

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Thursday, May 26, 1983 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 61  
Appropriation Act, 1983**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 61, the Appropriation Act, 1983. This being a money Bill, his Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this Bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, this is the traditional appropriation Bill and is self-explanatory.

[Leave granted; Bill 61 read a first time]

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I wish to place before the Assembly today amendments to Bill 44, as well as a press release which summarizes the highlights of those amendments. These amendments reflect the conclusion, as planned, of very effective public consultation by means of the hearings before the Standing Committee on Public Affairs of this Assembly.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the response to Motion for a Return No. 154.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. NELSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 28 grades 8 and 9 students from St. Martha school, which is in the large constituency of Calgary McCall. They're here today to see their government in action. These are bright and energetic young people, as are all the students in Calgary McCall. They are accompanied by their teacher Mrs. Holly Clifford, parents Janet Downes and Paulette O'Grady, and their transportation director Ian Atkinson. I'd like to ask if they would rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

MR. PENGELLY: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce 62 elementary students from the Delburne centralized elementary school in the Innisfail constituency. They are accompanied by His Worship the mayor of Delburne and group leader Ray Rekseedler; teachers Betty Brewster and Zena Cowkey; and parents Diana Powell, Jenny Farthing, Marilyn Beck, Dorthy Barrett, Shirley Tobis, and Elvin Penner. Also with them are Mr. and Mrs. Gregory, from England, and the bus drivers

Diane Sullivan and Peter Sorenson. They are seated in both the public and members galleries, and I ask them to rise and receive the warm welcome of the House.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly 12 grade 12 students from Sedgewick. They sent me a letter, dated April 15, for this visit; I received it yesterday. In the meantime, they had contacted me by telephone, and we got them in. They are accompanied by their teacher Volker Meier. They are very interested in politics and how the Legislature functions. I do hope the opposition can ask some good questions today, so they can really see how people can do their jobs in here.

MR. MARTIN: We're waiting for the answers.

MR. LYSONS: They're seated in the public gallery, and I ask them now to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. DROBOT: Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I introduce to you and to members of this Assembly 44 students from the grade 7 class of the Vilna school. Their group leader is Lucia Ash, and she is accompanied by other staff members. I ask that they rise and receive the warm welcome of this Assembly.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Human Rights**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier. It's with respect to the important announcement yesterday by the federal government, with respect to the formation of a parliamentary committee to hold cross-country public hearings on ways to combat racism in this country. In light of the federal initiative, could the Premier indicate to the Assembly whether the province of Alberta would consider the establishment of an all-party legislative committee to undertake complementary work in this province?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no, we would not intend to do that. We think the approach we outlined to the Legislature, I believe on May 12, 1983, is the appropriate approach.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. What directives, if any, will be issued by the Premier to all appropriate ministers to co-operate fully with the federal all-party committee? And will formal representation be made by the government of Alberta to those open hearings?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we would have to assess the terms of reference of the hearing, the timing involved, the manner in which it is established, and give consideration to it at that time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Labour, in charge of the Human Rights Commission. Is the minister in a position today to bring any additional information on the educational program to combat racism in Alberta by the Human Rights Commission?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I can indicate to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that this week I had a meeting with the chairman and director of the Alberta Human Rights Commission, wherein some further development of plans was discussed and some tentative arrangements were made to employ the necessary expertise that we believe may be required. Mr. Speaker, that follows on a meeting which was held about a week ago with the Cultural Heritage Council, and it is in preparation for a meeting of the full commission in the first full week of June.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In the discussions with the chairman of the Human Rights Commission, was there any discussion of whether it would be prudent to include public information on the laws on the statute books at the present time with respect to the distribution of hate literature and the penalties associated with convictions thereto, as part of the public education campaign?

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think it fair to say that the discussions are leaning away from the use of any threats or any coercion of that nature, but rather in the direction of trying to instill respect for all persons, whatever their religion, skin color, ethnic origin, or physical circumstances. I think I can assure the hon. leader that one direction in which there is general unanimity of the parties now in discussion is that we have to go in a positive direction, first of all to communicate the values and esteem that each one of us should have for our fellow man and, through that educational process, hopefully instill respect and tolerance.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. On April 20 I asked a question with respect to some of the documents and publications of a concern called C.H. Douglas Social Credit Supplies. The minister indicated at that time:

... we would look at the record or transcript to see whether, in that particular situation, there is any need to give consideration to concerns about section 281 of the Criminal Code.

Has the department had an opportunity to investigate some of the tracts distributed by this concern, to see whether there is in fact a violation of appropriate legislation on the distribution of hate literature?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was probably speaking of two things earlier. One was the transcript of the board of review case involving Mr. Keegstra. When I used the word "transcript", it was that that we were examining. There has been no conclusion reached as a result of that process.

In respect of the publication of certain "tracts", I believe the hon. leader said — although it sounded much like a similar word, which may also be appropriate in some respects — we discovered that a lot of what was said to be available, in the sense of the list the hon. leader presented in the Assembly one day, was really just a listing of things that possibly could be available, given some trouble in getting them. In other words, they're not available for distribution in Alberta at the present time, and that is of course a very important factor.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the government made any overall decision with respect to section 281(6) of the Criminal

Code, which deals with the distribution of hate literature? Subsection (6) says:

No proceeding for an offence under subsection (2) shall be instituted without the consent of the Attorney General.

Has the government made any policy decision, in view of the widespread concern over racism in this country, and particularly in this province? Has the government given any consideration to making it clear that the Attorney General would give authorization to any reasonable effort to prosecute by police departments or appropriate authorities?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that if a case could be made out that was appropriate in the circumstances and evidence was available, it would be proceeded with.

#### Health Ministers' Meeting

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, who I gather is meeting later today with his federal counterpart, the federal Minister of National Health and Welfare. Could the minister advise the Assembly when the meeting is scheduled and what is on the agenda?

MR. RUSSELL: The meeting presently is scheduled for six o'clock. I say "presently" because that's the fourth time that's been agreed upon today. There is no structured agenda.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the meeting at the request of the federal minister or at the request of the provincial minister?

MR. RUSSELL: The federal minister, Mr. Speaker. At the time of the introduction of our user fee concept, I had also offered to meet with her, so really it's a meeting we've both wanted to have.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Then would it be a correct assessment, reading reports, that one of the items on the agenda will be the concerns of the federal minister with respect to the application of user fees as it relates to the Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act, as well as Bill 38, as it relates to section 4 of the Medical Care Act?

MR. RUSSELL: As I said, Mr. Speaker, there's no structured agenda. I've indicated to Madam Bégin that I'm willing to discuss any item she wishes to bring up.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of statements attributed to the federal minister, is it the minister's intention to have present the legal advice which apparently has led the government of Alberta to the conclusion that both user fees and Bill 38 are not in violation of federal/provincial agreements?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the only persons who will be present at the meeting, besides ourselves, will be two executive assistants. I believe the federal minister is also bringing a press secretary with her. Insofar as advice, I assume we'll each have our own advice in our heads.

### Consumers' Association Recommendations

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. It's with regard to some recommendations by the Consumers' Association of Canada. One of the recommendations is with regard to bringing into the Assembly legislation relative to class actions. I wonder if the minister is considering changes in legislation relative to that in this Legislature or the fall Legislature.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the matter of class action has in fact been raised in about three instances, in terms of letters to my office. I have asked the Attorney General's Department if, in due course, they could do a review of that particular type of legislation. I understand the matter was raised with the federal Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and his response was something to the effect that possibly the provinces might also consider that. But I do not have an answer from the federal minister as to whether they are willing to proceed with that type of legislation.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Transportation. The association also recommends that infants and children being transported in an automobile be restrained by an approved restraint system; in other words, a seat belt system. I wonder if the minister has considered that recommendation and made any response in terms of their request.

MR. M. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the province of Alberta is a leader in child restraint systems for the front seats of automobiles. I believe we have been active for about three years now with a group, centred in Calgary, of volunteer citizens who are working to develop a more effective restraint system than presently exists and to encourage parents throughout our province to utilize that system. Most recently, I was pleased to provide that organization with a very substantial grant to further their work for the 1982-83 fiscal year, and in fact our budget has provisions to assist them again in the new fiscal year. We're hopeful that as a result of that volunteer work and work which has been undertaken by the safety branch of the Department of Transportation, the Alberta Safety Council, the Alberta Motor Association, and others, we will have in place a very effective system of child restraint programs, in terms of what's available to the general public to buy and also an education program. In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I — and I think all members of the Assembly — heartily endorse that kind of voluntary action.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, then the hon. Premier and the hon. Minister of Economic Development would like to deal further with some previous question period topics.

### Young Offender Program

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Solicitor General. It's with reference to young offenders. Will the Solicitor General advise what discussions were held with the Department of Social Services and Community Health prior to the assignment to the Solicitor General of responsibility to provide custody, supervision, and rehabilitation programs for young offenders?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, there were extensive discussions between myself and the Minister of Social Services and Community Health.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the Minister of Social Services and Community Health indicate his willingness to maintain responsibility for the juvenile probation program?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. If the hon. member would kindly refer to *Beauchesne*, he would find that intracabinet communications are not a subject for the question period, nor are communications between a minister and a member.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact that by arrangement with the Department of Social Services and Community Health, the cities of Edmonton and Calgary provide comprehensive rehabilitation services which dovetail to meet the needs of those under the juvenile probation program, will the Solicitor General propose that the Department of Social Services and Community Health be reassigned responsibility for the supervision and rehabilitation of young offenders who do not specifically fall under the Criminal Code of Canada?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I assume the member may be referring to the alternative measures referred to in the young offender program. That aspect of the federal legislation is in an evolutionary process at the present time. I think it would be premature to indicate what is either anticipated or can be expected, before there are extensive discussions between the federal government and the provinces on what is intended by that provision.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'd ask the minister what the government expected to accomplish by not reassigning this responsibility to Social Services and Community Health. There must have been a rationale for this.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I believe the ministerial statement I made on the subject matter indicated that there were discussions between the officials of the two departments to determine what facilities would be required for the young offender program and what facilities would become part of the Solicitor General's Department.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. We've gone through the Act and we're not clear about it, so I'll ask this question: will the Solicitor General at least assure this House that he will replace the current system with one which is equally comprehensive in its approach in dealing with rehabilitation of young offenders?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, the whole intention of the young offender program has been to have a much improved system, and it will be our intention to carry out that general objective.

MR. MARTIN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise the Assembly if any discussions have been held with the John Howard Society about the Young Offenders Act?

MR. HARLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there have been.

#### AOC Loan

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, May 24, I was asked a question by the Leader of the Opposition, to

advise whether any member of the Premier's staff, other than Mr. Dutton, held meetings with officials of Ram Steel during 1982.

I've had this canvassed with my staff and, to the best of their knowledge, no meetings were held with officials of Ram Steel on the matter of Ram Steel during the period raised in the question.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, if I may. The Premier indicated he met with Mr. Foster in July 1982. Could the Premier advise the Assembly if there were any initial meetings between Ram proponents and Mr. Foster during the cabinet tour of Red Deer on October 6 and 7, 1980?

MR. SPEAKER: It's true that the time frame of the question is much shorter than that in the previous one. But I'm still of the opinion that a question of that particularity with regard to a matter that happened that long ago should in all fairness be put on the Order Paper, so the necessary inquiries can be made and we don't have to deal with the thing in the House twice.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, that would normally be true, if we had the information on the Order Paper filed very quickly. But perhaps I could put it in a little more general way, then, and ask the hon. Premier whether or not, in canvassing his recollections, the Premier recalls meeting with any officials of Ram Steel or Mr. Foster prior to the July meeting.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I have the import of that question, having regard to the answers I raised. Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition could be more specific on the time frame. If I can answer, I will; otherwise I'd suggest it be on the Order Paper.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would love to be more specific — as a matter of fact, the October 6 and 7, 1980, cabinet tour of Red Deer. But bearing in mind your stricture and the Premier's request for a more specific question, I leave the matter with the Premier to canvass his memory and perhaps report back.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to canvass on that basis. I've now already answered three questions on which I've canvassed my staff. If there's a fourth one, I'd welcome it on the Order Paper.

#### Economic Development Appointment

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, on May 13 the Leader of the Opposition and I had an exchange about Mr. McMillan's activities in the Department of Economic Development. During that exchange, the Leader of the Opposition suggested that perhaps we had given some consideration to making Mr. McMillan the executive director of industry development. Following along on the idea the Leader of the Opposition gave me that day, I'm happy to announce that in fact on July 1, he will be.

MR. NOTLEY: Well, isn't that interesting. Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the minister advise whether or not this particular gentleman went through the competition process, in view of the fact that that process had narrowed down some finalists before Mr. McMillan was appointed to another position?

MR. PLANCHE: No, Mr. Speaker, we didn't. We were counting on Mr. McMillan continuing his distinguished-activity history. When he joined the Conservative Party, he came from the private sector. In a very short number of years, his batting average was 75 out of 79.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, no one is questioning his ability in politics. I didn't think we were making him the grand marshal for the next campaign in this province. My question is: bearing in mind the strictures in the Public Service Act, was this decision made keeping the present Act in mind or on the assumption that the Legislature would pass the amendments which loosen the requirements for competition?

MR. PLANCHE: No competition was held in terms of this appointment, Mr. Speaker. It will be a contract appointment for a period of time.

### ORDERS OF THE DAY

#### head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

177. Mr. Lee asked the government the following question:
- (a) What consideration has been given to the implementation of passing lanes on primary highways in Alberta?
  - (b) What studies have been conducted for the purpose of determining the potential costs and safety benefits of implementing passing lanes on primary highways?

MR. M. MOORE: We'll accept the question, Mr. Speaker.

#### head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

174. Mr. R. Speaker moved that an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:
- (1) The number of referrals made to Alberta mental health clinics by each of the other branches in the Department of Social Services and Community Health in the 1981-82 fiscal year;
  - (2) The amount of money spent by each branch of the Department of Social Services and Community Health for client counselling by private practitioners, including psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, and any other professional offering a counselling service;
  - (3) The number of mental health workers employed in the regional clinics of the mental health services division.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, I understand there are amendments, which I accept.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I've discussed the rewording of the proposed motion with the Member for Little

Bow. I'm prepared to recommend acceptance of the motion, but amended to read as follows:

- (1) The number of referrals made to Alberta mental health services from all sources in 1981-82, and in particular the referrals made by the child welfare and services for the handicapped branches in the Department of Social Services and Community Health.
- (2) The amount of money spent in the fiscal year 1981-82 by offices of the child welfare and services for the handicapped branches, for client assessment and counselling services obtained from private practitioners, including psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, and any other professional offering such services.
- (3) The number of permanent positions, including mental health therapist positions, in the regional clinics of the mental health services division in the 1981-82 fiscal year.

MR. SPEAKER: Just for clarification, might I ask the hon. minister whether the expression "to Alberta mental health clinics" occurs in the revised text?

DR. WEBBER: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: May I then respectfully draw the attention of the hon. minister to there being no one to whom those referrals refer.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, in the first part, I indicate "the number of referrals made to Alberta mental health services from all sources".

[Motion as amended carried]

#### head: MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

207. Moved by Mr. Notley:

Be it resolved that the Assembly approves of and endorses the principles enunciated in the document tabled in the Assembly on March 11, 1983, entitled Ethical Reflections on the Economic Crisis.

[Adjourned debate March 24: Mr. Oman]

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, I approach this with some trepidation. It's a subject that I approach with some willingness, because it's current and there needs to be discussion on it. At the same time, the answers are not simplistic. I therefore want to be careful about how I approach it. It's been said that one should never enter into discussions on either religion or politics, and here we're combining the two. I feel a little bit like the old beatitude: blessed is he who sitteth on a hornet's nest, for he shall rise a gain. [laughter] I suspect if I come down, it may be to go up.

When one has the opportunity to speak before a group, you are usually introduced with some background and flowery words. Because everybody knows better in this House, Mr. Speaker, I guess that's not done. Nevertheless, I look at my own background in relation to this. I'll spend a couple of moments on it, because I think it's relevant. I've been in the labor force, primarily in the construction industry. I know what it is do put in that kind of labor; I put myself through university and school in the construction business. I have spent my time in the theological field, having a master's degree and being or-

ained in the ministry, also having spent 17 years active in the ministry. I've also been in business for a good number of years in a couple of fields — still am. Furthermore, I've been on the political scene for longer than I care to think at this point. For that reason, I have an interest in what is being said here and approach it with a great deal of keen interest.

There have been those who have criticized the bishops, saying that they really had no business to get into the area of commenting on social issues; let them be left to the matter of saving souls, and let the economists and politicians take care of the concerns expressed. I disagree with that most strongly. First of all, I guess you'd have to say that perhaps it's the economists and politicians who got us into this mess, so I don't think they're completely the experts. Maybe other things need to be said.

Furthermore, in my own experience in the church, I have to say that if the church is going to fulfill its mandate, it must make comment on social issues. In the Old and the New Testaments of Holy Writ, you find that the minor and major prophets make social issues a major concern in many of the things they address. They talk about the fatherless, widows, and the poor, and the rich oppressing the poor. So it's certainly there, and it's a timely topic. I would say that the bishops have done our society a service in bring forth this paper on some of the reflections of our current condition. I'm glad they did it. I hope it will spawn a dialogue between the various segments of our society, because unemployment and poverty, if you will, are issues which face a relatively large section of our society.

The Holy Writ says that the poor you have always with you. But sometimes it becomes more prominent than others. There are people in the cities of Calgary and Edmonton and in our smaller centres who are poor: single-parent families, people who are now unemployed, and children who don't know what it is to have a flight on an airplane, to go camping in the summer, or to have steaks. Some of us would like to insulate ourselves from these facts, but they're true and they're true in Alberta. We ought to be concerned about those who are on the lower rungs of the ladder in our society.

I really believe the bishops were right when they called this a moral dilemma and a moral issue, and they should have said what they said. As far as raising the issue is concerned, I think they were right and they should have raised it. If they had not, I don't think they would have been doing their duty as good Christian leaders in our country. I mean that sincerely. In the last part of my discourse, I'm nevertheless going to be somewhat critical of the content. But I want to say at the outset that as far as the church getting involved, if the church is of no worldly relevance, then I think it has perhaps lost its mission. I do have some question and a little bit of uneasiness when the church officially becomes a lobby, however, because the church is of course not infallible and sometimes they take positions that are wrong.

I'm reminded a little of the Calgary tourist who was visiting the Grand Canyon. He must have been from Calgary, because he had a movie camera, a still camera, a set of binoculars, and other paraphernalia which indicate he must have at least been from Alberta, if not from Calgary. In the process of examining the Grand Canyon from the top, I guess he wanted to take a picture, leaned a little too far, and all of a sudden found himself tumbling over the edge. By some great miracle, he was able to grasp a limb of a tree just 10 or 15 feet below the ledge and was hanging there, over thousands of feet of

emptiness. As he hung there, he cried: is there anybody up there that can help me? He waited, and nothing happened. He cried again, can somebody save me? Then suddenly the voice came booming out, I can save you. He said, who are you? He said, I am the Lord. He said, will you save me? He said, yes I will. How? He said, you've got to have faith and trust me. What shall I do? Let go. There were some agonizing moments of silence. Finally, is there anyone else up there? [laughter]

Mr. Speaker, the point of that is that if the advice is not too good, you might sometimes tend to look elsewhere. That's why I want to get into what I think is basically a good step that maybe has some faults to it. I believe the same basic group of bishops some years ago made some rather strong criticism and observations of the process in establishing the Mackenzie Valley pipeline route. I have a good friend in Calgary whom many of you know, Dr. Louis Lebel, who has been involved in the energy business for many years. He's an active Catholic layman and highly respected. I think he got in contact with the bishops and said: look, there's another side to this; you must realize that here are some facts you haven't taken into consideration.

Perhaps this will be the eventual resolution, that the so-called religious professionals — I use that word somewhat loosely — would do well to take their laymen who are knowledgeable in the field and put them to use, because I think that's the way the church should work. We are called to be salt in the world and in the earth. What is happening from the pulpit to the pew then ought to be translated from the pew to society. For that reason, I think the bishops might have done better if they had used some their economists and so on in the church to reflect with them. But that is ultimately what they are saying they hope will happen, that discussions will take place in all the parishes across the country. Out of that we hope will come a consensus of some way in which we can move.

I might say that I think the problem with unemployment — and it's not entirely new, but it's serious when 15 million people in Canada who are not employed today. It's serious because most of us find fulfilment in what we do. I want to say something about that, because I think the bishops make some critical comments about social support systems and so on. I have to say that I think our society unquestionably provides one of the best in the world, maybe too much so. But that's not enough, because a man's fulfilment, as I said — his work is an extension of himself, and he is so tied to it. If he cannot feel that he is accomplishing anything in life, he asks: what am I doing here? I look around this room sometimes and ask the same thing. Nevertheless, we see some results when it comes to the end of the session.

It's important that a man has something constructive to do. At the same time, at this point when 15 million people really don't have anything to do, it's important that our society gives them the support that's necessary. I think it's true that at this moment the weak are being supported by the strong, recognizing that at some time the tables may well be turned. But I can think of no society that looks at people who are in need more than our society today, where there's a good deal of care. We ought to be thankful that we live in a place where free enterprise has some sense of compassion. If we compared our society with other societies, we'd be a little thankful about the level of our poverty, because the poverty line in Canada and in the western countries tends to be the luxury line in most other systems in the world.

[Mr. Purdy in the Chair]

Free enterprise gives more benefits to more people than any other system. Of course, if we give too many benefits, we breed a sense of dependency, where we get too comfortable. The initiative to work and to produce tends to drift away. I think you will find that in a free enterprise society, which we are part of, the benefits really are greater to the poor than they are to the rich. For if you look back a century or two or three ago, the rich had pretty well everything. They had their silks. They didn't have dishwashers, in one sense, but they had people who would wash the dishes for them. They had their chauffeurs. They had their means of transportation. The poor didn't have those. What has happened today is that our society, with its industrial, free-enterprise base, has lifted up the lower class to enjoy such things as automobiles, houses, televisions, and communication systems. So in that sense, our society has provided a great deal of support to those who might be called the poor.

I was skiing at Lake Louise, I guess a year ago, and a couple of university students were having a great discussion at a table next to us at the lodge. One fellow was holding great about socialist doctrine and how it would solve the problems. I listened with great intensity — not saying that there's no basis there — but I couldn't help but break in. I said: you know, it's true that there are some inequities in the capitalist, free-enterprise system. The great cry is that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer, so we ought to share. But what results — and what the socialist philosophy really is — is that it makes everybody equally poor. This is the way it really tends to end up. On the other hand, free enterprise gives everybody equal opportunity and provides the incentive for some achievement. The purpose of government in the kind of society in which we live today is to protect the system from injustice, so the weak are not unduly taken advantage of.

As I look at some of the solutions proposed by the bishops' paper, I tend to feel they are a little too simplistic. Again mindful of the fact that the motives may be right, I am not sure that the end is there. They talk about the matter of the priority of labor over capital. Now that's a nice-sounding phrase, but is it a legitimate phrase? Whose labor are we talking about? Are we talking about the laborer who earns a weekly wage? What about the labor of the man who is managing and who has perhaps saved up his capital? Capital does not have any rights in itself; it has rights as it is associated with a person. Capital really is labor's reward, which has been saved, invested, and risked, if you will, in order to provide job opportunities for the owner and others he employs. So I think it's a simplistic statement to say that you've set labor over capital.

The other thing I think we have to recognize is that the poor that are affected by the current recession are not just from the "laboring class". In 1981 there were 23,036 bankruptcies of either a personal or business nature in Canada. In 1982 there were 30,367 bankruptcies in Canada, which means that all classes are being affected. Some very, very wealthy people have seen dreams go down the drain. So it's not just the so-called one class that's being exploited or hurt in our current situation.

The other thing that I think must be recognized is that in our competitive world, it's not just between labor and management. The so-called investors, companies, or capitalists are in deadly combat with each other for the production of goods and services. I don't think we can do

away with that competition, because it provides cheaper products and services to all, thus enabling the poor man more than the rich, who could probably afford these goods and services in any case.

The bishops indicate that our emphasis should be on reducing unemployment rather than inflation. Great. Again, it sounds good. I think we'd like to see both of them reduced. But if you look at the situation rather carefully, I think you'll find that the real cause of unemployment is, basically, inflation. Because of inflation, for instance, and high interest rates, you have companies pulling back and saying, we can't afford to build new plants; furthermore, if we do — with increased interest rates, salaries, and so on — we cannot sell our goods, because they are not competitive with what's happening in other parts of the world. So it's extremely important that we get at the problem of inflation in order to produce goods that are competitive.

The real cause of unemployment probably is inflation. You can cure unemployment on a temporary basis by inflationary policies, I suppose — pumping more money into the economy. But it's like a drug fix. It temporarily cures the addict from some of the symptoms, but it ultimately ruins him. That's exactly the way in which inflation . . . In order to be free, the drug addict has to stop and get off the wagon. It's painful and difficult for a period of time. But ultimately, he becomes a free, productive man again. Furthermore, the rich can stand inflation much better than the poor, because they have the opportunity to invest in such things as real estate, gold, art objects, or whatever, which tend to maintain their relative value. The poor don't have that opportunity. So really, in the long run, inflation hurts the poor more than it does the rich.

There has been talk about the matter of emphasis on labor-intensive rather than high-technology industries. Again, perhaps it sounds good. I suppose the ultimate thing about that is that if you want to be labor intensive out here on the prairies, then do away with your roads and trucks. Instead of bringing your grain to the elevator by truck, have every man put a sack of grain on his shoulder and walk it to the elevator or, for that matter, ultimately to the west coast. That would put a lot of people to work, but we wouldn't be very competitive. The point is that we as a nation don't live in isolation from the rest of the world. We compete and produce competitively or we die. I think it's as simple as that. The rest of the world is going into high technology. Robotics: look what's happening with the automotive industry. Why is Japan able to do that? Because they have a producing labor force and because they have automated to the point where they don't need as much labor per product.

We've gone through this before, by the way, Mr. Speaker. There have been all kinds of changes. We went from the horse and buggy to the automobile. That put people out of work: the blacksmiths who, when I was a boy, were shoeing horses; those who were producing bridles, harnesses, and so on. They're not operating anymore. But there arose a new industry, the automotive industry, which I suppose employed literally millions of people. Every time there's been a change, yes, there's been some pain in that change. Nobody likes to see it. But ultimately, it itself spawns industries which employ other areas and technologies.

I think the challenge is to prepare people for change. I suppose if there's a challenge that really faces government, industry, and labor today, it's to get together and see if you can't prepare people for the rapid, accelerated

changes that are taking place in our society today. It doesn't really make sense that we close our borders, seal ourselves off, and say we can ignore the rest of the world. We can't do it. If we do, ultimately our employment situation will be worse than it is today.

Nevertheless, if the end result can be that there is a better relationship and interaction in society between what I call the big three — business, labor, and government — perhaps we will have achieved something that will solve some of our problems. I suppose the basic problem in society — and you can't point the finger at any one group — is greed, when it comes right down to it. Give us all we can, at the expense of the other group. It isn't isolated to one group. Business is saying: hey, let's get as much as we possibly can from the laborer for as little pay as possible. At times, labor seems to be saying: do as little as you can and get as much pay as you can. Everybody living for themselves. I think we need the sense of co-operation and belonging together, the family spirit, if you will, that seems to characterize the Japanese industrial scene, where a worker feels he's kind of part of the family. If he succeeds and the business succeeds, everybody succeeds and everybody profits. We're all people, whether we're in government, management, or labor. Respect for the person is what we need.

Not very long ago I was at a banquet in Calgary of a very, very successful small business in my constituency called Wemas industries. They were celebrating 25 years. They grew from nothing: a little shop, I think, in the back lane. Today they're recognized in Calgary as producing one of the best products in steel fabrication that exists in the province, if not in Canada. I sensed something there which I don't very often sense. They invited all their workers to the banquet. They do that every year. But this was a special occasion. They honored the workers who had been with them. There were those who had been there 22 out of the 25 years. Some had been there 20 years, some 17, and some 15. It was amazing, the loyalty that was felt, the sense of team unity and spirit.

I particularly recall that one employee, who had been there for some 17 years, had been injured, almost killed, in an industrial accident. They didn't let him go. He had to recuperate for eight or 10 months. He's still recuperating. But they've taken him back and put him on a job which he can handle for the moment, while he's still recuperating. They swore right there that they would never let this fellow go. He had served the company; they would serve him. I think that kind of mutual admiration and co-operation is what we need more of — the sense of caring, both by the management and the worker.

Mr. Speaker, we face a challenge. I think if there is the will to do it, and given the need, we can put our minds to it and solve our problems today. If the result — and I've been critical as well as praiseworthy of some of the things the bishops have said — is that all segments of our society can come together to solve the problem, then the bishops' paper was worth while. And this is what I hope to see.

Thank you very much.

MR. ZIP: Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk on Motion 207. Personally, I find no quarrel with the bishops and our opposition leader with respect to poverty and unemployment. In my time, I have been both. I personally feel a deep sympathy for both the poor and the unemployed. My life has probably been very similar to that of the previous speaker, the Member for Calgary North Hill. I have had to struggle in life, work my way through univer-

sity, and work my way up since I came to Calgary 26 years ago. Simply through diligence and hard work, today I'm not what you call a poor person.

Nevertheless, I doubt very much if any responsible individual lacks concern on these subjects. Just out of curiosity — I notice none of the opposition members are here — I wish to ask those in this Legislature who are in favor of poverty and unemployment to please stand up.

Mr. Speaker, the quarrel is with the method taken to solve the problem. Two basic errors are made by the Christian churches. One is simply closing one's eyes to what is going on in the world and sticking strictly to the performance of Christian service and teachings; let the world go by. The second error — and I believe this is a very serious one — is to become so absorbed and involved in world affairs as churchmen and as preachers of the gospel that they miss their real mission and purpose entirely. As a result, we have witnessed grave declines in Christian teachings today. All we have to do is look at the report of Dr. Bibby from Lethbridge, and his findings on the status of the faith in our own province, or at the results that came forth from the 1981 census, put out by StatCan, on the status of Christian following across this country. Surely something is wrong. If these teachings were applied by followers and seriously preached by our churchmen, it would greatly help to solve the problems alluded to by the report of the bishops.

I find it interesting enough — and it probably deflects from the seriousness of the report — that it was endorsed by just eight bishops. It does not appear to have mass support since there has been considerable negative reaction to the report by all types of Christians, both Catholic and non-Catholic.

Their response is typical of ivory-tower social activists who assume that somehow simply by intervening and increasing the size of the dole and increasing charitable assistance, problems of poverty will go away. They ignored the basic question as to whether the assistance is really good for the recipients. We have merely to look at what was done to our native people in this country to get this point. Cripples were made out of once resourceful people. On the contrary, the people who originally settled the west were told to get to work and either sink or swim. The result is what we see today in Alberta: a land of milk and honey which became that not by government programs but through the hard work and initiative of hundreds of thousands of people who came to this jewel of the Dominion and made it what it is today. Stop for just one minute and think that 100 years ago this was a wilderness. We talk about diversification of our economy. We get criticized about the west not being diversified. Look how diversified we have become in such a short period of time. It was done through hard work.

The problem of unemployment and poverty really has to be met by increasing opportunities to work, improving work attitudes, and improving skills. It is not just a simple matter of putting away the robots, as the report suggested. These automatic welders and other technically advanced machines have freed people from so many generally undesirable jobs, that are not only tedious but unhealthy, dangerous, and of low productivity. In Alberta, for example, we don't want to abandon our combines and go back to sickles and scythes just to make more low-productive jobs that will bring down people's standard of living.

The report strongly suggests intervention, controls, and higher taxes, which in turn kill initiatives to invest and create the jobs that this report is so concerned about. One

of our basic problems today is that over the past 20 years, intervention, income redistribution, and heavy taxation have, in a major way, placed our economy in the straits the report is so concerned about. In advocating community ownership and control of industries, the report totally ignores the importance of entrepreneurial talent in bringing about increased production and improved productivity. It's not just a question of labor contributing to the wealth of a country. That's the Marxist hang-up that seems to get accepted without much analysis. If you don't have the organizing skills of the entrepreneur, who organizes the labor, and the savings of the person called the capitalist — he is the saver, not the capitalist — who provides the money for the machines necessary to create more production, labor is not worth very much.

The recent history of countries without proper management skills has been combined with extensive capital investments to produce the very opposite effect to that suggested by the report. In the summary, the report basically ignores the truth that many people are poor because of their own negligence, lack of training and even desire for training, poor discipline, lack of morality, and lack of initiative. We have to realize that there are people who do not want to be helped. By taking away from the industrious, hence killing their incentive to produce, we run the serious risk of not having anything to dole out to those who do not have. We all come down to the low common denominator of poverty found today in so many countries where the solution suggested by the bishops' report was followed. By ignoring supply-side economics, they killed the goose that lays the golden eggs. Regardless of what Marxists have to say, Mr. Speaker, supply-side economics is important. It does two things: it produces the goods that the economy needs, and it also produces the income to buy the goods. Money does not grow on trees, and without money you can't buy anything.

In closing, I would like to comment on another problem which is really very closely related to what the bishops are so concerned about. Contemporary mankind seems to share — and it's a common failing, I guess, — a lack of appreciation of history. We live in a one-day world created by our media, our newspapers, our instant reports on CBC's *The Journal*. We have instant problems. One day it's one thing, and the next day it's something else. This lack of appreciation for the dimension of time is forcing us more than ever today to ignore the lessons of history. If we simply followed the lessons of history, we would realize that over the last 60-some years socialist policies have failed to work. Government involvement in the market place introduces rigidity and inflexibility to our economy that is not only counterproductive but is difficult to change.

All we in western Canada have to do today is look at what a problem the Crow situation is. We all want to change it. But damn it, it's very hard to change.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, shame.

MR. ZIP: Let's face it. It's comfortable for some people to maintain the status quo. If we had had a market rate for grain, we would have had a more efficient grain handling system. We wouldn't have had these antiquated elevators in the country; we would have modern inland terminals. We would have been competitive with the United States today in marketing grain. This is the rigidity that socialism and government intervention brings to an economy. It is an albatross around the necks of the

people who are under it. We don't need those albatrosses.  
Thank you very much.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, it's with pleasure that I rise to speak with respect to this motion. I think it would be well for us to read the motion again so that I can keep my own focus in my remarks with respect to the motion moved by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Be it resolved that the Assembly approves of and endorses the principles enunciated in the document tabled in the Assembly on March 11, 1983, entitled Ethical Reflections on the Economic Crisis.

I have some difficulty with the wording of the motion because, number one, it's very difficult for the Assembly to approve and endorse a document which was not prepared by itself. In actual fact, before that could take place, considerable fine-tuning and research would have to be done with respect to the document. As other members have noted in the course of the debate, the document is not really meant to be a definitive statement, the last word with respect to the issue, on behalf of the Canadian Conference of Roman Catholic Bishops.

The motion also refers to the principles enunciated in the document. I think careful reading of the document makes it a bit difficult to give absolute definition as to what the exact principles are. The way it's worded, the motion presents a great deal of difficulty for me as a member of the Assembly. If one were to carry on with respect to the motion, one of course would indeed have to engage in some ongoing dialogue of a very definitive nature with respect to the Canadian conference of bishops.

For a few moments, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take us through an interesting time line because this has great relevance. The document entitled Ethical Reflections on the Economic Crisis was put out to public release on January 5, 1983. I noticed an advertisement in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* that has this headline: "Church-labor links promote recovery". It is written by Grace Hartman who is the national president of the Canadian Union of Public Employees. She refers to this whole document before us. She said that there was a meeting on January 27 between the Catholic bishops and

clerics from other religious denominations, a dozen or more eminent economists, and representatives of welfare and anti-poverty groups.

This group was convened at the behest of the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

If hon. members would bear with me for a moment while I go through a few other things that happened here in this time line — it makes me just a bit concerned about, I suppose, the political naivete of the Canadian conference of bishops, those who were involved with respect to the preparation of the document. The next thing in the time sequence is another quote from the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of Wednesday, January 12, 1983. Here we have an interesting coalition, if you will, of the archbishop of the Anglican Church of Canada, the Most Reverend Ted Scott, together with the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Toronto, Emmett Cardinal Carter — no relation. Both of these clerics responded to the initial report. While they didn't disagree with the principle that the church should be speaking out on these issues, they did add these cautions. Archbishop Scott made this quote:

... the public could misread the bishops' statement as endorsing labor against management and communism against capitalism.

So the archbishop was pointing out that due care needs to be taken with the precise wording within the original document. Again Cardinal Carter made the following quote: "... getting into the details of economic policy is, in my opinion, risky."

That was January 12. We then have this advertisement which appeared on March 3 in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, paid for by the Canadian Union of Public Employees. There Grace Hartman regards the meeting as having been an historic meeting to set the stage for the formation of a "social movement" of church, labor, and other progressive forces.

We need to pause there for half a moment because my concern is that it seems other representatives from industry or from the three levels of political government were not invited to attend. That, I think, comes back to the comment I made earlier. Due care, consideration, and caution should be given by all religious denominations in terms of who they are involved with in the dialogue. It is simply not good enough to pick up with, say, the labor movement in terms of their dialogue with respect to the economic matter. It is very important that they be in dialogue, but it is also incumbent upon church leaders that they be in dialogue with the total community, not just one aspect of it.

I agree with the earlier comments made by the Member for Calgary North Hill, that the church should be involved in politics and political discussion. If he and I did not believe that, neither of us would be in the Assembly today. But it is incumbent upon persons who have a religious faith that if they are going to be involved in political discussion, they must do their homework, they must be engaged in true dialogue. Having served at the executive level of the Anglican Church of Canada for something in the order of 12 years, it has been my experience in the Anglican Church, as well as with regard to my knowledge of the United Church of Canada and, to some degree, the Roman Catholic Church of Canada, that all too often our national offices have allowed themselves to fall into the hands, if you will, of some pretty slipshod research. All too often, in some of the echelons of national staff offices, we have had some researchers and other personnel who have been only too willing to grind their particular political axe — often with respect to the NDP — and to try to push those kinds of partisan politics into the arena of the national stance of a national denomination. I don't know if that was, to some degree, part of the background in the preparation of the paper Ethical Reflections on the Economic Crisis.

To return to the time line, it seems that on March 22, 1983 — again quoting from the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, with the geographic date line of Ottawa — the Roman Catholic bishops had a follow-up to their previous paper, issued on January 5 and then went into a two-day conference in Ottawa so they might discuss the general public uproar and reaction to the issuance of their original paper. There were eight representatives of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops. According to press reports, as they went into that discussion, at least two, if not three, of their membership were at some odds with the majority who were entrusted to do the preparation of the paper. So it is that even within the church, as in any other aspect of society, there are differences of opinion and opportunities for dialogue and discussion. The church is not always in a position to be regarded as "monolithic".

I am pleased that within the Roman Catholic House of Bishops in this country there is a diversity of opinion as

to how they might go forward in discussion of the Ethical Reflections on the Economic Crisis. So it was, in my last aspect of the time line, that two days later, on March 24, there was another statement out of Ottawa on behalf of the 10 million Roman Catholics in Canada. The conference of bishops was asking them to co-operate, and listen to the words: "with organized labor in building a grass-roots movement 'for economic justice' ". That's only one aspect of the dialogue. I see that later on the statement was enlarged, so that they were to deal with local labor groups and community organizations — but for another very laudable and commendable purpose — in setting up centres to assist unemployed people in their struggles for justice.

Mr. Speaker, to underline my previous comment, I have a concern that while it is appropriate for churches to make statements such as the one made by the conference of bishops on January 5, it is incumbent upon them to do even better research and homework before they make the statement. It is also incumbent upon them to engage in dialogue with all participants to the discussion, and not simply, as in this case, to seem to be singling out those who are involved with labor.

The document has in its title "ethical reflections", rather than "theological reflections". I'm interested that the word *theos* for theology, means "word of God". I've commented earlier in my remarks that in terms of God's creation, every single aspect comes within the purview of what the word "religion" embraces. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate for any believer to discuss any matter whatsoever, including anything that supposedly is put into the political realm. But again I am concerned that in the footnoting to the document, two of the references are scriptural, seven refer to Roman Catholic documents issued under Pope John Paul, but 20 of the references are to secular sources. The difficulty with the sources in the footnoting is: where does one go to gain access, to see who really did publish that particular document, and what did it say in the total context? That refers back to my concern that there needs to be even better researching done by national religious bodies before they make their statements.

One of the scriptural references is from the gospel according to St. Luke, the fourth chapter, verses 16 to 17. In there, the point of flight is from the section which refers to preaching the gospel to the poor. When you give a hermeneutical interpretation of what that really means, yes, the phrase can mean to the poor economically. But what the phrase really means in its fullness is to people who are also poor in spirit. No matter how much money I may have, I can be terribly poor in terms of my spiritual condition. The reference to the scriptural notation here is partially correct but not totally.

I agree in terms of the thrust of the document with respect to having dialogue. Given the kind of profile the document has received throughout the country, I hope that Roman Catholic parishes throughout Canada are now engaged in some study mechanism; that they are reaching out to other denominations; that they are also reaching out to members in the ranks of the employed, members in the labor movement, persons who are unemployed, and small business men, as well as those involved in larger industries; and, yes, even reaching out to political persons at the municipal, provincial, and federal levels, so that together there might be that much broader range of what the dialogue is about in terms of this whole topic.

One of the difficulties which often surfaces when the

church gets involved in looking at the matter of labor is an underlying difficulty which is found in the book of Genesis. A careful reading of the early chapters of Genesis seems to put forth a conundrum: which is the better way of life, rural or urban? I'm not going to go into a great long discourse on that. I might invite some of you to look at the early chapters of Genesis and see how the theme is developed. It's a basic conundrum that goes on: is it legitimate to gain your work, working in an urban or village context?

What seems to come through is that the really noble effort is when you have a hands-on approach, being able to till the soil and see the fruits of your labor. That's a difficult situation for many people. I know that a tremendous number of people in this Legislature really do still enjoy that hands-on approach with respect to your farming or ranching endeavors. I just cite this today because, within the life of the church, there is this difficult assessment, which goes back to the book of Genesis, as to which is better, rural or urban life.

One of the things that then comes forth in terms of theological development and assessment over the next number of centuries has an impact because of the industrial revolution, where we then have people living in airless factories and that kind of situation, where they're not able to enjoy the wonder of the sweet-smelling, fresh, spring air. They're somewhat like legislators; they don't get a chance to go out there and enjoy it.

[Mr. Appleby in the Chair]

That same difficulty is there in the assessment of this paper, because it's not simply a matter of whether or not the laborer is worthy of his hire. It is really a matter of what type of labor is involved if we're going to move forward to economic recovery. What kind of labor is appropriate in terms of trying to seek — their phrase — economic justice?

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to make these comments with respect to this motion. In conclusion, I would underline that I do believe it is indeed appropriate for religious bodies to comment on all issues, whether it be economic, political, or social. But I also underline the fact that, at the national level, these groups must take due care and attention that their research is done in a much more exhaustive fashion, that follow-up continues, that there is indeed dialogue with all participants in the community with respect to some of the means and methods for being able to go forward in terms of dealing with economic, social, and justice situations.

I'm quite certain, Mr. Speaker, that I speak not only for myself but for many other members of the Assembly. Should local congregations wish to get involved in this type of dialogue, I for one, as well as others here, are only too willing to be involved in that type of positive discussion.

Thank you.

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, I've enjoyed the debate this afternoon. I think it has forced a lot of us in the Assembly to think philosophically about the economy, our role as legislators, the role of government, and the role of the church. While I'm not really religious and hesitate to offer any religious view, coming from past experience in a religious setting, I can perhaps comment on an historical one.

It's understandable for the church, the Roman Catholic Church in this case, to offer us a version of the social

gospel. I think the social gospel developed in the late 1800s and early 1900s, especially in North America, when the church was faced with the immense poverty in rural America — the backbreaking, miserable, short, brutish lives of very many people. The church, notably the Protestant church, believed then that in order to reach the minds, souls, and spirits of people, you had to first fill their bellies and allow them the opportunity and time to reflect on spiritual matters. So out of the late 1800s and early 1900s came the social gospel, the recognition that the church had a role to play in political life — a social engineering role — trying to make life better for their parishioners, so they could then have time to reflect spiritually.

So I understand why the church would continue in that path, in a tradition, with the document *Ethical Reflections on the Economic Crisis*. I disagree, though, with their analysis of the problem and their prescription. I think they are understandably very concerned about the unemployed, the welfare poor, the farmer, the fisherman, the factory worker, and the small businessman. We all share their concern. I think we might disagree with them, though, that the way to get out of our economic mess is to focus exclusively on the unemployment problem and not also tackle some of the other problems we have, notably inflation.

In their paper, the bishops seem to suggest that it would be much better for us to return to more labor-intensive industries. They talk about the traditional industries of fishing, construction, and labor-intensive manufacturing. They suggest we should return to those base industries, where men would be closer to the means of production, to the land, and would receive some spiritual or social fulfilment from their work. As I read that document, I was thinking about another book I'm reading right now. It's called *The Years of Lyndon Johnson*. While it doesn't really reflect on the Alberta experience, it does talk about Lyndon Johnson growing up in Texas in the 1920s and '30s and how lonely it was to be on a small farm, removed from almost anyone, not having any means of communication because there were poor roads and no electricity. Work had to be done basically with your own hands and back. You broke the fields with a horse or mule.

Mr. Speaker, it wasn't that long ago that that was the case here in Alberta as well, certainly before the Second World War. Our family has a history of agriculture. I can remember my uncles talking to me about breaking the land with a horse and how you just felt wasted and totally exhausted when you returned to the farmhouse in the evening when the sun set — perhaps at 10 or 11 o'clock in the evening — only to face the prospect of doing that again the very next day. Sundays weren't necessarily reserved for churchgoing. If you had to get a crop in and time was of the essence, that took priority. According to Thomas Hobbes, not so very long ago life was "nasty, brutish, and short". It was not a very pleasant life, although perhaps . . .

Mr. Speaker, the reason I'm saying this is that in the late 1700s in the United States, Thomas Jefferson really talked about the same kinds of concepts the bishops are referring to in their paper. He fought a very bitter intellectual war with Alexander Hamilton, who was then the Treasury Secretary. Thomas Jefferson came from Virginia, from the South where the economy was basically agricultural and traditional. Alexander saw a different vision for his country: an industrial economy where people would get their employment not from the farm but

from manufacturing. Debate went on in the 1700s, and goes on today, about what kind of economy we should have: what is most spiritually fulfilling; what kind of society do we want?

In Alberta today we have gone away from the agricultural economy that basically predominated in our province until the early 1940s. We are not the simple agricultural society that we were 40 years ago. Perhaps it would be more spiritually fulfilling for the bishops to turn the clock back. Indeed, to protect their people from the corruption of a modern, industrial society, the church in Quebec tried to prevent the clock from marching forward. But I don't think we can afford the luxury of turning the clock back, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, the land base in the province would not support, in the traditional sense, a population of 2.5 million, unless we all wanted to go back to the land and break the land with horses and mules again. The bishops seem to be advocating going back to labor-intensive, traditional forms of economic organization. It wasn't so long ago that you used a horse to harvest the timber in this province — horse logging. We could do that I suppose. The fishermen in the outports of Newfoundland are still going out fishing for cod in little dinghies, much as their forefathers did. But it's inefficient. It's a miserable life. Perhaps, for the bishops, it's spiritually fulfilling; I don't know.

Mr. Speaker, I think we're on an economic treadmill, and perhaps we're slipping back a bit. But we really have two choices: we run a little harder, do a little better, and create opportunities for more people; or we get off the treadmill and go back to the simpler, more primitive, brutish, nasty, and short life that was the lot of our forefathers not so very long ago.

Mr. Speaker, I've argued in the Assembly that I think the answer to our economic problems, in part, is not to turn the clock back but to go forward; to embrace the future whole-heartedly; to look at science and technology, research and development; to try to develop new products and ideas, and market them on the world scene; to take our place on the international stage. We have to be aggressive in investing capital and labor in new products and new ideas. This country has a very poor record in this area. We invest less than 1 per cent of our GNP in research and development. Our competitors in the market place are investing three and four times that. It means that the Japanese are going to have new ideas on petrochemicals, plastics, and genetic engineering.

The potential for new products and ideas is staggering. For example, the Japanese are exploring different ways of genetic engineering whereby you might breed a strain of cattle with the wool-bearing qualities of sheep. So you'll have both wool and meat from the cattle. I'm just using that as an illustration of the point that you can now engineer changes biologically. Or you can genetically add the nitrogen-fixing component of legumes to cereal grains, so you might produce a crop where you can grow fertilizer for the next crop year, as well as have increased productivity from the cereals.

If we don't move with science and technology to increase our opportunities and productivity, we really do ourselves a disservice. Worse, Mr. Speaker, I think we have a responsibility to help lift the people of the third world to our level. If we fall back, we can't help them. I think perhaps the mission of the western industrial democracies in the next century has to be to share our standard of living with our fellow human beings on this planet, many of whom go to bed hungry at night, starving, and

have a very miserable life.

I'm simply trying to say that I understand why the bishops might have prepared this report. Unemployment is a very serious problem in the country, and I don't think any of us dismiss that. I think we have suggested that the recipe they are offering us — returning to a more traditional, simpler way of life; more labor-intensive rather than capital-intensive — may be somewhat naive. Economically, I don't think we could survive in an economy that turned the clock back to the 1940s or '50s, when it took much more labor or manpower to produce, agriculturally or in a factory, a given unit of output. It's not a very good social recipe either. We would return to a period of time when life was a bit more miserable. Today we share a lot of labor-saving devices that make life a lot more pleasant and easier for us. I'm not sure that the people the bishops and the labor movement claim to speak for would really want to return to a life like that.

Finally, I think we have a mission in the world. Our world mission, in part, is to try to raise the level of opportunities for 3 billion of the 4 billion people who are now in the world and to share with them our technology and ideas about social organization, so their lives may be enriched as well.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think we can support this motion, and I urge members not to.

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to join in this important debate. While the principle of the debate is a good one, I think it's extremely worth while that all members of the Legislature and all members of society address the issue of unemployment and discuss potential solutions. Therefore it's useful for this Legislature to address itself to the issue. I really think that when we debate this matter, one of the fundamental questions we ought to be looking at is: are we always going to look to government, the private sector, or someone else to solve the problem? Or are we going to look at the real cause of the problem; that is, the person we see in the mirror every morning, you and me — ourselves. I believe that is the real issue.

Statistics have been raised in this debate, both today and previously. Statistics are very important, because they really point out the magnitude of the problem. On the other hand, they can be misinterpreted. After a considerable amount of research, I've obtained a document that was prepared by a former employee of the federal [department] of statistics who was let go because he worked too hard. He was embarrassing his fellow employees, and he didn't stick to that common view held by many people in certain government and private enterprise agencies, that you ought not to work too hard because you might finish too early. I want to quote it. It's an interesting statistical analysis of unemployment. It goes as follows:

The population of Canada is 24 million, but there are seven million over 65 years of age — leaving 17 million to do the work.

People under 16 total ten million — leaving 7 million to do the work.

Three million government employees — leaves 4 million to do the work

Two hundred thousand in the armed forces leaves 3.8 million.

Deduct 1.5 million provincial and city employees — which leaves 2.3 million to do the work.

There are 300,000 people in hospitals, asylums — leaving two million to do the work.

But 900,000 of these are unemployed and 1,000,000 are on welfare or won't work — so that leaves 100,000 to do the work.

Now it may interest you to know that there are 80,000 people out of the country at any one time.

And 19,998 people are in jail — so that leaves just two people to do all the work.

And that is you and me, brother — and I'm getting tired of doing all the work myself.

An interesting interpretation of statistics. I don't mean to denigrate statistics by reviewing this. But if everyone had this attitude, I would really see our productivity improving. As a result of our productivity improving, our standard of living would improve and our ability to create new jobs would be that much stronger.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly have no objections to the bishops becoming involved in this debate. I don't believe there is any particular group in society that has a monopoly or should have an exclusive voice in discussing important issues of the day. They have taken a valuable initiative, and the fact that it has been controversial is so much the better. I think it's healthy that more groups in society become involved in the discussion.

I'd like to make some observations on the content of the document, then offer what I view as some possible solutions to this extremely frustrating but important issue. I note in the document that the bishops have really emphasized the importance of community action — a very worth-while point of view. Just restating what has been stated so many times, we cannot look to government for all the answers. President Reagan said it best when he said: government big enough to give you everything you want is big enough to take away everything you have. Therefore, if we continue the cycle of dependency upon government, we will eliminate that essential ingredient for a vibrant society; that is, the view that people are self-reliant and will provide the answers to their own problems.

I think we ought to look at the church and say, yes, you've recommended community action, but what are you as a church going to do to create jobs? Perhaps it is not their role — whether it's the bishops' church or any other church — to create jobs but, then again, perhaps it is.

I learned a great lesson from the visit of His Highness the Aga Khan, the world leader of the Ismaili community, when he was here last month. It was an opportunity to look at what that essentially religious community does to create employment. It came about from one of the more intriguing rituals they have. There is a practice within the world Ismaili community of celebrating the 25th, 50th, and 60th anniversaries of the Aga Khan by weighing him and giving him his weight in silver, gold, and diamonds. I think a lot of people have heard of this practice; it's an interesting one. But most people have the view that the Aga Khan then adds that to his personal wealth — not so. The value of those jewels is identified, and a trust fund has been formed for each of these jubilees. They now have the silver, the golden, and the diamond jubilee trust funds. They are used exclusively for the purpose of investing in businesses all over the world that would create new jobs. To date, this unusual practice by a religious organization has created 10,000 jobs, primarily in Africa but certainly throughout the world.

Interestingly, this particular trust that was established then resulted in the creation of a venture capital corporation called the Ismaili venture capital corporation. Members of the Legislature may be interested to know that in

this province there is an office of the Ismaili venture capital corporation that invests not just in Ismaili businesses but in other businesses. There is a plastics company in this city that has created jobs because of this confidence that an institution created by His Highness the Aga Khan has resulted in.

Perhaps that might be an interesting and valuable lesson for churches. Perhaps they might adopt the slogan that President John Kennedy stated in his inaugural address, and I know you've heard it before: ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country. Perhaps the churches might adopt a variation of that: ask not what your country can do for your church; ask what your church can do for your country. In other words, I believe the church can be a vibrant institution. It certainly has significant financial resources. If the Catholic church, the Mormon church, the Protestant church, and the Anglican church with the wealth and resources they have, could adopt a policy that those resources would be dedicated toward entrepreneurial investment and creation of jobs, what a remarkable component that could be for the creation of jobs in society.

Carrying on, Mr. Speaker, we see that the document talks about the human realities: unemployment generally hits the working class — example, blue-collar worker — more so than the middle class. I don't think I'm taking this out of context, but I don't think it's a useful observation to suggest that any one class of society is hurt any more than another. There is no value whatsoever in that.

I can think of no greater tragedy than an unemployed manager, 55 years of age, who has worked all his life, even during the depression, who came into the recession and the business he was employed in went into receivership. He was unemployed. Accommodated and adjusted to a certain life style, he then went out into the work force, has been out for 12 or 18 months, and is unable to find a job. When you are conditioned to working for that length of time and suddenly you're faced with the hard cold reality of being older — and, by the way, I see the document says this affects young people more so than older people. I disagree. If you look at this example of one elderly person going out into the market place — actually I shouldn't say 55 is elderly; it's just older. After having led a productive life, what greater tragedy is there than to go home day after day after day, not being able to find a job, and having to face the wife and family?

So for heaven's sake, let's not endorse any document that promotes class differences. We don't need to spend any time debating our differences. What we need to do is spend more time addressing what we have in common. As a principle of the document, I certainly could not endorse that.

Mr. Speaker, under the section on human and social costs, the document talks about the psychological strain that comes from a loss of feeling of self-worth — absolutely true. What greater loss is there to anyone than losing that sense of self-confidence, of self-worth, of knowing that you have the ability to do what you have to do? There is no question that people lose that sense of self-worth when they're not working.

But frankly that is not a problem indigenous to the unemployed. I believe one of the biggest problems in society today is a lack of self-worth in all people, a loss of self-worth because, over the period of growing up, they developed limiting beliefs about themselves. They may have encountered applying for a job and not getting it, and they developed the attitude that they couldn't get a job. They may have loved and lost and developed a belief

that they couldn't love successfully. They may have developed an attitude in their career, in their organizations, or whatever they do, that limited their beliefs about themselves to do things. Certainly the problem is not the loss of self-worth that comes from not having a job; the problem is a loss of self-worth period.

I believe that it is a responsibility of every institution in society to foster the belief that people are absolutely okay the way they are. They don't need to adopt a political position that is similar to ours, join our organization, belong to our church, or do what we want them to do to be okay. They are okay the way they are. I believe it's incumbent upon elected leaders to create the belief that people are okay, that sense of self-worth. The more we can reinforce that by telling them things about themselves that are good rather than bad, the better society will be.

Incidentally, probably the fundamental and most important institutions we can emphasize in this regard are our educational institutions. I look at our educational curriculum. In so many areas, the values expressed in those systems talk about what is failing and lacking in people rather than what is good about them. I think that's an important area.

Mr. Speaker, what are the solutions? Many have been mentioned. I wish to mention a few of my personal favorites: number one, strengthening a person's view of himself; number two, strengthening the family. For example, unemployment in Newfoundland, a province within this country, is greater. But because I believe there are stronger family ties, it's not as great a tragedy when you can depend on your family, and not necessarily government, as a basis of support. Thirdly, a very important ingredient is to look more to the private sector. That includes government getting out of doing so much. I think the proposal for a single tax system has merit in unleashing the potential of the private sector.

Fourthly, I think we have to do more to foster the entrepreneurial spirit. One very important group in this community — in Edmonton, Calgary, and throughout the province — that I believe does that at an early age is the Junior Achievement program, a high school program that allows young people to actually form their own mini-corporations, raise capital, create a product or a service, sell that product or service, then shut down their company towards May or June and see if they make a profit or loss. An excellent example. Many good entrepreneurs have come out of that program.

Fifth, I think one of the huge opportunities for creating employment is the barter system; in other words, allowing people who have unused services or products or goods to trade those with other people who can't sell them. I think a computerized barter system provides great opportunity for creating employment.

There are two other areas, spoken of very well by the hon. Member for Edmonton Glengarry: research technology and science development.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I regret having to interrupt the hon. member, especially when we're getting down to solutions at this time. However, it's time for the next order of business.

MR. LEE: Mr. Speaker, I should conclude my remarks by saying that this was a most worth-while debate. I commend the hon. member for introducing the motion, although I certainly can't agree with it in its entirety.

head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS  
OTHER THAN  
GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Second Reading)**

**Bill 219  
An Act to Amend  
the Municipal Election Act**

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, this being my second kick at the cat, I am reminded this afternoon of when I was beginning my ministry, having just gotten out of school. I went to a little church out in the country. It was a wintry day, and there was only one person present at the service. I thought, gosh, I guess what's good for one is good for a hundred, or vice versa. So being filled with all the theories that I had studied over the years, I decided I would give him the works. I went on and on and on. I guess it got to be an hour or so. Afterwards, when it was all done, I went up to the farmer and said, how did you like the sermon? He said, well, son, I'm a farmer and I don't know much about all the studies you had and so on, but I do know that when I bring in some feed to my cattle and there's just one cow around, I don't dump the whole rack on him at once. If you feel like you're getting dumped on today, I guess that's the way the schedule works out.

Nevertheless, with regard to my Bill, perhaps a little history is in order. Two years ago, in 1981, I attempted to bring in a Bill with similar emphases. However, it was a little different, in the sense that it was legislation that would enforce on all municipalities in the province of Alberta a system whereby expenses for a particular election would be limited by a specific formula, donations from any particular person or corporation would be limited in every election, and disclosures of any gift over \$100 to a candidate would have to be made public. If they had been passed, those would have been placed upon all municipalities whether they wanted them or not.

It was an interesting debate. Interestingly enough, there were pros and cons given. There was a significant amount of support from the municipalities across the province for that particular motion. But there were also some criticisms. One was with regard to the province sort of strong-arming or coming down on the municipalities and telling them what to do. I recall when discussion was being given to this matter in the city of Calgary. One of the alderman — Barbara Scott, I believe — said, give us the privilege of doing this ourselves if we so choose, rather than enforcing it from on high.

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I've brought in this Bill this year. It was introduced last year but never got onto the floor. The essential difference this year is that the legislation would be permissive rather than enforced upon all municipalities. In effect, it treats the municipalities of Alberta like the adults they are, able to make judgments with regard to some of these areas of election expenses.

Let me go into the reasons for the Bill. A number of people in this Assembly have previously served on municipal councils and therefore have some appreciation of the problems involved. First of all, I should say that legislation concerning election limitations and disclosure as far as donations are concerned is now incumbent upon ourselves as members of this Legislature. It's also incumbent upon federal candidates running in an election. It seems to me that if it is thought necessary on those two levels, of all levels, it certainly should be necessary or desirable for the municipal. The municipal government is unquestionably

tionably the closest government to the people. The issues which civil politicians face usually affect interest groups within the community. When you think of such areas as zoning, rezoning, planning, building permits, and community development, there are all kinds of pressure groups that exist within a municipality. I guess it's particularly intensified as that municipality grows. For that reason, I think it is desirable to make available to our municipalities the kind of legislation I ask for here.

To sum up very briefly. Right now, a municipality such as the city of Edmonton has passed a resolution — it's been in force for a number of years — indicating that candidates for election should publicly disclose all donations. But it is not enforceable, because the municipal Act does not mention this as a right of the municipality. So it's really a voluntary situation. Some candidates have done it, and some have not. I also understand that the city of Edmonton sent a resolution to the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association requesting the government to give the municipalities the right to do this. It passed there. So it has some municipal support.

Mr. Speaker, all of us know what it's like to be in an election and to raise funds. But as I mentioned, some of the pressure groups and interest groups that exist on the municipal level — I've said before and I will say again that I certainly have no evidence and would never accuse any current or past elected municipal person in Alberta of misusing the present system, but the possibility for abuse is there. From time to time, questions have been asked.

I recall when I ran for mayor of Calgary, almost six years now. I suppose that's part of the motivation as to why I'm bringing this in. My good friend and colleague Ross Alger was successful in that. I think his campaign at that time cost him something like \$15,000. The last time around, I think it went to \$150,000. Some people were asking, who's putting up this money? Are there interests behind the scene? Even though the candidate himself is not susceptible to corruption, nevertheless an uneasy alliance is formed. I'm saying that while I am as sure as I can be that nothing underhanded was happening. Nevertheless the possibility of misuse could be there, and the questions are being asked and generated. For that reason, I think it's imperative and really important that we have things out in the open and on the table. Then these questions would not need to be asked, or suspicions raised.

It certainly is true that if you have an interest group that wants to put forth a candidate because they feel that candidate will be sympathetic, they could raise unlimited amounts of money. While dollars are not the only factor in an election, they do give unfair advantage to certain candidates. So that possibility is there.

By the way, I understand that in one recent election, perhaps the last one, somebody at a forum put a question to the present Member for Calgary Millican: we hear that there is a hidden force in the background that is giving direction, pulling strings, and so on; do you want to comment on that? He said, no, I want you to leave my wife out of this. Nevertheless the possibility is there. It's for this reason that I bring forth this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that in reality this does have municipal support. I mentioned the city of Edmonton having previously passed a resolution. When I first brought this matter to the attention of the Legislature some years ago, I canvassed the cities of the province. I got replies from almost all of them except the city of Edmonton. The present mayor of the city of Calgary wrote to me and said:

Regarding your letter of December 1 . . . please be informed that you have my full support on this matter.

As you know, I made a full financial disclosure on a voluntary basis after the last civic election and, of course, I would do so again if I were to run.

The city of Red Deer passed a resolution saying they supported my Bill. The city of Camrose supported it in principle, although they had certain reservations with regard to a census. The city of Grande Prairie said that while it wouldn't affect them, they had no objection; the same with regard to the city of Medicine Hat. The city of Fort McMurray passed a resolution supporting my Bill, as did the city of Wetaskiwin.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there is considerable support from the citizenry, certainly in my constituency. In a questionnaire I sent out in 1981, I asked the following question: "Should restrictions be placed on the level of spending by candidates in municipal elections?" The replies, which totalled about 900, were as follows: yes, 780; no, only 45; and no opinion, 31. So you can see that there is overwhelming support out there for restrictions to be placed on municipal elections on at least the same basis as in the provincial and federal scene.

Mr. Speaker, I can't see why there would be objections to what I'm trying to accomplish here today. I can see why there might have been the last time around. But this Bill is flexible enough to give the municipalities not only the right and privilege, but to take action as they see fit in their particular circumstances. If it does not suit the municipalities, such as the smaller ones, then they don't have to enact legislation. It would be helpful — and I think it could be done — if the Minister of Municipal Affairs put forth a model by-law which municipalities could copy for their particular needs, perhaps according to the size of the city.

Just one thing more, Mr. Speaker; I shall not go further. It has to do with what is a little bit different from the provincial and federal scenes. That's the first part of the Bill, which says that a municipality may make a by-law which would limit the amount a candidate could spend in an election — not just raise, but also spend. That is not a requirement at present on either the federal or municipal level. However, the reason I bring this in is that the situation is a little different locally than it is provincially or federally. First of all, it's much more difficult for an individual candidate to raise the amount of money — if you think of \$150,000, for instance, that's a scary thing.

I remember when I had to sign a note for to my bank for \$40,000 when I ran as mayor, in order to have enough money to reserve television and billboard advertisement space ahead of time. You had to do it or you didn't get it. We weren't far enough into the campaign yet to see funds coming in to pay for it. So my neck was out a mile. Not a man of great means, I literally lost sleep from it and wondered if I should drop out rather than put myself out on that kind of limb. You see, the present system tends to favor people who are financially independent and close out some people who are not.

It's well known that last time in the city of Calgary, a candidate dropped out simply because he didn't dare take that kind of chance. In my case, fortunately I was only out \$9,000 when everything was booked in. But at the time, it looked like I could be out \$30,000 or \$40,000 until our campaign took off. I'm saying that maybe there ought to be some limitation placed on the ceiling. After the last election, one of the papers in the city of Calgary

quoted Mayor Ross Alger himself, who said that he felt the thing had gone too far and that perhaps the province should step in and put some regulations on this. Mr. Speaker, it may be debatable as to whether or not this should be included. But it seems to me that we can give the municipalities the option of enacting that kind of limitation if they so please.

Mr. Speaker, I leave it with the Assembly to do as it pleases. But I think the Bill has merit, from my own experience and from observation.

I thank you, sir.

MR. MUSGROVE: Mr. Speaker, it's a great pleasure this afternoon for me to make a few comments on Bill 219. I would like to commend the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill for his interesting remarks. I'm certainly in favor of Bill 219 as it stands, particularly the suggestion that it allow municipalities to pass by-laws requiring disclosure of contributions of expenses and placing limits on them.

Mr. Speaker, there are several kinds of municipal elections in Alberta. I agree that in large cities where a lot of money is spent, particularly on campaigns for mayor but also on campaigns for councillors, that should be covered by a by-law that says how much is spent. I agree that there should be a limit on it.

The other kinds of municipal elections are the rural county council or municipal council election where, to this date, there really hasn't been a problem with money. I was involved in six municipal elections. Not only did I not spend any money on my campaign but, to my knowledge, no people running in that election spent any money on it. As a matter of fact, the laws of Alberta require a deposit to run in an election, but the municipality, by by-law, can exempt any member from having to put up a deposit. Of the elections I ran in, in all cases there was no requirement for a deposit.

The other type of election is the village under a certain population, where they have only three elected members and one of those shall be mayor. Similar to the rural municipalities, the problem is more of getting people to stand for election than of people spending money to get elected. In the case of rural councils, the elected person has a problem because of the time-demanding aspect of it. Generally those municipalities have daytime meetings. You have to be of a certain occupation in order to be able to run. Those people who have daytime jobs are excluded for the simple fact that they will lose a day's work every time you have a meeting.

I'm not sure that everybody knows the difference between a municipal district and a county. The answer is simply that in a county system the municipal council is also the school board. They look after school affairs. Incidentally, last night I was happy to attend the opening of an addition to a school that I was involved in the planning and financing of when I was still on the county council.

Along with that, there's a lot of responsibility in those positions and, as I said, they're time consuming. When I was on municipal council, I represented approximately 9.5 townships of land that was not very thickly populated. I think there was a population of about 700 people, including two hamlets. Somewhere between 40 and 50 miles of secondary highway was part of the councillors' responsibility, and about twice that many miles of local roads. You were responsible to see that they were in repair, serviceable for the amount of traffic they handled. There were five school buses in my division. I was

responsible for seeing that there were drivers and that they were run economically with enough students to get the grant necessary and not waste public funds. We had one local school with six grades. The rest of the students went to another school. There were two hamlets. We put water and sewer in one while I was a member of that council.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, recently I sat through a series of meetings about the responsibilities and the funding of both urban and rural municipal councils. There was a consensus that there should be fewer restrictions put on provincial funding to municipalities. With a bit of tongue in cheek, I believe we made some recommendations that all unconditional operating grants should be thrown into a pot and then distributed by some other formula, probably something to do with population, remoteness, and several other factors involved. As I said, we didn't think that would sell completely as we had recommended it. I was at both the urban and the rural municipal conventions, and we didn't get one word of concern about unconditional funding to municipalities.

The only people I really got word from were the libraries. Almost every library in Alberta contacted me one way or another and said, what are you fellows recommending here? You're trying to do away with our library grant. We said, no, we're saying that municipal councils are all responsible people and will look after all the services required out of government grants, so you just go back and talk to your municipal council. Those things are just in the recommendation stage right now and have a long way to go. But I bring that out as the responsible position municipal people have to take at this date.

Another point we discussed quite seriously was zero-base budgeting. At one time, I was very much opposed to the concept of zero-base budgeting. However, I've had a complete change of thinking. I have to agree now that if one service you offer a municipality costs X number of dollars this year, you shouldn't just add 10 per cent to it and that becomes next year's budget. You should sit down and figure out how much money you're going to spend on each service, what kind of service that would provide, and then set up your funding accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, I have to agree that we shouldn't allow the possibility of people who are well off becoming elected people because of the mere fact that they are well off and able to put up a better campaign than those who are less fortunate. I see no problem with that in the case of rural Alberta at the present time. I wouldn't say that the possibility might not exist sometime in the future, because I agree that the public is taking more interest in all levels of government, including municipal government. So this could happen. At the present time, it's not a problem. But I see the possibility of it happening in the cities and recognize that it has happened.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should support Bill 19. Thank you very much.

MR. SHRAKE: Mr. Speaker, Bill 19 gives me some very serious concerns.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hesitate interrupting the hon. member, but in order that *Hansard* may not be misled, or mislead people who read it, perhaps we should be clear that we're referring to Bill 219. I understood that

the two hon. members who spoke, including the one who's just started, referred to it as Bill 19. It's 219.

MR. SHRAKE: Sorry, Mr. Speaker.

Speaking on this, I find some very serious concerns. I, as well as the mover of this Bill, have had experience running in civic elections. Perhaps he had some bad experiences running for mayor — probably these are expressed in this motion — but I think I've run in more civic elections than he has. I've run in four successful ones. Usually I found that your contributions were too small and you didn't get enough of them. That was your main problem. If you wish to try to relate to our own experiences, a ward in the city of Calgary is roughly the same size as a provincial constituency in the city of Calgary. They usually have the same area, the same number of people. They have just as many yards to put signs in, as many doors to knock on, and as many mailboxes to put material in. The newspaper ads cost you exactly the same. TV and radio coverage costs the same. But you've got no political party behind you to put forth your platform. If you're a newcomer, the news media basically ignore you. They give you no coverage whatsoever. The incumbents get a little bit.

So when I look at this proposed Bill 219, section 145.1(a), to limit the donations — we're going to set the amount or allow the city council to set the amount — I have real problems with it. If it stated the amounts as something reasonable, say very similar to what we are allowed in provincial elections, I'd say that's fair. You could almost go with the set standard allowed in a provincial election. But that's not in this Bill. Mind you, if you set the amount, then each time there's inflation we would have to change the Act. So I guess we'd have a few problems there.

But there is a very distinct problem here. This gives the advantage to the incumbent. The incumbent can use his council meetings to gain a little advantage by stirring up a contentious issue before an election. He gets a lot of name recognition. The poor newcomers just about have to stand on their heads to get any. If they jumped off a bridge or something, they might get half an inch of coverage in the *Calgary Sun*.

The incumbent can recycle all his old signs, wooden stakes, banners, and leftover campaign buttons, and he's more likely to get a campaign office donated. The newcomer has a little problem. He has to buy all this material new. You can spend up to \$200 for one canvas banner. The incumbent can get a successful campaign for a lot less cost. Yet we're going to give him the power to set the amount. The newcomer to politics must start from scratch. You have to buy hundreds of lawn signs, wooden stakes, and staplers. Of course you have to get a sledge hammer to drive your stakes in. You have to get your photographs taken; you have to buy brochures and get them printed; you have to rent a campaign office, because usually if you're not an incumbent, they're not sure you're going to win, so they don't donate one like they would otherwise. You have to round up a typewriter; get some desks, tables, chairs, and maps; hook up the phones — an endless list of items. In fact nowadays you almost need a coffee machine. This all costs money. How much? I don't think any of us here knows any more than members of city council. Yet we're going to say, you can set an amount for anybody to run.

Section 145.1(a) gives the incumbent members of city council the right to restrict the very people who are going to be their opponents, because you can limit the amount

of money they can spend on their campaign. Now I'm sure members of this House would be most upset if the federal government started any kind of process to tell us how much we can spend on campaigns. I don't feel very much like setting something in motion that would allow some cities or towns to restrict how much they can spend. We haven't had a problem with that so far.

We run into one problem, a serious problem in the city of Calgary: the quality of people who are willing to run for office. The last city council, the ones who are sitting now, does not have any lawyers, doctors, architects, engineers, accountants, or economists. You're going to run into the problem of having a lot of unemployed people going into this, the people who are not the most skilled, because you're going to make it tougher and tougher for people to get on that council. Remember, they work as many hours as we do, if not more. They have more meetings than us, and very often they get more phone calls than us. They have less back-up staff, and they get paid less.

I have no problem at all with section 145.1(b), limiting the amount, but I don't think it should be set one penny lower than what we're allowed in a provincial election. There's no big problem here, because in a civic election your donations don't get all that big because, first off, they're not tax deductible. Maybe we should consider making it tax deductible in this Bill, so they would get these big donations that we'd have to worry about. The mayor sometimes gets a large donation. I think in the last civic election — Mayor Klein printed his in the newspaper, because he got fewer donations than other people. He did get some \$1,500 donations. Now that's big money. But when it was all over, he still spent \$6,000 out of his own pocket.

Another little section specifies who can donate and who can't donate. Boy oh boy, we can really create a few problems here. I'm sure your right-wing candidates on city council would probably like to restrict unions and any left-wing groups from making donations. By the same token, I'm sure all your left-wing members of city council would probably like to restrict all free-enterprise and right-wing groups from making donations. I hardly think we should be creating a situation where they can restrict who can and who can't give donations. I think this Bill would create a lot of problems there. As far as I'm concerned, let anybody over the age of 18 donate all they want. The candidates need financial help; they need encouragement. They need all they can get. And I think we do want people to run for office in civic elections.

In section 145.1(c) we have another one. In civic elections right now they're having problems getting donations. Usually the newcomer goes in and spends most of the money out of his pocket. But here we're going to have him put this in the news media; they have to print this. Can you imagine how many donations you'll scare away from the poor guys that are trying to get donations? First off, if you donated to the wrong candidate — say Jones and Smith are running. You donate to Jones. He loses. Oh my gosh, it comes out in the paper that you donated to him. You're going to feel pretty nervous each time you go to city council to get approval for a permit, a planning approval, or something like that. In a city like Calgary, city council votes on every item from restaurants to sewers, from day care to infants. In short, from the cradle to the grave, from day care to cemetery plots, everything goes through city council. They vote on everything. If you're in business, there's no way you want city hall mad at you.

But consider this: you have to put it in the newspaper. You have 14 wards and four or five people running in every ward. That gives you 60 to 70 candidates. Say you really did feel like getting out and giving a little donation from the old corporation to that guy over there. He looks like a really good candidate. What do you do with the other 50 to 60 people? If you give to one candidate and not to the others, and it's put in the newspaper, first off you have a few of them a little cheesed off at you because you didn't give them a donation.

The other thing that happens is that next election some of the smart candidates — I know I'd do it — would clip this newspaper and say: okay, these guys donated last time; let's make sure we really descend upon them with a nice letter asking for a donation. I think you'd discourage a lot of people if you forced them to put who donated in the newspaper every time. Remember, in federal and provincial elections, you have a political party. The party has platforms, and it's very acceptable to make a donation to a political party. If nothing else, you give to the party and they distribute to all the candidates as they see fit. But that's not the case in a civic election. In a civic election, you have the individual.

Further, what about the poor individual who runs and wins his election? He got a \$50 donation from the Jones corporation. Every time this corporation has an item going through city council, does he have to sit there and feel embarrassed to vote on the item? If he votes on the item, is he voting because of the \$50 donation made a year prior? Of course not. But there's still a little suspicion. It's a different thing when you're running in a civic election without the party to shield you from this type of problem.

In my election campaigns in years gone by, I always appointed a finance chairman and said: go after the money, but don't tell me who it came from and don't tell me how much; I just don't want to know. I felt a lot better about it. But I see in this Bill that we will force them to put it in the newspaper so the whole world knows exactly how much they got and from whom.

Frankly, I don't think we need Bill No. 219. There have been no problems in the past two decades, and the average amount spent per voter in civic elections is still much less than the amount spent per voter by candidates in a provincial election. I heard mentioned in a previous speech that the mayoralty candidates spend \$100,000 or \$150,000. Boy, that's a lot of money. But if you take a city of 600,000 people and average it out, he probably spent less per voter — I think if you averaged it out on some of those, it came out to 30 or 40 cents per voter. That's a lot less than most members of this House spent per voter in our election. [interjection] No, we won't mention that, please.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think we need another Bill of this type, and I hope we won't bother passing it. Thank you.

MR. McPHERSON: Mr. Speaker, I guess the wonderful thing about the democratic process is that one gets the opportunity to speak to a motion like this — has his thoughts in mind, ready to deliver them — and then hears a preceding speaker come up with all sorts of areas he would just love to rebut, which I hope I will do in due course. I do want to stick to my main remarks at the outset. Initially I would like to congratulate and commend the mover, the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, not just on moving this motion but on his persistence and tenacity on Bill 219. Looking through some of the research material, Mr. Speaker, I saw Bill 221, Bill

240, and Bill 201. Certainly the member has brought forth this type of Bill a number of times to be debated in this Assembly, and I congratulate him for that. On balance, I support this Bill, perhaps with one or two reservations I'll make reference to momentarily.

The issue of contributions and expenditures with regard to municipal elections is not addressed in the Municipal Elections Act. It has not been dealt with in any other Alberta Act, including Bill 39 that's before us now, with a minor exception that I don't think deals specifically with this area at all. The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill mentioned that the city of Edmonton passed a resolution several years ago requiring that disclosure of all donations, money, or gifts of kind would be recorded and that there would have to be disclosure for any amount over \$100. Of course the problem with this is that in the absence of any provincial law, there are no sanctions involved and no enforcement possibilities whatsoever. I think the indication is that only one member of council at that time disclosed.

The member went on to say, and rightfully so, that in 1977 and '81 the Edmonton and Calgary councils passed resolutions urging the provincial government to require the disclosure of contributions of \$100 or more to individual candidates, and that this resolution was endorsed by the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association. There is a need for these types of measures, Mr. Speaker, based on recent experiences in Calgary and Edmonton. In each of the last two elections in those cities, one mayoralty candidate was able to spend far more money on his campaign than any other candidate. In one case a candidate dropped out of the race for financial reasons. In three or four cases, the big spender was elected with a sizable plurality based on the votes and because he was the big spender. The danger clearly exists, then, that in the absence of some kind of control, only the rich are going to be able to campaign in municipal elections, particularly in large cities.

The federal and almost all provincial governments have laws. We in this Legislature certainly have restrictions as to contributions we may receive from various sources. It seems an anomaly that municipal elections have not fallen under these kinds of guidelines as well. Disclosure and limits on expenditure and contributions in municipal elections are desirable in a democratic system of government. The base of political donors would be broadened if a limit were imposed on individual contributions.

I suppose this harkens back to the comments by the Member for Calgary Millican. I happen to believe it would be in the best interests of democracy if we could broaden the base of financial support throughout and not have to deal with large amounts of money from very few sources. All candidates would be equal in financing their campaigns, and it would eliminate any edge due to personal wealth. If contributions were made public, it would be easier to resist pressures by donors for favors, as disclosure permits analysis of connections — a very important point that has been referred to. I for one have no knowledge whatsoever of any municipal candidate who has ever used his influence or allowed anyone who has made a significant contribution to his campaign to bias his judgment. I just don't think it's happened, but questions do arise. As has often been said, justice must not only be served but must be perceived to be served.

In addressing Bill 219, I'm pleased to see that in the first case it states that "a council may make by-laws". It is permissive. Certainly there is a difference between a municipal election in the city of Edmonton, the city of

Red Deer, and a small municipality elsewhere in Alberta. The rules change; it's a different mix. By virtue of the fact that this legislation is permissive, it will allow various municipalities to develop their own parameters with respect to disclosure and contributions.

The one area I have some reservations about is option (a),

establishing a limit on the expenses that may be incurred by or on behalf of a candidate for the purpose of a by-election or a general election and defining expenses for the purposes of the by-law.

I had some very serious reservations about that part of it until the sponsor of the Bill quite aptly pointed out that perhaps all of these would be optional. Nevertheless, if we are going to provide an individual with the opportunity to raise funds and have all those funds disclosed one way or another, it's my view that that would increase his base. I don't think there should be any restrictions on the amount of money he can spend in a campaign, assuming he is raising the funds through the proper parameters and channels.

The other area that concerns me, but does not really reflect on this particular Bill, is an area that has been mentioned before: attracting quality people to enter public life. It is becoming increasingly more difficult these days to attract people to municipal government. I suppose one major reason has been the conflict-of-interest rules that apply. I'm not against the conflict-of-interest rules, but I'm wondering how broadly they're defined sometimes. Certainly any professional man or individual in any city who is involved in business, land, and land speculation finds himself in a most tenuous position by seeking and gaining public office. Perhaps he finds himself voting on so many situations where he has a direct pecuniary interest that he just says it's not worth while. I don't know if there's an answer to that, but I think it's a whole area we should be looking at very closely. I am concerned that we are not attracting the type of people to public life that should be getting in.

Mr. Speaker, while the Bill may be an attempt to have municipal elections opened up to a broader range of people, it may also result in an increase in the number of frivolous or less serious candidates. I do not agree with this comment. It's one that was brought out in debate on Bill 220 last year. It labors under the assumption that by broadening the base we'll have more frivolous people entering the campaign. I don't think that's necessarily so. All people should have an equal opportunity to enter political life. No doubt each person is as serious in his efforts and contribution to public life as the next. We should not be in a position to flush out, if you will, people who are prepared to make a commitment, at whatever level, in public life.

With those comments, Mr. Speaker, I urge the Assembly to consider Bill 219 very seriously. I think it has much merit, and I support it fully.

DR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments with respect to Bill 219, an Act to Amend the Municipal Election Act. Hopefully, in the course of our present sitting, Bill 39 will be passed by the Legislature. But I'm interested in comparing the two — there doesn't seem to be that much impact with respect to the issue we're dealing with today. I'd like to go on record that in terms of the general principle, I'm very much in favor of the Bill before us. All too often, constituents and friends have raised the matter with me, and I'm sure with other hon. members, that it is a bit of a conundrum that we have

similar legislation with respect to political donations at the federal and provincial levels but not at the municipal level. I firmly believe that those of us who are running for political office, whether it be federal, provincial, or municipal, indeed should be only too willing to disclose the sources of income donated to us with respect to any election campaign.

I guess I have some concern, some dialogue, with respect to the Bill. It leaves as an optional basis that the municipality may set guidelines. I would need some further discussion and guidance with respect to whether that really is the route to go or, should the Bill be passed, whether it should be a compulsory exercise that the municipality would indeed set guidelines for political contributions for all candidates. One matter raised in terms of the wording of the Bill is that it's directed at individuals. Perhaps the sponsor of the Bill would consider not only individuals but also political parties, should that become more of a feature at the municipal level within our province.

I'm given to understand that there are two other provinces where similar legislation has been enacted. Those would be the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. From a review of the research material respecting those provinces, it would appear to me that a model along the lines of Ontario is much more acceptable than that which was put in place in 1978 under the municipal elections procedures Act in the province of Quebec. It seems to be much more an action of constraint. For example, the Quebec legislation provides that a candidate — I now quote — for municipal office may accept donations only from individuals residing or organizations located within the municipal district or division in which he is seeking office. I would not be able to support that type of amendment to this Bill should it be brought forward at any time. Obviously it's a situation where you have friends, and relatives for that matter, as well as other interest groups which span the various ward boundaries or constituency boundaries, and I think that's an unnecessary restriction

in the Quebec legislation. But of course we're dealing with legislation here in the province of Alberta.

I need to comment further with respect to the Ontario legislation, Bill 119, the municipal elections Act, which was passed in 1982. Again, it has that provision that a municipality may enact if it chooses to do so, and they talk about restrictions on contributions to any person to a maximum of \$500 per year.

Mr. Speaker, one would hope that if the Bill before us were to pass, there would be some mutual consultation between municipalities, our Department of Municipal Affairs, and the minister, some mutual dialogue as to the setting up of model guidelines. That would be a useful exercise in itself. With respect to Bill 219, the bottom line is simply that I believe there is strong public support for this type of legislation to be in place. It is very much an issue in the hearts and minds of many of our mutual constituents. They are concerned that any person seeking public office should be only too willing to give full disclosure as to the contributors and the size of the contribution that is given to any of our political campaigns.

Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: It is so ordered.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the House will not sit this evening. Tomorrow morning, it's proposed to proceed with second reading of Bill No. 44.

[At 5:25 p.m., on motion, the House adjourned to Friday at 10 a.m.]

