

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Friday February 16, 1973

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a return that was outstanding from the fall session of the Legislature under the hon. member, Mr. Henderson's name.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to report on Return No. 248 in the last session, which was a request for the correspondence between the provincial and federal governments in regard to the Irrigation Rehabilitation Program. We have been in contact with the federal government with regard to making this correspondence public, but as the matter is still under active negotiation the federal government has requested that this correspondence be maintained in confidence with the proviso that after the agreement has in fact been consummated they will reconsider their stand in regard to making the correspondence public.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to Question No. 248, outstanding from the last session.

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a reply in response to Motion No. 245 that was outstanding from the fall session.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

Grande Cache Mine

MR. NOTLEY:

I would like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. In view of the fact that McIntyre Porcupine is controlled by Superior Oil of Texas, can the hon. Premier tell us who, in fact, made the decision to close down the No. 5 mine? Was that made in Houston, was it made in Toronto, or was it made in Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED:

That is exactly the sort of information that we are still seeking. With regard to the matter of Grande Cache, after the cabinet deals further with the report we are receiving next Tuesday, I would hope that we would be in a position to say something affirmative by the middle of next week. And that is, of course, a specific part of it -- the question raised by the hon. member. The Alberta Federation of Labour during their meeting with us made some representations --, very effectively we thought -- with regard to the matter, and the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour was involved. Perhaps he might

like to deal with the response that he gave to the question of the notice of the lay-off.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Assembly, I said to the Alberta Federation of Labour -- and I have stated publicly and have communicated, or will communicate, this information in all fairness to the management of McIntyre Porcupine -- that the notice was, in fact, no notice. I said that corporate responsibility and citizenship would have required better performance in this respect by the mine management. I concluded my assessment of the situation by regretfully calling the action of the company, in regard to the lay-off, irresponsible.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. By way of explanation, it is my understanding, sir, from talking to one of the officers of the union, that Canada Manpower had given the union the understanding that they would pay the moving expenses of all employees --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please come directly to the question?

MR. NOTLEY:

My question to the hon. minister is: have you had an opportunity to meet as yet with the Canada Manpower people to make sure that we can cut through the red tape so that these people will have their moving costs covered by Canada Manpower?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, these and many other questions will be answered, hopefully, after next Tuesday's meeting. But we are in constant touch with the committee and with Canada Manpower, and we have the assurance that the moving costs will be paid. Our department is attempting to co-ordinate the efforts made by the union, the management, and Canada Manpower.

MR. NOTLEY:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The problem is not moving within the province. The problem is moving across the country. My supplementary question is: will your discussion take that fact into consideration?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, my answer was intended to be in that context.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Is some assistance being given to the miners who now find themselves in precarious positions because of this lay-off?

DR. HOHOL:

Yes there is, Mr. Speaker, through a combination of efforts, particularly from the company itself and from the union. There is a co-ordinated attempt to develop assistance with respect to severance pay, with moving, allocation, seeking jobs and the placement of people in jobs with other companies. In general, the answer is yes, there is assistance here.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

A further supplementary to the hon. Premier. Has the cabinet committee or a member of the cabinet been to Grande Cache to get first-hand information on this problem?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, many of our ministers have been to Grande Cache on a number of different occasions. As I said, the cabinet committee will be making a report

to the full cabinet on Tuesday, and we hope we will have something further to report to the House after that time.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

Let this be the last supplementary on this point.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Has that cabinet committee or one of its members been there since the lay-off, or in the last two weeks?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure about that particular answer. I know that constant communication has been established by about four or five ministers and their departments, but as far as the report is concerned, we will give a report to the Legislature following our Tuesday cabinet meeting.

MR. FARRAN:

Can there be an allowance for one more supplementary?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

MR. SPEAKER:

I regret that we have already covered this point at some length.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

Elevator Strike

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. I'm sure that he shares my concern and the concern of many Albertans for the problems that face --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member come directly to the question.

MR. KOZIAK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. This is in connection with problems arising from the elevator strike. I understand that the --

MR. SPEAKER:

I must ask the hon. member to resume his seat unless he wishes to come directly to the question.

MR. KOZIAK:

I'm doing that directly, Mr. Speaker. I understand that the hon. minister met recently with the --

MR. SPEAKER:

I regret that the hon. member is not coming directly to the question.

The hon. Member for Calgary North Hill.

[Applause.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

Oil Supply

MR. FARRAN:

Thank you. I much appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the applause.

I have a question, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Is there any truth, Mr. Minister, in the report that the federal government is applying export restrictions because of an anticipated shortage of crude oil in March, west of the Ottawa Valley?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is of doubtful propriety. If it refers to a newspaper report, it is definitely out of order. If the hon. member wishes to take responsibility for the accuracy of the report, he may ask the question.

MR. FARRAN:

I'll take the responsibility for it, but I'll rephrase it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HENDERSON:

That is an irrelevant question. I think ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

Oil Supply (Cont.)

MR. FARRAN:

I'll rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker, just to put everybody's mind at rest. Is it anticipated there will be any shortage of crude oil in March, anywhere in Canada?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to answer that. First I would like to advise the hon. members that we do have information in respect to the controls by the federal government. We have voiced strong objection to those controls; we have done so starting in January, and since that time. I can say - in respect to the question of Canadian refineries getting their supply in the months of March and April - that we met on Monday with 17 of the companies representing the crude oil purchasers. and checking again today, I am satisfied that there will be no problem in the Canadian purchasers supplying to the Canadian refiners the quantity of crude that is required for the Canadian refiners.

MR. FARRAN:

If that is the case, Mr. Minister, do you attribute the federal statement -- slowly now, wait for it -- to any pressure by the 'state control party' on the other half of the coalition?

MR. SPEAKER:

Surely the hon. minister is not required to answer with regard to the motivation behind the federal statement.

The hon. Member for Camrose followed by the hon. ... Is this a supplementary?

MR. HENDERSON:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Mines or the hon. the Premier could advise as to whether there was specific consultation between the federal government and the ministers of the provincial government - presumably either the Premier, the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs or the Minister of Mines prior to the announcement that the federal government was going to apply the principle of restrictions in the forthcoming months?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can answer that. Starting in January we met with the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, the hon. Don MacDonald. We also met with representatives of the National Energy Board. At that time the question was discussed of controls by the federal government and alternatives such as voluntary controls. Following that meeting I arranged for a meeting with the crude oil purchasers on Friday, January 26. I confirmed the results of that meeting with the hon. Don MacDonald. I subsequently had telephone calls with him as a result of the meeting last Monday, and last evening I was called, before the official announcement, and advised that the federal government was going to take this step before the committee of the federal House.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary to the Minister of Mines and Minerals. Has the government seen a copy of the National Energy Board background report on this question, and secondly, further to that, will the government obtain sufficient copies so that members of the Legislature can receive a copy?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can answer that by saying that report, The National Energy report which is dated December, 1972, was submitted to us in the first part of January, 1973. We have copies of that; I understand a copy was tabled in the federal House last night, so we would be in the position now to make that available to all hon. members.

MR. HENDERSON:

I wonder, if for reasons of clarity, the minister might advise the House as to whether it is or whether it is not the government's policy, the Province of Alberta, that national export controls on crude oil are not required at this time, or under any particular circumstances?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think I can answer that on behalf of the government and say it is our view that controls are unnecessary at this time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this a supplementary? Might this be the last supplementary on this question?

National Energy Board Hearings

MR. DIXON:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, and it has to do with the public hearings to be held with the National Energy Board. I am wondering if the government is going to make any representation to Ottawa to have those public hearings held in western Canada, and in particular, in Alberta, and would consideration be given to having the National Energy Board appear before the Committee of the Whole House of this Legislature when the hearings are held?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. member is alluding to the suggestion made by the hon. minister for the federal committee last night, Mr. MacDonald, that the National Energy Board would hold public hearings with respect to the nature of these controls. Because the announcement was made last night we have had no opportunity to assess the matter in that context and, of course, we would want to know more -- which I hope we will know -- about the details of the controls that are proposed.

As far as having the National Energy Board undertake hearings within the province of Alberta, we of course, as would the hon. member, go further than that. We would hope they would perhaps decentralize some of their operations and be considerably more involved within the Province of Alberta. However, as far as we are concerned, a government representation would be made directly on a government-to-government basis. It would probably not be our intention to make representations as a government before a federal organization or agency.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Camrose followed by the hon. Member for Highwood.

Use of Strap in Schools

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Education. Since the Minister of Education in the Province of British Columbia has banned the strap from her schools, will you be giving consideration to doing the same in Alberta?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the move that was made in that province. Certainly, it represents a blow to local autonomy in the school system there! [Interjections] Our objective in this province, Mr. Speaker, would be to maintain and retain the local discretion and autonomy of school systems to make decisions as to whether or not the strap should be used in the schools.

It is used, I think, fairly rarely in the Province of Alberta. In many cases the board delegates its authority to the school principals.

I would not see the government making any move to follow what has been done in British Columbia. I believe there is a place for discipline in the schools of the Province of Alberta. I recall myself in Grade 8, I was on the receiving end of the strap. It had a very salutary effect on my hand, my conduct and attitude.

MR. HENDERSON:

As a supplementary question, I challenge the last few words of that statement.

[Applause]

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if the hon. Premier is deciding to use the strap on some of his cabinet ministers?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood followed by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

Municipal Grants

MR. BENOIT:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is addressed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It has to do with the tax reduction plan. Would the hon. minister give the Legislature at this time some indication of the formulae used for distributing the grants to the various municipalities?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are two kinds of grants that are being distributed. The one grant, the incentive grant, is tied of course, in a direct way to what the supplementary requisition had been by the school board in the previous year. That grant is based on a sliding scale which gives a municipality 100 per cent of the supplementary requisition for supplementary requisitions that had been 5 mills less in the previous year; 5 straight mills for those between 5 mills and 15 mills; and one-third for those in excess of 15.

The others, the municipal assistance grants -- we are now having the formula for the straight municipal assistance grants prepared for distribution to the various municipalities. Many of them have shown an interest in getting what they call the formula. That, perhaps, is not the correct term to use inasmuch as it is in the form of about a 20-page working paper at the present time. We are attempting to get it down to a more condensed form for distribution to all our municipalities.

MR. BENOIT:

Does the hon. minister consider it possible for the MLAs to answer questions alluded to in the advertising if the MLAs don't have that information in advance?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I think the information that was given to the MLAs was fairly substantial in order to help them answer questions from their constituents. I don't think I have had many supplementary requests for additional information since we sent the original kits out to you. In actual fact, knowing the basis of that working paper for the municipal assistance grants would really be of no assistance to you or to the municipalities, it is going to be distributed merely as a piece of information.

MR. CLARK:

A question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs what consultation there was between the government and the municipal associations in the province prior to the announcement made over television?

MR. RUSSELL:

Of course there has been substantial ongoing consultation with both municipal associations. I'm sure the hon. member appreciates that any government can consult up to a period in time, and then comes the point at which you have to come to a decision and make your announcement. We had consultation specifically with the two associations right up until the latter part of December.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier. I would like to ask the hon. Premier what response he has given the Alberta Urban Municipal Association as a result of their open letter to you regarding the Alberta Property Tax Reduction Program. Is it going to be possible for that organization to appear before the members of the Legislature, as they request in the last page of their brief?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure about the latter but I believe there was a request with regard to the meeting with the Executive Council and perhaps the hon. minister could respond to that.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, just so there is no misunderstanding, quoting from the open letter: "The executive association would like to meet with you, members of the Executive Council, and if possible all members of the Legislative Assembly to point out our serious concerns and give you first-hand knowledge of specific problems and the dilemma we face." It is signed by the President of the Urban Municipal Association. That is the basis of my question now that the Legislature has assembled.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, we have dealt with the first part of the request first, and arrangements have been made to hold a meeting with the A.U.M.A. executive and cabinet during the evening of one of our regular cabinet meetings later this month. If they decide that they still want a meeting with all members of the Legislature, that remains to be seen, but the first part of the request has been replied to by telephone and the answer will be in the mail today.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, --

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff has a supplementary he has been waiting to ask, and the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury has already asked two or three supplementaries.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. When the hon. minister was in Medicine Hat he indicated that none of the cities would have to increase their mill rates this year. I wonder if the minister still agrees with that statement. Is he aware that Medicine Hat may have to increase their mill rate up to six mills because of the so called reduction?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the calculations and forecast provided for us by the task force indicated that what I said was quite correct. If all the benefits worked and were applied for and earned according to those that have been provided, in fact none of the municipalities should be in a worse position than the year before. Of course, what has happened is that some of the municipalities have compared the total of the two kinds of grants they are receiving this year with the one grant they received last year, and have shown themselves to be out of pocket. But that is not entirely correct because they must take into account the other benefits. When I speak of the other benefits, the total package adds up to \$48 million as opposed to \$42 million last year. Now that \$6 million increase represents a 14 1/2 per cent increase. To the best of our knowledge, as a result of those changes, no municipality should have to levy an additional mill rate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

Human Rights Study

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. Has the government conducted a review of existing legislation to ascertain if any sections of existing legislation are in contravention of The Human Rights Act? You recall at the last session you said a study would be made with the idea of bringing in amendments. Has this study been completed?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the study hasn't been completed, although we do have an interim report. I think it was on the matter that the hon. member raised where there was a reference in a number of our statutes regarding, I believe, British citizenship. I am just speaking from memory now, but that is one of the factors involved. We are working on it on an interim basis but it probably will require an omnibus bill later in this session or in the early fall. That is the only interim report we have. A more in-depth report is going to take longer.

MR. FRENCH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will a supplementary report be made at the current session as to what sections are in contravention of the act, so we will be aware of the study being made?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I will ask the hon. the Attorney General to respond in relationship to the time element involved in the question.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member refers to a supplementary report, I am not quite sure to what he is referring. Perhaps he could give me a bit of help there, and then I can answer the question.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I am not as well versed in the English language as the Attorney General. I meant an interim report.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, at this time I can't give the House a date when such a report might be available. We have had a number of indications where reports or opinions on various acts might be in breach of some section of The Alberta Bill

of Rights. As to when a report would be ready that we could file in the House and make available to the hon. members, I just couldn't give you a date.

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. Attorney General give us any indication of whether the studies are a third complete or a quarter complete? Have any acts been studied at all?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I really can't give him any indication as to how complete it is. We have had some reviews, a number of reviews, but we are trying to pull together a comprehensive report. I really can't say at this moment at what stage it is. I would be happy to make some further inquiries and let the hon. member know as soon as I can.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the hon. Premier has indicated there is an interim report on this issue, would he be kind enough to table the interim report for the information of the hon. members?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, what I am referring to by way of an interim report is a memorandum we have received from the Legislative Council and, I think, from others, pointing out to us the possible areas where there may be some problems for us to look at in terms of legislation. It really isn't in the form of a report that we could table. It's an interim report in terms of advising us as to the directions in which we can move. I tried to give one example to the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, do I gather from the hon. Premier that there is, in fact, no report?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, there is a memorandum forming the basis of wording by the Executive Council as to some of the areas we will have to consider by way of review, and possible amendment; to the statute. But that is the state at which it is now. I don't think it could be considered a report we could table in the House, as it is a memorandum between the various departments of government and for that reason not something that can be tabled.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on that particular matter. I think that the hon. Premier will recall that this question was raised during debate on the bill in the fall session. We were assured at that time that an interim report would be prepared and hopefully finished by the end of the year. I suggest ...[Inaudible]...

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. Opposition House Leader asking a question?

MR. HENDERSON:

I am asking, Mr. Speaker, that in honouring the commitment which I understood was made in the House, whether or not the hon. Premier will reconsider his statement and will table that particular memorandum?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, no, I won't table the memorandum, but we will make a review to see whether or not the information within the memorandum can form the basis for any useful interim report.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

Elevator Strike (Cont.)

MR. KOZIAK:

My question is addressed to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour, Mr. Speaker. Did the minister meet with the Alberta Contractors Association recently, and if the answer to that question is yes, . . . [Laughter] . . . my supplementary would be . . .

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member take one part of his questionnaire at a time?

MR. KOZIAK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I did meet with the Construction Association of Alberta two days ago, for an hour and a half. Twenty people representing many building companies met with me. I anticipated the supplementary question because the subject of the meeting was the elevator strike.

If I can report very briefly on this cross-nation strike, the situation is this. Negotiations are presently being conducted in the City of Toronto for the nation through the services of a mediator, a Mr. William Dickie. We are in constant touch with this gentleman, the owners, and the union representatives across the nation, who are represented at the table in Toronto. A week ago last weekend mediations broke off. My report yesterday was that Mr. Dickie had reconvened negotiations with respect to this very serious strike.

The Alberta Association of Contractors made several specific recommendations to this government. We are presently studying those recommendations. At the same time, the government has been watching the effects and the results of this strike and drawing some conclusions. I would like to report them in summary form, Mr. Speaker, in this way.

While we will continue to work very closely with the federal negotiation team, we also feel constrained to meet our responsibilities in the Province of Alberta. And so we will be taking certain initiatives based on the recommendations, not only of the construction association, but also of the unions, many concerned citizens and many building owners. We are working on this literally around the clock, and should have some recommendations for the hon. Premier and the Executive Council within a very short time.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the hon. minister had an opportunity to meet directly and personally with representatives from the union in this dispute?

DR. HOHOL:

To be as specific as I can, Mr. Speaker, I have not met personally with the bargaining agent, but I have had discussions with members of the union as recently as during the past week. I was also questioned very closely by the bargaining agent following a speech I made in Calgary about 10 or 14 days ago.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Before any recommendations are made to the cabinet, can the hon. minister give assurance to the House that he will meet with the bargaining agent of the union?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the question. I should respond in this way. The bargaining agent has a standing invitation from me to visit with me personally at merely a moment's notice.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, my question in relation to the elevator strike concerns the Norwood Auxiliary Hospital, or a portion of that complex. I would like to know, how much delay in utilization of that new facility has been occasioned by this strike?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, with reference to that particular project, I could also reply for many others. The strike is now of five months duration. It began as an international strike across North America. The final settlement in the United States occurred about five weeks ago in the City of New York, when 5,000 workers returned to work. This isolated the strike to Canada.

With different legislation from province to province, it becomes difficult to apply a national agreement that is completely within the labour act of each province, and so one of the major challenges here is to so modify a national agreement so that it fits the provincial situation. The option for the long term is to simply withdraw the advice of national agreements within the limits of our province and, therefore, have more direct capacity to deal with a strike, such as the one we have here.

So to answer the member for Jasper Place, that particular project has been delayed since its inception. It will be impossible to open a large number of buildings more than three storeys high because of the incapacity to deal with equipment and people, and in this particular case, senior citizens. It is a very regrettable circumstance. We will make every effort to assist in terminating the strike.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Labour. What maintenance is being carried out on elevators in use and what are his inspectors doing in regard to checking to make sure that elevators being used are not jeopardizing the lives of people who use them?

DR. HOHOL:

An excellent question, Mr. Speaker. The inspection branch under the Labour Act in legislation places the matter of safety inspection very specifically on the owner of an establishment. So the management of many companies has hired private safety inspectors. We do inspect the elevators across this province, but in the same way we would have had there not been a strike. That is to say, we did not feel that the situation, at least to this point, has been such that the government could rightfully employ additional staff to deal with a situation that exists between the employers and the employees. If a state of emergency in essential services appears to be the kind of assessment that will be made at some point, and it well could, then this situation could change, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this point, please?

MR. TAYLOR:

To the hon. Minister of Labour. Does the certificate that appears in the elevators, signed by inspectors of your department, not indicate that that elevator has been checked and is 'elevator-worthy'?

DR. HOHOL:

Yes, --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is for information that is available to everyone.

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

Students Auditorium Rates

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. Did he have any consultation with the high school students of Calgary before he agreed to double the rate charged to students for the use of the South Alberta Jubilee Auditorium for graduation ceremonies?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question I would like to say the following. We have had discussions with the superintendents of schools in Calgary, Separate and Public.

We have had discussions with a special high school which sent the letter regarding the increase in fees. All of them have indicated personally to us that actually they only wanted to find out what the increase was all about. Also some of them indicated that it was rather a political matter, and that they were being pushed by a certain member to do those things in Calgary.

[Mr. Ludwig rose]

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member wait until the hon. minister has finished his question? [Interjections] Order, please! Order, please!

MR. SCHMID:

It may be of interest to the hon. members assembled here that the rate increases were not 100 per cent. Previously, high schools renting the auditorium in Calgary had usually only rented the main floor and were charged a certain rate. As it came about, these graduation exercises became very successful -- in fact the most successful so far this year -- despite a small rental increase, and this year we have about eight high schools taking not only the main floor but also some of the balconies. Because of this, there is an increase in the rate. Last July 1 we announced an increase not only for high schools, but for the total use of the auditorium, which for commercial enterprises is \$800, but for high schools and similar organizations only \$400. May I also suggest to the hon. member that if he has such a concern for the Jubilee Auditorium increase in Calgary, I would like to state --

MR. LUDWIG:

Point of order, point of order!

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. minister please allow the hon. member a chance to state his point of order.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I asked the hon. minister a specific question, and I got a 15 minute speech. It is contrary to the rules of this House for an hon. member to elaborate and give the history of his department. I asked him if he had had any consultations with the high school students in Calgary before he had agreed to double the rates for graduation ceremonies. It was a specific question that requires a specific answer. I'm not interested in his ability to procrastinate and beat around the bush. I want an answer and I'm entitled to it, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. I must agree that the hon. member's point of order is valid. He did ask a question with respect to one particular point. May we consider the question as having been answered?

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister care to disclose the name of the hon. minister who went to bat for the high school students against this very arrogant and dictatorial kind of --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. The question is clearly out of order on the ground of innuendo, as the hon. member undoubtedly knows from annotation 171 of Beauchesne.

MR. LUDWIG:

I'd like to rephrase my question. Mr. Speaker, would the hon. minister care to indicate the hon. member who wrote to him requesting that he reconsider the decision?

MR. SPEAKER:

A question as to a communication between an hon. minister and an hon. member is out of order. The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation, followed by -- sorry, did the hon. member have a supplementary?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I have another supplementary, please, on this very issue.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lacombe. His supplementary, please.

MR. COOKSON:

Perhaps this could be directed to the hon. Minister of Education in conjunction with the answer the minister made. Are facilities available in the schools for graduation ceremonies, and if so, are there any rates charged?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, that question is hardly supplementary. It is an entirely different matter. It's not a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to direct a supplementary question to the hon. minister --

MR. SPEAKER:

We haven't yet had an indication from the hon. minister as to whether he wishes to answer the question from the hon. Member for Lacombe.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, facilities are certainly available, and decisions regarding the use of the facilities, which I think usually are free and made by local school boards, are consonant with continuing local autonomy.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this point?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation would advise whether he received any correspondence from the students concerning this matter?

MR. SCHMID:

I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, I didn't quite understand the question. Could he repeat the question, please?

MR. LUDWIG:

Has the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation received any correspondence from students and other sources concerning the issue of doubling the rates to students for graduation exercises?

MR. SCHMID:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have. In fact the last one I received stated clearly and precisely that they now understand the problem of having to raise some of the rental rates, which were not 100 per cent, Mr. Speaker. They now understand it, and they appreciate our having informed them of the increase.

[Applause.]

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I didn't understand that outburst. Would the hon. minister table the information he got?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed --

MR. LUDWIG:

I asked if the hon. minister would table the information he got. I didn't get an answer yet.

MR. HYNDMAN:

He should put it on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

We had the last supplementary. If the hon. member wishes to deal with it further, he may do so in another question period or on the Order Paper. The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation, followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Provincial Parks

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Lands and Forests. Has the government had any consultations with the cities of Edmonton and Calgary with regard to the establishment of a provincial park within these cities' municipal boundaries?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, these of course are separate cities and the answer could be different, one as compared to another, but in any case I have received communication from both cities in this regard.

MR. SORENSON:

Supplementary question. Has any land been optioned or purchased by the Government of Alberta for this purpose?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I expect to be in a position after the weekend to relay additional information on this matter to the House.

MR. SORENSON:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is there any danger of Big Knife Provincial Park, which is located in east central Alberta, being closed or moved to a new location in the near future?

[Interjections]

It is certainly a supplementary! It could be moved to Edmonton or Calgary.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is some question as to whether the hon. ...

MR. HYNDMAN:

Could it be stated as to how we move a park, as the hon. member ...

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of Order. It takes very little intelligence on the part of the minister to appreciate he is talking about shifting the boundaries of the park.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Perhaps we should accept the hon. member's question as a supplementary.

DR. WARRACK:

I'm sure we would because I am just delighted to report that we have not moved Big Knife Provincial Park from the Camrose constituency to either Edmonton or Calgary. In fact the hon. Member for Camrose, Mr. Gordon Stromberg, and myself have been giving that matter very serious attention over several weeks and as a matter of fact, the attention given to it by MLAs has entirely thus far been from the hon. member, Mr. Stromberg, from Camrose.

MR. SORENSON:

A supplementary. Has consultation been made with Alberta Power, Alberta Coal and Luscar Coal concerning the future of the park, and if so, what are the results of these consultations?

DR. WARRACK:

These discussions have been initiated and are under way at this time.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Is it the government's intention to convert the lands, commonly known as Lowery Gardens in Calgary, to a provincial park?

DR. WARRACK:

Not at this time, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, the hon. member asked that very question last year. I know he is following up this year, and the answer is the same as last year.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Freedom of Speech

MR. TAYLOR:

I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister responsible for Tourism, Mr. Dowling. Having regard to freedom of speech in the Bill of Rights, did you advise the Hutterites to keep their mouths shut and not to make statements concerning ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What's out of order about that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is loaded with innuendo; perhaps the hon. member could ask it in a simple way.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, this was reported in the press that the Hutterian Brethren were told by the minister to keep their mouths shut and not to speak. I want to know if freedom of speech is being restrained in this province. I'm asking a simple question for the minister to say yes or no. Did he say this to the Hutterites, or did he not?

MR. DOWLING:

Well, I don't agree with the phrasing of the member's question. Perhaps he could say it another way.

Could the hon. member rephrase the question? It's incorrect.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I don't see why I should rephrase the question. I want to know if the hon. minister told the Hutterites to keep their mouths shut; not to talk about Hutterian matters in public?

MR. DOWLING:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR:

Did the hon. minister have a conference with the Hutterites and indicate to them that they should not make public statements?

MR. DOWLING:

No, Mr. Speaker, I told them that they should be careful when discussing matters anywhere in public. I said they should be very careful that they don't say anything that could be confused or misunderstood.

MR. TAYLOR:

Is this not a threat to the Hutterites, that they either keep their mouths shut, or else?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member will have to do his own interpreting of the remarks. Order, please. The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake followed by the hon. Member for Macleod.

Location of Airports

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is the government currently studying any new major airport locations in Alberta?

MR. PEACOCK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARTON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What areas in the province are these? Is it in the form of recreation?

MR. PEACOCK:

I'm not sure of what the member is asking, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARTON:

I would like to make a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio Responsible for Tourism. Is his department doing a study of any major airports in Alberta?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned about airports and the traffic coming in and out of the province. I can't be very specific. We are very much interested in every square inch of our province, so we are interested in all airports whether they are in High Level or in Lethbridge -- all of them.

MR. SPEAKER:

We have time for just the final question by the hon. Member for Macleod.

Grain Charges

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture regarding the some 40 farmers, Mr. Minister, at Bentley, charged under The Canadian Wheat Board Act. Has your department made an investigation why such a large number of farmers were charged at this one location?

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, that of course is a federal matter, but my Grain Commission looked into it when the charges were laid. Unfortunately, there were incidents of over-delivery and The Canadian Wheat Board in their judgment, went ahead with the charges in that particular area.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is there any difference, in your opinion, between the deliverer of wheat and the deliverer of rapeseed, regarding charges?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking for a legal opinion.

DR. HORNER:

Not being a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, there is a substantial difference between the deliverer of wheat and the deliverer of rapeseed to a crushing plant in regard to a number of matters. At some future date I would be quite willing to take up that question with the hon. member and elucidate at some length.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion for Adjournment

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. I beg leave to make a motion, seconded by Mr. Robert Clark, the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury for the adjournment of the Assembly for the purpose of discussing a matter of definite urgent public importance as per section 23, subsections 1, 2, and 3 of our Rules, Orders and Forms of Procedure.

In the interest of ensuring that the freedom of speech and freedom of the press, provided for by the Bill of Rights is not further jeopardized, it is of urgent public importance for this House to set out immediately the contractual limitations between the Government of Alberta and the RCMP to guarantee that in the future the RCMP will not be used as a vehicle for investigating private citizens for political purposes.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege raised by the hon. member. He has now made a motion under Rule 22 which I consider to be out of order because we are entering into Throne Speech debate in which any matter can be discussed as fully as they would like and --

MR. HENDERSON:

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the minister are out of order. I specifically refrained from adding to my comments with a view to allowing the Speaker to review the motion I have made. As I understand the rules, it is not the prerogative of anyone in this House, Mr. Speaker, including myself, to comment further on the matter until you have examined it.

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, surely we are not going to be told by the Leader of the Opposition that we can't even speak in this House or raise a point of order or a point of privilege. Surely we, as individual members, are going to continue to have that right in this Legislature. My comments on the point of order were simply to point out to your Honour, that in my view --

MR. HENDERSON:

On a point of order. Is the minister --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. Opposition House Leader permit the hon. Deputy Premier to finish stating his point of order? Anything which arises out of the rules may give rise to a point of order, but there may not be a point of order on a point of order or there would be no end to it.

DR. HORNER:

Well, Mr. Speaker, thank you. What I am trying to point out to you sir, and to the House generally, is that we are now commencing, or very shortly thereof, the debate on the Speech from the Throne. This is a --

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, could the hon. Deputy Premier state a point of order and not debate some nonsense that he doesn't know --

MR. HENDERSON:

[Inaudible]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! There is a point of order before the House as to whether or not the request for leave under Rule 23 is in order.

MR. HENDERSON:

[Inaudible]

MR. SPEAKER:

I believe I have understood the tenor of the hon. Deputy Premier's remarks, and if there are any other members who wish to express an opinion on the point of order, which I am required to decide, I would be glad to hear from them.

DR. HORNER:

I did not have the opportunity to conclude, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View cut me off. I am trying to make the point, Mr. Speaker, that each of them has an opportunity in the Throne Speech debate, to debate any matter they like. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has unlimited time, and each of them has at least 40 minutes to debate any matter that they so wish on the Throne Speech debate. Therefore, moving a motion to adjourn the House to discuss a particular matter is completely out of order at this time.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could make one or two comments on the point of order. A matter of urgent public importance takes precedence over any other debate. According to Beauchesne it must be raised at the earliest possible moment, and the earliest possible moment is the present time. It must also be raised under Orders of the Day. If it were precluded simply because we had the Speech from the Throne in front of us, it would preclude a number of matters of

urgent public importance in the House of Commons and even in this Legislature. Some few years ago one was moved by an hon. member of the opposition.

But I suggest that a matter of urgent public importance has nothing whatsoever to do with other debates that are in the House at the time. It is so important that it must be raised immediately, according to the rules.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, on speaking to the point of order I would like to raise two other reasons why I suggest that the motion is not in order. Firstly, it is not the urgency of the issue but the urgency of debate and I submit that there is every opportunity for debate on this issue even as early as this afternoon. Secondly, the hon. Opposition House Leader moved, under Rule 23 to adjourn the House, and Subsection 6(e) of that rule clearly states that the adjournment of the House may not be moved where a question of privilege is involved.

MR. HENDERSON:

Speaking to that particular point of order, Mr. Speaker, the question of privilege is the privilege of myself rising in my place to make the motion. There is nothing in the statement handed to the Chair raising a matter of privilege on the part of any hon. member of this House, other than the privilege to present the motion to the House. It does not concern a matter of privilege, in the technical sense, of a specific member of this Assembly sitting on that side or on this side.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I think there is one other reason why we shouldn't adjourn to debate this matter. I am not questioning the allegation of public importance, but I am questioning the additive "urgent." This particular question has received quite an airing in the media. I understand that it took place several weeks ago. There is no urgency for immediate debate and, as the hon. Deputy Premier has pointed out, there is complete latitude in the debate on the Speech from the Throne to discuss any subject. There seems to be a failure of this motion on the grounds of urgency.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the debate that took place on this point of order, and I will speak to it. It took place in this House within the last twelve months, and involved the tremendous importance of The Bill of Human Rights to the citizens of Alberta. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that when one talks about the priority of this item over the Throne Speech one uses the same argument presented by the previous speaker. In his view everything in the Throne Speech is presented in the press, and what this motion calls for is specific action on a specific item of specific importance. The government itself has attached tremendous importance to this item in the past and I presume they will do this in the future as well. I therefore ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker on this particular matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

We must have some order in the discussion on the point of order, and we must not have hon. members getting up two or three times. I wonder if we could hear from the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as the hon. Opposition House Leader has referred to something that has happened in the last 12 months in the House, I thought I might draw to your attention -- so that you can use it in your assessment of the Opposition's request in this case -- that last year on opening day, or the day after the opening when the Throne Speech was to be debated, the hon. members at that time made a similar motion. Then when they had the floor, they adjourned within an hour. So I just thought, Mr. Speaker, you might assess the real urgency and the way they feel --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! The hon. minister is discussing motives and not points of order. The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, on this point of order there is a very important thing to be considered in your deliberations -- simply that there is a direct conflict between the human rights act and, apparently, the RCMP agreement.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is now starting the debate as to which is to be the subject matter of the request for leave, and we are not at that stage yet. The hon. member for Drumheller is anxious to state some further views on the point of order. He has already spoken once. Has he the leave of the House to speak again?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members of the House. There are just two points I would like to raise. The hon. Opposition House Leader, the hon. Leader of the Opposition on this side, did not rise actually on a point of privilege. I think this should be disregarded. He rose on a point of urgent public importance.

Secondly, I would like to draw to your attention for your consideration the fact that the Premier of Saskatchewan, at the session in 1972, did himself raise a matter of urgent public importance on the second day of that session dealing with the matter of movements of grain. That was accepted and debated in the Saskatchewan Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER:

I thank the hon. member for bringing to my attention the precedent from the Legislature of Saskatchewan. We have had similar situations in this House in the past year and the Chair has expressed the wish that although the Rules don't require it, a point of this kind might be brought to the attention of the Chair an hour or two before the sittings.

I realize that the hon. Leader of the Opposition was in my office without being able to see me, about ten minutes before the sitting. But, if there is an occasion of this kind in the future, then I can assure the members that it will be treated with the utmost confidence. I would be obliged if I might be given a copy of the point which it is proposed to debate.

With regard to the request for leave, under Rule 23, I think I might respectfully draw to the attention of the House that this type of debate does not lead to a resolution. The request for leave, if it is granted, leads to a debate. It does not lead to a resolution that the House do or decide one point or another. I'm not even aware that there may be a vote at the end of such a debate because the request for leave is merely a request for an opportunity to debate.

As has been pointed out, both last year and today, the question is not the importance of the matter, and, concerning which, the Chair, in the Chair, expresses no opinion. The question is rather the urgency of debate, and there is no doubt with the rules of relevance, and the rules of debate being as broad as they are with respect to the debate on the Speech from the Throne that there is practically nothing which might be said under this request for leave, if it is granted, which could not be said in the Throne Speech debate. I must therefore rule that the request does not come within the terms of Rule 23.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I simply say I regret your decision. We accept it, sir, and we will certainly take under consideration and discuss with you further the recommendation that you have made, and I would therefore conclude we are now going to proceed with the "Battle of Trivia Heights", otherwise. . .[inaudible].

MR. SPEAKER:

I didn't get the hon. member's concluding remarks.

MR. HENDERSON:

I said that I conclude from your ruling that we are now going to proceed with the "Battle of Trivia Heights", otherwise known as the "government's folly."

MR. SPEAKER:

The Opposition House Leader's remarks might be more appropriate during the debate rather than to be directed to the Chair after a ruling.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, would you be kind enough to let us have the basis and the authority for your decision?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sit down!

MR. TAYLOR:

Surely we're entitled to the authority so that we can follow it through.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller is certainly perfectly in order. The rules indicate, both in word and in spirit, that wherever possible the Speaker should give reasons, from precedents and from rules, for his rulings. May I just refer the hon. Member for Drumheller to Annotation 100 in Beauchesne, Section 3 on page 90 of Beauchesne.

1978 Commonwealth Games

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like, under Orders of the Day, today to make an announcement of, I believe, some major importance to all of the citizens of the province, but particularly to the citizens of the City of Edmonton and the area surrounding Edmonton.

As the hon. members are aware, there was a reference yesterday in the Throne Speech to the providing of recreation facilities to the larger centres in the province. There was also a reference in the Throne Speech to the matter of fitness and amateur sport.

I am pleased to announce today that we have, in the cabinet, decided after full consideration and consultation with the City of Edmonton, and the Mayor of the City of Edmonton, the degree to which we will contribute as a provincial government to the Commonwealth Games to be staged in Edmonton in 1978.

I would like to take this occasion, on behalf of the government, to express to the City of Edmonton and all the people who were involved, our congratulations on the very effective way in which they made a presentation and secured this important event for Alberta and for Edmonton.

The Provincial Government is prepared to contribute up to \$11,600,000 as its share toward the capital cost, excluding land, of the Commonwealth Games to be staged in Edmonton in 1978.

The total capital costs for the games are estimated to be approximately \$35 million. The provincial government will contribute one-third of that \$35 million, or one-third of the actual capital cost, whichever is the lesser.

The cabinet today has also approved a grant of \$3,700,000 to the Edmonton Exhibition Association as the first portion of the Provincial Government's financial commitment to the 1978 Commonwealth Games. This capital grant, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the Assembly, will be used to help finance construction of a sports, trade and exhibit complex on the Exhibition Grounds, and is payable over a ten year period. The 1978 Commonwealth Games will utilize the coliseum facility for a number of sporting events. The remainder of the \$11,600,000 will be made available as required.

There are other planned facilities such as a stadium, an olympic pool, a bicycle velodrome, and a shooting range, all of which will accommodate in excess of 60,000 spectators.

We recognize that a substantial proportion of the citizens of the whole province should have access to this event, and to the recreation facilities. We believe that the 1978 Commonwealth Games will provide this segment of the population with a better opportunity to enjoy sporting events and more particularly, Mr. Speaker, to participate in recreation programs through the use of these new facilities to be built in association with the Games.

Amateur sport in our view, Mr. Speaker, will benefit for many years to come through sound site choice, planning and provision of facilities, and we hereby declare our fullest co-operation with the City of Edmonton to make the 1978 Commonwealth Games the most successful event ever staged in the capital city of our province.

Road Allowances

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege to inquire about a question that I put to an hon. minister which was made a Motion for a Return on November 21, 1972, and it is Motion No. 250. It deals with the locations of legally and illegally closed road allowance, and I wonder whether the hon. minister can indicate to me whether it is his intention to answer this question. There is a growing wave of protest over this issue and I would like to have an answer at the earliest possible date.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's point of privilege is not a point of privilege. A minister is not obliged to answer a question, but perhaps the hon. minister would like to comment on it.

MR. LUDWIG:

It was a Motion for a Return, Mr. Speaker, not a question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Sorry, in that event.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I will be tabling those reports probably this coming week.

CONSIDERATION OF HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

Mr. Chambers proposed the following motion to this Assembly, seconded by Mr. Harle:

That an humble address be presented to His Honour the Honourable J.W. Grant MacEwan, the Lieutenant Governor of Alberta, as follows:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech that Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of this present session.

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, I consider it a great honour, not only to me, but also to the people of my constituency of Edmonton-Caldor, to have been invited to make this motion, and I wish to convey my sincere appreciation to our hon. Premier.

Mr. Speaker, as we prepare at the opening of this, the second session of the 17th Alberta Legislature, to implement plans for the future of our province, let me remind the Assembly of some of the more significant accomplishments realized in phase one of this government's mandate. Assistance in easing the financial burden of our senior citizens, help for the handicapped, programs for assisting agriculture, preserving the family farm, new natural resource policies, and important steps towards diversification of our Alberta economy were major achievements in long-range proposal to preserve and promote the quality of life for Albertans.

Phase two of our government's program is outlined in the Throne Speech. It promises the same vitality and directness of action that characterized the first phase.

Most programs will be of interest to most Albertans. For instance, I am sure that everyone will share my pleasure in the further attention proposed for the needs of our elderly citizens. Legislation last year freed these senior citizens, the pioneers of our province, from paying medicare premiums, optional health services, most drug costs, and the provincial education tax. These measures were of significant benefit. Of less financial significance perhaps, but equally vital to the well-being of these people, is the proposed new policy with regard to better accommodation and better recreational facilities.

Edmonton Calder probably has the highest proportion of senior citizens living in senior citizens' homes of any constituency in Alberta. So I feel I can speak with some authority on this subject. It is my opinion, formulated after many discussions with the residents of these homes and other senior citizens in Edmonton Calder, that vast barnlike recreation halls are not what they are looking for in recreational facilities. They would prefer small workshops where they could glue a chair back together, build a cabinet or perhaps do a little mechanical tinkering. They would like a reading room or a library, stocked with good books, and a small games room where they could enjoy an interest in checkers or bridge or pool or some other game they have grown old with.

So I take this opportunity to suggest to the Minister of Health and Social Development that, in the planning of future accommodation for our senior citizens, these desires be taken into consideration; in fact, that these people be consulted. A plan featuring good industrial design could incorporate these needs from the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech has recognized the necessity of expanding our programs in the areas of mental health and handicapped children. I am most gratified to see that intensive treatment is planned for patients who have been or are potential law breakers because of mental disturbances. Too often in the past the underlying emotional problem has not been discovered, and severely disturbed patients have been released, only to run afoul of the law again. This is a situation, I might add, that lends nothing to the progress of such a person's health. The decision to tackle this problem is a courageous one, and one that will, I am sure, benefit not only the persons directly concerned, but the whole population of Alberta.

This government, Mr. Speaker, has already demonstrated its ability to make courageous decisions and to stand firm in the face of criticism. I'm talking now, Mr. Speaker, about the difficult decisions, and the resulting advantages in connection with our natural resource policies. The public oil hearings last spring, the subsequent decision to apply a mineral tax, which would return an additional \$70 million per year exclusive of production and price increases to the Alberta treasury, and the two-price rebate gas policy announced last fall -- this breaking with tradition -- generated a great deal of criticism and concern.

I freely admit I was one of those in the industry genuinely concerned about the effect that the mineral tax would have on the exploration activity in the province. After all, the easy deposits have been discovered. Although it was estimated that nearly one-half of the conventional oil reserves in this province have not been unearthed, it is this latter half that will be more expensive to uncover. How would we maintain adequate motivation for people to risk the large sums of money required to discover and develop these additional 10 billion barrels? We needn't have worried. The drilling incentive plan provided the answer. This excellent plan has already resulted in a greatly increased level of drilling activity in the province. Rigs that have lain idle for years have now shaken off the dust and are rotating once more, as their bits probe into the Alberta sediments looking for new finds.

Moreover, the drilling business, which by the way is 85 per cent Canadian owned, is highly labour-intensive. Each active rig creates, both directly and indirectly, in the neighbourhood of 120 jobs for Albertans. It generates a payroll of some \$4,400 per day. Most of the rig workers come from rural Alberta. Most of the indirect jobs are generated in the rural areas where the rigs are working. This is a most significant fact in our efforts to overcome regional disparity.

It is interesting to note that there are 35 more rigs working in Alberta now than there were one year ago. If we compare the six-month period just ended with the corresponding six-month period of last year, an additional sum of more than \$15 million has been added to the Alberta payroll. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the drilling incentive plan is proving to be a highly effective one. The Minister of Mines and Minerals and the Premier deserve full credit for an outstanding job.

The natural resources of Alberta belong to the people, who must receive fair and honest commodity value for their sale. There are some people out there in right field who have blinders on when it comes to recognizing this fact. On the other hand, there are also people in the far left who would kill the goose that lays that black gold egg.

The goose killers were unusually silent over the last several decades when the oil industry was risking hundreds of millions of dollars in search of oil, with no assurance of ever realizing a payout. They closed their eyes to the implication inherent in the long interval between the start of exploration and, hopefully, the first financial returns on their overall investment. They conveniently forgot that the dry holes must be paid for. Now, when the market picture has taken on a bright new sheen, the state control advocates are prepared to wring the goose's neck in order to grasp what they term a moral and fair share for the commodity. Have they given any thought to how they would pay for discovering another egg? That's to say the 10 billion barrels of undiscovered conventional oil, or even the whole nest of eggs in the tar sands.

Mr. Speaker, it makes me very proud to be a member of a government that has acted with integrity, in the best interests of the people of this province; a government working to ensure the orderly development of our resources, maximum employment and a fair value to the people of Alberta for resources sold.

The new gas policy announced during last fall's session provided a tangible lift to the gas exploration business which had been sagging due to wellhead prices that were demonstrably low. With most of our gas reserve contained in deep reservoirs along the foothills where deposits with heavy sulphur content proved uneconomical the deep probes became fewer. With significantly higher well-head prices, imminent exploration drilling is picking up to near record levels.

The two-price rebate system for natural gas represents a fantastic achievement for the people of Alberta. Natural gas is the most convenient, clean-burning, pollution-free fuel presently available, and Albertans, through the rebate, will continue to have the advantages of natural gas at an economical price. We will also enjoy the advantages of increased revenues from the higher prices assessed for sales outside the province. Additionally, the availability of low price gas in Alberta will provide an incentive to manufacturers and other industries to locate here, an incentive other provinces cannot offer. The rebate system will also help us in this province to offset the disadvantages of a relatively small isolated market and the disadvantages of inequitable freight rate differentials. It will undoubtedly help in some considerable measure to combat a general situation which, from an industrial development standpoint, has traditionally favoured the East.

The initial grumbling from the East is gradually dying away like a passing thunderstorm. The United States is prepared to pay the higher price for whatever Alberta gas they can obtain and so the people of Alberta will benefit through the direct price rebate, through increased returns to the provincial treasury, and from additional job opportunities now being created.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all looking forward at this session, to the finalization of the new Natural Gas Revenue and Royalty Plan for Alberta, just as we are looking forward with anticipation to the new oil sands policy which will be announced later during this session.

The Alberta tar sands have the potential to develop into one of the greatest economic entities in the world. The impact upon the economy and the growth of this province could be enormous. There is a known deposit of more than 500 billion barrels, of which approximately 10 per cent, or say 50 billion barrels, is recoverable by strip mining operations. The balance must be recovered through deep mining, or in SITU the methods for which technology is still in the development stage.

Compared to conventional oil producing operations, tar sands production is a highly labour intensive business. It has been estimated that each mining plant will result directly and indirectly in some 9,000 new jobs and that these jobs will support more than 20,000 individuals, including the employee families. Now if we postulate a total of three or four plants on stream, say, by 1980, one per year coming on stream thereafter, simple arithmetic would show that by 1990 a quarter of a million people in Alberta could be supported by synthetic crude operations.

When we consider all of the supporting and resulting, secondary and tertiary industries such as power projects, pipe lines - including manufacturing and construction of these miscellaneous equipment manufacturing and sundry

service industries, we begin to realize the potential impact on Alberta, indeed on all of Canada. However, potential is only potential until it is properly nurtured to realization.

It is no secret that the Great Canadian Oil Sands project has not been profitable to date. Synthetic crude operations have much greater labour expense, much larger capital investment than conventional oil operations. In addition their basic product, raw bitumen has far less value than does conventional oil.

Oil value is dependent on several factors including impurities such as sulphur and their specific gravity. For example, heavy, high sulphur conventional oil from Lloydminster is worth only half the price of light, low sulphur crude from the Bonny Glen field. The raw bitumen which is twice as thick as Lloydminster crude, and contains even more sulphur, is worth considerably less per barrel. Also the tar contains many other metal impurities which interfere with normal refining processes. They must be purified and upgraded through the use of costly and elaborate processing equipment.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, the minister is well aware of these facts and he is taking them under advisement in considering the tar sands royalties. It occurs to me that given the current marginal economics of tar development, the oil companies must be counting on future price increases of sufficient magnitude to cover inflation and to yield a present-value profit on tar operations. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I venture to suggest to the minister, that the initial royalty be sufficiently low so as not to adversely effect an already marginal economic situation and that such royalty be tied to future conventional crude price increases. In this way the people of Alberta will be assured a fair return in the future for the sale of this resource. Actually these royalty payments, regardless of their amounts, will be very small compared to the revenue which will accrue to Albertans through the overall impact of the industry.

Whatever royalty is proposed, there will, of course, be the detractors who argue that we should wait for a decade or so until the price of crude oil goes up. To them, let me say this: at the ever increasing rate at which the world is consuming oil, it may well have to be replaced as our main source of energy in a span as short as 30 years. Alternately energy sources to power cars, and heat buildings, will be developed.

The tar sands plant has a gestation period from conception to stream as much as 10 years. To ensure that we realize the potential of our tar sands then, we must within the next two decades, develop the needed technology and get as many plants as possible into production. Only if it can be used is the tar a resource. Otherwise it is merely a sticky substance covered my moose pasture.

With regard to employment in this industry major training programs will be necessary, but they will provide great opportunities for all of our citizens including out Metis and native peoples. However, let me warn against a policy of parochialism in this situation where Albertans must be given priority. There will be a need for skilled people from all parts of Canada.

Let me also warn against parochialism in investment. There are considerable technological and economical risks in the early stage of tar sands development. While I am all for maximum participation by Albertans and by all Canadians in our future resource development, the tar sands are a risk that I would rather see the big oil companies take at this particular time. It is conceivable that hundreds of millions of dollars could be sucked into oblivion by tar sands projects where the economics fall short. I, for one, think that I will defer any direct investment until the technology has proven itself.

Let me leave the subject of natural resources with a final thought for the minister. I recall a recent editorial in an American trade journal which advocated the importation of United States crude oil, not the finished product. The idea, of course, was to maintain refinery employment and technology in the United States. I am not loath to borrow a good idea, so I think we should endeavour, and I was happy to see a reference to this philosophy in the Throne Speech, to ensure that considerable of our synthetic oil be refined in Alberta. Not only would this provide additional jobs for Albertans, but it would develop the process expertise which would have valuable application in many areas.

Mr. Speaker, by this time all members will be familiar with the recently announced property tax reduction plan. I think it is great, and I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. minister and Mr. Farran and his task force for an outstanding piece of work. The basic premise that property tax services property and that the burden of social services rebate from general

provincial revenues reflects the advanced philosophy of this government. It is one that I predict will be adopted by most jurisdictions in Canada. Equally significant is the fact that every citizen of Alberta -- urban or property owner, mobile home owner or renter -- will benefit and will receive a tax rebate or credit up to a maximum of \$216, representing the assessed cost of education and health. With the province assuming financial responsibility for hospital administration and providing increased municipal assistance grants, the municipalities too, will find themselves in a much more acceptable economic position. The cost of this plan is \$50 million, which will be realized through the increased natural resource revenue I mentioned earlier. Obviously this policy represents a direct and major dividend to be paid to the people of Alberta on the ownership of their natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I take particular pleasure in the Throne Speech reference to a new provincial parks policy which will provide for provincial parks in urban centres. It has long been a somewhat contentious issue that the people who could best utilize our provincial parks -- the young and the old alike -- are often without the transportation to reach them. Urban area provincial parks will fill a real void for these people providing there is adequate public transportation so that non automobile owners may have ready access to these recreational facilities. Urban transportation has become a rather serious problem in itself. I am happy to see that plans are in the making to help alleviate these difficulties in the larger cities.

As a representative of a solidly populated urban constituency, I would be interested in hearing more about the exchange program between young city and rural people. I am sure the youth from both areas could benefit from such exchange visits.

Speaking of an inter-relationship between urban and rural young people, it strikes me that our rural children often enjoy a distinct advantage in the matter of recreational facilities. We have many fine young athletes in Edmonton Calder, but because of the dense urban population they are handicapped by insufficient recreational facilities. The matter of hockey facilities is still a problem in my constituency. The young players are still short of ice time. There is a genuine need for more covered ice facilities throughout our communities, and I note with anticipation the reference of the Throne Speech to improved urban recreational facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that each member here is concerned about the cost and sharp rises in food prices right across the country. This grave situation has a direct adverse affect on the standard of living of many of our citizens, particularly those living on fixed incomes and those in less fortunate circumstances. The question that must be answered first is where does this price increase originate? It is not on the farms. As a member whose parents still operate their family farm, I know that the farmer has not yet escaped the vicious squeeze of the demands of bigger and bigger prices for machinery and supplies but little more for farm produce. I, for one, would like to see an examination of the whole area of food pricing.

Mr. Speaker, the prospects of a new Workmen's Compensation Act will be good news for Alberta's labour force, as there are certainly shortcomings in the present act in the light of present day needs. One of these shortcomings which I hope to see corrected in the new act, is the amount of compensation for a worker who is totally incapacitated. These workers are usually men with families to raise and support, and present compensation makes for a very tight purse string.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate how very fortunate we are to live in Alberta. We are one of the strongest economies in Canada, and we have the best employment record of any province. There are abundant natural resources, and in our recognition of the need to develop a more diversified economy we can look forward to a limitless future.

It is unfortunate that national policies in the past tended to retard the development of this province and the whole of western Canada. It is apparent now that the entire field of federal-provincial relations must be deeply probed, and negotiations continued, if we are to realize our potential as a province. Our Premier recognized this priority from the first, creating a separate Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to establish and maintain good working relationships with other governments in Canada. The minister of this department, Mr. Getty, can certainly be commended for the advancements he has already achieved in federal-provincial relationships.

My only disappointment is that the official opposition has attached so little importance to co-ordinating our efforts with those of the rest of Canada.

I hope that this year they will broaden their outlook and foresee the usefulness of looking beyond their own provincial boundaries.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne has outlined a program of strength, using as its guideline the basic commitment of this government to the people of Alberta. We enjoyed some exciting legislation in the last session, and it appears that we can look forward to equally imaginative legislation in this session. For me, it has been a privilege to have been selected to move this reply to such an impressive Throne Speech. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for the honour.

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honour for me also, representing a rural constituency, to speak on the motion thanking His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Alberta for the address he gave us yesterday.

I must first speak about my own constituency. As far as my constituency is concerned, the reference in the Speech from the Throne to further implement the Progressive Conservative platform to decentralize government offices will be very welcome news indeed. The population of the town of Stettler, according to the latest census that was made in January, has fallen under 4,000 people. This is the first time for some years that we have been under this figure. In 1970 our population was 4,381, according to the municipal statistics.

To further compound the problem, the Alberta Government Telephones announced a program to reduce its telephone staff in Stettler by some 22 jobs within the next year or so. The telephone jobs lost will be jobs for women, and if this occurs some families in my home town will find it a little more difficult to maintain their present income level. Some obviously will have to leave. Included in the loss are ten jobs held by young single girls, and lack of jobs for young people is a very urgent matter in our small towns. This loss, really in the final analysis, will be much more serious.

The people of the province have seen that our government means business when it talks about decentralization. Two recent announcements have indicated this. The announcement to locate the Alberta Opportunity Company at Ponoka was the first concrete indication that the party platform on this subject was to be implemented in government policy.

The more recent announcement that the Agricultural Development Corporation is to be located at Camrose shows that the first announcement was not just paying lip service to our principles.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the purpose of government decentralizing its offices is to provide leadership in this matter to the industrial and commercial world. It shows our government's confidence and the viability of our smaller centres, and it should result in decisions by the industrial and commercial community to establish plants and offices in rural Alberta. This will all take time, but once a trend is established, the business community will find it easier to make these types of decisions.

The people of Alberta, including our hard working civil servants, can expect further announcements of this kind in the future. I am, therefore, very concerned that the president of the Civil Service Association should say that some of his members feel it will mean the end of their career, and that employees who move will be out of the mainstream of their department, thus hurting chances for advancement, as reported in the Edmonton Journal recently.

I can assure civil servants who will be affected by such moves that there are many men and women in all walks of life who serve part, if not all, of their careers in smaller towns and cities, and each and every one of them will tell you that the life of the smaller centre expanded their opportunities. There is absolutely no reason to believe that such will not be the case for civil servants.

I, therefore, say to the members of the Civil Service Association that our smaller centres will make you welcome. In fact, the red carpet will be out. We need you; we respect you; we will try to understand your problems, and we are very anxious to have you fit into our communities because we know, in the end, you are going to enjoy it.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne tells us that there will be exchange programs involving young people in the cities and rural areas as mentioned by the previous speaker, and that there will be development of a new

concept called Future Farmers of Alberta. Those who were involved in the Man and Resources Alberta Program of 1972 of the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers will recognize these needs.

The meeting held at Coronation heard the suggestion that students should be trained through Manpower for farm work, that young people do not want to stay on their own farms, but if the opportunity came, would like to move to other farms for work. Another suggestion was that there is a need to reorganize the farm economy, to keep youth on the farm and preserve the family farm.

The meeting at Barrhead heard the suggestion that we need to encourage and train farm sons so that they will return to the farm -- proud to be farmers. At the Barrhead meeting there was also a suggestion of apprenticeship on neighbours' farms to encourage and train young people to return to the farm.

From Rimbey there was the concern expressed that the family farm is disappearing, and they asked the question, how do we keep the youth on our farms? They made a suggestion of some sort of city farm exchange program. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the future farmers program and the exchange program are a definite response by our government to the needs of the people in our rural areas. Those who are interested in the exchange program might be interested in the July 20, 1972, issue of the "Western Producer."

Other needs also discussed by those attending the rural portion of the Man and Resources Program have also been met in the Speech from the Throne. I am sure our rural residents will welcome the provision of more information on the type and quality of production needed for domestic and foreign markets, the encouragement to be given to secondary and tertiary processing of farm products in rural areas, the plan for expanding the benefit of gas to rural Albertans, the improvement and extension of our highways with special emphasis on rural development, and the Alberta Government Telephones' plan involving extended-area service.

Mr. Speaker, these plans by our government reflect the concerns and suggestions made by almost every board of trade, chamber of commerce and farm organization, and I am sure that they will receive the approval of all Albertans.

I would like to commend the government on its plan to have a disaster service act to cover hardship caused by natural disasters. The work now being done by the Emergency Measures Organization, goes largely unheralded and, in fact, is not even recognized by the community at large. I assume that the work of EMO is being broadened and strengthened by the new act so that relief will be available when a natural disaster strikes, such as a hailstorm or windstorm, tornado, flood, an early or late snow. The act will probably cover such things as the provision of funds, medical, food, and feed supplies, and the development of contingency plans and emergency housing.

Mr. Speaker, our government took a step this year which was somewhat unusual. It announced the Alberta Property Tax Reduction Plan already been referred to, so that the people of Alberta and the municipal representatives would know as early as possible the government's intentions in the areas of municipal finance, without having to wait for the Speech from the Throne and the Budget Speech.

Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that the area of most concern appears to be in the incentive grants being based on limiting the increase of the municipal mill rate to 7 1/2 per cent. The 7 1/2 per cent figure represents a reasonable municipal growth rate, but when applied to each municipality there may be some difficulties. Some municipalities will be below the rate this year, some above, and next year their positions could well be reversed.

A suggestion has been made that there be provision in the act for either an appeal to a board which would have the right to return the incentive grant to the municipality in the proper case -- for example, where unexpected events have created budget imbalances -- or a plebiscite procedure, whereby the municipality would require voter approval to exceed the seven and one half per cent figure, thereby retaining the incentive grant. Mr. Speaker, this might go a long way towards retaining the idea of local autonomy in the minds of municipal officials, as voters would respect the government's guidelines and would only give approval where it could be justified. But, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the general public, the municipal taxpayers, approve of the seven and one-half per cent figure, and they will be reluctant to see the government modify its position on this.

Mr. Speaker, The Bill of Rights and The Individual's Rights Protection Act were introduced last year and became law. All of us in this Assembly will recall the hon. Premier's warning that these will not be easy pieces of legislation to live with. He indicated that their effect will come to our attention in unexpected ways. However, there is one area which we in this Assembly thought we had anticipated, but apparently we were wrong. The Alberta Catholic School Trustees' Association sent a brief to the cabinet adequately setting out the problem, which is simply that Roman Catholic public and separate schools should continue to have the right to recruit Catholics and appoint them to their staff. The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, you will recall, indicated to us that Catholic school boards wouldn't be in any way inhibited from advertising for Catholic school teachers. A letter received by one of the member boards of the association from the Human Rights Commission appears to express a different opinion. I express the hope that this matter will be cleared up promptly in favour of the Catholic School Trustees' Association. Surely this is a matter that does not need to be debated, as debate would only create a problem when none really exists.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed encouraging to hear that gross farm income will be over \$900 million for 1972. This, incidentally, represents an increase of \$112 million over 1971. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, Statistics Canada has not yet published the more telling figure of farm net income for 1972. There has been considerable inflation, which affects not only the price farmers sell their products for, but also the price of goods they have purchased. Over the last few years farmers' costs have also been increasing in the cost-price squeeze. While we hope that the farmers' net position has been improved, it is too early to speculate on the amount of the improvement.

Mr. Speaker, there is another matter I would like to mention, relating to secondary and tertiary industries in rural Alberta. On January 26 of this year, Mr. Channon of the Alberta Grain Commission spoke to the Alberta Rape Growers' Association about the aim of the provincial government to develop appropriate processing plants in rural centres of the province, and thus have value added to Alberta products before they leave the province. He stated that it is necessary that rapeseed be crushed here in Alberta, and that the products of crushing be either further processed here or exported. In his view, the rapeseed should not be shipped. He talked about encouraging equal opportunity of growers to sell their rapeseed by expanding the number of crushing plants in Alberta.

Mr. Channon, in his speech, also discussed the significance of certain court cases in which over 100 rapeseed producers have been charged with over-delivery of rapeseed to the crushing plant at Lethbridge. The charge is being laid by the Canadian Wheat Board. One producer, and maybe more, has been convicted.

Mr. Speaker, the court cases, I understand, will be appealed, as the rapeseed growers agree with the Alberta Grains Commission that the Canadian Wheat Board is hindering the immediate economic growth of Alberta. The annual brief to the cabinet by Unifarm also discusses this problem. The brief states that Unifarm feels the position of the Alberta government does not reflect the position of most Alberta farmers, as indicated by their delegates at their convention. Their brief further states that, although the present regulations give growers in particular regions, and with particular connections, marked advantages, farmers are willing to sacrifice some market equity to ensure the well-being of the crushing industry and they, therefore, support the present system. Just what is meant by these two statements, I am not too sure.

There is, however, concern among our farmers about the implications of all this. They fear that the Alberta Grain Commission is taking issue with the quota system. Our farmers have, for many years, been used to the principle of market equity in the grain business. By market equity I mean that every grower receives a quota, and therefore every grower has the opportunity to sell his product, no matter where he may be located in the province. This has been combined with a price-pooling system in the marketing of other grains but not, of course, with the rapeseed. There is, therefore, a partial market sharing by producers.

I read Mr. Charinon's speech to mean that if the Alberta Government can regulate Alberta rapeseed going to crushing plants in Alberta, there will indeed be a more favourable system of market equity for Alberta producers. I hope this can be spelled out by the commission in greater detail. I am sure that farmers generally will look with approval on the efforts of the Alberta Government to increase the rapeseed market, provided the principle of market sharing by producers, using some sort of quota system, is maintained.

Mr. Speaker, as a MLA, I welcome the government's intention to continue to have a fall session. The advantages for both sides of this Assembly far outweigh the inconveniences. The spring session is not the time to complete the debate on major pieces of legislation. Public reaction to such legislation is needed and this, in fact, can be received in time for the fall sitting.

Other innovations of last year, the Alberta Hansard and the introduction of TV into the House, have, I think, proved themselves. I look forward to working under the new committee system of studying the estimates included in the House rule changes last year.

Mr. Speaker, may I conclude by seconding the motion, thanking his Honour for the address he gave to us yesterday.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, in view of His Honour's affair tonight, and more particularly due to a tradition of permitting the opposition to review the Speech over the weekend, I now beg leave to adjourn the debate.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Are there any announcements of any kind before we close?

MR. HYNDMAN:

The House might wish to have information concerning the hours in future of sittings of the Assembly on Fridays. Members will recall that last fall, as an experiment, the House sat from 1:00 to 4:30 o'clock. Today we sat from 2:30 to 5:30 o'clock and it is contemplated that government would not be introducing the motion for the next two Fridays to change that. But within about 10 days we would be bringing forward a motion, the effect of which would be, that starting Friday, March 9, the House sit on Friday afternoons only, from 1:00 to 4:00 o'clock. I have mentioned this informally, Mr. Speaker, to the Opposition House Leader and because of the fact that some school children have already made arrangements to come next week at 2:30, and because the budget is on March 2, this is suggested as a motion which might well receive favourable consideration in about 10 days.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, on the subject on the motion to adjourn, I would just like to say --

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion to adjourn has been agreed to.

MR. FARRAN:

I just thought it wasn't very urgent in light of the position taken earlier today.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, one more announcement concerning next week. It is anticipated at the moment, subject to change next week, that we would sit in the evening on Tuesday night only of next week. I would move we call it 5:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it it will not be necessary for the hon. Member for Drumheller, in view of the additional items that have been covered, to renew his request for adjournment of the House. The House stands adjourned until Monday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 4:32 o'clock.]

*
* ERRATUM *
*
* In a speech by Mr. Chambers on Friday afternoon,
* February 16, 1973 page 2 - 32 second paragraph,
* line 8 should read:
*
* ... in order to grasp what could only
* be termed a 'more than fair share' for
* the commodity.
*
* Fourth paragraph, last sentence, should read:
*
* With significantly higher well-head
* prices imminent, exploratory drilling
* is picking up to near record levels.
*
* Page 2 - 34 first paragraph, second last sentence,
* should read:
*
* The cost of this plan is \$50 million,
* a sum which will be realized through
* the increased natural resource revenue
* I mentioned earlier.
*
* The Editor
*
