one we can win if we approach it on the basis of not forgetting about the long term, of not dealing only with the short term; one we can win if we talk about things like tariffs, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, stabilization, a better marketing system, and perhaps some input in the organizations we've been talking about, in terms of improving market development here in Alberta and elsewhere in Canada.

I'd be pleased, Mr. Speaker, if hon. members -- and I know there are many of them in the Legislature today -- would put forth some of their positive ideas about what can be done to improve the market position of beef producers in Alberta, and put them in such a way that we might have an opportunity to follow them up with some positive action that would help everyone in the industry, whether they are in northern or southern Alberta.

Thank you very much.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like to say in fairness to the present Minister of Agriculture, I remember the first statement I ever made when the minister was appointed to his present portfolio. Somebody asked me, "What do you think about the appointments to the Executive Council?" I said I agreed with some of them, others I didn't. I felt Mr. Moore was a man capable of doing the job. But I also said, "It's going to be quite obvious he's going to be the sacrificial lamb for some of the policies of the former Minister of Agriculture." And right now, Mr. Speaker, I would say the chickens are starting to come home to roost . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, come on.

DR. BUCK: . . . and I think the facts, as they unroll in the years to come, will bear that out.

Mr. Speaker, we are elected to this Legislature to serve the people. And I would like to say, in fairness to the people who were at the meeting at the

Capilano Motor Inn, and in fairness to the National Farmers Union, that the people there were not only National Farmers Union members but farmers who are in a desperate situation. They are going broke. That's why they were there.

I would like to say this, Mr. Speaker: if there were 40 members on the government side and 35 members on the opposition side, you can be sure that the minister and at least a half dozen cabinet ministers would have been there. But when you have an overwhelming majority, as we have in this Legislature, we can see the indifference. We can see the callousness because we've got that kind of a great big, large hammer. [interjections]

Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very plain to see. We hear from the hon. Member for Athabasca, always snipping and yipping, but we never hear him stand up in this Legislature and say to this House and to the people of this province, I have a problem in my constituency with the cow-calf operator. And we haven't heard from the hon. Members for Drayton Valley, St. Paul, Lac La Biche-McMurray, Bonnyville, Vermilion-Viking, Vegreville, Whitecourt, Redwater-Andrew, saying to the people of this province and to the Executive Council, boys, we have to have a look at the situation because it's urgent. Mr. Speaker, just how much more urgent can it be when some of these people, who as a result of government direction have gone into this kind of business, are going broke? How the government, which says it is there to serve the people, can show such indifference, I think is unpardonable, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

DR. BUCK: I think it is unpardonable. It's an affront to the people of this province.

I think the Premier of this province is an excellent politician. I give him his dues. I think he's an excellent politician. I never thought he would miss an opportunity to sit down with fellow Albertans and discuss mutual problems. I think the government had better have a look at its public relations role, because it has fouled it up in this.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. minister says we have done so much, I will grant they have. But, Mr. Speaker, a government which prides itself on forward-looking programs surely isn't going to come into this Legislature to tell us all the great things they've done in the past. We're not really concerned about the past. We're concerned about what is happening to these people right now. "Now" used to be a favorite word with this government, but they've forgotten it. Now means at the present. Right now, that's where the problem is.

[interjections]

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Member for Athabasca, I would like to say this: there was a serious problem in 1961 in the cow-calf business. But, Mr. Speaker, the problem was not half as serious as it is now, because the cost of production has gone up almost threefold. How can anybody

stay in business if it takes him \$300 to raise a cow and he sells it for \$100? There's just no way.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has covered some of the areas when we start talking about stabilization programs and so on, and the programs that are going on in the other provinces. In 1969, '70, and '71, we heard many times from the Deputy Premier, let's not blame it all on Ottawa. Let's not blame it on Ottawa. Let's show some initiative right here in this province. We kept hearing that story time after time after time. Let's hear now what the now government's going to do. Let's not hear it blame Ottawa, because it's the Alberta farmers who are going broke, Mr. Speaker. It's not Ontario or B.C. farmers. It's Alberta farmers who are going broke.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in subsidies per se. But I do believe, because we indicated to the young farmer and to the man who is having trouble selling his grain, to go into beef, because we have initiated these programs using the experts we have hired and advised these people to go into beef, now they are going broke, we must show a responsibility and bail them out. If we can invest \$1,000 million in the Syncrude project, surely, Mr. Speaker, we can use \$25 million of the taxpayers' money to tide an industry over a very, very difficult time. I don't think that's asking too much, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that's asking too much of the people of this province, to help out their fellow man in a situation such as this.

At the same time, I have to give credit to the former Minister of Agriculture, when he tried to inform the consumer in this province and in Canada that we must return to the farmer a just return so that he can look at some long-term planning. If he has to pay 7 per cent for his money, then he has to get more than 7 per cent back so he can pay off this money. I do compliment the former minister because he did take the stand, when the consumers were boycotting beef, to say to the consumer in Alberta, you're getting some of the best product in the world and you're getting it at a reasonable price. So it's not all bad. I don't knock the former minister for everything, because he did try. But when we reach the situation we're in now, then, Mr. Speaker, as the motion reads, it's an interim solution we must have.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think the members on the government side really appreciate the seriousness of the matter. It doesn't seem to be getting through that the problem is very, very urgent. We have to show compassion. We have to show understanding.

Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to enlighten the members, who don't seem to want to be enlightened, on exactly what is happening. In this letter which was addressed to the Minister of Agriculture in the middle of the summer, a young farmer explained his plight, in dollars and cents, as to what is happening. To the hon. members representing urban areas, who maybe don't know or don't care, I'd just like to give one or two pertinent points from this

letter. This farmer is speaking about his calf:

It was sold on December 17 of '74 for \$32 per hundred, grossing \$185.60. Now, six months later, on June 10, 1975, I sold the twin to this calf for \$25 per hundred, grossing \$172.50.

He fed it for six months and lost \$10. And he goes on, telling just what he has done. He says:

I realize the government's in a difficult position. However, as can be seen here, the farmer is in a worse predicament. I wintered these calves at a cost of over \$1,200, excluding labor don't forget. For doing this, I received an interest-free loan of \$1,275 which now must be paid back out of my profits! Had I not taken your advice [saying to the minister] and sold all my calves in December of '74, I probably would have received \$10 to \$25 more per head, saved \$1,200 in feed, et cetera, and not owed the government \$1,275.

That's the kind of program we have.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in confrontation. I believe in consultation. But, Mr. Speaker, I happened to be in that orange tent Friday morning at a quarter to eleven, and I asked the members of the NFU, what correspondence have you had with the Premier? They showed me a copy of a telex they had sent to the Premier, asking if they could meet with the Premier and Executive Council, and asking for two days' notice. I don't think this is unreasonable. I don't think it's unreasonable for people who are elected by us, who are serving us, the taxpayer and the electorate, to meet with them. I don't think that's unreasonable, Mr. Speaker. I think that's a normal function of government. That's a normal function of the parliamentary system, the democratic system.

So I think we're playing little games here. The minister can accuse the NFU of playing games, and the NFU can accuse the minister and the government of playing games. But the point, Mr. Speaker, is that these two groups have to get together, and I think the government of this province owes it to the NFU and the concerned farmers to sit down, as an Executive Council, and speak to the executive members of that organization. I think it's incumbent upon them. If the democratic process is going to work, I think the Executive Council must do that.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, as the Member for Spirit River-Fairview said, is that I think we have to decide who this building belongs to. At one time I thought it belonged to the people of this province. I'm starting to have my doubts. Now, there has to be security, but at the same time are we going to have to require passes to get into this building? Is the man on the street going to have to ask a Member of the Legislature to be admitted to this building that belongs to the taxpayer, to serve the taxpayer? No, I think it is an

overreaction.

When the farmers demonstrated in 1970, I believe, they came to this Legislature. The Premier of this province heard them in this Legislature building. Now, that doesn't mean we can solve all the problems. But I think it's incumbent that this building belong to the people of this province. Mr. Speaker, I think it's most incumbent upon the Premier and this cabinet that they meet with these people, because the problems are urgent. I ask the hon. members of this Assembly to appreciate fully just how urgent that problem is.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BATHURST: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure, for several reasons, to participate in the debate on this resolution. First, I think it is very timely, particularly when over the last week the members of this Legislature had the chance to view the demonstrations by the National Farmers Union indicating its concern for the prices paid to producers, particularly the cow-calf program.

It is also notable that some very important people reside in my constituency of Vegreville, and I think a number of them were the sole organizers of this demonstration. The regional co-ordinator of the National Farmers Union lives just a few miles from my place. We have lived together, we grew up together, we have worked together. Our politics are not always the same, however.

Another, I think, very prominent person who put a lot of work into the organization of this demonstration is also a farmer in my constituency, and if not the largest, very close to the largest farmer. There have been others, and I was particularly concerned to see one or two farmers who have not had a fence around their land for the last many years, so it's obvious that they do not yet have any cattle. They played an important part in this demonstration.

Mr. Speaker, as a rural MLA, I have lived my entire life on the farm. Some may know the conditions I have gone through, but I can honestly say that I don't believe there is a member in this Legislative Assembly -- including those in the gallery -- who had a harder economic life than I did during my younger days. I saw, not only once, how farmers had been fleeced or, if you want to use the word, "shafted", and I am very interested in what goes on. I have always felt, and I still feel, that the prosperity of the farmers is going to have a good significance on the prosperity of the community, of the province, and of the nation as a whole. I know that the farmers are considered to be the best spenders of all, and if they are going to have the buck, everybody else will.

I can never forget, as a young boy under the age of 10, in the very early '30s when there was a non-delivery strike. Wheat was selling at 18 cents per bushel, oats 7 [cents]. Beef was bringing in .5 cents per pound, pork was 1 cent. For a number of days, my father used to go out in the mornings to the intersection to picket.

But after only a few days he came back, and he said, "Well, the strike is over." It was very uncomfortable when he told us, "Well, the reason for it was that the police have come, and they've taken this person, and they've taken this person. There is evidence that the strike was organized by the Communist Party." As I grew up, I had watched the things go on.

Today I would like particularly to commend the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. It's not always that I agree with him, or not too often that I may commend him, but I do commend him for bringing in this very important resolution.

What really surprises me was on the opening day of the Legislature, when the Premier brought in the government motion: "Moved by . . . Mr. Lougheed that this Assembly approve in general the operations of the Government since the adjournment of the spring [sitting]." I checked through Hansard the other day and found the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview not once mentioned the price of beef, or the concerns for beef. There was everything else, and I wondered whether he already has seen the light over the last short while. However, if it's so, I commend him; and if he's doing it on this particular day to make political hay, well, I don't go along with it.

I would also like to commend the hon. Member for Clover Bar for the interest shown in his address. I'm very glad to see that the member of a party which ruled this province for 36 years, and met defeat, finally had to recognize the pleas and the needs of the farmer. When I think back to 1970, when their government was in office, this same farm organization came to the Legislature. They were miles away from the Legislature when there were already dogs [there]. Today he says that the Premier met them. One of my constituents had to break through the crowd at the door to get into the Legislature Building. However, if it took this much time, I can still go along. I hope that people learn -- I do. It takes a long time. Sometimes it takes more, sometimes less.

What really encouraged me to run as a member of the Legislative Assembly was during 1965, while serving on the local government, I was one of almost 2,000 people who sat in the Jubilee Auditorium and listened to a former premier of this province bluntly tell us that within 10 years 85 per cent of the population of this province would be in the two metropolitan cities. I wondered, is this right, is it possible? When I saw what happened through the next five years, I can honestly say that, had that government stayed another five years until today, its objective would have been gained. We saw how farm buildings were harréd up, how people were moving out, forced to leave the farm. That is what committed me, with pressure from people, to seek the political area in a party that committed itself in 1971 to help preserve the family farm.

Everything is not as good as I'd like to see. However, this has changed. The population has stabilized, and already I

see a reverse trend in my constituency. Mr. Speaker, I honestly feel that since our commitment was to preserve the family farm -- I know there are a lot of farmers throughout the province, there are some in my constituency, who are suffering, particularly those dependent on the beef industry. I would again urge the hon. minister to give help to these people who definitely need it. Whether it should be an open policy and [whether] persons who may be just short of that \$7,500 to their \$1 million would qualify is a different story. I feel that if there is a subsidy, every Albertan is going to pay for that subsidy. If people definitely don't need it, I don't think they are entitled to it.

It's very good to listen to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview as he says so many dollars for Syncrude, nothing for the farmers. Mr. Speaker, over the last four years, the things that have been done, the assistance to the farmers of this area -- I believe that no government in this province which has ever given such assistance, and no government in any other province.

The Minister of Agriculture just announced a number of the programs. He didn't mention all of them. There were some programs and assistance to farmers in my constituency that the people may not be aware of. Despite beef prices being poor, we've had a reasonably good harvest, maybe better than we've had for many years. Dairy products are bringing a reasonable return, poultry prices and their profits are not too bad. There has been an increase in the initial payment of wheat. This all helps those who are depressed by the low beef prices. When 80 per cent of our beef producers are mixed farmers, it shows that maybe not everyone is suffering. Here again, I feel assistance should be given to those who need it.

But of the other programs that have been given to the people of this province, and which people in the Vegreville constituency have gained from is the tax reduction on the resident home-owners. I was on that task force which worked this out. Farmers do not pay taxes on their homes. However, this was extended so they could have it on their land, which in dollars and cents brought a great relief to farmers. The 8 cents farm fuel allowance brings this province of ours the lowest cost in farm fuel. Flooded-land assistance in the constituency of Vegreville when the Vermilion river spilt its banks in 1973 -- there have been reports and records back to 1908 that this river has been [doing this] from time to time, yet there was no assistance. Nothing was done.

The former Minister of Agriculture and the former Minister of Environment saw fit to appropriate \$54,000 for the number of farmers who were affected. Our former Minister of Environment saw what happened last year, and budgeted \$1.7 million to control the Vermilion river. There have already been numerous works done to control it.

The disaster service assistance: one of the farmers in my constituency, through

no fault of his own, lost a good portion of his herd to toxic algae. Never before was there assistance for that. The former Minister of Agriculture saw that this man was helped, and he is farming today and expanding. Otherwise, I'm sure that he would have been off the farm.

What about unharvested grain? All the money that was borrowed -- and I know many made use of it, but I know there were some who abused it. They even told me they took that money -- it was available interest free -- they'd invest it in the bank and they'd make themselves \$600 to \$700. But wherever there is a good program, there is abuse. So it all has its way.

Now the cattle incentive program has been criticized today, Mr. Speaker. I think and I know that this program was not intended for the people who didn't need it. It was first announced for the people on the grey wooded soil. At that time, the quota on grain was 5 bushels per acre, and these people were desperate for money. They were selling their feed oats at 25 cents a bushel. Trucks came in from the Lethbridge area taking 800 to 1,000 bushels at a time at 25 cents. That was when the Minister of Agriculture felt that if they had some assistance, they could put that feed through the cattle and they would be able to do well. I might say that the following year some who took advantage of it were able to sell next year's calves and receive up to \$350 for them. Nobody said that maybe it was too much. We bought those heifers a year ago for only \$300. But this program must have been well appreciated, because I had people from my constituency and others say, why is it restricted to the grey wooded soil? We want it, and then it was done. More was given. Nobody forced anybody to take a loan. As I say those who took it and used it are still on the farms today.

What about the water system for cattle? Many took advantage of it, even for their homes. I put water into my own farmyard not too long ago, but there was no assistance. I had to pay every cent of it. What about the farm facility program up to \$2,000 that the hon. minister mentioned? Very many farmers took advantage, otherwise they would have to put up these facilities on their own. I think this was fine assistance.

There was also the feed and grain assistance, and it is still continuing. Assistance for natural gas to farmers of \$116 million plus -- for years and years the gas was being sold to all parts of this country, yet people walking over it had to haul coal. They had to burn wood. With this assistance the people of Alberta are finally going to have the opportunity of using clean fuel.

What about the \$300 grant to every farmer who bought haying equipment in 1972? There was an allocation of \$15,000 to each municipality.

With extended flat rate calling -- we can phone our neighbors today without additional cost. Before, it was long distance. There was \$80 million for that, totally for the rural areas.

It's very good to listen to the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview ask, why doesn't Alberta do what other provinces do? Well, when you look at British Columbia, it produces only 4 per cent of the beef in Canada, not enough to feed the people of British Columbia. It was all right for the Premier of British Columbia to announce a subsidy or assistance to the beef producers. However, I think it was mentioned before that Alberta produces 80 per cent of the beef. Any subsidy to that would be a subsidy to those people receiving the meat through export. I think this province for far too long has been subsidizing all of Canada in other ways, particularly through the oil.

This announcement the Premier of British Columbia made to give assistance to the beef producers is much the same as if the Premier of Alberta would announce a subsidy to the apple growers of Alberta. Regardless of how things go, I wonder how many members in the Legislature would like to see everything in Alberta as it is in British Columbia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no!

MR. BATHURST: Mr. Speaker, this demonstration we've been viewing for the last few days -- and this is an opinion of my own -- I feel there was reason to a great extent for a demonstration. I have seen demonstrations here before I was a member of this Legislature. I've seen them this year. But for some reason I have even felt embarrassed, as a member of the Legislature representing a rural area and, from time to time, standing up in this Legislature trying to defend the rural people, to see what assistance they have. I was sort of disappointed that it had to be in this fashion. Just recently there was a six weeks' postal strike. I never saw on the television that the police had to be called or anything, and there were 22,000 of them involved for over six weeks.

I think the farmers' organization that was here, which has many members I really respect, could have been done in a different way. The minister announced how many times he tried to sit down and discuss things. I still believe in Shakespeare's philosophy that the pen is mightier than the sword. I sure would not want to see militancy.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned before, as I started to farm I felt there were other segments of society that were organized well. Because of this, they were going ahead. I looked for the day when the farmers would be organized properly, and the first chance I had I became a member of the Alberta Farmers' Union. Later, as it disbanded, there was Unifarm -- I joined that. Later on, the National Farmers Union was organized -- I joined that. Because, through my experience in local government, I have seen there is a need for organizations provincially and federally. I was a member of the Alberta School Trustees' Association, and I saw the need for a Canadian school trustees' association. It was the same with other areas. I stayed as

a member, Mr. Speaker. I did drop out, and here again politics set in, and that was the only reason.

Despite what I am going to say, this is my way of looking at it. As I have mentioned, there are many members of Unifarm, of the National Farmers Union, members whom I represent. I've had the pleasure of representing them over 4 years, and 20 [years] previous in local governments.

However, I obtained a document in 1972 which clearly made my decision that I could no longer remain a member of the National Farmers Union. However, I put this document away in security, hoping that I would never have to look at it again. But when I saw what was going on over this past weekend and this weekend, I thought it would be really interesting for the people in this Legislature, in the gallery, to see exactly what goes on. I am not going to condemn anybody. They are good people, and so, sometime down the road, years from today, they won't say, gee, how I was maybe taken advantage of.

I have a photostat copy of a letter, signed by Don Currie, national organizer of the Communist Party of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I think the information is very valid, and at this time I am going to read that letter so the members may acquaint themselves.

The letter is on a letterhead, Communist Party of Canada and Partis Communistique Canadienne -- if that's the way you pronounce it -- I never was too good in French. If it had been in Ukrainian, I would have been able to read it. However: 24 Cecil Street, Toronto 130, Canada. This is [addressed] "To all provincial secretaries":

Recent events related to the farm situation across Canada makes it imperative that the Communist Party of Canada must now give direction to organized farmers. Wheat sales and commodity demands across this country in recent months have again satisfied the majority of farmers and all our past efforts to have a militant farm force appears to be deteriorating. The marches on Parliament in Saskatchewan and Alberta are prime examples how a disgruntled farmer can be led to the point of civil disobedience without too much difficulty. It is my fear that we may not again be able to reach the height of discontentment in the farm community that was so evident in Regina during the past year or so.

The National Farmers Union, which we helped in founding, is now the greatest force that we have at hand. Our influence in this union is only due to the hard work of the farm comrades who have been able to discreetly work behind the scenes. Persons such as the President, Roy

Atkinson, and the Vice-President, Walter Miller, are dedicated socialists and it is therefore very easy to influence them with our progressive aims and objectives. We must be cautious not to move too swiftly as we cannot afford to jeopardize what has already been accomplished. However, at the same time, we must be prepared to exploit the current farm unrest as every well planned step is [another] step towards our goal.

The Convention of the National Farmers Union which will be held in Winnipeg during early December, will again afford us [the] opportunity to manipulate some of the more prominent and progressive minded delegates. However, it is imperative that we do not make the same mistake as before and openly pass out literature and Tribune issues. This can only cause the press to label the Convention and our efforts could conceivably be set back for obvious reasons. We have enough able comrades that can influence the Convention and will, therefore, rely on them to present our program.

It is also the responsibility of every trade union comrade to help develop a good rapport between the Labor Councils and the National Farmers Union. The strength of unity, which can develop as a result of labor endorsing the National Farmers Union, will build [such] a strong labor force that the government could no longer ignore the farm element . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member has been reading at some considerable length from this letter. Perhaps the hon. member might indicate what he is attempting to show, and how it may be relevant to the continuation of the debate.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, as I had . . . [interjections]-

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned at the beginning, I was reading this letter for information. There are two more paragraphs. If it is the wish of this House to hear the remaining part of it, I will be willing to read on. I still have a few minutes to go on. If this is the wish of the House, I will be glad to continue.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. BATIUK: May I continue, Mr. Speaker:

At this time I wish to commend all comrades for their dedicated efforts thus far in furthering our cause with

respect to the building of the National Farmers Union. The efforts of Comrades Bill Ross in Winnipeg; Fred Schofield in Regina, and Bill Tuomi in Edmonton serves as a reminder as to what can be done. Schofield was the driving force in the Saskatchewan Farmers Union and now has many friends in the National Farmers Union, which, I am confident, can only enhance our position in that province. In view of their past achievements, these comrades will authoritatively act as our spokesmen and will be available for speaking engagements across Western Canada.

We will also use our influence in the Canadian Labour Congress in an attempt to obtain its endorsement of the National Farmers Union as the only voice of the Canadian farmer. It is not anticipated that we will receive any real opposition as we do have several friends in the Congress. The Canadian Federation of Agriculture and the related provincial groups act only for the monopolist agri-business farmer. Therefore, Labour Farmer unity will be attractive to many and can win new agricultural policies such as collective bargaining, etc. Through the conscious militant efforts of all comrades, our ultimate goal will eventually be attained.

Another area that has not yet been fully exploited is that of the student movement, which is an extremely important field. There are many progressive minded students at both the high school and university level, which includes many farm students. If better organized, they could be a valuable asset not only with respect to the building of our Party but for our struggle for control of the National Farmers Union.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Has the hon. member just about finished? Notwithstanding the indulgence of the House, there would be some doubt as to whether some student union or movement should be brought into this resolution.

MR. BATIUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is in conclusion:

However, this is something that I will discuss in detail during my next tour of the western provinces. In the meantime, keep up the good work.

Comradely yours,
Don Currie

Mr. Speaker, if this is the wish of the House, it would be a pleasure for me to

table two copies in case members want to . . .

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, when I gave this report, it was not the intention to hurt anyone, but I feel that, to some extent, I was misled. There are very many members of farm groups and so forth that it's been a pleasure to work with, and in no way can I see that anything should be done to harm them. However, I thought this would be for information.

Furthermore, I again appeal to our Minister of Agriculture and our government seriously to give assistance to those beef producers who are in dire need. Since we were committed to preserving the family farm and spending many millions of dollars to assist farmers, I would [not] like to see any farmer leave the farm now just because of this crisis. So, once again, it would be a real pleasure to see these individuals helped.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: I wonder if the hon. member would entertain a question.

[interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. NOTLEY: Is the hon. member not aware that the document he tabled today has been circulated in the thousands and has been discredited many years ago?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, regardless whether it's been circulated, I have . . .

MR. NOTLEY: It's been discredited.

MR. BATIUK: . . . only one copy of it and there are many others, I'm sure, who haven't seen it.

[interjections]

And there's a signature on that letter, so I think it's very important.

AN HON. MEMBER: Give it to a comrade.

MR. BUTLER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise this afternoon to speak to a very important industry, which is very near and dear to my heart. Maybe I should say dear to my heart and near to my pocketbook. It's very near to the pocketbooks of a great many of my constituents.

At the outset, I would like to pass on a number of congratulations that have been phoned to me. Concerned people have said to me, "Do you think the minister is going to bend?" I said, "No, I'm sure he's not." They said, "Well, give him our congratulations." These are true cattlemen. They have no other income except cattle.

One chap who phoned particularly impressed me. He is a young man who started with borrowed money. He is in exactly the same position as a lot of these young people. He is a good young cattleman. He

got along the way a few years, bought some wrong heifers -- he imported them from somewhere. He came down with Bang's [disease], lost his entire herd, and had to start over again. He is in the process of starting again now. He said, "Nobody needs money worse than I do, but I don't want that kind of money." That's the kind of young person we need in the cattle business. I congratulate them for it. That's the kind of men and the kind of spirit that built the cattle business in Alberta to the business that it is today.

I started in the cattle business, and I don't mean to brag or be boastful. I started in 1951 with borrowed money. Everybody knows what happened in the winter of '51 and the spring of '52. After I bought feed all winter, the cattle weren't worth half what I paid for them with borrowed money in the fall before. It was four years before I could possibly have sold everything I owned and paid off my debts. Since that time, things have come along and the cattle business has been good to me.

But I think there are many areas we should look at in the cattle business. Through serving with Western Stock Growers, Canadian Cattlemen and Unifarm, I've been interested in the cattle business all my life. It has been my life. I've travelled the length and breadth of this province, and there are many areas we could be interested in.

One of those is the inequity of freight rates throughout the length and breadth of this Canada of ours. Built the way it is, I think freight rates are the one thing we can look at very substantially. I've done a little homework on the freight rate for cattle from west to east. From 1974 to 1975, a single-deck load went up 57.2 per cent in one year. I think that's pretty serious. I'm aware that our minister knows that, and I congratulate him for it. He is looking into it pretty seriously. A double-deck load from Calgary to Toronto went up 115 per cent in one year. That is another of our freight rate inequities. Our dressed beef in a 42,000-pound car went up 36.3 per cent. In a 60,000-pound car, it went up 36.5 per cent. The freight rate on grain from Calgary to Montreal went up 30.8 per cent. I think these increases are unwarranted. I think the railroad should be reprimanded for that. I don't think those increases are needed at all.

I'd like to get back to the consumption of beef. When the government said, the consumption of beef is going to be increased, it was not that far wrong. It made a few wrong judgments. Where the judgment went wrong, every country all over the world did the same thing, and the supply increased quicker than the consumption.

It is relatively interesting to note that the consumption of beef is tied very, very closely to the disposable income. From 1965, we consumed about 83.6 pounds of beef per capita. In 1975, because the year is not over yet, the unofficial estimate is 100 pounds. That's a significant increase. The only time it dropped back, or did not

increase, was in 1970, when there were fewer cows killed, when a lot of cows were going back to breeding herds. This was when cattlemen were bringing in their breeding herds, and other people were taking them back to get more calves from them. The heifer kill was the same. The heifer kill was down considerably in those two years. In 1969, we killed 626,000 cows; in 1970, we only killed 579,000. The heifer kill in 1969 was 650,000; in 1970, it was only 568,000. So you can see what happened there. The price of beef rose to the point where the increase in the retail cost of beef was slightly more than the increase in the disposable income, so the consumption dropped back.

The same thing happened again in 1973. In 1972, 92.5 pounds of beef were consumed. When the high point came through in 1973, there were only 91.8. Once again, the increase in the cost of retail beef exceeded the increase in the disposable income, so they backed away from the counter once again.

I haven't got the figures, but this year the retail cost of beef is considerably below the disposable income, so there is going to be a large consumption of beef. Cattle are being killed now in great numbers. The tonnage of beef is not up much, because cattle are going in lighter. Until June this year, the cow numbers were still up. It looked like about a 2 per cent increase in the cows in 1975. But since then, there has been quite a kill-off of cows and heifers. It now looks [as if] the total cow herd will be down about 3 per cent by January 1.

I don't think we're in any kind of trouble. As far as consumers are concerned, you hear people say, you know if we don't protect these cows there is going to be a great kill and we'll be short of cows. There is no evidence of that yet. If we're only down 3 per cent, that's still a good deal above what we were a few years ago. Since 1970, the cow herd has been increasing. In 1970 it increased 6.5 per cent, in '71 it increased 10.6 per cent, in '72 it increased 4.6 per cent, in '73, 7.1 per cent, in '74, 7.9 per cent. Now, if we are down 3 per cent below '74, as far as consumers are concerned, I don't think we're in big trouble. Quite a few cows have been going to the States. Since August 11, about 85,500 head of live cattle have gone across the line. Most of those have been cows.

A lot of cows have been kept on ranches. Go back to 1970. A lot of cows at that point should have gone to the can. They were bought and taken back for reproduction. I think if the [matter] had been left alone, this would have been all right. But this cow-calf loan wasn't entirely wrong. Anybody who took it properly, used it properly, and stayed with their cows may be in some trouble. But most of them at least got one good calf crop away at a good price, which certainly lowered the price of their cows.

I don't buy that the government is entirely to blame for getting these people into the cattle market, because some legit-

imate operations have developed out of it. At the time, I didn't agree with up to \$6,000 loan, or the loan that was put out last fall interest free. But I still say that anybody who took that loan and handled it properly, kept their calves over if they had the feed -- if they didn't have the feed, they shouldn't have kept them over -- and if they had the grass to put them on -- if they didn't have the grass, they shouldn't have kept them over either -- but anybody who took that loan and handled it properly made out all right with it. They had to make out all right.

Now with all these statistics I've given you, I am sure that the cattle business is on its way out. I think it will come out of this dilemma. There's nothing new about hardships in the cattle business. Anybody who's put his lifetime in it has gone through hardships. There's nothing new about hardships in any business. Any man, whether he's a machine dealer, a grocery store operator . . .

DR. PAPROSKI: Or a doctor.

MR. BUTLER: Or a doctor. I don't know about them.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about dentists?

AN HON. MEMBER: You've got to draw the line somewhere.

MR. BUTLER: Yeah, you've got to draw the line somewhere.

But anybody who stays with a business is going to come out. There have to be hardships in business. This kind of separates the men from the boys.

AN HON. MEMBER: We've got the boys here.

AN HON. MEMBER: You bet.

MR. BUTLER: I was going to mention something about the GATT agreements in the Canadian Cattlemen's Association. I've gone through that route, but that's been talked about. The minister is certainly homing in properly on that one.

Under stabilization, there's only one type of stabilization that really works. Whether we like it or not, as cattlemen we're catering to a bunch of housewives. She's the woman who's got the purse that buys our product. She's our stabilization, and she will be our stabilization as long as we produce the kind of meat, the product she wants.

AN HON. MEMBER: No wonder we're in trouble.

MR. BUTLER: Don't look at me like that.

We have to get these signals back from her through the market to know what she wants. It's up to the producer to produce what she wants, and it's up to the producer to get his rewards at the market place with a quality product, and a product that's needed at the market place.

AN HON. MEMBER: She's not waving a red flag at you.

MR. BUTLER: As far as leadership of the province is concerned, as a cattleman I personally am damned proud of the leadership the province has shown, because if there ever was leadership shown in the cattle business, the province is showing it right now. When somebody else starts getting something, it's very easy to say, me too. It hasn't been easy for the minister to hold his line. He's been advised by a lot of cattlemen; and a lot of the cattlemen he's been advised by said, don't do it. Stay out of it. We want to keep our markets free.

I think, in order to keep a free market, one thing the government could do is to get out some more market information. I think a lot of people who sell cattle are not informed about what goes on in the market, and I think the cattleman himself could do a lot to keep himself informed of what is needed at the market. These markets develop in different parts of the province, and they're developed by the people who put the orders. The people who put the orders in are going to put their orders where they think the kind of cattle they want are going to be.

Now I've heard the Edmonton market criticized many times, because somebody had some good cattle that didn't bring what they should have. I've tried to make a study of the Edmonton market, and I've spoken to many order buyers. If they have an order for top cattle, there's no way they'll come to the Edmonton market. If they have an order for some mediocre cattle, this is where they come. Anybody who has some top cattle and brings them to the Edmonton market probably is going to be sorry. This is where the producer can do a lot for himself, to find what market his cattle are going to fit into, and what market the orders are going to be that are going to pick up the cattle he has. This is the key to the cattle business: know your cattle and know your markets.

The government has been criticized for Syncrude. The amount of money it put into Syncrude, why can't it put into the cattle business? Well, Mr. Speaker, if it gives the cattlemen the same deal it has given Syncrude, I would be the first one to stand up on a table and holler to high heaven, because if it's going to put in a small percentage of the capital input to the cattle business, and want 60 per cent of the royalty, by God, I don't want to get into the cattle business.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's right.

MR. BUTLER: The CCA, the Western Stock Growers, and Unifarm combined have had meetings all over the province, and in most of these meetings the result has been the same. They don't want government involvement in the market place.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, I have pretty well made my point, and there are other speakers. I have a lot of other statistics here, but there are other speakers wishing to get in on this, so I thank you for your time.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few remarks on this motion, and in all fairness to the minister, I have to agree it is a complicated situation. The reason I say this is that there are two different trains of thought on getting assistance for the serious situation we're facing in the cow-calf operation. One comes from the southern part of the province, and the other from the northern part.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me back to my rodeo days, when I was having it tough, the same as I am now in the cow-calf operation. I was in several of the major events, but I wasn't in the bull riding. I was down in Williston, North Dakota, so I decided to get into the bull riding. I saw it was a pretty tough event, that it was going to be pretty tough to compete in that area, so I got hold of one of the judges and said to him, "How do you ride these bulls?" He said, "It's simple. Put one leg on this side, one leg on this side, and keep your mind right in the middle. You'll be able to ride one of them bulls." Well, I did that, and I finally did come out of the situation I was in.

As I say, it's really a tough decision for the minister to make, and he's in a precarious position. I am from the southern part of the province, and I certainly sympathize with the cow-calf operators who are in this business. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because they've been in this type of situation for a long period of time. It's been over two years. I would also like to say that it's not only the cow-calf operator who has been facing this situation: it's the feedlot operator. This is one of the reasons it's backed up to the cow-calf operator, as a result of the feedlot operator facing a situation that was also depressed over a number of months.

The concern I have is that some of our small cow-calf operators are going to have to fold. I hate to see this at a time like this. As the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen has indicated, there's a possibility of this straightening out, and I certainly agree that it's going to be straightened out in the very near future.

I would have to say one of the reasons we're facing this situation -- it's not the only reason -- I can recall in the early '70s the federal Minister of Agriculture going out and saying, cow-calf operators, farmers, we want you to break up your land. Break up as much land as you can. We'll give you \$10 an acre to seed it to grass. This they did, and for several years, Mr. Speaker, this is what happened. Some of our small farmers, to supplement their operation, broke up their land, seeded it to grass as a result of this program the federal government came up with. They told us at that time that it would be 1980 before we'd have a sufficient supply of beef in Canada. Well here it is in 1975, and we've got an oversupply of beef.

This is one of the reasons I would have to say that the southern part of the province is opposing this. This is one of the reasons we're facing the problem, because they got cut and promoted it. Then we came up with the provincial program to

loan money to the small operator, to have guaranteed loans to the small operator. So what happens? Some of the small operators, in many cases, bought their culled cows from the ranchers with this guaranteed money, instead of these cows going to market. The small operators bought these cows, put them into their breeding herds, and increased the cattle population in the Province of Alberta.

All the programs we've got throughout Canada have caused the problem we've had. The cow-calf loan -- as it turned out, I don't think it's been beneficial. I would have liked to have seen a moratorium put on the cow-calf loan for six months and then taken a look at it, interest free. I say this, Mr. Speaker, because I think at the present time some of the lending agents are taking security from our cow-calf operators to loan them this money when they have to renew the loan. If they are doing this, I think it's very serious, because a cow-calf operator needs all the security he can muster at this particular time.

As I said, I agree with the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen. I think our situation is going to be solved in the near future. At the present time the packers are slaughtering a lot of our calves, and they have come to the rescue as far as the calves are concerned. The eastern buyers are buying our top quality calves, and the packers are buying our calves that have got enough cover or flesh on them to slaughter. This is certainly helping considerably, and reduces the numbers of cattle as well. Also, our heifers that are not quite finished -- this is another of the large kills of the packers at the present time.

All you have to do, Mr. Speaker, is go down to the Edmonton Stockyards and watch the cattle going through there. The majority are cows. Whether they are stock cows or cull cows, they're all going to the packing plants. So I can see this situation reversing completely. I can see that it's going to reverse, and it's going to be the same as the hog situation at the present time. So I would like to see some method of helping some of our operators who got involved in this as a result of government programs, [so they] could come out and carry through this, and be able to enjoy some of the prosperity that I'm sure we're going to see in the cow-calf industry.

However, I can't agree with having short-term programs. I don't really appreciate that a grant could solve our problem. I think, as the minister said -- that he was pleased we're debating this this afternoon, and if we could come up with some type of stabilization program, or some type of assistance, in some area, to carry these small producers till such time that we're going to see the market straightened out. I'm going to be the first to agree that this situation is not one that we just have in Alberta, or in Canada and North America. It's a world situation. I attended the Stock Growers convention in Calgary and listened to a speaker there who was indicating that they were anticipating using the beef from Australia for fertilizer.

So this is a situation we're facing not

only in southern Alberta, northern Alberta; it's an international problem. I was pleased to hear that the minister wanted all the input he could get in here, and I realize it's tough to try to come up with some solution to solve the situation we're facing. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TRYNCHY: In entering this debate, Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that I've had a number of meetings in my constituency and, contrary to what the hon. Member for Clover Bar says, I started mine on September 2. We started our meetings with NFU organizations and all other farm groups in my constituency, and I held a number of seven. At those meetings we came up with a number of proposals. They range anywhere from government subsidies; leave cattlemen alone; support pricing; grants; processed meat give-aways; labelling meats such as cow, steer, heifer, and so on; and also, a member has prepared a production table. I think the information that came out of those meetings is very useful. I also might add that I presented these at a number of caucus meetings as early as September 15, and I'd like to table these briefs that I got from my constituency, from my members, for other members to see.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Member for Clover Bar mentions that we've had no representations from a number of constituencies, he really doesn't know what he's talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

AN HON. MEMBER: He never does.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, we've had representation in our caucus. It's unfortunate, maybe, that he is not part of our caucus, but that's his tough luck.

DR. BUCK: He might get something done.

MR. TRYNCHY: We've had representation from each one of the members he named. I'm going to name these members again, Mr. Speaker, because I don't think they'll have a chance to speak. I would just like to have it recorded in Hansard that they have their names on my list. They are Mr. Kroege, Mr. Appleby, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Tesolin, Mr. Zander, Mr. McCrimmon, Mr. Hyland, Mr. Packus, Mr. Lysons, Mr. Miller, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Dallas Schmidt, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Topolnisky, Mr. Fluker, and Mr. Gitter, [the group] that's going to present the views of the urban people.

Mr. Speaker, we've had representations made by all these members to our caucus, and we're working on programs. We have talked to the minister, we've talked to the whole cabinet, and there are things you can do and things you can't. We have waited in earnest for the federal program to come about. I can see now -- and I think we could see this a while ago -- they're not going to do it. So what will we do? We'll have to come up with some programs, and I would like to suggest, as I go along, what I thought were some proposals that might be used.

I've noticed that the opposition, members of the other parties, suggest that we aren't heard. Well, I don't agree with that. I'd like to mention something we did when we had the snowed-under crop problem. As a matter of fact, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, at that time a member of the Legislature for Smoky River, attended with myself, Dr. Horner, and Bill Furdy, through the constituencies of Barrhead and mine -- we landed in a few spots, looked at the crops, and came up with a program. We were able to convince the caucus and cabinet that action was needed, and we got it. But you have to do these things on an individual basis.

I'd like to suggest that . . .

MISS HUNLEY: Consultation.

MR. TRYNCHY: . . . consultation, not confrontation. I'd like to suggest to the hon. Member for Clover Bar that if he wants to play politics and jump around from one stone to another, that's fine, he can do it. It's pretty easy in a one-man caucus, or a two-man caucus, or a four-man caucus, as they have. That's his priority.

Mr. Speaker, let's go back to the beginning of our cow-calf situation. I can go back before I was a member of this House. I was in the grain business. The LIP program came out in the late '60s and early '70s, and what did we do? The LIP program was good for my area. It was good because our land could not raise crops that greatly. So we all turned to grass. At \$10 an acre everybody went to grass. So if you have the grass, what do you do next? You buy cattle, because you can't get rid of your grass with that much. So we went into that. All our grey wooded soils were put into grass production and, of course, that made another problem. We were short of feed grains for our feedlot operators. The next thing we knew, there's no grain, so what does it do? It goes up so high in price that no feeder can afford to keep cattle and make a profit.

We talk about the young people who took out loans. I remember in 1971 after I was elected, and while I was going through my campaign before the election, the first thing that came to the minds of all the young people in my area was, we'd like to have some loans so we can do our thing. We'd like to get into cattle, because we've got the grass, we can't raise grain. I discussed this after I was elected. So we implemented a program where you could buy cattle with no repayment for two years, and it was just based on the northern area. It was such a good program that it went through the whole province. Of course, that complicated matters some more.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder -- I have some people in the same situation as the ones who took out loans who didn't take out a loan at all. They didn't take out a loan. They went into cattle because they thought they were going to make good, and they went in in other ways, and they're in the same problems today. So we didn't force them into cattle, yet they have the same problems the other people have. And that's

what we're talking about today, how to resolve it. We know we've got problems. I don't think anybody has to tell us that.

But really, what do we do? We present our programs to the provincial government, but when you have the amount of beef we have in Alberta, where we raise 40 per cent of the total beef in Canada, where do we really go? Where should we go? We should go to the federal government. After all, it's their responsibility to do something for western Canada, because the beef from here goes down there. But no, they don't think that's wise. I think we should lobby our federal minister, our federal MPs, to work on cutbacks of beef imports from Australia and New Zealand, work out new GATT agreements. I think this can be done. You know, I'd go even further than that if I had the authority. Unfortunately I don't. I would consider that if they don't take our beef, they don't get our oil -- something like that. Let them realize that when the oil was scarce it became a national product, but now when we have the beef, they don't even want it. Let's go down the road four or five years and become scarce. I'll bet you a nickel to a doughnut they'll want our beef. They'll say it's ours, it's a national product. So that's something we can look at.

As mentioned before, the beef situation is a world problem. We didn't cause this in Alberta with all our loans. You know, if we didn't make one loan at all -- not for one dime -- the beef situation wouldn't be any better. So let's not kid ourselves. Let's not pass the buck. I don't mean Walter Buck.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Speaker, I've sat here and listened, and they tell me more people talk their way out of here than into here. Maybe that's why I haven't spoken as often as I should, but that was pretty good advice and I thought I'd take it. But [hearing] this, I have to speak. You know, it bothers me somewhat when I hear about the leadership of the NFU. I have a lot of people in the NFU organization. As a matter of fact, I was a member myself. They're good people. They're hard-working people, and they're hard pressed and in trouble. But let's not have the leadership lead them down the garden path.

Yesterday I listened to the radio, and our regional director for Alberta, Mr. Dascavitch, said he was going to use unorthodox methods to get his point across. So I looked that word up in the dictionary, and what does it say? It says it's a person who will not conform to established doctrine, which means he will not obey the laws of this land. Is that what he wants to lead his people to -- my people, your people? Is that what we want? I say, no. I don't mind him getting hurt if he wants to, but do not drag our innocent people into it. You know, they talk about meeting the minister, and he went along with them. They should have met with him. They meet with me as an MLA and I'll meet with them

again. But I don't have to bring a minister with me. I'll take the problems to the minister. The minister with his group, in turn, can take the problems to the cabinet. That's the way we operate.

Mr. Speaker, there's some mention they're doing this because they have a conference coming here on December 8 for a membership drive. I really hope not. Because if this is what they're doing to have a membership, I don't see how it will last. You know, we've got to have membership, we've got to have strong organizations, but we've also got to have some discipline, some authority and some leadership, and a leader with responsibility.

They talk about a national group. I think it's great to have a national group. But what are our brothers in Quebec and Ontario doing for Alberta? These brothers are National Farmers Union members. They're not going to the MPs, to Ottawa, telling them to cut back the beef imports and do something. They haven't done a thing. Why aren't we picketing down there too? Because that's where we should, along with here. I don't mind that, that we picket and do it in an orderly manner, because I like to see the message get across. Maybe I can't get it across to the minister, but I hope I have. I hope the other members have. But we've got to do this together, not separately.

Mr. Speaker, one of the solutions I'd like to put forward is that we've got to find some new markets. I think markets is a thing. We've talked about our hog market of \$41 million. Well, let's go into beef, and let's do everything we can. Let's get our Export Agency working harder than ever. We've got to improve our grading system at our stockyards. I think it's just rotten. When you ship a 4-h beef carcass that is top quality meat, 1,000 pounds, and get a D-1 for it, there's got to be something wrong. So I checked into it, and what did I find? We don't have any jurisdiction -- federal government.

Well, I say that's wrong. I say we should be in there somehow. I don't know, fill our own stockyards and kick them out, or something. But let's get in there. We've got to remove the discrepancies between the Edmonton and Calgary yards. True enough, maybe we don't have the type of cattle they have down south, but we've got some pretty good cattle here and there shouldn't be a 3 or a 5 cent difference, or the same difference from Toronto to here.

I think we've got to prod the federal government into recognizing there is a west, that this is the breadbasket for Canada, and that they'll be looking to us for their beef needs in a very short while.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to suggest we do something with our ADC boards. Let's make our boards a little more flexible. The minister's consented to that. Let's extend the time period on some of our loans. Let's reduce the interest where possible, and possibly give some loans with no interest at all to get these people over. Because I know, if we help them now and things improve, they will make it. And those are the ones I'm after.

You know, we could implement other programs, with no interest at all and based on individual need. I've heard some people say, you can't do that, that's discriminatory. Well, I say, nonsense. We pay out welfare, and it's done on an individual basis. We don't really care about it. If we don't do something pretty darn quick, we might have these people on welfare, and we don't really have to worry because they get it every day.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I think we've got to work together -- all groups, not just a fraction, not 6 or 7 per cent of the people but totally, 100 per cent -- to get this thing through, and I think we can. I think our tactics have to change. We can't use the tactics we've seen the last week because it doesn't prove anything in my mind. My mother told me something when I was a little boy -- she died when I was 10 and so I was little -- she said, you know, you can catch more flies with honey than you can with vinegar. I think this is the way we've got to work.

Thank you.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I want to analyze the resolution. And I read it first:

Be it resolved that, the Legislative Assembly urge the Government of Alberta to provide immediate direct assistance to the cow-calf industry in the form of cash grants of \$100 per calf per producer up to a maximum of 75 head.

The first point which comes to my mind which needs to be analyzed is "immediate direct assistance". I take from that it's to be done immediately, and it's to be done directly between the government and the farmer. Whether it's allowing for some type of investigation or otherwise is questionable. A hundred dollars is supposed to be provided to every producer up to a maximum of 75 head of cattle, immediately. Well, that's what it says, I take it that's what it means.

The second point that needs analyzing is the grant of "\$100 per calf". Now, there's nothing to indicate why \$100 was chosen. Is this the figure that's going to raise the producer with 75 head of cattle above the loss line? Is it the figure that's going to make up the difference of the spread between the producer and the consumer, and consequently not have to raise the price to the consumer? Is it the cost of the feed to raise a calf, to prepare it for market? I don't know. A hundred dollars is just taken out of the blue, maybe because it's a round figure. But surely, there should be some justification on the part of the honorable mover of the resolution why \$100 was chosen.

Will \$100 make up the difference for the man who only has 25 head of cattle? Will \$100 bring the young farmer who has never had the benefit of the higher prices a few years ago up to the point where he can continue in the market? I don't know. The mover of the resolution didn't give any type of figure as to why \$100 was chosen. Maybe it should have been \$200. Maybe it

should have been \$500. Maybe it should have been only \$50. Surely, when we're going to deal with public money, there has to be justification for the amount. I find no justification in the resolution, I find no justification from the mover of the resolution.

The third item that needs analyzing is the "per producer". I take it that we have probably 7,000 producers of beef in the province. I might be up, I might be down. I hope I'm within the ballpark with 7,000. Is this to be paid to every producer? It says "per producer". Some of these producers -- I can think of one or two -- are rich, are actually, I'd say, close to being millionaires in this province. Are we going to hand them \$75 per head? That's what the resolution says.

I thought the resolution and the arguments presented by some hon. members were to help the young farmer who never had the benefit of the higher prices a few years ago, and consequently has been in the industry only during the period of the slump in the market. If that is the case, it presents an entirely different argument than presenting "per producer". I'm wondering what the former Leader of the NDP in Ottawa would have said if he was still the leader, and if he knew the government was going to give \$100 per head to rich farmers. I know what he said about it in other industries. I imagine he would have said the same thing about this one. "Per producer", that's what it says. That's what you're voting on when you vote for the resolution.

The fourth thing is, a maximum of 75 head. Again, why was 75 head chosen? Is that the average of the producers, or the number that only the young farmer had? Why was 75 head chosen? Under this resolution the man with 1,000 calves could collect up to \$7,500, because it says "per producer", and \$100 per head up to 75. There's no limit on it. There's nothing to say it's only for those who need it. It's going to every producer. Again, a man with one calf will collect \$75. Will that \$75 be of any value to a man with one calf? Yet this resolution says he's entitled to \$75. He's a producer of one calf. What about the man with 10, 100, or 50 calves?

I suggest the resolution is not very clear. It says nothing whatever about the causes that resulted in this situation, nothing about markets, nothing about inflation, nothing about the spread between the price the producer gets and the price the consumer has to pay, nothing about the feedlot operator, nothing about the producers who are suffering hardships, nothing about poor or excellent management, nothing about how many of the 7,000 or so producers need or want or are asking for a government subsidy, nothing about that number.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest the resolution was sloppily and ill prepared.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. TAYLOR: It is badly worded. It does not even come close, as I see it, to helping those really in need in this cow-

calf industry today. I would say this resolution is actually an insult to the intelligence of the members of this Legislature. It's an insult to the intelligence of the producers, because the producers of cows and calves are men just as well educated as any of the rest of us. It's an insult to the people of the province whose money we are giving away.

Mr. Speaker, there is a problem. I think it is a problem that cries for a solution. A solution may not be easy, but there are solutions. Something can be done about a number of the things that I said the resolution says nothing about. If we did something about those things, we'd be solving the problem. If it is passed, all this resolution would do, Mr. Speaker, is squirt a little perfume on the sore to cover the smell. That's all it would do. It's not even a Band-Aid. It would simply cover the smell. That's not good enough for an industry as important as the cow-calf industry. It's not good enough for the people suffering in that industry today.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those who are knowledgeable in the cow-calf industry -- whether they belong to the NFU or Unifarm, whether they're the general public or individual farmers who won't join any union of any type -- accept the invitation of the minister to sit down, endeavor to resolve this by cool, collective, and proper thinking out of solutions, and then apply them. In that way, we can get a solution to this industry, and get it rapidly. I believe the invitation that the minister has given should be accepted. I think every hon. member of this Legislature has a responsibility to assist the minister to solve the problem at the earliest possible time.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say there is no limit to the good an MLA can do if he doesn't care who gets the credit.

MR. HANSEN: I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Bonnyville adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until 8 o'clock this evening.

[The House recessed at 5:31 p.m.]

[The House reconvened at 8 p.m.]

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (Second Reading)

Bill 79 The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1975 (No. 2)

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of Dr. Horner, perhaps I could make some introductory comments on his behalf, if that would be agreeable to the House.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the basis of this legislation, essentially, is to present a proposal that comes within the federal wage and price guidelines. We have discussed it at considerable length, and we think it is legislation that comes very fairly and very clearly within those guidelines. I believe it's clear, Mr. Speaker, that when the Minister of Transportation introduced the bill, he stated that the position with regard to the ministers of the Executive Council was that we would provide in the bill a certain percentage of increase, but that we would take the position -- and I wanted to make these comments and underline what the Deputy Premier said -- that insofar and as long as the federal income guidelines existed, we would fall [into] a limitation of \$2,400, which was the basic concept set forth in the federal anti-inflation program as a maximum amount for members of the Executive Council. Perhaps, having made my introductory comments, I could relinquish my responsibilities and call upon Dr. Horner.

[laughter]

DR. HORNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I was on the phone to my wife, and my clock and yours, or hers and mine, didn't really coincide.

Having heard what the Premier has said, I can just suggest what I said on first reading; that indeed the recommendations in the bill are well within the ambit of the federal anti-inflation guidelines and more than within the guidelines the province has set. As the Premier has noted, we have said that the members of the Executive Council, and those which the \$2,400 maximum will catch, will be voluntarily restrained as to the amount of indemnity they will receive.

I might also say that perhaps this has not been what a number of members of the Assembly might have expected, but in their responsibility as Canadians, they have accepted [it]. I think it's rather important that our members accept that kind of restraint as a token of their leadership in the real, sincere battle against inflation in this country. I don't think I can add any more, other than that we think this is a very responsible approach and should be accepted by members of the Assembly.

[Motion carried; Bill 79 read a second time]

Bill 72
The Alberta Uniform Building
Standards Amendment Act, 1975

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to move second reading of Bill 72, The Alberta Uniform Building Standards Amendment Act, 1975.

At the present moment we have different regulations, for instance, one regulation in the city of Calgary and perhaps another one in the city of Edmonton. [This] causes some further confusion for the administration as far as enforcement is concerned. Secondly, one wonders if a person should comply with the National Building Code, the civic bylaw, or the provincial regulation. So what we're saying is that the building industry would have to comply with one regulation to eliminate some of this confusion. Briefly, Mr. Speaker, this is the amendment.

[Motion carried; Bill 72 read a second time]

Bill 73
The Municipal Affairs
Statutes Amendment Act, 1975

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to move second reading of Bill No. 73, The Municipal Affairs Statutes Amendment Act, 1975.

I think it is perhaps appropriate that I highlight some of the areas which I think are important and which reflect a great deal of my department's work and effort over the past year or so in bringing forth amendments to at least four major bills embodied in the administration of my organization.

The amendments reflect changes in The Municipal Government Act, which is probably the heart of our legislation, and in The Municipal Taxation Act, which deals with collection of revenue from properties, [which] certainly all of you are receptive to. The Municipal and School Administration Act is amended as well. Finally, by way of a consequential amendment, The County Act is amended within this omnibus bill in front of you.

Generally, as I said in my remarks with respect to introduction of this bill at first reading, many of the amendments here are to increase the efficiency of the operation of what have become very large organizational structures found in the cities and in many of the towns. [These] require increased administrative efficiencies, which will be passed on by way of tax savings and administrative organization. I think this has to be one of the highlights. These items were brought forward both by the Alberta Association of Municipal Districts and Counties and by the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, so they have indeed been well founded and well debated before they became embodied in this bill.

Secondly, as I mentioned before, we

have made some decisive efforts to deal with the question of conflict of interest, an area which of course has been fraught with many court cases, and with much uncertainty over the past few years. In this legislation [we] attempt to remedy what might be described as the commonality of interest which prevails in Alberta. By that I mean, why should one council member be disbarred from acting or talking in the area which affects not only his area, but as well the area of common interest throughout the province.

Finally, as I said, one major thrust of this bill is to deal with the question of the local authorities board, which we felt had to be reduced or brought back to Executive Council to allow Executive Council to have ratification of major annexation decisions. [These] decisions, to my mind, really reflect growth policies which represent balanced economic thrust in the province, and which are certainly important to the future of the metropolitan areas and other areas within the Province of Alberta.

Generally, I think I would appreciate the views and the comments of others in opposition as to the direction of the bill. Certainly through third reading and committee I would more than welcome views, criticisms, and suggestions for changes and emendments within this act.

Mr. Speaker, with that as a brief introduction to the bill, I hope the House sees fit to recommend second reading of this bill.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend the Minister of Municipal Affairs for his bill. One concern I have is in regard to summer villages. I was wondering why the act is now written to allow summer villages to have their annual meeting on the third Saturday in July. That falls into a lot of activities going on in the city of Edmonton. I thought it might be more expeditious to hold that in the third week of August or some other time. Was that a recommendation from the summer villages association or from some other group?

MP. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member's question, along with a number of others, could be dealt with when the bill gets into committee stage.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I rise rather reluctantly, if any other member wants to take part in the debate, because I had indicated to the Government House Leader that I'd like to move adjournment of the debate on Bill 73, having regard to the fact that the bill just came in yesterday. I'm sorry, it was three days ago. We've sent copies to a number of people involved in municipal government, and [they] haven't had an opportunity to respond. I indicated to the Government House Leader that I'd like to adjourn debate on second reading, and he was agreeable to this. So I'd like to move adjournment of the debate on Bill 73.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the motion by the hon. Leader of the Opposition acceptable to the Assembly?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

Bill 84
The Provincial Court
Amendment Act, 1975

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I am indeed very pleased to move second reading of Bill 84, and do so. As I indicated in first reading, this is the heart of the recommendations of the Kirby Board of Review. The Kirby Board, as we recall, is comprised of Mr. Justice Kirby, Mr. Ted Bower of the Red Deer Advocate, and the former president of the University of Alberta, Dr. Max Wymar.

I have been asked by a number of members of the House, Mr. Speaker, whether it's my intention to respond, under Resolution No. 8 on the Order Paper, to the Board of Review Report No. 2 with respect to the provincial court. My response has been that I would like very much to speak in this House and respond in detail to the proposed report and would do so in committee stage of this bill, and not at this time. I am in the process of making certain submissions to cabinet, relative to the report, and would expect that by next week I would be in a position to respond in detail to Kirby, and will indeed be very pleased to do so.

I should say that all of us in this province are most grateful to Mr. Justice Kirby and the members of his board of review for their very considerable time and effort in bringing this report to the attention of the government and the public of Alberta. It represents, as we all know, the compilation of public opinion by the bench, the bar, the police, the public, government, and other interested citizens, arising out of concerns in the operation of the provincial court over many, many years.

The essence of the report, I believe, is the recommendation that there should be a chief judge of that court. I would comment in some detail on this recommendation at a later date. There is no doubt, however, that the chief judge is the captain of the ship, and we expect the provincial court judiciary will indeed find very, very substantial leadership from the appointment of a chief judge, which I hope we'll be in a position to announce in the next couple of months.

Secondly, the bill deals with the restructuring of the judicial council in The Provincial Court Act. As members may remember, this council is intended to deal with complaints against members of the provincial court and to recommend and, in fact, comment on nominees to that court. Both functions are entirely appropriate, and I am very pleased to invite the House to support the changes currently proposed to this bill.

The current structure of the judicial council includes only representatives of

the provincial court. It is my view, and [that] of the board of review as well, that we should return to some modification of what was previously the situation in this province, where the board of review includes representatives of other courts in the province. Indeed, I'm most grateful that both chief justices and chief judge of the district court have concurred and agree in sitting on this most important judicial council.

The third major recommendation in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to create the provincial court as a court of record. With the amendments to the Criminal Code currently before Parliament to delete the trial de novo capacity, it will become essential that the provincial court of Alberta become a court of record. There's absolutely no doubt that implicit in that change is the assumption that many new additional staff will have to be available to that court as well as the addition of recording equipment and significant changes in procedure to allow the court of record to come into play. It's a necessary, desirable, and most appropriate change in the circumstances. You will note, however, that the court of record will only be proclaimed in this act once we in fact have adequate staff and resources to carry out the function that a court of record implies.

There is a minor modification to the act to clarify the pension arrangements. That will give us the capacity to make certain changes, recommended by the Kirby Board of Review, to the pensions of provincial court judges. With respect to the pension recommendations, I will be responding in the House at a later date. Needless to say, I'm not necessarily in agreement with the recommendations of the board. However, at this stage, we propose to make some modifications by order in council as the legislation currently authorizes.

It would be my preference that at some point down the road, perhaps a year or so from now, we incorporate in legislation, perhaps as a separate part of this bill, specific provisions of the act that relate to pensions. It can be done by order in council right now, and that's fine. I think at some point in the future we must be prepared to codify the pension provisions in legislation. It would be my intention at some time in the future to present a bill amending The Provincial Court Act to provide specifically in legislation for pensions of the provincial court judges.

Mr. Speaker, I said at the outset that I propose to speak at some length on the Kirby Board of Review during committee stage. I hope I will have the assistance and support of the House, as I would appreciate the opportunity of taking some time going into that report.

[Mr. Clark rose.]

MR. SPEAKER: Without wanting to interrupt the hon. leader, there could be some possible practical procedural difficulty here, because we have two items on the

Order Paper dealing to some extent with the same subject matter. I would therefore suggest, when we're debating the bill, that the debate should really be confined to the provisions of the bill, and the other aspects of the Kirby report could then be dealt with under the debate under Motion No. 3. Otherwise, we may get into a position where we're just going around in a circle and repeating debate on various aspects of this matter since both items are so related.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to say just a few words with regard to Bill 82, The Provincial Court Amendment Act. With regard to your comments, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate them, but I would hasten to add that I would hope we would give the Attorney General considerable latitude during the course of committee work, so that he would in fact be able to respond in some detail to various aspects of Kirby. One of the advantages, certainly to those of us on this side of the House, would be that we would be able to become involved in a rather frank discussion on various points. I would hope all members of the House would keep that in mind when we're in the course of the committee work.

I'd like to make just three quick comments this evening as far as the bill is concerned. The first is a comment I would have to [make] to the former Attorney General, because when he appointed Kirby and the Kirby [board], I was frankly critical of the make-up of the panel. I'd have to say my suspicions were not well founded. In my judgment, Mr. Justice Kirby and his colleagues did a very fine job. I recall standing in my place in the House, I believe it would be a year and a half or perhaps two years ago, and being critical of the appointment. I think it's only fair that I now say I was wrong on that occasion. I say [that] so the former Attorney General has the satisfaction of hearing me say that.

Secondly, I assume from the Attorney General's remarks that the decisions on moving on the recommendation of chief judge, on the judicial council, and in fact making courts of record [of the] provincial courts in Alberta are the three high priorities with regard to Kirby, as far as the Attorney General is concerned. I'd like the Attorney General to comment on that, perhaps, as he concludes the debate on second reading.

My third and last comment centres around a comment the Attorney General made following his return some time ago from, I believe, a meeting of his provincial colleagues. He indicated it would be his recommendation to the government that the 11 per cent spending guideline would not in fact apply to the Attorney General's Department. I'd like to ask the Attorney General to give us some indication as to what kind of progress he is making in that area, because frankly I don't think you can place a price on justice. I for one, and my colleagues I'm sure, would be prepared to see greater than 11 per cent spending in the Attorney General's Department. That

isn't to say there aren't other departments that in fact should be below 11 per cent. But certainly, in my judgment, a high priority must be placed on the administration of justice in the province. So I would ask the Attorney General to comment in that area when he is completing his remarks.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I certainly support the principle of Bill 84. In the light of your comments, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney General doesn't have an opportunity for a full-scale discussion as to his view of Kirby during second reading of either this or the other bill, I would suggest that the Government House Leader agree to bring back the motion on the Kirby Board of Review prior to the discussion of this legislation at committee stage, if possible, so we'd know in which context these recommendations are made, and what the government sees as overall priorities in implementing the recommendations of the Kirby Board of Review. I certainly share the sentiments, expressed by both the mover of the resolution and the previous speaker, that the Kirby Board of Review is to be commended for a very comprehensive study of the lower court system in Alberta, and [for] a package of proposals which by and large can obtain the support, I'm sure, of most members of this Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, I endorse the creation of the post of chief judge. As far as the judicial council is concerned, when the Attorney General concludes debate, I'd be interested if he would comment on just what role he sees in the council passing judgment on appointments of people to the bench, and whether there would be any substantive change in the appointment procedure of judges to the bench.

The only other comment I would make, Mr. Speaker, is generally on the question of the judicial system. I'm pleased the recommendations of the Kirby Report are not going to be caught in the government's 11 per cent guidelines. However, I would be a little more pleased if the minister would be able to rise in his place and assure the House that the legal aid program and the commitment of funds to legal aid also would not be caught by the 11 per cent constraints. No matter how much we strive to improve the efficiency and performance of the lower court system, Mr. Speaker, in the final analysis it is fundamental that people have right to counsel, that that counsel be competent, and that the funding be there so people can have not only equity before the law, but equity in fact. With those words, Mr. Speaker, I'm certainly pleased to endorse the principle of Bill 84.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to join in this debate with regard to the bill particularly, but a number of, I think, pertinent questions have been raised with respect to the forum, or more particularly the method by which the Kirby report itself could be debated. I wonder if I could suggest to Your Honour that insofar as the next bill for second reading, No. 86, The

Department of the Attorney General Amendment Act, does deal with the entire organization of the administration of justice in the province, as far as the government is concerned, it would be entirely appropriate -- and I believe the hon. Attorney General agrees with me -- that during discussion of that bill, a full and complete review and discussion of the Kirby report take place.

The general approach towards Motion No. 3, to which Your Honour referred, would be that we probably would not be calling that again. Possibly [we] will. Therefore, we are most agreeable to having Bill 86 be the base, including second reading and committee, on which a full discussion of the board of review take place.

MR. CLARK: We'd welcome that approach.

MR. SPEAKER: I'd have to agree there. The main point is simply to avoid duplication, and I take it there is unanimous agreement that Bill 86 will now become the vehicle by which the Kirby report will be debated further.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could just comment briefly, in closing debate on second reading, on the three or four points raised by members opposite.

The contents of Bill 84, Bill 86, and the earlier amendments -- I forget the bill number -- are here not necessarily because they are the highest priority of the department and the government, relative to the board of review, but because these are the areas that require legislative change before other changes can take place. Certainly there are some aspects of the board of review report that are critically important, that need to be done, but don't require legislation. One of my high priorities, frankly, is not necessarily found in legislation. I'd be happy to deal with that, as the House leader has pointed out.

But the legislation currently before the House includes all the changes the board recommends that require legislation to bring them into place. Other changes may require orders in council, and we'll get to those at a later stage. I'm simply saying that at this stage I'm trying to demonstrate to the House, and indeed to the public of Alberta, that the government of this province is prepared to move reasonably quickly and in total response to Kirby by bringing forward at this particular session of the Legislature the amendments to legislation that are in compliance with the board's recommendations.

Now, I've said the chief judge appointment is a high priority, and indeed it is, as are all the recommendations before the House. But there are other things in the board of review report that are, in my judgment, as high -- and I'll deal with those later -- that don't require legislation, that require policy decisions or changes by regulation. So we have put to the House, Mr. Speaker, the items of Kirby that require legislation.

There are areas of the Kirby report not found in Bill 84, Mr. Speaker, that may indeed require legislation at a later date. But that will come as a result of policy decisions taken at a later date and that really need study at this time. Again, I will deal with those later.

With respect to the 11 per cent guideline, although my budget has not yet been reviewed by my cabinet colleagues, I think I can safely say -- in fact I'm sure I can -- that the 11 per cent guideline will not apply to the Department of the Attorney General with respect to the administration of justice in the provincial courts. That statement also applies to legal aid. There is no doubt that we will not be able to respond sensibly and meaningfully to the recommendations of the board of review unless we are able to move above the 11 per cent guideline. There is no doubt about that, including legal aid.

I'm grateful that some of my colleagues are prepared to give way and see the priority the government established as to the Kirby Board of Review in its report and our response to it. So I can assure you that will happen. The question of how far we go above 11 per cent in that area is something we are still working on, and I can't give you a definitive answer right now.

With respect to procedures to appoint judges to the provincial court, we follow the practice the legislation currently outlines, and is supported again by the members of the judicial council. All nominees to appointments to the provincial court are forwarded, first of all, to the judicial council. We receive the observations and comments of that council before they go to cabinet. I think that's an entirely appropriate and fully acceptable procedure. I would not suggest changing that in any sense or at any time. It's most important.

[Motion carried; Bill 84 read a second time]

Bill 68
The Attorney General
Statutes Amendment Act, 1975 (No. 2)

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 68, The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1975 (No. 2). Mr. Speaker, this is a straightforward and relatively simple act. If passed, it will amend The Chartered Accountants Act, The Dental Association Act, The Legal Profession Act, and The Medical Profession Act.

There has been some misunderstanding or misinterpretation, publicly and in the media, as to what the bill really does, Mr. Speaker. One of the newspapers headlined it as being a double standard on income growth. The suggestion was that it was a bill for the especial benefit of four professions.

Mr. Speaker, what it does, in fact, is to remove a discrimination against these four professions, that is, the accountants, the dentists, the lawyers, and the doctors,

so they can incorporate their businesses and include their professional income under corporate income. This is a privilege or opportunity that all other businesses and professions have had for many, many years. It extends to engineers, architects, plumbers, electricians -- you name it. They can incorporate and take any tax benefits that flow from that incorporation.

Mr. Speaker, the concept of this bill has been under consideration [since] 1968 and 1969. The reason it hasn't gone ahead more quickly is probably because of certain aspects of the professional relationship between those four professions and their clients or patients. Finally, the draftsmen have come up with a way of handling those particular problems, so the bill can go ahead at this time.

The advantage to these particular businesses or professional people, Mr. Speaker, is that by incorporating their companies or businesses, they can level out the peaks and valleys in their income, so the good years balance out the bad years. They can defer some of the tax on their income by withdrawing moneys from their companies after they retire or in years when their income is not as high as it might be in other years. In effect, it gives them the opportunity of balancing their incomes as do other professions or business people.

The bill, Mr. Speaker, would permit the governing body of each of these professions -- be it the medical council, the benchers in the case of the lawyers, or a board in the case of the other two -- to make rules or by-laws covering the issuance of a permit to conduct business as a professional corporation. This would be dependent on a number of things. One would be that the company be a limited company in good standing with the registrar of companies under The Companies Act. Also, the company would have to use the name "professional corporation".

Again, the legal and beneficial ownership of all issued shares of the company would have to be vested in one or more members of the profession. Fourthly, all directors and persons carrying on the practice in the particular corporation would have to be of that particular profession.

A couple of aspects in the bill that perhaps slowed down passage were, number one, the liability question. There was a hurdle that had to be overcome, so that by incorporating lawyers or doctors or the other two groups, you didn't limit their liability to their customers or patients. A clause in the bill would maintain their liability in the form that it was prior to the [incorporation] of the practice. Another aspect that had to be maintained was the fiduciary or confidential or privileged relationship between the solicitor and client, the patient and the doctor, the accountant and his client. That has been retained in the bill.

Another section of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is the disciplinary power of the governing bodies. For conduct unbecoming that particular profession, they do have power of revocation, suspension, reprimand,

or fine. All of these are provided in the bill. Another consequential change, Mr. Speaker, is an amendment to The Companies Act, which would permit only one person to incorporate in this particular company. That is a change from the typical company under The Companies Act, where you have, I believe, at least three for a public company and two for a private company.

Mr. Speaker, as I've said, it's a rather straightforward bill. It isn't a special privilege as such for these four professions, but rather permits to them something that has already been given to all other occupations and businesses. With that, Mr. Speaker, I would solicit the support of the House.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part briefly in discussing Bill No. 68, the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in charge of the city of Calgary pointed out an argument discussed in the media. With great respect, Mr. Speaker, I don't really believe he answered the concern expressed by those who raised the argument in the first place. Essentially, Mr. Speaker, by allowing the four professions -- accountants, dentists, doctors, and lawyers -- in effect to incorporate, you will be reducing their effective tax rate. It may not mean an increase in total income, but there will be a net improvement in their income position, because their tax bill will, in fact, go down.

Mr. Speaker, the concern this government has to come to grips with, and any government in Canada which is trying to sell the wage and price policy at the present time -- and I take it that tomorrow or Monday we're going to have a bill presented to this Legislature which will authorize Alberta's participation in the federal wage and price guideline program for a year or a year and a half at least. The problem this government, or any other government, is going to encounter in selling that kind of package to wage earners is the very widespread scepticism that there will be loopholes and cuts for various professions.

The minister said, and he's quite correct in saying, that other professional groups have had this privilege, if you like. Engineers and other professions have been able to take advantage of incorporation. If an architect can do this, if an engineer can do this, why shouldn't the same ground rules apply to accountants, doctors, dentists, and lawyers? That may be a reasonable argument, Mr. Minister, in a time when controls are not being placed on the wage-earning sector of the economy.

Because the net benefits for the people involved -- the disposable income -- will, in fact, improve under this incorporation scheme, in my view, the effect can only be to increase suspicion and concern among wage earners in this province. I would frankly suggest, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect to those who have proposed the change, that it may well have merit, but it is the kind of change which [it] would be wiser to postpone at least until

after Alberta's participation in the federal program has ended.

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, if I might address a few comments to that position. Obviously in an area of conflict of interest, but well disclosed, I think the argument I've just heard is probably the second foolish argument I've heard today from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview . . .

[laughter]

AN HON. MEMBER: He's only spoken twice.

MR. GHITTER: . . . and he's only spoken twice.

Mr. Speaker, what this has to do with any anti-inflation program we are dealing with in this Legislature is beyond the realm of comprehension. If the hon. member would examine our tax laws, he would well and readily determine that as soon as the individual professional takes the money from the corporation, he is going to be taxed as an individual in the very same way he has always been. The only option available is whether or not he will leave it in the corporation. If he doesn't need the money and wishes to leave it in the corporation, the corporation will be taxed under the tax law. But the moment the individual takes the money from the corporation, it's the very same thing.

So all that is really happening is that there is no saving whatsoever from the point of view of the professional individual. It's as the honorable sponsor of the bill mentioned. It merely allows the professional to deal with the high points and the low points and even out his position. Some of them have better years than others, and this gives them a more even situation.

It really creates a situation where professional classes who were previously discriminated against from the point of view of tax laws are now dealt with as any other businessmen. After all, professional people are businessmen like anyone else. But, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest respect, to suggest that this bill has anything to do with our fight against inflation or is preferring a benefit on one and not the other is beyond my comprehension. Maybe the hon. member would like to explain his accounting background in a little more detail.

[Motion carried; Bill 68 read a second time]

Bill 86
The Department of the
Attorney General Amendment Act, 1975

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm again pleased to move second reading of another bill, Bill 86, which arises essentially out of the board of review report. The essential ingredient of this bill will grant to my office the capacity to establish, among other entities, the provincial court reorganization agency, which was, I believe,

the final recommendation of the board of review.

A careful reading of the amendments, Mr. Speaker, will indicate that they are really no different from those that have been passed and, indeed, [from] most of the departmental legislation in this government. Essentially it is twofold. One is to provide for such advisory boards and committees, et cetera, as may be appropriate, and the second is to provide for an enabling section to allow grants to be made. As I submit, those are two basic sections we'll find in most departmental legislation in the government.

I would welcome the initiative of my colleague, the hon. Government House Leader, and the concurrence of the House in discussing the board of review report under committee study of Bill 86. I would indeed welcome the opportunity to go into the reorganization agency as I see it, the work it might do, and how it might be comprised. Again I say I'm not particularly in agreement with the proposal of the board of review, and have a suggestion to make to this Assembly.

There are other areas in which this amendment would be most appropriate. One of them has recently come to my attention in discussing the whole question of gaming and lottery laws in this province. My recent communications with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police have suggested that perhaps the Attorney General should establish an advisory committee on gaming and lotteries. It's a suggestion that is most appealing to me, and I would anticipate using the provisions of this amendment to move in that direction if indeed that is our final conclusion.

[Motion carried; Bill 86 read a second time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain bills on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair.]

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of the Whole Assembly will now come to order.

Bill 78
The Social Development
Amendment Act, 1975 (No. 2)

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Chairman, I move the bill be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 66
The Motor Vehicle Accident
Claims Amendment Act, 1975

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Attorney General if he'd give us some explanation with regard to Section 2(c), the question of off-highway vehicles, especially as it would apply to those machines which have come into their own in the last few days -- snowmobiles. In fact, what effect will this have on the operation of snowmobiles, as it relates to the earlier portion of the act?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, my memory is that snowmobiles are defined as off-highway vehicles and are registered under that legislation. This simply treats an off-highway vehicle as a motor vehicle, and allows claims to this fund for damages or injuries occasioned as a result of an accident arising out of the operation of an off-highway vehicle. So it simply treats snowmobiles, for example, which are registered under that other legislation, as motor vehicles. It puts them in the same category. It really extends the coverage, if you will, to that sector of the vehicle class. That's all.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 66 be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 67
The Agricultural Service
Board Amendment Act, 1975

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the amendment to Bill 67, which has been passed to the members of the Assembly. Sections A and B make the bill a little more readable. Section C pertains to The Agricultural Service Board Amendment Act being under the Department of Agriculture. Under "Definitions", the word "minister" pertains to the Minister of Agriculture. In C, Section 24 of the amendment, because it pertains to improvement districts, the word "minister" refers to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Chairman, I move Bill 67 be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 69
The Water Resources
Amendment Act, 1975

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, a xeroxed amendment was distributed to the members during this afternoon's session.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Has everyone had an opportunity to go over the amendment to Bill 69?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be reported as amended.

[Motion carried]

Bill 71
The Alberta Labour
Amendment Act, 1975

MR. CLARK: Mr. Chairman, during second reading of Bill 71, the Minister of Labour, in concluding his discussion, spoke in rather general terms with regard to Section 163. That's really basically a change from "extreme privation [and] human suffering" as a basic reason for the Lieutenant Governor in Council, in fact, to pass an order in council which says various groups on strike go back to work.

Yesterday, when he was dealing with second reading of the bill, the minister gave us some reasoning as far as the change. If I recall correctly, the minister said that in the course of the last year or two when the government had looked at using that section from time to time, they found [it] might not be broad enough to deal with some situations they were looking at. I think, with regard to the discussion [of] the labour act and that major amendment, if the minister could perhaps enlarge upon that somewhat, the kinds of situations he was looking at, the kind of consideration the government went through before bringing forward this amendment, we could start the discussion there.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt that one of the occasions when consideration was given to using Section 163 related to a protracted work stoppage involving teachers. I don't think it's entirely good form to discuss solicitor and client questions openly, you might say, but I think the client can sometimes waive that right in part.

In effect, during that period the law officers of the Crown did advise the possibility that an interpretation of privation by a court might not include such a case, particularly since it was modified, I believe, by the adjective "extreme or severe" privation. This was not known in

the sense that no judgment had ever been rendered on the subject. On the occasion when it had been used before, it had not been challenged. Yet I think prudence would call upon the government to allow for the fact that it could be challenged, and that we had been given that particular type of advice. That is a fairly clear example, and although given in confidence by law officers of the Crown, as the hon. leader suggests it might as well be laid before the committee and is one of the reasons.

MR. CLARK: So I understand the minister is saying to the committee that even though this section has been used at least once, and I believe on more occasions, to order teachers back to work -- and I recall the situation in southern Alberta -- the law officers of the Crown felt [and] indicated to the government that had this gone to court, there is some question as to the judicial decision. Well then, can I take that just one step further and ask why the government felt it was necessary to go as far as it has in bringing in these amendments. As I read the amendment, this doesn't only give the government the opportunity -- let's use teachers as an example -- to order them back to work. If I read Section 163 correctly -- and my legal interpretation isn't always that good -- it gives power to the Lieutenant Governor in Council to pass an order in council before a strike takes place. If it's simply a matter of legally clearing up some uncertainty, that's one thing, but as I read this section, it gives the Lieutenant Governor in Council a great deal broader scope on which they could pass an order in council. That's one of the real concerns I have.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I think the leader has come to the more important question of merit now, in the sense that he is asking whether this type of legislation is appropriate, rather than dealing with the question of whether a change was made for one reason or another. In debate of the bill on second reading, I did indicate that the government's intention in making the changes was -- despite the fact that there is some disagreement over whether legislation of this character should be in the provincial statutes, the judgment of the government has been that it is appropriate in labor relations and the labor management relations climate of Alberta at the present time. Therefore, the intention was to be sure that the section reflected what many people always presumed it meant; that there was a power in circumstances that were unusual in some way. I don't think that particular word appears in the act, but in circumstances where a reasonable person might judge it to be appropriate that a work stoppage cease, that could be done.

The hon. leader's specific question is: why would you want to do that in anticipation of the event? The answer to that, of course, is that sometimes I'm sure it wouldn't be difficult to conceive of cases where anticipated damage, either to a

group of people in the sense of social or economic deprivation, or in the sense of a physical plant in the case of operating equipment related to a utility or something similar to a utility that had a broad public value and use, is so apparent that the impending closedown would be a type of crisis or emergency which would be second only to having left it going too long. Therefore, the ability to look ahead and make a judgment is second only in importance to the ability to make the judgment after a severe and damaging event.

MR. CLARK: Two more comments, Mr. Chairman. I just remake the point I hope I made yesterday. I think it's regrettable that the government chose not to discuss this legislation with the groups that most likely will be affected. In my judgment at least, it's one thing to clarify a situation which exists. But clearly, all of us must understand that what we're doing here is not giving clarification to a situation that many people feel has existed in Alberta for years and years.

I recall sitting on the other side of the House as Minister of Education when there was a caretakers' strike in the city of Edmonton. I recall parents and other groups coming and saying, you know, go ahead and use Section 163 of the labour act -- or whatever the section was at that particular time.

Despite what the minister says, I would have to say that I have yet to hear anyone in Alberta come forward and say, we think the government has the power to stop a strike before the strike starts. Now that may be a common feeling among many people. But as a member of this Assembly for 15 years, I have never had anyone, be it in labor, management or any other field, express to me the opinion that the government has the power to stop a strike before the strike starts. That's clearly what we're doing here. We're giving the government the power to move in and pass an order in council before a strike takes place.

Now, the minister has alluded to some possibilities. That may be the case. But I think what we're really doing here is candidly sliding legislation through under the guise of it legally clarifying a situation, when in fact it's giving the government a great deal more power when it comes to the question of executive action to prevent pretty well an accepted right, the right of people in the teaching profession, certainly, and people in organized labor to withdraw services.

I think we should call it what it is. In my judgment anyway, it's simply a matter of broadening what the Executive Council can do in the field of labor management, and without any consultation with the groups before. As I said yesterday, I think that's just a very, very serious error in judgment as far as the government is concerned.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Chairman, just several comments. Rather than restating my objection to the principle of this kind of proposal, which the minister is well aware

of . . . I didn't have an opportunity to be here when the minister concluded debate, but my understanding of his remarks was that the reason given for not consulting with the Alberta Federation of Labour, the ATA, and other groups which might possibly be affected was that the government knew their position already. Their position was opposition to any kind of essential services provision in the act. That being the case, the government didn't feel it was necessary to consult.

I wonder if I am reading correctly what the minister said in concluding debate last night. As I say, I wasn't here. But if that is in fact what he said, I am a little concerned about that. As has already been said, it seems to me what we are doing is broadening the power of Executive Council in a rather important way. As I read the old act, the Executive Council could act, but subject to some pretty definite constraints. Those constraints are clearly laid out: if "life or property [is] in serious jeopardy", and then, "extreme privation or human suffering". That's very clear and straightforward. What troubles me is the substitution of "damage to life or property being caused", and the addition of "or is likely to be caused", and then the substitution of "extreme privation" for "unreasonable hardship". Quite frankly, Mr. Minister, "unreasonable hardship" is something over which reasonable people can differ. What a businessman considers unreasonable hardship may not be what a reasonable person in a trade union or the ATA would consider unreasonable hardship.

I'm interested in how the government arrived at that particular wording, "unreasonable hardship", because it seems to me that allows not only additional flexibility to deal with those situations where you're worried about the legal problem of being challenged in court, but it now authorizes the widest possible option for Executive Council. Frankly, that seems to me a rather important change. Under those circumstances, it seems to me it would have been reasonable, before the amendment came in, to sit down with the groups concerned and discuss the reasons the government had come to the conclusion that this particular widening of the scope of 163 was necessary and, in the government's view, in the public interest.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I'd be glad to remark on the comments of both the hon. leader and the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. The first thing I'd like to say about the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition is that just before his last comments, I really meant to convey to him an answer in two parts. When I said the generally held impression of Section 163 was the impression that was meant to be clarified, I meant to convey generally that we were talking about the concept of emergency power as such, the power to cease a work stoppage, whether it be by strike or lockout. That was always the character of that section, and the change in wording certainly clarified that. I didn't mean to convey that the section

had always been understood as one that was capable of stopping an event before it occurred.

I think I might say two things about that. One is under the heading, I suppose, of closing the barn door after the horse is gone, which is quite familiar to everyone and, which I think, was implicit in the remarks I did make in saying that sometimes [in] a gravely damaging situation, either socially or economically, for a group of people or to a plant or equipment in, say, a utility or the like, it would just be obvious to everyone that harm was about to occur, and it would really be too bad not to be able to deal with it until after harm was done.

However, the other thing I wanted to say about that was that the previous section was not entirely devoid of the power to look ahead. It is true that in the section that didn't deal with life and property and utilities -- that is, in the generalized section -- there was the past tense only. But in the existing Section 163, the language is still there: "life or property would be in serious jeopardy by reason of any breakdown or stoppage or impending breakdown"; and again the words, "a stoppage or impending stoppage of hospital services". Now that is the existing legislation. In that sense, the ability to anticipate in the new section is perhaps different in language but not in character.

The other change being made in regard to extreme privation or unreasonable hardship is the one that introduces for the first time, it is true, the ability to look ahead and anticipate difficulty. The previous section required that extreme privation or human suffering had actually been caused, entirely in the past tense.

So all I do is comment on those as highlighting the differences. The government did indeed consider those points and concluded that it would be appropriate to consider using the section in the case where it was apparent to everyone that grave damage was about to be done. That might be the most difficult time to try to resolve the problem by means of calling the Legislature together.

Admittedly, as has been pointed out, the procedure of calling the Legislature together is not in the usual case a very time consuming one. But it would be an extremely difficult power to exercise in a Legislature -- to have it act under the anticipation of damage, no matter how serious it was, no matter how obvious it was to everyone how grave the harm about to be done was going to be.

Mr. Chairman, in commenting just briefly on what the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview said, I would like to elaborate to this extent on the remarks I made in closing debate in second reading. I hope I didn't indicate that in any general sense consultation is not useful or in most cases necessary, because it is. In most aspects of most legislation, there is indeed much consultation. That's true at the level of the passing of regulations too. That that will always be done is a well-established principle of consultation with

the public and with special interest groups. I'd be surprised if there were provincial governments in Canada where that didn't happen.

However, I think I meant to convey that in the specific instance at hand, knowing the contents of previous briefs, knowing the character of previous conversations, it would simply not have been a productive exercise to go into any detail on what an advance consultation would be. It had in fact been held a number of times and, as I say, the disagreement on the matter of principle was there. It was recognized, each side respecting the views of the other and simply not being in accord. Surely that will happen from time to time.

Of course, we also indicated to the Federation of Labour -- and this was done informally -- that the entire contents of Bill 71, which covers four or five issues, was not meant to be the government's sudden response to its representations, which are making recommendations so different from what is in the labour act at the present time. It was conveyed to the federation that the government would, of course, examine and further consult, in the fullest sense, with them in regard to their proposal for a new labour act, and that would be done without preconceived ideas in respect to the points made in the brief. Admittedly, the differences that would arise, if that brief was adopted as it is, would be very, very significant. No doubt we would be fooling ourselves if we didn't say a great deal of persuading would have to be done for some of the basic changes of principle. But it is certainly also fair to say the government could indeed be persuaded to look at many things sympathetically by way of amendment, by way of evolution of law in regard to labour relations.

Again, I say the assurance has been given that the existence of Bill 71 is not, in effect, a written response to the brief that was filed. We will be having more meetings on that, and we have agreed the meetings will involve representatives of management. I'm sure that would be very useful.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know if there is much more I can say in connection with this. I think it would be fair to add, in view of the questions raised by both hon. members, that this change to 163 at the present time is not directed at any specific group in society. I hope the fact that a particular example has been used here this evening won't be interpreted as anything other than a reflection upon the fact that that was the previous example, not that the proposing of these changes was directed in any sense at that group, or at any other.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I believe Section 163 reflects the thinking of the vast majority of the people of Alberta. The people, generally, are sick and tired of strikes, and I think any action that can be taken to stop a strike before it happens would be welcomed by the people of this province.

It is my view that all essential services should be bound by compulsory arbitration. I can see no sense at all in a strike taking place in a gas system in the middle of winter and then settling it after the services have been withdrawn. It doesn't make sense to me. It's far better to settle it before it [starts] and stop hundreds of homes from freezing. Nor is it reasonable to me to think that the police should be permitted to go on strike, and then deal with it afterwards. This is what they did in Quebec and in Nova Scotia, and we know the results, the plundering and the other terrible things that happened when there were no policemen on duty. As a result, a lot of innocent people suffered the vandalism and damages that need never have taken place had they had legislation like this and had government been prepared to act.

I believe the people of this province strongly support some type of compulsory arbitration for all essential services. If it was possible, I'd be quite prepared to wager that if a plebiscite were taken, more than 70 per cent of the people of this province would support this clause exactly the way it stands today. I support it because I think it reflects the thinking of the people of this province. I think it's wise to stop every strike possible before it happens, because I've never seen a strike yet where the worker comes out to the good. The worker is the one who loses in almost every strike, if not all of them.

I come from a labor constituency. I fought an election on Section 163 after it was first passed -- in a labor constituency -- with an overwhelming majority over the man who opposed 163. It shows that labor people realize strikes are useless. I've been in homes where the miners went on strike, and I know the privation that happens there. It takes weeks and sometimes months to catch up on what you lost, even if you do get an increase in wages and an increase in pay. The people of the province are getting sick and tired of this type of thing.

I say once more, in my view 163 reflects the thinking of the vast majority of the people of Alberta. I certainly support it.

MR. YCUNG: Mr. Chairman, my questions deal first with Section 6 of the bill. Mr. Minister, it seems that subsequent to the passage of the act as it now stands, prior to this amendment, there has been some uncertainty as to interpretation. I would request that you enlighten me, both from a legal point of view and a policy point of view, as to exactly what we have changed by deleting the word "or" between what used to be (a) and (b) of Section 23(1), putting what seems to me to be very similar content in two sentences, and numbering them (1) and (2).

Are we saying that the employee shall not exceed 8 hours per day, period, and that the maximum hours per week shall not exceed 44? Must we interpret that to mean that if the employee works 44 hours, the 44 hours must be worked in 6 days and not 5?

If we are, why are we doing that? Is it because of health reasons that we think 8 hours is the maximum, or is it for reasons of distribution of income -- that we feel nobody should work more than that, because we want to spread the work around? Or is there some other reason?

MR. CRAWFORD: Briefly, Mr. Chairman, the 44-hour week is still the normal work week in the Province of Alberta, and the 8-hour day is still the normal working day. The reason the section was recast was so that it was clear interpretation could be made of either a daily limit or a weekly limit. Now, the 8 hours a day or the 44 hours a week -- the requirement in regard to working 44 hours a week. If one works as much as 44 hours a week, it would not, in cases where the hours of work were changed by an order of the board, be necessary to spread them over 6 days. Otherwise, my understanding is that it would be. The normal work week would be a five and a half day week. But if you did make the application under Section 25, I believe it is, for the flex-time, there would be no reason, for example, that there couldn't be 4 days of 9 and 1 day of 8 -- a 5-day, 44-hour week.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Minister, I was approached twice in the last 2 years by, as it turns out, 5 members of a union who were very exercised over the fact that they regarded this section, as it now stands, to preclude their working 44 hours, even when they were paid overtime for 4 hours, except on the sixth day. I want to know: do we have before us a statute which continues that situation, or do the changes permit those employees the opportunity of working 44 hours in 5 days as long as they are paid overtime for the 4 hours in excess of 40?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I can only repeat what I indicated before. My understanding is that what the hon. member describes is, in fact, the situation unless an application is made to increase the hours of work, to fit it within the permitted work week, on such days as would bring it to five days instead of five and a half or six working days.

MR. YOUNG: Well then, Mr. Minister, my concern is, what is the policy of the Board of Industrial Relations in terms of granting that kind of application? We have a system here which isn't an appeal from the exception, but rather an appeal in order to make the exception. The board has to grant all of these things. In the situation I have in mind, obviously these employees wanted to do the work. They objected, especially during the summertime, to working during the sixth day, which ruined their weekend. In order to get around that, as I understand your comment, they would have to go to the Board of Industrial Relations with the employer to get a specific exemption applied to, in this case, their distribution or assembly centre, as would every other individual group. Is that what you're saying?

MR. CLARK: I might support the point made by the Member for Edmonton Jasper Place. I relate specifically to a situation in my own constituency. At a lumber mill, under the old legislation if the law was being lived up to, it was essential that the workmen, mainly farmers incidentally, had to work five and a half days a week. This just caused real havoc with their farming operations. I know they had gone repeatedly to the Board of Industrial Relations with the concept of trying to work four nines and one eight. It was my understanding that wasn't possible until this legislation came in. In that particular case, it was a small number of employees, but they were young farmers primarily, working in a fairly sizable lumber operation. As I read the legislation, if the Board of Industrial Relations was agreeable, this would make it possible for them to work four nines and one eight.

I would just go on and say I would hope most sincerely that in his discussions with the Board of Industrial Relations the minister would have the board [take] somewhat of a positive attitude if in fact management and labor go to the board and say, yes, this is what we want to do. In fact, I'd see no reason the board wouldn't say yes on that kind of arrangement. Because it's very important in some rural areas where people are involved in the kind of lumber operation I referred to.

MR. YOUNG: In order to save time when the minister responds, there is one way I can see out of this situation, given subsection (1) and subsection (2). They're both subject to subsection (3). Subsection (3), if interpreted in the broadest way, would permit the continuation of the practice which has been started in this particular concern to the satisfaction of both groups. I'm not sure that will be the case. Perhaps you'd address comment to that.

MR. CRAWFORD: Yes, I welcome the opportunity to comment on that, because both hon. members have put it in the perspective of what the board policy will be. I think I can say my discussions with the chairman of the board have been to the effect that there should be the type of flexibility that would now be allowed by this. Having ascertained his view was that the flexibility was denied him by the legislation -- that was his view -- that is why this legislation is here.

When the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place spoke on second reading, he made a very useful point and asked me at the time if there was any reason it couldn't become a matter of policy. He said in the cases where the employer and the employee came in together and asked for it, it should be only a matter, really, of filing the agreement, and no actual hearing or deliberation need take place in most situations like that. I'm inclined to agree with that.

The only sort of exception is in types of work where the board reserves the right to call expert evidence relating to the possibility of increased hazard because of

the type of work -- say, exposure to a particular environmental health risk. Everybody in the world knows that if you expose a person for more than seven and a half hours at a particular level of inhaling a certain substance, it would be bad. In those cases, whether the employer and employee both agreed to work nine hours on that day, the board would undoubtedly say, well, we can't do that, at least [not] until better facilities for protecting against such a disease occur. There are other ones where actual fatigue is the danger. Although it's not in provincial jurisdiction, I think the familiar example is the rules that relate to airline pilots. Shifts have to be of a certain length and then terminated because of the dangers involved. Those types of things would also be considered by the board in respect to flex-time applications.

MR. TRYNCHY: Mr. Chairman, to the minister. I too would have some concern if we moved from the 5-day, 44-hour week. Some time ago the men in a logging outfit in my constituency sent a petition to me with 60 names. They wanted to work 5 days and 44 hours. Four hours, of course, was overtime. I would hate to see us take that right away from people who really want to work. I think it's a backward step. It's a logging sawmill outfit, and I don't know if the hazard there is any greater than anywhere else. But in my mind if we took that right away, we would be making it pretty tough for these workers. They don't want to come back Saturday morning for 4 hours. It disrupts their weekend, their family life, and all that. I hope you strongly consider leaving that, with some provision to come with employer or what have you, but do not take that right away at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: It is my understanding, Mr. Minister, that the law reform commission is now reviewing the labour act? Is that correct? It is my understanding it was before the commission.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if I wasn't clear in my earlier remarks or if maybe the hon. member has taken note of something that I haven't. The law reform commission moves in mysterious ways and reviews a great deal, and may indeed be reviewing it, but it hadn't come to my attention there was a review there. I did refer to the review that had been done by the Federation of Labour a few minutes ago.

MR. NOTLEY: I know there has been a review done by the Alberta Federation of Labour, and the minister mentioned it in his comments. It's my understanding, Mr. Minister, that they are, in fact, reviewing the labour act, so perhaps it's something you might check. As a matter of fact, this came to my attention last night. I wasn't aware of it either. One of the law professors at the University of Alberta said, well, why is the government going ahead with changes in the labour act when this is before the law reform commission? So I'm

kind of surprised that you aren't aware of it. It may or may not be proceeding, but I was advised by this gentleman it was.

Mr. Chairman, before we leave the flexibility of the committee stage, I'd like the minister to give us his views on the principle of co-determination, and whether he sees any application of that concept in the Province of Alberta.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, one of the nice things about co-determination is that it can be made the subject of quite a number of different interpretations. Anyone who wants to use that word or similar language can envisage in his own mind whatever more or less accords with the meaning of the words. Then that's his vision of what labor relations should probably be. Someone else uses the same language or similar language, and a person is sure they're talking about the same thing. They may be, but they may not be.

Having said that, I thought I should say there are some well-known examples of co-determination, which in the European contexts are generally described by the involvement of members of the work force on the board of directors to a certain percentage level, in some cases as high as 50 per cent, although 30 per cent seems to be a fairly popular figure.

Just dealing with it from that point of view, I think that specific type of proposal has merit, but it may be too rigid for Alberta to contemplate at the present time. The European system developed over a period of years for reasons that are uniquely European. I think we can learn by sensing what concepts might also help us that they have found are helping them. But my hope is that we will be able to find a uniquely Canadian way to achieve some of the same objectives, and I think that's possible.

I'll note now that the federal minister, the hon. Mr. Munro, has structured a tripartite council where the three parties involved are government, management, and labor. It seems to me the smallest group of the three is government, which is an interesting concession -- if my recollection of it is correct -- for the federal minister to have made.

The first reports that have come out are that they're working on some specific problems, and that the feeling about three-party consultation is pretty good. I know Mr. Munro is encouraged by it. It's a credit to the other parties involved. I would think, of course, they would approach it in good faith and with every effort to assist the council in working, and it appears they have.

The sorts of individual items they have been looking at recently include things like common types of data that might be available to parties who are bargaining, so that the parties wouldn't argue as long over whose figures were right as they would argue over what the real merit of the situation was, based on figures that both agreed upon. That by itself might be one thing on a list of very, very many that a council like that could look at.

But what is that achieving? I think

that by itself it's achieving something. But what lies beyond that is the hope, I know, that the three-party type of consultation will lead to something closer to a Canadian version of co-determination. My own belief is that it will be a slow process, despite the enthusiasm that anyone looking at it must have. I'm eager to work with management and labor in Alberta in the direction of that sort of discussion, and I believe that type of discussion will be occurring in the coming months.

MR. NOTLEY: If I may, are any specific steps now being contemplated by the Alberta government, within the jurisdiction of this province, to explore further the applicability of co-determination, or a variation of it, in the Province of Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD: Nothing formal, Mr. Chairman. I think the only sort of formal step I've looked at so far is the possibility of a three-level conference in Alberta to discuss it. I think that will take place, but that would now be into next year. That is only the beginning of some thinking on the subject. I think government policy in this area will continue to develop in that direction, but the pacing of it is the point that . . . I say I have some doubts that it can be all that soon.

MR. YOUNG: I have a question with respect to Section 14, Mr. Minister. Section 14 again seems to be a recasting of a section in the existing act without making much change, although I suspect it's making provision for the requirement of [more] information than is now provided.

Specifically in that connection, last evening I had a phone call from a constituent who expressed his concern to me that at one time he was a member of a union. In the course of recent circumstances, it may happen that he may have to seek membership in the union again. He advised me it will cost him an initiation fee of something in the order of \$200 to join the union, and then something over \$15 a month dues. I am wondering, Mr. Minister, under your existing authority, is the department able to know what initiation, entry, or commencement fees, however they are identified, are required by each union? Because in this case we have a painter who, in order to get his certificate, had to go through the process of being examined by the trades qualification branch. [After] completing the certificate requirements, which is a challenge in itself, now he is faced with a \$200 initiation fee. In his particular case, it would have been \$50 or \$46 less if he hadn't at one time been a member of the union and dropped his membership. Does the department know what unions charge, as a rule, for initiation fees under your existing statute?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, without further consideration, the way I would look at that is: in essence, unions are, if not totally voluntary associations, associations which are under the control of the membership. I think all one can do is

leave it to the membership to resolve things like that. Undoubtedly, the payment of an initiation fee is in most cases . . . There may be some cases where it's invalid or improper for some reason -- if the by-laws weren't done with proper authority, for example -- but in cases where the by-laws are done with proper authority, there is no reason an initiation fee, approved by the majority of members, shouldn't be charged. As I say, that is a reaction on what I think the essence of the matter is.

It may be of interest to have some of the information the hon. member is really asking for in saying, does the department have sufficient data to show what the custom is among unions and whether some may be more fair in that respect than others. There might be glaring examples of ones that are clearly not fair. If that was so, it would be necessary to presume that the membership either wasn't aware of it, or was aware of it and had approved it. So I think, Mr. Chairman, it would not be a high priority for me to single out one sort of thing that might appear in the by-laws of a number of associations which happen to be trade unions. I think there are ways, though, that the department, over a period of time, can probably assist, say, labor and management in updating clauses in collective agreements in cases where, as is so often happening, the same sorts of terms are brought forward with rigid regularity from agreement to agreement. Looking at the question of by-laws, that same sort of situation could well exist. It may be, as I say, not a high-priority matter, but something the labor relations branch might interest itself in would be some guidance in respect to by-laws.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Minister, this is not an issue I really directed much thought to until the call came to me. This morning I did phone the union headquarters. At 11:39 this morning I was told by one of the officers that that indeed was the case, that these were the charges. Now my concern is really this: there are a number of closed-entry professions in the province, and many of them have by-laws which are set out and have to conform to statute. Then certain of their by-laws and adjustments must be approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. I think it's usually a routine processing. Nevertheless, at least information is provided to government, when this happens, about what actually are the terms of entry into the organizations. For instance, I'm pretty sure The Alberta Teachers' Association is one such association which has to provide that information publicly.

I'm concerned that we may have a situation developing whereby if there is, for instance, a shortage of work, or if all the collective agreements, all the opportunity for employment, is subject to the negotiations of one bargaining agent, that bargaining agent can write into the collective agreement with employers that employees must belong to the union. Then it can jack up the entry fee to the union. That's

advantageous to the union and to the existing members, but it's very disadvantageous to society and to some would-be or potential members.

So I'm concerned that we should, perhaps, begin to look at what is happening here. I think we're past the stage when we had to nurture unions in the sense of enabling them to survive. I'm not talking about the relationship they have with employers. That's a whole other question. I'm talking now about the opportunity, if you will, that may be developing for abuse of their privileges. I don't have to recount to the minister or to the members of the Assembly, Mr. Chairman, some of the abuses of union activity which have come to public attention in the last couple of years. It would seem to me we would be well advised to know what is going on, even if it's not generally public knowledge but simply a matter of record in your department. Because it seems to me we have a situation which could lend itself to abuse. While we may talk about the democracy that exists within unions and associations, there is some question that that democracy may be perceived at all times by all potential members and, in fact, all members.

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Chairman, I move Bill 71 be reported.

[Motion carried]

Bill 72
The Alberta Uniform Building
Standards Amendment Act, 1975

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 72 be reported.

[Motion carried]

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Dr. McCrimmon left the Chair.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. MCCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration Bills No. 78, 66, 71, and 72, and begs to report the same. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration Bills No. 67 and 69, begs to report same with some amendments, and begs leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the report and the request for leave to sit again, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, an outline of business in the House tomorrow. We would proceed to third reading of Bill No. 78, The Social Development Amendment Act, 1975 (No. 2), and perhaps a few other third readings; committee study on Bill No. 79, The Legislative Assembly Amendment Act, 1975 (No. 2), and on Bill No. 68, The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1975 (No. 2), and begin committee study on Bill No. 82, The Election Amendment Act, 1975.

I move the Assembly do now adjourn until tomorrow at 10 a.m.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion for adjournment by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

[The House rose at 9:51 p.m.]