

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Wednesday, February 21, 1973

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair.]

Speaker's Ruling

MR. SPEAKER:

At yesterday evening's sitting we had one of those occurrences which require the Speaker to decide a difficult point.

I refer, of course, to the point of order or privilege raised by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View concerning a passage in the speech of the hon. the Premier.

A reading of 155, on page 130 of Beauchesne shows clearly that this is a difficult point. Undoubtedly, similar expressions have escaped unscathed in this House in the past.

What I am about to say may well be too strict an interpretation of the precedent in Beauchesne -- but it seems better, in these matters and especially in an Assembly which maintains the high level of debate and decorum which ours does -- to err on the side of strictness.

I have read the relevant lines in Hansard. I expressly refrained from making a ruling last night. I must now rule that the point raised by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View is valid.

MR. LUDWIG:

May I say now, in view of the fact that you have ruled in my favour that the hon. Premier's remarks were not parliamentary; that the customary thing is for the offender to apologize to the House.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, because of the sensitivity in the matter, I am prepared to accede to the member's request.

MR. LUDWIG:

The Premier has now conceded to the apology. Let us have the apology.

MR. SPEAKER:

The matter is closed!

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 9 The Alberta Loan Act, 1973

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce two bills, the first being The Alberta Loan Act, 1973. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes an increased amount of borrowing which may be required during 1973.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 8 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 8

The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1973

And the second bill, Mr. Speaker, is The Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation Amendment Act, 1973. As I explained to the hon. members last year, each year the aggregate borrowing authorized under this act was required to be increased by the amount allocated under the Canada Pension Plan to the Province of Alberta. This bill accomplishes that for 1973.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 8 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 4 The Garagemen's Lien Amendment Act, 1973

MR. HANSEN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Garagemen's Lien Amendment Act, 1973.

Under Section 4 of this act, The Garagemen's Lien Act, as it is presently in effect, they have to keep records both alphabetically and by serial numbers, making two lists. Due to this, there is more expense. And on top of this, the Vehicle Branch registration division also keeps an alphabetical list. There is duplication in keeping both lists. This act will do away with the alphabetical list to save money and also to save time.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 4 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Advanced Education, that this bill be moved to Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 6 The Agricultural Service Board Amendment Act, 1973

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Agricultural Service Board Amendment Act, 1973.

The purpose of this bill is laid out in Section 16(1), which reads:

Where a board finds, from investigation and inquiry, that farm land in a municipality included in the area with respect to which the board has been appointed

This amendment will allow taking the word "farm" from "land". Presently, there are many subdivisions throughout the rural areas of the province, as well as the metropolitan cities, and these little parcels of land are not called farm land. Yet many of them produce enough noxious weed seeds to pollute the province in one year. This will allow the Agricultural Service Committees to look into this and take action.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 6 was introduced and read a first time.]

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, that Bill No. 6 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 5 The Public Highways Development Amendment Act, 1973

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Public Highways Development Amendment Act, 1973.

The purpose of this bill will be to enact stricter legislation with regard to making it an offence to further place property on land that comes into contravention with the act at the present time.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 5 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Industry, that Bill No. 5 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 10
The Public Service Vehicles Amendment Act, 1973

MR. TRYNCHY:

I beg leave to introduce a bill being The Public Service Vehicles Amendment Act, 1973. This amendment will allow no person to carry a passenger for compensation in a truck which is a public service or commercial vehicle.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 10 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Minister of Advanced Education, that Bill No. 10 be now recorded under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 11 The Libraries Amendment Act, 1973

MR. DOAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 11, being The Libraries Amendment Act. This bill will amend Section 63, subsection (1) and amendment that strikes out the words "not exceeding two mills on the dollar".

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 11 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, that Bill No. 11 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. HENDERSON:

It is my pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to introduce to you, sir, and the members of this Assembly, a class of 72 Grade 6 students from the community of Thorsby. They are seated in the members gallery along with their teacher, Mr. Sehn, the school principal, Mrs. Knowp and several drivers being Mrs. Zingel, Mrs. Borys, Mr. Bilar, Mr. George, Mr. Masyk, Mr. Pickonsky, Mr. Kruger, Mr. Pearson, Mr. Chura and Mr. Kuzio. I wonder if they would please stand up and be recognized.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce to you, and to the members of this Assembly, what I believe is the first group of students from Calgary to visit us this session. There are 30 of them, sir; they attend Grade 6 in the Kingsland School in my constituency. They are here in the public gallery with their teacher, Mr. Lamarsh and I would now ask that they stand and be recognized.

[Laughter. Students not present!]

MR. LEITCH:

They may still yet be the first, Mr. Speaker --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Attorney General has unbounded confidence in the reach of our sound system.

MR. WILSON:

On a point of order, just to clarify the record, particularly for the hon. Attorney General, I think we should draw to his attention that earlier this week we did have a group of school children who actually showed up from that well known Calgary constituency of Calgary Bow.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I thought that the members of the Assembly, because of the motion that we passed a year ago regarding the invitation to Her Majesty to visit Alberta, would be interested in the correspondence. I have provided copies of this to the hon. Member for Macleod, and I would also like to inform the members of the House that the hon. member for Macleod has made a suggestion.

Because of the final position taken by the Prime Minister in his letter of February 8, 1973, we will do our best to try to arrange it so that some of the citizens from Fort Macleod will, during the visit of her Majesty to Calgary on July 5th, have an opportunity to meet the citizens in that area and Her Majesty. The correspondence commences, Mr. Speaker, on January 15, and concludes on February 8.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, for the information of all hon. members, I would like to table three reports today required under The Financial Administration Act and its provisions.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table a copy of the report entitled The Peace-Atabasca Delta. Mr. Speaker, I had to make this report public several weeks ago by virtue of a news release at the wish of the federal government, though I would have preferred to have tabled it initially in the House. I want also to indicate to the hon. members that as soon as sufficient copies are available, because of the nature, complexity and interest of the report, each of the MLAs in the House will be receiving one copy.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the government offered too, on an annual basis for the interest of the House, to table the manifest on the use of the CF-AFD King Air, and I now have the honour to submit the copies of this manifest here today recording that for the calendar year of 1972.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table two items. The first is the Annual Report of the Alberta Liquor Control Board, and the second is the contract between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Province of Alberta regarding the employment within the province of the RCMP, and this is the contract to which I referred last night.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might rise, not specifically on a point of order but it relates to the statement by the Minister of Mines and Minerals the other day in the House -- that he would make available to the members a copy of the federal government's report on their policy regarding export controls on crude oil.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to reply to that and to state that we had only one copy. We are having additional copies made. I anticipate that they will be completed today or tomorrow and I certainly will make them available at that time.

Hansard

MR. SPEAKER:

In this regard, perhaps I should mention to the House that the duplicating equipment which ordinarily serves the members is being moved, and it is expected to be operational again at 4:00 o'clock. This may also delay the arrival of print-outs from Hansard for corrections.

CRAL QUESTION PERIOD

Oil Policy

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Mines and Minerals could advise the House whether, under the new government mineral or royalty taxation policies, freehold oil and gas mineral leases are automatically subjected to or are liable to payment of the new mineral reserves tax?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, that's quite involved but I can provide the act to the hon. member. I would like to state that certainly freehold acreage is covered under the provisions of The Mineral Taxation Act.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I bring the matter up that is in the act, that the Executive Council has the authority to exempt leases from payment of the tax. I gather it is not the policy of the government to exempt them. They are automatically liable to payment of the mineral tax.

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

MR. HENDERSON:

There is no option available to them as to choice between royalty and tax?

MR. DICKIE:

No, Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question regarding the unitized field. I was wondering if the government has worked out who is going to make actual decision if some companies want to go the royalty route, other companies wish to go the tax route? What decision has been made up to now and whose responsibility is that going to be?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, that did present a problem when we first considered it. We announced in our policy statement that we issued on July 29, and confirmed that by the regulations that were filed on December 21. Those regulations provide that whoever controls the lease has to make the decision. If there are a number of companies involved, they have to look to their agreements to find out who controls the lease. If the agreements are not clear, then they could not elect the option to go under the new royalty schedule, and as a result would be under The Mineral Taxation Act.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for --

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the hon. minister not feel that in light of the option given to the mineral holders on Crown leases, that freehold interest owners should not have a similar option, even though it is a different royalty rate than would be applicable on Crown acreage?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, that was given some consideration. The difficulty is that that is an arrangement between two parties. It was difficult to see how the government could step in then and say how we could change the agreement between the two parties.

MR. HENDERSON:

I think the hon. minister is misinterpreting my question. I am talking about an option payable to the Crown in lieu of the mineral tax, that there is a special royalty rate struck as an option, just like the option on the Crown leases between payment of the mineral tax and royalty. ... [Inaudible ... granting a similar privilege to --

MR. DICKIE:

Again, Mr. Speaker, those aspects were considered, but in view of the position of the freehold interest it wasn't possible to look at that point of view to carry out the spirit and intent of The Mineral Taxation Act.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would to direct my question either to the hon. the Premier or the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has the government of Canada indicated to our government at what point they will interfere with the price system as far as export of natural gas beyond Alberta's boundaries?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the answer, if I understand the question 'to what point would they interfere', the answer is there has been no indication of any interference at all.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury.

Oil Supply

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Is there a build-up of oil in the province at the present time in view of the fact that there is difficulty in handling it outside the province?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I find that rather difficult to answer. The procedure followed is that each month nominations are considered by the Energy Resources Conservation Board. At the time they make the nominations they also estimate ahead of time the subsequent three months. During that period of time they then have subsequent meetings to determine exactly how those nominations are working out and the pipeline capacity, and whether the pipeline could take all the oil that was available.

At times, and from time to time during the month there are build-ups of the oil, and that fluctuates. So I would be unable to state specifically at this time whether that occurs. However, I can assure the hon. members that yesterday there was another nomination meeting in which the questions of the supply for the month of March and April was considered. There was some concern expressed by the representatives of the federal government that that supply would not be sufficient. However, there is no problem now. We are assured that the Canadian refiners will receive the supply they require for the months of March and April.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has industry been able to meet the nominations during January and thus far during February?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. There was a question in January. They did overcome the difficulties there. There was also some concern expressed because there was what was called a crisis situation in the first part of February. That however has been met, so there was no problem there at that time either.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is there ample storage for this oil, and how long can this go on before it starts taking effect in stopping the production, and laying off men, et cetera?

MR. DICKIE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are storage facilities available, and Interprovincial Pipe Line Co. presently has an application before The National Energy Board to increase the storage facilities.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this point? We have a fairly long list of people wanting to ask questions.

Export of Oil to American Market

MR. HENDERSON:

Could the hon. minister advise as to whether the nominations for March for the American export market are up or down for the month of February?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I just can't recall. I would say that they are up from the month of February, but I could check that for the hon. member if he would like me to pursue that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

DREE

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. At what stage are negotiations between the Province of Alberta and Canada regarding the inclusion of central Alberta in the DREE program?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, as we have pointed out to the House on other occasions, the government is not attempting to negotiate with the Government of Canada to establish any particular boundaries or areas within our province in which the programs under the DREE administration can be administered. As a matter of fact, the government has been trying to establish that DREE programs will be available to all areas of this province, depending upon the merit of their need.

Program Co-ordination

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Premier. What minister is in charge of this Lesser Slave Lake . . . program or now, program co-ordination?

MR. LOUGHFED:

For the information of the hon. member, that responsibility would fall with the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, who is also charged with the responsibility of the office of program co-ordination.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

Tax Exemptions - Family Farm

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, and this regards the exemption of the family farm from capital gains tax. Is it true that the farmer must die first to pass on the exemption from this tax?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is asking a question of law with regard to a federal statute, and even if it were a provincial statute it would still be a question of law.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, the point I raise -- I understood from the minister at an earlier session that they are making representations to the federal government concerning the adverse effects of the capital gains tax on the family farm. This is the information I seek from the hon. member.

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I will answer the question even though it may be out of order. Certainly that is the case, Mr. Speaker. The tax isn't levied on capital gains. It isn't being realized except on death. There is no tax levied unless the farmer dies. We represented very strongly to Ottawa on the first finance ministers' meeting we ever had, that this would disturb a natural way of life in rural Alberta -- the fact that the new tax laws, as they proposed them, would require that when a father passed away and left the farm to his sons, they would realize capital gains which would be taxed under income tax law. We indicated that we felt this was disturbing a basic way of life in rural Alberta. That's why, in Mr. Turner's budget on Monday night, I was pleased to see that he had reacted to the objections we had indicated to him at the finance ministers' meeting.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview followed by the hon. Member for Stony Plain.

Government Investigations

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. the Attorney General. In view of your statement last night about showing files and background information to the people concerned, have you had an opportunity to meet with Messrs. Griesbach, Thomas and Burger to disclose the information collected on them?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is misinterpreting the remarks I made last night. I said, as I recall it, that there was never an occasion when a minister or a member of the government would take some action detrimental to a person based on information within a file that I was satisfied that the policy ought to be that information which was forming the basis of his decision, would be made available to him and he would be given the opportunity to refute it.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier or to either the Attorney General or the Minister Without Portfolio in charge of Northern Development. Has a formal letter of apology gone out from the government to each of the three men in turn?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have corresponded with Mr. Thomas. I have not had any communication from or with the other two persons.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Attorney General could also advise us whether it is his intention in this particular instance to destroy the files in question?

MR. LEITCH:

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said last night, it is the practice for the police as a matter of their practice, to destroy them the end of two years. I have certainly no objection to doing that in this case. It is not a matter that I have addressed my mind to.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Oil Plant -- Golden Spike Area

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of the Environment. Has the minister received any correspondence from the residents of the Golden Spike area which is in the southeast corner of the Stony Plain constituency, in regard to Imperial Oil's application to increase the capacity of their plant?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I received a number of letters, as well as a petition.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the Minister of Mines and Minerals. What procedure does the Energy and Resources Conservation Board follow, since the public has now voiced opposition?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, the rules are very flexible. If objections are voiced, as a rule they will then order a public hearing.

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary question. If public hearings are held, will there be any possibility of having these public hearings held in the constituency?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh. Easy -- Easy.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is strictly hypothetical, but it could be put in a factual way.

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to answer that. Without wishing to interfere with the independence of the board, I would like to suggest that the hon. member has raised it in the House and that he make a recommendation that they do be held in the constituency, so that the people involved will be spared the expense of journeying to say, Calgary.

MR. HENDERSON:

Question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of the Environment. Could the minister advise the House as to whether his department has specifically studied the area for any evidence of damage to vegetation, flora, and fauna, in the area as a result of the operation of that particular plant?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, that is a somewhat technical question, and I can't answer at this moment whether or not that particular area has been studied. There have been studies in this regard. And we have commissioned a study with respect to the Research Council, to continue the study of the life of sulphur dioxide in the air.

We also have applications under the Environmental Research Trust for continued studies by several companies.

MR. HENDERSON:

One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Do I gather from the hon. minister's words that his department has approved this particular matter without conducting such an inquiry first?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I might explain to the House the procedure in regards to approvals on gas plants. The Energy Resources Conservation Board is used as the window of approach by industry -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member asked whether in this case there had been hearings before the approval was given.

MR. YURKO:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to explain the process in regard to obtaining approval to answer whether or not the department has approved the application.

MR. SPEAKER:

With respect I must disagree with the hon. minister and would ask that he come directly to the answer.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the Department of the Environment doesn't approve any application until such time as the necessary policies and regulations are met. And in this regard it certainly hasn't approved any, and the final approval is a ministerial approval.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Camrose, followed by the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation.

Veterinary Clinics

MR. STROMBERG:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. With the agreement with the federal government under ARDA for the proposed building of six new veterinary clinics in Alberta, are you prepared to tell this House the location of these clinics?

DR. HORNER:

The final decision with regard to the location of these clinics has not been made. I might say though that it is our policy to encourage all of the areas to take advantage of the loans through the Agricultural Development Corporation to build veterinary clinics either jointly with veterinarians, or by the veterinarian himself in these areas on a private enterprise basis, because this will ensure that veterinary medical services will remain in the area. The

disadvantage of having a government clinic is that veterinarians tend to move very quickly and do not have an on-going function.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation, followed by the hon. Member for Athabasca.

MR. BARTON:

A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member proceed with the supplementary?

MR. BARTON:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister of Agriculture consider High Prairie in his deliberations?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, this government has considered High Prairie to a far greater extent than the previous one ever thought of.

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Rural Gas Distribution

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Telephones and Utilities. I am wondering if the minister could give some indication as to when he will be announcing the rural gas distribution policy?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, as indicated in the Speech from the Throne, a report will be tabled or made available in the House, and I would anticipate that the full program will be announced during the budget debate.

MR. BARTON:

A supplementary to the hon. minister, have any co-ops been established prior to this announcement?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, there have been probably 30 or 40 natural gas co-operatives formed in the past five or ten years.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Athabasca, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo.

Snowmobile Insurance

MR. APPELEY:

My question is addressed to the hon. Attorney General and I would like to ask the Attorney General if his office has had any communication with the Alberta Insurance Board regarding a possible review of the snowmobile insurance rates?

MR. LEITCH:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have learned that the board passed resolutions recently, providing that the maximum amount that could be charged for the public liability portion of an insurance policy and for public liability limits of \$35

thousand, would be \$30, and that \$30 charge would also include the premium for passenger-hazard coverage. I am told the orders that go out from the board to the industry to put that direction into effect are now in the process of being prepared and sent out.

MR. NOTLEY:

Will that mean that there will be a rebate to those people who have paid more than the \$30, or will that just be for new policies taken out?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to see the orders. I have not all the details in the orders. I will also check the legislation to be certain of the answer to that question.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, what about the accidental death benefits? Will they be in addition to that then?

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker, the premium for the accident portion of the policy would be included. I will correct that answer, Mr. Speaker. The passenger hazard portion of the policy is included in that \$30 charge. I will have to check on the other item the hon. member has raised.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Motor Vehicle Registration

MR. GHITTER:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Highways and Transport on results of the recent announcement of the government relating to the vehicle registration plan. I would like the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport to advise the House as to how this plan would protect innocent purchasers of stolen motor vehicles that have come into Alberta in great numbers during the past year or so.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, it will now be required by anybody from out of the province to show proof of ownership when registering a vehicle in Alberta. That will require a bill of sale and a registration from some other jurisdiction. It will be further subject to an inspection by the agent of the registrar. If he finds that the inspection shows that there is some discrepancy in the proof of ownership produced, then it will be referred to the police for further scrutiny.

MR. GHITTER:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Will the registrar then search the serial numbers of any motor vehicles coming into his jurisdiction from other jurisdictions to make sure that the vehicles are not stolen?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. By this procedure we will be able to search the ownerships and validity of the claims made by the person making the application in order to ascertain whether they are valid or not.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliffe.

Air Pollution - Calgary

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of the Environment. I wrote him a letter some time ago complaining of a dust pollution problem on the site of the demolition of the Robin Hood Flour Mills in Calgary. I wonder whether he has taken any action on the complaint I have lodged with him?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, it is correct that the hon. member has written me a letter, and I have replied. If he would like to write me another letter, I'd be glad to answer it again.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I have not the reply, but I wanted to ask the hon. minister, and I did ask him, whether he has taken any action to abate the problem complained of?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The department has investigated the dust problem as a result of the demolition of the Robin Hood Flour Mills, I believe, and has imposed some conditions on keeping the dust level down as low as possible.

MR. LUDWIG:

What were the conditions imposed, Mr. Speaker, and when were they imposed?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Put it on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question is of a nature that really should appear on the Order Paper. It is asking for a great deal of detail.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary question to the minister regarding air pollution in Calgary. There have been charges that the air pollution records in Calgary have been "cooked", as one of the news and weather broadcasters was saying. I was wondering if the minister did anything about the request to him about the discrepancy in the air pollution rating and the actual rating?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, nothing has been cooked in Calgary by the Department of the Environment! All information which we gather with regard to air pollution in Calgary is made public and will certainly be made public in the future. The report that was, in fact, supposedly given out in Calgary, to my knowledge is completely false. It was something to the extent that a news release was written in Calgary by one of the officials in my department, and it wasn't released. That information is entirely false.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliffe, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Ottawa Office

MR. WYSE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. What is the present status of the Ottawa office? Is it humming yet, or is it closed? How many are on staff there?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the office is very busy. Many of the government's ministers and officials are consistently going to Ottawa to discuss matters in a whole

variety of federal-provincial matters with the federal government. In terms of the staff, there are two people there.

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question, Mr. Minister. Has this number been decreased since the Lougheed government took over power in Alberta?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I have been advised that we have reduced the staff from four to two, but we have picked up the workload 200 per cent!

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary, is the staff women or lawyers?

MR. GETTY:

I wonder if the hon. member would want to rephrase the question?

MR. TAYLOR:

I wouldn't want to, but if I have to, I will. Is the staff in Ottawa stenographers, or is it professional help, such as lawyers?

MR. GETTY:

It is professional staff, Mr. Speaker, although there is not a lawyer there.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for --

MR. WYSE:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister really trying to say, then, that it isn't humming?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican, followed by the hon. Member for Whitecourt.

Mental Institutions

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Has the minister checked with the directors of the mental institutions in Alberta to ascertain whether or not sexual sterilization operations are still being carried out on patients since the repeal of The Sexual Sterilization Act last year?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member refers to mental health institutions. Of course, there are a great many of those in the province, operated in both the public and private sector, which can be referred to as mental health institutions. I think in reference, though, to The Sexual Sterilization Act and to sexual sterilizations, the hon. member may well be referring to whether or not such operations could still be performed upon a person who is mentally incapacitated. My understanding of the law after the repeal of The Sexual Sterilization Act is that in proper guardianship arrangements, where there was a person appointed guardian of a mentally incapacitated person, that guardian could give his consent. Whether or not such consents have been given, either before or after the repeal of the act is information that I don't have at my fingertips but I would be glad to make an inquiry along the lines suggested by the question.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Yellowhead Pass Route

MR. TRYNCHY:

My question is to the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport. In your recent meeting with the federal government, can you tell me, or tell the House, if you were able to convince the federal government of a secondary highway in Alberta, namely the Yellowhead route?

MR. COPITHORNE:

I wonder if the hon. member -- I didn't quite catch the last part of his question.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Were you able to convince the federal government of the need for a second Trans Canada highway in Alberta, namely the Yellowhead route?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. When I was talking with the representatives of the federal government, we discussed not only the Yellowhead highway but we discussed many of the highways that are pertinent --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. minister please come directly to the answer?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, when we were discussing the Yellowhead route we discussed with it other routes as well.

MR. TRYNCHY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Were you able to convince them that we needed some money for this highway, and when can we expect same?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, only time will be able to tell.

Mackenzie Highway

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In your discussions with the federal government, what is the current status of negotiations on the Mackenzie Highway between High Level and the Northwest Territories border?

MR. SPEAKER:

Could the hon. member save that question till his next turn, since it isn't supplementary to the preceding one?

The hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest.

Crowsnest Pass Route

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, did the hon. Minister of Highways, in his conversations, refer to the second Trans Canada which is No. 3 through the Crowsnest Pass?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake with a supplementary.

Yellowhead Pass Route (Cont.)

MR. BARTON:

...would continue pressing for an extension of the Yellowhead Pass through Edson, Whitecourt, Swan Hills and Kinuso?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, there are many places where the federal government are being pressed for funds for building roads, even in the Northwest Territories where they have made very large claims and raised the expectations of those people in regard to the building programs they are going to do in that area. This has kind of fizzled down to a very small actual amount. We are trying on behalf of the areas in Alberta, but at this time the success has not been noted.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Taber-Warner.

Urbanization Policy

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. the Premier. When can we expect details of your government's long term urbanization policy?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the details and probably the most significant one that I can refer to today, and by the way it has been extremely well received, is of course the new provincial park in the member's home city of Calgary. This is the sort of positive action that our government is looking for. I think that to a very large degree the problem we have had in the past is perhaps too many studies and not enough action.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier. Are you aware that a lack of a detailed, long term urbanization policy is frustrating the long-range planning by our major urban centres?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is making a debating statement.

MR. LOUGHEED:

With regard to that matter, and as I have mentioned previously in the House, I was delighted to receive a message from the city council in Calgary, which is the member's home city, to the effect that they were delighted with the progress that we were making by working together on many of these matters in terms of urban needs. I believe the Speech from the Throne specifically deals with the matter of a proposed conference on a tri-level basis between the federal and provincial governments and Cities of Edmonton and Calgary. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs would like to expand upon that now, or perhaps he might want to expand upon it during the course of his remarks in debate.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, are you aware that some of your government's existing shared-cost policies have a regressive effect in our major urban centres?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is clearly making another debating question.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary then, Mr. Speaker, if I can reword it. Are you aware that your ceiling on shared cost road programs has the practical effect of dictating the amount of major road construction --

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! The hon. member is debating by means of a series of supplementaries.

The hon. member for Taber-Warner followed by the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen.

CKUA Services

MR. D. MILLER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. Will the services of Radio Station CKUA be extended to all communities in southern Alberta during 1973?

MR. WERRY:

Mr. Speaker, there are plans to bring the operations of CKUA under a different administrative authority, other than AGT, and I am certain that the Minister of Education will shortly be making an announcement in the House regarding the future of CKUA, or he may wish to make some remarks today.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary to the hon. minister. Is it the intention of having a centralized operation of radio and TV services to the people of Alberta, rather than the more independent operation that CKUA has at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. In view of the answer given by the hon. minister, the supplementary question offends against the rule against anticipation, and perhaps the hon. member might save his question until after the announcement has been made.

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

Grazing Land Rates

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Has the government made a decision as what the royalty rate on grazing lands would be for 1973?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, that matter is before the government at this time.

MR. FRENCH:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. When may we expect a decision?

DR. WARRACK:

I'm very sure, Mr. Speaker, that we will have a decision made on that important matter shortly.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West followed by the hon. Member for St. Albert.

College of Optometry

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Advanced Education who seems to have been neglected during this session so far. Have you or your department given any serious thought, or has there been a study completed on the

feasibility of starting a school of optometry in one of our Alberta universities?

MR. FOSTER:

The department has not done that, Mr. Speaker, but I know the question of a school of optometry has been considered by the University of Calgary, and I think also by the University of Victoria.

I could report to the House, Mr. Speaker, that at a recent meeting of the ministers of advanced or post-secondary education in the western provinces, the matter of a college of optometry was discussed and the results of that meeting have yet to be communicated officially to the federal authorities or to the provincial authorities responsible for optometry -- that would be the association.

However, very briefly, we concluded that we were concerned that a five year optometry program, cum master's program, cum PhD program, was, on the face of it, far too extensive to provide the kind of health sciences skill that optometry is designed for. We are asking our departments of health for an assessment of the needs and the educational requirements, and we will be discussing it again on a inter-provincial basis some time in the next several months. I will be happy to keep the member up to date if he is interested.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Can I assume then that the proposition seems to be a joint --

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member asking a supplementary?

MR. GRUENWALD:

Yes, this is a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry. Is it a joint venture you are studying then between all western provinces?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, there are some special and unique post-secondary educational facilities that I think require the joint co-operation of the four western provinces. It may be that a college of optometry is one such venture. The four provinces have agreed that we will consult on these kinds of cases and we are doing so. So that if a college of optometry is, in fact, made available to the people of western Canada, it will be done with full consultation with the four provinces. The general understanding is that if we do have a facility of this kind in western Canada we may need only one, and it will be then for the four provinces to ascertain where it should be located to serve the best interests of western Canadians.

MR. GRUENWALD:

One final, very short supplementary. Would you feel it would be desirable that it would be within the Province of Alberta?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I am really not in the position to make that kind of value judgment at this time. ... [Interjections] ... I'm on this side of the House, where are you? You are obviously where you should be.

Mr. Speaker, the matter of a college of optometry has very significant financial implications and professional implications for all provinces. Frankly, I am extremely pleased that the four provinces have adopted a very broad-minded point of view, to work together and co-operate in this area. I don't expect that any other minister in western Canada is going to say, "I want this institution for my province." I think we will try to assess the needs of western Canada and make that decision when the decision becomes necessary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for St. Albert, followed by the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake.

Trapping

MR. JAMISON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Since asking this question last year I have had a considerable amount of correspondence from concerned citizens regarding the use of steel leg-traps in trapping. I was wondering if the minister might be considering banning this type of trapping this year?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I too have had considerable correspondence on this matter, often several times from the same people. In the intervening time this summer, I had a chance to meet extensively with the Alberta branch of this particular organization in Calgary, at the Southern Alberta Office of the Premier. We have gone over a number of the matters that are involved, including the suggestion that it be banned. There are some difficulties in banning the leg-hold trap, because it certainly affects the livelihood of a number of people, and for the most part these are people who are already disadvantaged. But we have reached some accord in terms of some of the research needs and the mutual hopes that we have in the future, so that these activities can go forward in a less cruel and more humane way in the future.

MR. APPLEBY:

I wonder if the minister has had any discussions regarding this type of trap with the Trappers Association?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, yes, indeed I have.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake, followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller. And I believe that will conclude our time.

Fish Lake Park

MR. BARTON:

My question is a follow-up from a question I asked two days ago and I would request a yes or no. Is the government, or the parks department going to set up an advisory board or committee to put local autonomy back into Fish Lake Park?

DR. WARRACK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, since local autonomy has never been in Fish Lake Park because there has never been one before, I don't quite know what he is referring to.

MR. BARTON:

I will explain it to the hon. minister. Is an advisory board going to be set up by your department to help local autonomy and local input into the park?

DR. WARRACK:

Park?

MR. BARTON:

Creek, sorry.

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, that's the one I am referring to. We announced it Monday and there never had been a park before so there couldn't have been an advisory committee, so there has not been one abandoned.

MR. BARTON:

Is there going to be one?

DR. WARRACK:

Why didn't you ask that? We have established a very firm degree of consultation with respect to the involvement of the City of Calgary and the citizens of Calgary. As a matter of fact, I welcome the opportunity to reflect the very happy conversation that I had with the people --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. minister was asked whether he was going to establish an advisory board, might he please come to the answer?

DR. WARRACK:

Not today.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller.

Coal Markets

MR. TAYLOR:

I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Has the hon. minister had any talks with ministers in Ontario or others in Ontario with a view to getting a share of the Ontario coal market for Alberta coal?

MR. DICKIE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the hon. member that we did meet with representatives of the Province of Ontario. We did express our interest in their coal market. We subsequently forwarded to them different reports that we had received on Alberta coal. There was some initial concern expressed about the quality of Alberta coal. We have since heard from them that that is not a problem now. The real key problem in reaching the Ontario market is a question of the cost of transportation, and the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce is working actively on that area.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to supplement the answer that the hon. Member for Drumheller has asked about.

During the meeting that I held recently with Premier Davis of Ontario, during a natural discussion we had with regard to natural gas, we raised, during the course of that discussion, the suggestion that they very seriously in the Province of Ontario -- Ontario Hydro in particular -- take a very hard look at the economics and review the economics of their utilization of Alberta coal. With all of the concern about the limitation of that fuel, we feel that there would be a great deal of merit, as far as Canada is concerned, if the Province of Ontario, and Ontario Hydro, reassessed the whole matter that the minister has mentioned, and looked at Alberta coal.

MR. TAYLOR:

One supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the government considered the possibility of using some public money, provincial or federal, that is aimed at reducing unemployment in regard to the use of subsidy for freight, as this would be quite an incentive to employment in the province?

MR. PEACOCK:

I will respond to that question. We are carrying on a very extensive dialogue not only with western Canada and other provinces in western Canada, but the federal government, the Ontario government, and the shippers and suppliers and facility handlers themselves in regard to looking and analyzing this grave question to identify what the problem is, and to come up with a constructive program that we may recommend to our Premier to take to the First Ministers meeting with the Prime Minister.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, possibly I phrased my question badly. What I was wondering is in connection with the contributions of public money, federal or provincial.

In order to reduce the unemployment problem has any consideration been given to using some of this money to reduce the freight rates to Ontario as an incentive to provide employment in our coal fields in Alberta?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. member is well aware that the subject is very complex, and to 'ad hoc' a sum of money for a single situation that might exist at this time isn't an answer to the problem. All we are saying is that when we identify what the problem is on a continuing basis, to identify what we have to have, in regard to an equalization program brought out for moving our coal from the Alberta coal fields into the Ontario or eastern Canadian market, or for that matter to the eastern American market -- that when we have identified those problems, and know exactly where we stand, then we can present it on a sustained program and then we will present it to the federal government to use those funds he is alluding to.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I think the last question was asked relative to the response of the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals that the problem was transportation. He stated that the Minister of Industry and Commerce could answer the question, and this is what we are trying to find out.

MR. SPEAKER:

We have gone beyond our time. Perhaps the matter might be raised at a later question period.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Purdy.]

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, as it is customary in this House, I would also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder for a job well done in conveying His Honour The Honourable The Lieutenant Governor's Speech to the Province of Alberta, and to the constituency they reside in, and also to relate back to the Legislature some of the problems that arise in their constituencies.

It was mentioned in the Legislature a couple of days ago that the Throne Speech did not elaborate on what the government had done last year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we made a fairly significant step forward. It is the first time in a long time that any government could point out in the Throne Speech some of the accomplishments made in the previous year. The last time this took place was in 1969, but in 1970 and in 1971 the Throne Speech had no mention of this, mainly because no programs were brought forward for the betterment of the citizens of Alberta. We as a Progressive Conservative government have pledged ourselves to make Alberta a better and more viable place to live and it can only be done through legislation which was enacted last year.

The Alberta Bill of Rights and The Alberta Rights Protection Act are two acts which show that the government will take significant steps for the protection of the individual. Granted there may be problems, but I don't think so.

Emphasis put on agriculture last year has boosted the economy of this province to a level higher than it has ever been before, and when the expansion of this figure comes to one billion dollars for gross income, it will be a new era for agriculture in Alberta.

How has agriculture been boosted? It has been boosted through the capable and able leadership of a man devoted to agriculture in Alberta, a man I believe who wanted this portfolio for a long time. He worked for it, he got it. Dr. Horner has put together an excellent program and has certainly boosted the morale of his department. He expanded his personal thoughts on agriculture as it should have been expanded decades ago. The Department of Agriculture has done a tremendous job in promoting agricultural products in Alberta and it can only be done through various pathfinding trips that have been held by various officials of the Department of Agriculture into various countries of this world. People say that pathfinding trips are a loss of money and that running around the world looking for new markets does not mean anything. But you stop and talk

to the farmer on 'Main Street', and ask him what the most significant step is, and he will say, "in marketing".

As pointed out in the Throne Speech, we want to get young people involved in agriculture, and I am particularly talking about the young people in the 12 to 18 age bracket. This, Mr. Speaker, I believe, will bring rural and urban people closer together. I am patiently waiting for more information, as this program will be announced.

The ARDA Agreement signed between the Alberta Government and the federal government, to spend \$13.3 million between now and 1975 on programs to encourage farm diversification and farm development, is a step forward for a better farming outlook in Alberta. The province will be responsible for the implementation of the program, and the costs will be shared equally. The plan will be primarily aimed at improving incomes to the small farm, largely through expansion and development of the livestock industry.

The second aim is for reforestation of Crown lands. The phase of this agreement that looks favourable to me, is the livestock water supply program. I have many problems within my constituency, of high water lines that do not allow a farmer to cut all available hay. And today I forwarded a question to the Minister of Agriculture and to the Minister of Environment, asking if a grant structure could not be worked into this, where we could lower some of these high water lines.

We also have areas in the province where we have no water, and this is where this specific part of the act will come in. It will give the farmers grants in that they will have a better outlook, and be able to have more water for their cattle industry.

A significant step to promote the cattle industry took place in 1972, and this was the guaranteed loans for the promotion of female cattle. This has brought more cattle into my constituency, and I imagine, in many other areas of the province, than there had ever been before. The price of beef is good and I can see this program still going ahead.

It is an excellent feeling, Mr. Speaker, to pick up any publication, not only a magazine printed in Alberta, but in Canada, and see the headlines, "Value Of Livestock Sales At The Edmonton Public Stockyard Highest On Record", with sublines stating "a 15 per cent increase". Another headline in another paper: "Sales In The Hog Industry In Alberta Tops"; and still another headline, "Grain Export Up". Mr. Speaker, agriculture in Alberta is finally on the move.

The Minister of the Environment, the hon. Bill Yurko, has legislation in this province with teeth in it, legislation that will eventually clean up some of the pollution hazards and some of the problems that we have had in our environment in the past decade. I believe the new bottle depots being set up under The Garbage Container Act was one of the best moves that has ever been made in regard to cleaning up our glass and cans. Now that there is money involved in these items, the people are saving and taking them in. The bottle industry is going to be one of the largest industries we have for the small businessman in Alberta.

The Clean Air Act and The Clean Water Act certainly have teeth in them and will certainly stop the pollution in a lot of our streams and the pollution of our air.

In the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, mention was made that The Alberta Police Act be re-written. It is about three years overdue. When the new Police Act was brought into this province in 1970 it made many people nervous. It set up an Alberta Police Commission; it did a lot of other funny little things.

We have heard in the House recently about inaccuracies in law and not rights for the Province of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, this was not an act for anyone in the province. It took away a lot of local autonomy and did not give autonomy where it was granted. I feel that the previous administration, back in 1970, erred very badly in bringing out a piece of mediocre legislation for the protection of the people of Alberta. I will have more to say about this when the legislation is introduced.

The announcement of a provincial park within the boundaries of the City of Calgary is a significant step forward. I spoke in the Legislature last year to a resolution in regard to this pertinent question. At that time, I did not make any concrete stand, but thinking it over during the summer recess, and again during the fall session, and listening to the debates in the Legislature, it is

an excellent move. It will certainly aid the people of the City of Calgary, in that they will have an approximate area of 2,000 acres for parks and for recreation. The announcement that this will take place in Edmonton is also welcome news to me. We have one prime example just outside my constituency at Big Lake. This could be very conveniently turned into a provincial park and a rapid transit system could be brought in to serve this area.

Last year in the Legislature, as most hon. members are aware, Mr. Speaker, I posed a question to the Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation in regard to grants being set up for operating costs of various communities in Alberta. The minister at that time told the Legislature that the department was reviewing the grant structure. I then forwarded a memo to the minister, pointing out some of the problems our small communities are incurring by way of operating costs. I was most pleased when the minister informed me that he and the department had gone along with my recommendations, and they would be setting up a grant structure to aid communities that are having problems. This is certainly going to be a great step forward to aid towns such as Stony Plain, Spruce Grove, Onoway and Wabamun. Three of these areas are operating arenas, and they are operating at deficits.

Recently the Town of Spruce Grove held a plebiscite asking the people of the town to give the town council the mandate to build an arena and swimming pool for this town. I sided with this plebiscite. The community is growing by leaps and bounds and something had to take place. The result of the vote taken last Saturday was 840 for, 130 against. I think that this gives the town council a fairly significant mandate to go ahead with both projects. I say at this time, "Spruce Grove, good luck in your endeavours."

Going back to the new grant structure which will be set up, I have recently discussed this matter with the minister, and I am still of the conviction that if any monies are going to be available for the communities, they should go directly to the communities involved, not to recreation boards. A lot of money within these recreation boards is spent needlessly on administration, and a significant chunk of this could go directly into the town coffers.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to relate to the Assembly some of the accomplishments that have happened in the Stony Plain constituency in the last year. There is one minister in this House I would like to give a bouquet to. To my knowledge and the knowledge of the people in the Stony Plain constituency, he is the only minister who has ever visited the area with problems concerned. He visited this area last July, and drove out to see what I was talking about -- "Why all the letters? Why are you saying this? Why are you doing this?" After he got back into his office here in Edmonton, he knew what I wanted. He knew that out there there were problems that should have been rectified 10 years ago.

At one time the emphasis was put on the highway system between Edmonton and Calgary, but, Mr. Speaker, in my book this is not the most important highway in the Province of Alberta. I submit that Highway 16 West and Highway 33 are beginning to be two of the most highly-used provincial highways in the province. This is why the hon. minister had all the correspondence from me.

I am happy to see, at the present time, that we are going to have more of the four lane road twins in the very near future. We are going to have a greatly needed road overpass at Wabamun. Work is starting this year on the Stony Plain overpass. An overpass is projected for Devon -- an interchange; the interchange started back in 1971 in the Winterburn area is now completed. I think it needs another lift of pavement in the spring.

The overpass at Winterburn, Mr. Speaker -- and I'd like to dwell on this for a minute -- in my estimation is of poor engineering quality. It is the first time I have ever seen ads placed in a paper designating how an overpass works. I can't blame this on our minister. The project was started back in 1970. I can't relate to any of the hon. members the problems which prevented the ordinary overpass from being built, but I believe it is because of land acquisition, and so on.

Just recently, with regard to the Winterburn overpass, I have had representation made to me by the businessmen involved in this area. I then went back and saw the minister, and the question posed to me was that there was not sufficient signing in the area, that people proceeding east on Highway 16 into Edmonton cannot get onto the north side of the highway. They don't know how to get in there. We met with some of the government people -- this was before I took it to the minister -- and the government engineers in the department said, "No, that's all there will be." At that time I contacted Mr. Copithorne and Mr. Copithorne's executive assistant; we met with the people in the Winterburn area

and the businessmen concerned. I am happy to report today, Mr. Speaker, that as of last Thursday, more, and more adequate signs have been placed in this area.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Bravo.

MR. PURDY:

This is another step forward to show the progressive leaders our departments have. I met with some of the people on Monday of this week, and they seem satisfied.

Another aspect in which they are satisfied is that now they see government people in the area -- people who will come out and talk to them. That is why, Mr. Speaker, I can see this government is going to move ahead. They will take time out and talk to the ordinary citizen about their small problems. People might think they are small, but I don't. I think that any problem is a problem until it is solved.

One of the other programs that has taken place in my constituency is a gigantic weed harvesting operation carried out on Lake Wabamun. I had the pleasure last summer, during the month of June I believe it was, to host some 48 deputy ministers and directors of parks from the provincial and federal governments across Canada. They came out, looked at this aspect of weed harvesting on the lakes, and they were really interested in it.

Highway 43, north to Alberta Beach from Highway 16 will be twinned this year -- a significant step forward. One mile north of Onoway, the secondary road system will go into effect, and this road will be pushed through to St. Albert, another step forward. An overpass will be constructed in conjunction with the CNR, the Alberta Government, and the County of Parkland at Carvel.

During the last year I have had many federal complaints also, mostly about unemployment insurance. I am happy to report to the Assembly that I have saved the federal member a lot of time in that I have really good working co-operation with the Unemployment Insurance Commission office here in Edmonton.

Education is another problem we have. The minister has come out with the plan now that we have so many vacant school buildings in the province; he says that we can also open this up, that we have problems where an influx of people are coming into the area. We have two of these, Mr. Speaker, one at Spruce Grove and one at Winterburn. I can see the need for more classrooms at Spruce Grove. At Winterburn, just north of the new overpass, a Westview Mobile Homeowner Court has been set up. This will, by 1975, house some 4,000 people in 925 mobile homes. At the present time there are approximately 150 mobile homes in this area and the projected number by the end of 1973 could be in the neighbourhood of 600.

I met with the developers of this land on Monday night in my office, and they related to me that the plan they would like to see take place in this area is that they would ask the County of Parkland, in conjunction with the provincial government, to set up portable school units within this area to serve maybe Grades 1, 2 and 3 and to keep the problem off the Winterburn School so that it would not be overcrowded.

Natural gas has been spoken about in this Legislature. Recently, as long as 15 months ago, the people in the Lac Ste. Anne area, Onoway east and west, formed a natural gas co-op. I think that every time Dr. Horner's phone rang he said, "Oh, oh, there's Onoway again." But they have gone ahead, they have 900 customers now and it is projected that they will have 1,500 customers by spring. They are still plowing line in there, Mr. Speaker. This is one group of people that knew that the government was going to come out with a policy but just couldn't afford to wait for it; and they have gone ahead and put this gas line in, a much needed line for this area.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today, in the question period, I raised a question to the Minister of Environment in regard to Imperial Oil Limited's application to the Energy Resources Conservation Board for approval of a scheme to increase the maximum permitted hydrogen sulphide inlet rate from 2.8 thousand cubic feet per day to 110 thousand cubic feet per day, and to increase the maximum permitted sulphur dioxide emission rate from .211 long tons per day, to 8.2 long tons per day at its Golden Spike plant in my constituency.

The application states that the sulphur dioxide would be admitted to the atmosphere through a new flare stack 300 feet in height. The sulphur dioxide

air monitoring network in the plant vicinity will be expanded from the present requirement of one continuous monitor in operation for one month each year to a continuous monitor to be in operation for six months each year and the number of exposed cylinders to be increased from 9 to 12 stations.

I question this proposal and would submit that when public hearings are held, it be brought out in the hearings where these monitoring stations are going to be located. As we know, the prevailing winds west of Edmonton are from the westerly area and the question could be asked, are they are going to be situated east of the plant. But at other times we get winds from the southeast and they could also pose a problem there. I would submit that in both these monitoring stations maybe 12 isn't enough in number.

I have received up to 20 letters opposing the application and at the present time, Mr. Speaker, I take the stand that I am against the further increase of the plant capacity. In the particular area extremely east of the plant, approximately two miles, we have numerous land developers who are subdividing this land into acreages. What will be the detrimental effect on the livelihood -- and more so the livelihood of the farmers in the area -- if this application is accepted? I know this is only preliminary at this time and we will further assess the problem when public hearings are completed.

Finally, someone within the government has come up with an idea to utilize water being discharged from the power plant at Lake Wabamun into the lake. I don't think anybody has ever before given this serious thought. Some of the non-residents have put up quite a hue and cry that it is in fact polluting the lake. I am not going to take any stand because of my affiliations with the company involved. But I would like to say that Dr. Horner's proposal along with Calgary Power to put a pilot project in there in an attempt to grow vegetables year round is certainly a good idea. If it works and we can utilize this water and the land in the area, I can see that Wabamun will be a large and viable town.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to dwell on the oil industry for a minute, and some of the other industries we have in our province. In summing up, the oil industry in Alberta will benefit now as it has never benefited in the past. The hon. Member for Edmonton-Caldwell, Mr. Chambers, states that rigs were difficult to obtain for drilling because of the incentive plan. I say "terrific". Alberta will further benefit by the moves made by the two socialistic governments on the left and right of us. I see a move that will push more oil companies into good oil-sensible Alberta, a province that wants and will share with their people the oil still underground, but will still encourage the oil companies to locate and find new sites. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe the companies in British Columbia and Saskatchewan, who will be faced by a great increase of the royalty rate, will be most welcome in Alberta.

The recent takeover of the insurance industry in British Columbia must have been a blow to the industry. How would you, as members of the Assembly, like to wake up tomorrow morning and read headlines in the paper that your industry has been taken over? This would probably put 2,000 agents out of work. They say they may allow them to keep the life insurance premiums. That is questionable, and that is just the skim milk off the insurance business anyway. Not only will agents be put out of work, but it will probably affect another 2,000 people directly involved in the auto insurance business.

Speaking about this philosophy reminds me of the MacMillan Blodel processing plant in Saskatchewan. In about 1960, the CCF government financed the construction of a board plant at Hudson Bay. By 1964, after the plant was opened, at that time it was losing from \$50,000 to \$60,000 per month while the taxpayers subsidized this failure. The philosophy of the government was that if the plant were shut down, the taxpayers would have to support the unemployed on welfare. No thought was given to allowing private industry to take over this plant until the defeat of the government in 1964. The new Liberal government put the plant up for sale and MacMillan Blodel brought this government-run white elephant into a money making industry.

While the government is expected to provide basic public services, efficiency is not always achieved in the area of government controlled and owned industry, and incompetence is sometimes evident. May this province protect us all from the fantasies of those who imagine that government can do a better job of managing the complexities of industry. Thank you.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, as is normally done in the Speech from the Throne, one should acknowledge both the mover and the seconder of the speech. May I simply say

that I admired their skill in delivering their speeches, even though I didn't really think there was too much substance to their remarks.

The Speech from the Throne debate offers not only an opportunity to discuss over-all provincial issues, but an opportunity, too, to raise some issues which are of relevance and importance to the individual constituencies.

Perhaps I will take just a few moments to blend both provincial and local issues, starting first of all, Mr. Speaker, with the government's announcement of a transportation policy. The policy was released on Monday, December 11. It talks a good deal about the emphasis this government places on developing better transportation facilities in northern Alberta. It also suggests, and I point to page four of the press release, that the government is going to negotiate with the federal government for improved facilities in the North, such as the extension and paving of the Mackenzie Highway and the paving of the Alaska Highway.

[Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.]

I certainly concur with any efforts made by the Alberta government to seek faster action by Ottawa on both these two major arteries. But I would remind the Minister of Highways that if we are going to talk about the development of northern transportation, and if we are going to seek early completion of the Mackenzie Highway and also the paving of the Alaska Highway, we should be very fast to move on the completion of those two roads in Alberta, which link the two major northern arteries. I am referring to Highway No. 49 on the south side of the Peace River, and the so-called Grimshaw to Fort St. John Road on the north side of the Peace River. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment both these roads deserve a much higher priority than they have received to date.

It is quite obvious that from a viewpoint of national security, it is necessary to have reliable roads connecting our two major northern arteries. In the case of the Fairview-Fort St. John Road, for example, this would allow the connection of the Mackenzie and the Alaska on the north side of the Peace River in case any kind of hostilities broke out. As we can all appreciate, it is the easiest thing in the world to knock out bridge connections, and to build bridges across a river as large as the Peace River is a pretty major undertaking. So the completion of the Grimshaw to Fort St. John Road is, in my view, important, not just from the viewpoint of the local residents in the area, but it is important from the viewpoint of security interests of the nation.

I want to say just a word or two about the residents of the area, Mr. Speaker, because the communities that would be serviced by the completion of this road, have been opened up now for many years. An area like Worsley was first opened up by settlers in the very early 1920's. People have lived in that community and carried on their agricultural pursuits now for more than half a century. Yet they are still required to travel nearly 60 miles, over some of the most unbelievable road conditions, into their major market centre in Fairview. So I certainly want to commend the work of the Fairview - Fort St. John Highway Committee and to assure them that I will continue to work with them to try and get the government to make this a higher priority and one, which I submit, Mr. Speaker, is consistent with their northern transportation policy.

Similarly, on the south side of the Peace River, there are now just 27 miles of Highway No. 49 left to pave to finally complete the scenic route from Edmonton via the Lesser Slave Lake, right through to Dawson Creek in British Columbia and linking up, of course, with the Alaska Highway at Dawson Creek. I am advised by the British Columbia Minister of Highways, Mr. Speaker, that the British Columbia Government will finish the construction of their link, into Dawson Creek, of Highway No. 49 and will pave it this fall if weather permits.

While one talks about transportation requirements, Mr. Speaker, and we look at the government's policy paper, I believe that it is important for this Legislature to consider what is going to become a major issue in Canada, and that is whether or not we have a Mackenzie pipeline, or alternatively should we consider a Mackenzie railroad instead.

Yesterday, during the debate on the ARR resolution, I made reference to the Canadian Institute of Guided Ground Transport, Queens University, Kingston, Ontario. This study, which I obtained several months ago at the request of a number of local residents, is one which, in my judgment, every member of this Legislature should at least read. I note that in the government's transportation policy they state they would like to see the Great Slave railroad extended from Pine Point into the Mackenzie Valley. I obviously concur with that proposition. But, Mr. Speaker, if the government is prepared to go that

far, surely it makes sense for them to at least assess the advantages of a Mackenzie railroad?

Now the obvious advantages are: (1) it would be much less detrimental to the environment; (2) the initial outlay would be much less substantial. But in the long run, the long term advantages, Mr. Speaker, are the ones, which it seems to me, we must consider pretty carefully. If this pipeline is completed the most it will employ on a long term basis would be 400 fulltime people. But on the other hand, the railroad would employ 5,000 people directly in the Northwest Territories. There would be an additional 5,000 service jobs, not to mention 13,000 more jobs created in southern Canada. At least this is the proposition submitted by the Kingston Institute On Guided Ground Transport.

Mr. Speaker, as a representative from the Peace River country in the Alberta Legislature, I am naturally interested in making sure that any development of the North helps our area of the province. And certainly if many people are employed by a railroad on a long term basis, it seems to me that a good part of that prosperity would spill over into the Peace.

I think that there is another feature that we have to consider about a railroad, Mr. Speaker. A pipeline is a one-way proposition. You can bring oil or gas out, but there is nothing much that you can take back in. A railroad is a two-way proposition. You can not only bring out raw materials, but we can utilize this transportation system to bring goods into northern Canada. And of course, as we consider the commercial impact that a railroad could have on northern Alberta, and even on the City of Edmonton as the gateway to the North, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me absolutely vital that this government at least commission a very careful study as to the practicality of a Mackenzie railroad. Let's not get caught in the trap of supporting a pipeline when a railroad would be much more in the long term interest of the people of our province.

The second point that I would like to deal with, Mr. Speaker, has provincial overtones too. It concerns the crop situation in northern Alberta, especially in the northwestern section of the Peace River country, where in many cases large numbers of farmers still have virtually all of their crop left out, under the snow.

As a result of the really dreadful harvesting conditions last fall, most of the men have had to seek employment elsewhere. Just to illustrate how widespread this is, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity on my pre-session tour, to speak to the postmistress at a little post office called Silver Valley. Of the 45 men who are householders in that area, 30 of them, or two-thirds, are employed with oil rigs in the Arctic, or are away from home during the winter. Two-thirds of the heads of families then, Mr. Speaker, are not at home where they should be, looking after their wives and families, and staying with their families. But rather they are forced, because of the circumstances of the crop conditions, to seek employment in other parts of Canada. That's rather unfortunate, and I am sure most of us would agree that it is not desirable, especially in areas where you have rather unsatisfactory road conditions, areas that are 50 miles away from a doctor. It is not desirable to have most of the men away so that women are forced to deal with the circumstances, the accidents, and the problems, that arise in any family farm operation.

Mr. Speaker, while the provincial government has come out with some assistance, and this assistance is welcome, in my view it really isn't enough. I say that the same is true of the assistance made available by the B.C. government too. The four dollars an acre based on 75 per cent of the unharvested crop, is not going to be sufficient, to come close to covering the cost of production.

Mr. Speaker, I know that there have been some in this province who have complained about even the very modest level of assistance that has been granted to date. They say, "Why should we be spending money helping out these farmers all the time? That's just another form of subsidy. Why can't they stand on their own feet?" But perhaps sometimes it is important to put this thing in perspective.

I want to quote from a speech that Mr. Alf Gleave, the member for Rosetown, made in the House of Commons dealing with the assistance that we give to corporations, and he says:

We have provided assistance for corporations already. When the United States proposed, and indeed imposed, restrictions against the export of certain Canadian manufactured goods to the United States, we took action not more than a year ago to provide assistance. And we did not make it a limited program. We made it an open-ended program so that if companies

could prove the damage done to them and the amount they needed, that amount of money would be paid under the formula in the act that we passed.

In short, no limitations whatever the problem was, whatever the extent of the assistance needed -- we were prepared to provide it.

Perhaps we can use another example, Mr. Speaker. In 1970 the Alberta Government decided to cut the royalty rate for Great Canadian Oil Sands. The reason, as a matter of public policy, they decided to take this course was to protect the jobs at stake in Fort McMurray. While I may or may not agree with the course of action, at least one can understand the reason. Now, Mr. Speaker, last year that decision cost the taxpayers of Alberta somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$3,700,000. If you calculate that by the number of people who are employed directly by Great Canadian Oil Sands, that works out to a subsidy of \$3,880 per job. Even if you include all the people who are indirectly associated with the operation, that works out to \$2,500 per job.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me rather odd, that we have people screaming and crying the blues because we are providing assistance to farmers in the North. I should point out, that taking the first applications, and the amount of money paid out to date, the level of assistance averages out to \$302.86 per farm. But we have people who are concerned about paying \$300 per farmer on one hand, and yet they are quite prepared to turn around and pay \$3,800 per job to a large American-controlled corporation. I sometimes wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we don't have a double standard, and if perhaps the time should come when charity, in fact, begins at home.

I do want to say, in order not to leave an entirely negative picture, that the crop insurance report tabled in this Legislature last fall has a number of excellent recommendations, and that as far as I am concerned, I was pleased to see, in the Speech from the Throne, that the government seems prepared to go ahead with the recommendations of this report. Might I suggest, however, that it may be wise to extend further our provincial commitment, so that the package can be made even more attractive than the one offered by the interim report on crop insurance.

Mr. Speaker, turning from the crop situation in northern Alberta to another issue. During the last provincial election we heard a great deal from the Tory Party about all the things they were going to do to bring the government back to the people -- that they were going to de-centralize this, that, and the other thing. Well, to be fair, I think it should be noted that the step to move the Agricultural Development Corporation to Camrose is a good one, and I want it on the record that I support it. I think, to be fair, that it was a wise step to move the Alberta Opportunity Fund to Ponoka, and on the record I want it stated that I so support that move.

But, nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, when I look at the bulk of the Tory policies today, I see rather a dangerous trend towards centralization. Let's take, first of all, the Alberta Property Tax Reduction Plan. We were told that this is going to save the taxpayers of Alberta, at least the property taxpayers of Alberta, a good deal of money, and no doubt in the first year or two it will. What will happen three or four years down the road, when the full impact of supplementary requisitions are considered, will perhaps be another matter. But in the short run, it is no doubt going to save almost every Albertan some money on his property tax.

But let's just take a brief look at the history of municipal grants. As we all know, the former government at one time divided the oil royalties on the basis of two-thirds to the provincial government and one-third to the municipalities. The municipalities were entitled to spend that money on whatever particular course of action they chose. If they wanted to build a statue to the Minister of Agriculture in every small town in Alberta, they were quite able to build a statue of the Minister of Agriculture with a knife, or do whatever they wanted with it.

But on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, in 1971 we had a change. At that time instead of the two-thirds, one-third formula, the former government froze the grant at some \$38 million. But again the money was still designated to the municipalities to spend as they chose. And even in 1971 if they wanted to build a statue to the Minister of Agriculture, they were perfectly entitled to so do. But the difference this time is, in my judgment, a pretty significant difference, because 40 per cent of the municipal grants are in the form of incentive grants which the municipality will not receive if they exceed the seven and a half per cent requirement set out in the plan. In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, this represents an erosion of the whole concept of municipal autonomy. And you know the way that it at least appears on the surface, I am glad to see

that the Minister of Municipal Affairs says the government may be prepared to adjust the plan somewhat.

But in the rural Municipality of Fairview, for example, where their municipal expenditures have been very low and their mill rate for municipal purposes has been 12 or 13 mills, the seven and a half per cent formula would have meant that the maximum increase they could have levied would be one mill. If they went above that one mill figure, they would lose their incentive grant portion of the provincial grant, and of course, as the secretary pointed out to me rather forcefully, here we have a municipality that tried to make do, that had been cautious in its expenditures, that had deliberately tried to work within its means, spend within its means, but it is now going to be penalized, it appears, by a formula which will penalize it for being prudent. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that sort of thing is completely wrong.

When the former Minister of Highways, Mr. Taylor, made his speech on the reply, he cited the community of Standard. There are many other communities that we might examine. What is going to happen to Grande Cache, for example? Grande Cache is likely going to lose 800 or 900 people but the level of public services will have to remain at a pretty high level -- if not exactly at the level of 1972, pretty close to it. Does that mean they are going to lose their incentive grant? What kind of formula are we going to work out in the case of a community where the population growth for one reason or another is stagnant, or even declines?

Well, Mr. Speaker, still another area that in my judgment represents a rather dangerous centralizing trend is the Agricultural Development Committees, which have been appointed across the province. The first point that concerns me about these Agricultural Development Committees is that we deliberately put on them civil servants, usually the DA, a representative from the Department of Lands and Forests, and one municipal representative, who very frequently is an officer in the ID's of the government, and one representative from Federal Farm Credit. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think this is a sound principle.

I have no objection at all to having government personnel at committee meetings, to give advice. But I think that it is an unsound principle to have them actually on the committees where they are able to influence and sometimes dominate discussion at the committee level. As a matter of fact with respect to the Agricultural Development Committee in one part of my constituency, the local DA was acting as a de facto chairman. He was calling the meetings. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that is a very unsound principle.

I would like to say that these committees should be drawn up so that the members are designated certain areas. They represent these areas. And these members are elected by the farmers involved. Now I know that the argument may be, "Well, their elections are expensive, they cost a lot of money. The school house approach of electing these members may not be the most democratic." But I submit that an election process on something as important as these development committees would make them more responsible, make them more responsive, and would, it seems to me, involve the people of the community in the whole program.

Right now, there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the function of these committees. There is also no small amount of discontent, Mr. Speaker, that they are appointed rather than being elected by the people involved. So I would suggest as a principle, Mr. Speaker, that first of all they should be elected, and secondly, that they should not include as voting members, people who are employed directly by the government. The government people should be there in an advisory capacity only. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, similar to having the Legislature expanded by 22 deputy ministers and bringing our deputy ministers in and giving them the opportunity not only of speaking, but the opportunity of voting. Some of us may feel that this might improve the quality of the answers during the question period but, Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the principle would be unsound, and it is still unsound when we do this at the local level with the Agricultural Development Committees.

The third area that concerns me about centralization, Mr. Speaker, concerns the announcement on January 26 of the proposed grant structure for elementary and junior high schools in the province. Mr. Speaker, the problem that I see in this new grant structure is that, inadvertently, it is going to discriminate against the smaller jurisdiction in the more remote part of the province where you aren't going to be able to make as efficient utilization of the teacher-pupil ratios. This is going to cause problems. It's going to mean that a number of rural high schools may have to close down. In addition, the old sparsity grant formula, where additional grants are given to those remote areas where a great deal of travel and distance factor exists, is going to be done

away with. This is going to be extremely disadvantageous to many parts of Alberta.

Just before the Legislature convened, Mr. Speaker, I had a pre-session meeting in a corner of my constituency some 60 miles away from Fairview where the community was facing the prospect of having their high school closed down. The school board had looked over the announcement from the minister, had got out their pen and pencil, and had decided that they simply couldn't keep this high school in operation.

As an alternative they were considering the busing of students some 45 miles a day, one way, to the town of Hines Creek over the roads that I previously described, which not even the Minister of Highway's mother would say are good. Mr. Speaker, the suggestion of the administrator -- and I don't raise this to make fun of him because he was caught in a bind, he has to work within the very prescribed limits of the grant structure -- the suggestion of the administrator was that the students would start out at a quarter to nine and get into Hines Creek at a quarter to ten. That means that they would miss one period each day of classes going to school and miss another period coming back. So he suggested that they might wire the school bus with earphones and they could be given pre-taped instruction on the school bus.

Mr. Speaker, as a student, I went to high school on a school bus, and I'm sure that any hon. members of this Assembly, who went to high school on a school bus or spent any amount of time on a school bus, would testify that that is not the best place to learn your studies, whatever those studies may be. I don't raise this to make fun of the superintendent. He was advancing a proposition with which I may disagree; but he felt, after reviewing the grant structure, that there just simply wasn't enough money around to keep this high school in operation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no point in prattling about de-centralization of government programs -- there is no point in making all sorts of speeches about defending the family farm -- if we are going to bring in a policy which will close down our smaller high schools. Mr. Speaker, we are talking about equality of education. It is fundamentally important that there be, intrinsic to any teacher grant structure, some formula which makes allowance for the fact that costs are going to be higher and that from the cost accounting point of view, the school boards are not going to be able to make as efficient use of their money.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment or two today and make some reference to the decision to close down the Number 5 Mine at Grande Cache. I'm sure that, regardless of where we sit politically in this House, we were all shocked at the decision of McIntyre Porcupine. But it is important to determine who made that decision. Was that decision made in Alberta? Was it made in Toronto or was it made in Houston by the Superior Oil Corporation of Texas, which controls McIntyre Porcupine? What is at stake here is not just a question of the closing of the mine, although that's a very important issue, but what is at stake is the impact of these giant multi-national corporations on the Alberta economy.

We have heard for a long time, all the advantages of foreign capital. But there is a balance sheet. Yes, there's a credit side to foreign capital, jobs are created in the short run. But there's also a debit side. It may well be, Mr. Speaker, that Grande Cache is part of that debit side.

I would like to know from the government whether or not the company is attempting to pressure this administration into permitting them to strip-mine on a massive basis near Grande Cache. I want to know, from this government, what they are going to do about the workers who were enticed to come to Grande Cache and were told they would have 15 years employment? They get here and they find that they're out of work. It was brought to my attention, Mr. Speaker, by a daughter of one of the officials of the British Mine Workers Union, that as early as the first week of February there was still advertising in Great Britain for men to come to Grande Cache.

I am wondering whether or not the Minister of Labour has had an opportunity to meet with Canada Manpower to finally straighten out this question of whether they are going to cover the moving costs anywhere in Canada of those men who voluntarily stepped down. As a matter of fact, there are five of them now, Mr. Speaker, who have jobs in Ontario. But because of the red tape occasioned by Manpower jurisdiction between Ontario and the Prairie region, the union has still not heard to this day whether Manpower will pick up the moving costs of these five people, who have jobs in Ontario.

I would ask the Minister of Labour to look into this matter and, if he can, to use his influence to smooth over the administrative details. Because, Mr. Speaker, to me what has happened has been reprehensible right from the word go. It is completely inexcusable to allow government bureaucracy and red tape to stand in the way of people who have found employment and who were led to believe that Canada Manpower would pay their moving costs.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not attempting to prejudge the final decision of the administration because I understand that a report will be coming out shortly on the immediate situation. What is finally decided is really the responsibility of the government. But I do believe there is a lot of merit in the recommendation made by the Alberta Federation of Labour, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for a full scale management probe into the operations of Grande Cache. It is not just the individuals who have been laid off, but there is a tremendous amount of public investment -- a good part of which is jeopardized by the irresponsible action of corporate management.

Mr. Speaker, I will deal very briefly with two other areas before I conclude. The Legislature last spring held hearings on the question of petroleum royalties and in the summer the government announced their program. I said at the time and I say again, I don't believe that program is adequate. I think it is wrong for us to get locked in to a five-year agreement with the industry, especially in view of the fact that we now seem to be entering a very critical stage. We are now clearly in a position where our bargaining power is much stronger than it was some years ago.

The American energy crisis will mean that the price of oil is going to rise in the next five years. I had the opportunity of speaking to one of the senior management officials of a large American firm and I asked him what his estimate was, as to the increase in the price of petroleum over the next five years. He suggested that he felt that the price of crude oil within five years would be somewhere between \$5.50 and \$6 a barrel. So that the price of crude is obviously going to rise. How much it will rise may be the subject of some debate, but there is no doubt about it that crude oil prices are going to increase.

Mr. Speaker, who is going to get the benefit of this windfall increase caused by the American energy crisis? Is it going to be the industry which is already doing pretty well, or is it going to be the people of Alberta? Or is it going to be the industry getting the lion's share and the people of Alberta getting a very small share? I think it is important to point out that the industry is now doing very well in Alberta. This may not be true of every single corporation, but it is certainly true of the industry as a whole.

Between 1970 and 1973, the difference between what the industry spent in Alberta and what they took out of this province has been very dramatic. In 1970 it was \$281 million. In 1971, \$391.5 million; 1972, according to Oil Week, \$665 million, and the estimate, Mr. Speaker, contained in the February 19 edition of Oil Week is \$868 million. Mr. Speaker, with the probable further increase in crude oil this year, plus the increase in natural gas, it may even be that difference will reach a billion dollars this year. There is virtually a haemorrhage of capital from this province. And therefore tying oneself into five-year agreements is completely wrong, at least as I see it.

Now, much has been said about the question of natural gas. The government outlined its policy in the Legislature in the fall and made it very clear that they want the price of natural gas to increase. Frankly, I am sure that I speak for all members of the House when I say that the price of natural gas should increase. Clearly it is under-valued compared to other types of fuel. But who gets the benefit of this increase? On page 35 of the Energy Resources Conservation Board report on the field pricing of natural gas in Alberta, we find that the total revenues that we can expect by 1975, as a result of this increase, will be \$224 million. But the increased government revenues will be \$32 million. In other words, \$192 million will go to the companies and \$32 million will go the people of Alberta in the form of royalties.

Now, to be fair to the government, I think it must also be acknowledged that the royalty structure will be reviewed, and so that may change somewhat. But the fact is that the bulk of the increase is still going to go to the industry -- whether it's five-sixths, or four-fifths, or three-quarters -- the bulk of it is still going to go to the industry and we will still end up with a fraction.

Mr. Speaker, in that fall statement the government also committed itself to a two-price system for natural gas, but did not tell us how they were going to pay for the two-price system. Is it going to be through some form of excess

profits tax levied on the industry, or is it going to come directly from the provincial treasury in the form of a rebate? Because if it does, if we look on page 41 of the Energy Resources Conservation Board Report, we find that the costs in terms of increased price will be \$20 million. In order to maintain natural gas prices then at their current level, we would have to take \$20 million from our royalty if that is the way the government is going to approach this issue. I would hope that it isn't, but the statement last fall didn't spell out how the Lougheed administration plans to finance its own two-price system.

But in any event, no matter how you slice it, Mr. Speaker, the industry is going to receive the lion's share of the windfall as a result of rising energy prices. And I think that is completely wrong. I am not arguing that the industry doesn't deserve a generous share and a reasonable return on their capital investment -- few of us would argue that point. But what is reasonable, Mr. Speaker, should not be analysed from a viewpoint of a price structure which is out of date.

What is reasonable should not be analysed from the viewpoint of a price structure which moved the former Manning administration to set a certain policy in 1962 -- that's 11 years ago. What governed us then should not determine our action today. We are in a different situation, our bargaining power is much stronger and it seems to me that we must, if we are going to take full advantage of this energy crisis for the taxpayers of Alberta, take a somewhat different course. I would suggest that perhaps we should establish a gas and oil marketing board which would be directed with the purchase of all gasoline and oil in the province and marketing it so the bulk of the increase will go to the people who own the resource, not the companies who develop it.

There is one other point that should be made when I talk about oil and gas development in the province, Mr. Speaker. That is the price of gasoline at the consumer level. I was very impressed in reading over the annual submission this year of Unifarm to the provincial cabinet. Because one of the recommendations Unifarm made was that gasoline and fuel oils be brought under the Public Utilities Board. I believe there should be some changes in the structure of the Public Utilities Board to strengthen the position of the consumer, but nevertheless I maintain that would be one means of at least cushioning the impact of rising energy prices for Alberta consumers. It is my understanding that the Government of Nova Scotia brought gasoline pricing under their Public Utilities Board, and I would most heartily concur with Unifarm's recommendation. I hope the government will seriously consider it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a word or two about the development of the Athabasca ...

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

Hon. member, you have one minute left.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, just to conclude on the tar sands, it seems to me we are talking about a very valuable resource. I have said for a long time, and I repeat it today, that I believe the tar sands should be developed publicly. Admittedly, the initial experience of GCOS did not look too promising. But the fact of the matter is that the company is almost certain to turn a profit in 1973, and with rising energy prices ultimately the tar sands will be a resource worth a great deal to all Albertans. The benefits of this resource should go directly to the people through a Crown corporation.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, if you will give me a moment or two to conclude my remarks. The Speech from the Throne is not really the kind of exciting document one would expect after listening to all the rhetoric of the 1971 campaign. There are very few new ideas. It is essentially just a case of the government patting itself on the back for accomplishments during the past year. What the people of Alberta are looking at, Mr. Speaker, and what they are looking for, is policies for now and tomorrow -- not just accomplishments of the past. As I view The Speech from the Throne, it is essentially a document of a government caught in mid-term doldrums.

Mr. Speaker, that clearly is not good enough for the people of Alberta in 1973.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vegreville has the floor.

MR. BATIUK:

Mr. Speaker, approximately one year ago I participated in the Throne Speech debate, and on that occasion I discussed some of the issues that were of vital concern to my constituents. I also took the opportunity to outline some of the programs I felt our government should consider.

Over the past year I have kept my requests in mind, and considered the programs our government has already established or outlined for upcoming legislation. As a result I would like to make a few observations on the policies that not only affect the constituency of Vegreville, but the province as a whole.

One issue of high priority in my constituency was a section of Highway 16, west of Vegreville. This was a piece of road on the Yellowhead Route that has been left for a dozen years, narrow, no shoulders, deep ditches, sharp curves -- mishap after mishap, and fatality after fatality -- nothing had been done. The residents of that area, and I along with them, many times wondered why this road had been neglected. It was not until recently that I discovered that the reason was that the residents of that community and area wished the up-graded highway to follow a route it follows at present.

However, the former Minister of Highways, in his dictatorial governmental rule, decided that the road should bypass the community, as he had done in many areas of the province. This is why many of our small towns and villages are dying -- because of that action.

Mr. Speaker, this was deemed undesirable by the people of the area, and, because of this, a stalemate was created with the result that for the last 12 years this road was a reminder of the past government's obstinacy.

Mr. Speaker, -- you'll get your chance, Walter -- I believe that when a road is going to affect the entire life of a community, the people of that community should be given a chance to voice their opinion. It is very gratifying, Mr. Speaker, that a contract has been awarded this December to upgrade this road, and work will commence this spring. However, it is more notable that this road is going to follow a route, not where the Minister of Highways said that it should follow, and not where the Member of the Legislative Assembly representing Vegreville says it should follow. It is going to go on a route where 4 thousand people of the community, and several thousand other people who use that road regularly, want it to go.

Mr. Speaker -- I'm talking about Highway 16, and you'll get your chance -- this is an excellent example of open government selected by the people to serve them.

The area of social assistance, Mr. Speaker, takes a lot of my time as a member of this Legislative Assembly. Sometimes I get several representations weekly from individuals, and sometimes from groups on behalf of individuals. I have always opposed the granting of social assistance wherever possible, especially when the opportunity for its abuse was possible or even probable. However, Mr. Speaker, when I reviewed many of these representations, on numerous occasions I have had to sympathize with the claims. Some of them have health problems, and because of this they could not obtain employment to supplement their assistance. Others may have had dietary problems and they too needed additional assistance. Realizing that the cost of living is continuously rising, I think that our government should consider a review, and consider giving assistance commensurate with the cost of living.

Another item of concern was car drivers and insurance. Even though, I may say, I am glad to see already that some people who have been convicted of impaired driving may have a limited suspended licence -- I think that this will help to alleviate many persons seeking social assistance. However, I still disagree -- many of the young people who prove they may be better drivers than some older ones are punished by paying an additional cost on their insurance. I feel only those who are responsible for accidents should pay the higher rate.

Also, another factor disturbing to me is the general increase in insurance. I know from my own experience that my own insurance rates have been increasing continuously, yet I never had an accident or had a reason for them to increase. I think maybe some control on insurance rates must be looked at.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn now to the field of education, with specific reference to the Commission on Educational Planning. I was very amazed, at the fall sitting, to hear the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc criticize the job that the commission did. He stressed that this exercise had

cost the province nearly a quarter of a million dollars and that he could have made the same predictions for \$7,200 -- the member's indemnity. I believe that this statement was ludicrous considering that it was the former government, his government, that had established this commission and appointed its members.

I would like to ask the hon. member to think back to January of 1971, when Dr. Harold Dyck of Westrede Institute, in a Social Credit government commissioned study, presented a series of predictions tabulated in Social Futures 1970 to 2005. And one of the first predictions that Dr. Harold Dyck made was, "Social Credit must die unless it awakens." I wonder why the hon. member didn't make the prediction at that time and save the government \$52,000 -- the cost of the study. Or they could have even -

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's open government!

MR. BATHURST:

They could have listened to the Leader of the Opposition then, the now Premier, because he did on numerous occasions remind the government that it was time to awaken.

I am pleased indeed, Mr. Speaker, to see that our government is considering some of the recommendations of the Worth Report. Most particularly, I was happy to note that the standard for certification for teachers is raised to four years. I look forward to the implementation of more recommendations that would give this province even more progressive educational policies.

MR. BARTON:

Now's the time.

MR. BATHURST:

One area I would like to briefly consider is kindergarten programs. Several years ago, as the president of a zone of the Alberta School Trustees' Association I participated in numerous meetings and seminars, and one of the top concerns was kindergarten classes. At that time, many mothers were forced to go out to seek employment to supplement the family income. Because these jobs were not paying too well, they had to get babysitters -- cheap babysitters. And as the old saying goes, you get what you pay for. As a result some of these children were deprived of the advancement they would have had if they had been with their mothers. So I believe that perhaps kindergartens are really essential, especially for those children whose parents must go out to work.

Though it may be difficult for us to accept, one-fifth of the children entering school today have some learning disabilities. I believe that a comprehensive kindergarten program could help detect these disabilities. And they may be detected and worked on sooner, probably with more and better results, than if treatment were delayed for a couple of years.

Surveys have shown, however, that children who have gone to kindergarten classes need not have too much advantage over children who are at home with their parents, by the time they reach the third grade. However, there could be a world of difference if these children had to sit with a low calibre of babysitter. I think for this particular reason we should consider good kindergarten programs.

Also due to the changing complexity of society today, and since children are more educationally advanced than they were some years ago, I believe our government should consider a policy for financing a comprehensive kindergarten program.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I would like to make a few observations on this House. Last fall when the hon. members of this House were debating an increased indemnity for the members, I did not participate in this debate. As a farmer, I have been accustomed to existing on a low income and I am sure that had the indemnities not been raised, I would have not been disgruntled in the least. However, I did feel that there was a need for an increase in the expense allowance, particularly for the rural members. Many of them have to travel hundreds of miles to visit every area of their constituency, so I felt that this was one area I was favouring.

I was particularly amazed at the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, when he said that he favoured an increase but because he wished that there would

have been an unlimited tax-exempt expense allowance, he refused to vote for this. And right then I felt how true and how whole-heartedly I agreed with the Deputy Premier when he mentioned that leopards sometimes change their spots. Realizing that the hon. member was so concerned over his expense allowance, I am puzzled why he did not seek a seat in the Edmonton area where he resided. That way he could have toured or circulated his constituency on bicycle or even by foot and that way minimized his expense. I cannot understand how a leader of a political party ever can expect to form a government when he travels the province over to seek for a constituency that is going to be favourable to his political views. I believe that a good political aspirant should be able to capture a seat in any constituency and leave the stronger areas for the weaker candidates.

MR. DIXON:

Do not lose any sleep over it.

MR. BATIUK:

I was also disappointed -- but hardly surprised -- that this same member, during the debate on oil royalties stated \$70 million dollars was far inadequate, that it should have been three or four times as much. Yet he did a complete about-face-turn, when he applauded the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, when the hon. member almost shed tears in defence of the oil companies and The Mineral Taxation Amendment Act last fall.

Mr. Speaker, such an agreement between two opposition parties often leaves me wondering what has happened to the Tory twins we heard about so much in the first part of 1971. I can only hope for the hon. member, regardless of what constituency he is going to choose to run in the next time, that there will be more candidates and maybe he will have his communist cousins to compete with.

When I hear the hon. member argue that there should be more sharing, I am reminded of a passage from, Why Shoot a Teacher. This was written by Max Braithwaite, young teacher in Saskatchewan, and this is what he says:

These crackpots talk about socialism. They want to take everything from everybody and spread it all around. That is fine for them. They've got nothing anyway.

Mr. Speaker, agriculture has been one of the top priorities of our government and I look forward to a continuing concern for the future of the farmers of this province. I have already noted a change in the province's agricultural situation over the last year. Markets are available for farm produce and farmers are encouraged to produce even more.

DR. BUCK:

That is not listed here.

MR. BATIUK:

The farm income has risen over 15 per cent in the last year and a half and prices are increasing to the producer -- with the exception of grain, which I feel is far too low. However, the situation is such that we have our hands tied. Perhaps it is unfortunate that we do not have an Alberta Wheat Board rather than a Canadian Wheat Board. Perhaps the Minister of Agriculture would see that the prices for grain would be in the right area.

Mr. Speaker, listening to some of the members on the other side criticize the tax reduction plan, I would like to say a few words concerning the Provincial-Municipal Finance Task Force, of which I was a member. It is one committee in particular that has spent a considerable amount of time to fulfill one of our obligations to the people of this province. It has been an honour for me to serve on this committee and I am glad that I was selected to be one of its members. Even though the only remuneration we got for that was the expenses and a lot of criticism from the other side of the House, I feel that the experience and knowledge I gained was worth several times more than monetary compensation.

MR. BARTON:

That doesn't cost money.

MR. BATIUK:

I believe the program of reform the task force recommended will prove satisfactory in the province. Already I have heard many favourable comments from individuals, and certainly the removal of 30 mills of education costs will assist both residential property owners and renters to a great degree. I am confident that the financial rebates to the residents of Alberta will be useful and well appreciated.

MR. BARTON:

It'll buy votes.

MR. BATIUK:

I believe that once the municipalities calculate the amount of grants and hospital coverages that will be available to them, they will find the program advantageous. Naturally, I expect there will be some grievances, especially from elements that resist change, but it is a sign of progress when the people of a province can accept change open-mindedly and adapt to it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to a matter of a cultural nature. Plans have been underway for a little while to hold a cultural festival in Vegreville. Should the plans materialize, and indications are that they may, it will be the first such undertaking in any community west of Winnipeg. Since our government is, in a sense, committed to preserving the cultural heritage of our province, I would request that it offer its support, both moral and monetary. If the festival is undertaken, it would be appreciated if many members of this government would participate.

It was with these observations and thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to thank the hon. members for their attention, and I am looking forward to a fruitful session. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I must extend my compliments to the mover and seconder. I can't help admitting, after listening to the hon. member, Mr. Purdy, that I have to agree with him on at least one point. He said that they were going to utilize hot air to make things grow in his constituency, and the Minister of Agriculture is the man to implement this program. I hope he is listening, because he's going to get the only compliment he'll probably ever get from me, and that is that if hot air will make things grow, I don't know of a better man to implement the program than he.

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. PURDY:

Mr. Speaker, just to clarify this on a point of order. It's not hot air, but hot water the hon. member is talking about, and that's what he's in.

MR. LUDWIG:

The hon. member forgot already what he said.

I also have to make a comment to the hon. member who spoke before me. He was worried about socialism. I've been in politics about 14 years, and I haven't been able to distinguish between an Alberta socialist and a Saskatchewan conservative. I think that if any trouble is going to arise in this province, perhaps the government we have in office at the present time is going to put the skids under our economy.

One thing for certain, Mr. Speaker, is that we have entered into an historic session. Hardly three days have elapsed and history has been made. We've had the Premier pulling leather from all sides, apologizing to all concerned. I don't know where he is now. He's probably beating Mr. Adair and Mr. Leitch over the head for being indiscreet, not for what they did, but for how they explained it after they did it.

I also wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that when the hon. member, Mr. Notley, got up to speak, almost the whole side over there, except 19, got up and left. It's interesting that they did get up and leave, because it shows that on one more occasion, the integrity of the whole government is in serious question. They keep preaching and repeating over and over again that they are interested in input from the people. They have raised the pay of the MLAs. The MLAs gather

the problems and the issues from their constituencies, they come here -- a man who was duly elected stands up, and the whole front line with the exception of 7 walk out -- there were 19 people in the House. It's proof beyond any doubt that interest in The Speech from the Throne, and in the problems of the people of this province, are at an all-time low and the government hasn't been in long enough to get tired. It indicates that after the election, and after the pay raise, their attitude is that all is well in Alberta, Mr. Speaker is in the House, we do not have to stick around.

[Interjections]

Yes, I am sure that he will miss me like I miss him, Mr. Speaker, but I want to tell you that I must deal with history a little bit. I must review just some of what happened in the House last session and I have to come back to the hon. Premier. I hope that what happened last time never happens again in this House. He moved the motion of the state of the union and then he cut off debate on that motion. If ever there was a hit and run operation in this House, the hon. Premier pulled it off because I felt that I wanted to speak on that motion but, believe it or not, nobody could find time for the hon. members to debate the motion because they were losing ground so quickly, they cut off the session. And now, with egg all over their face, I am of the opinion that this one is going to be short also. They double their pay and try to cut the session in two, and that is the way the new government is going to handle things.

MR. GETTY:

Point of order. It may be insignificant but the hon. member continues to say that they doubled their pay and I was wondering if he could explain whether the government raised the --

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister has not really a point of order. If he wishes to ask a question perhaps the hon. member might --

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the point of order is that the House increased --
[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! Would the hon. member please allow the hon. minister to state his point of order.

MR. GETTY:

My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that the House increased the salaries of the MLAs. It is not strictly the government. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member probably would --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! Would the hon. member allow the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill to state his point of order.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. I refer you to 155 in Beauchesne to which you drew our attention earlier today, and in paragraph three it says that no member can be allowed to attribute any intention to insult others or to question the honour of one or to --

[Interjections]

Now you were talking about double pay; that's questioning honour. It gives this example -- Beauchesne says that Bourinot gives this example of an unparliamentary phrase: that you can expect no candour from someone. The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View was inferring that the hon. Premier was limiting debate, that he was not being candid. He said it was a hit and run, a hit and run process. That must be unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER:

With due deference to the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill, although I agree that 155 should be construed fairly strictly, I am unable to take it to that extent.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to question the hon. member's honour, but I am entitled to question the judgment and I believe many people will also.

[Interjections]

Mr. Speaker, another problem in which I think the government did a hit and run job on the Legislature was the Worth Report. I got the impression that, when this thing was introduced and touted as being the major issue for the fall session, we were going to have a real debate. I got the impression by the time we had two or three days debate on it that apparently, the intellectuals wrote it, the Conservative politicians couldn't understand it, and they were going to go to the lay people to tell them what it was all about. I hope they have done it by now, because I am under the impression that the Minister of Advanced Education will once again have nothing constructive to say on the Worth Report.

We hear lots of talk from the hon. Minister Responsible for Tourism that all is well in this province.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

I think notwithstanding that all is well, there are some serious problems he should look into. I understand that bankruptcies in this province have leapt rather rapidly in the past year and I am wondering whether he is looking at these bankruptcies, whether he will tell us what is the cause of them, and whether some of this Opportunity Fund is breaking other companies, or whether it is available for existing companies, and see whether he can help. It's all right to talk, but it's a different thing to solve the problems.

I am also pointing out, Mr. Speaker, at this stage, that it is quite obvious the gap between pronouncement and performance is widening with this government. They talk about all sorts of problems, but they fail to deal with them in the Speech from the Throne. I really feel that interest on that other side on the Speech from the Throne is very low, and even when their own speakers spoke they tended to ignore them.

The problem of unemployment has been a major issue in this province for quite some time. Every member then in the opposition got up and gave us his opinion as to what is to be done. Unemployment has never been higher in this province than it is today, and what does the Speech from the Throne say about unemployment? Nothing.

MR. FOSTER:

-- [inaudible] -- the Worth Report

MR. LUDWIG:

The hon. minister wants to know what I think about the Worth Report. I think about as much of it right now as I think of you, which isn't very much. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect, I hope you will give me additional time because I am being heckled -- and I'll take it too.

MR. FOSTER:

We're all listening; we'd like to know what you think about it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Well, obviously if we wait for you to say something on the Worth Report we'll never get it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please!

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand here a panic bill introduced by the hon. member who is grinning, the hon. minister Mr. Hyndman. This was his temporary unemployment measures act. It sets out all sorts of interesting things -- that we can set the machinery in motion to get rid of unemployment. This was when he was in the opposition. Now this year, I wonder how much of this program is in motion?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Most of it.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, I will also tell you where, Mr. Speaker. I will just read to you some of the programs that we started in Calgary which cost millions of dollars and which provided a lot of employment. These programs are still in progress.

The Alberta Vocational Centre, \$4,575,000; we got the fish hatchery under way, almost \$5 million; parking facilities at the court house, almost a half a million dollars; the SAIT art complex, sewer construction, alteration to teaching buildings, parking structures, et cetera, roughly \$8 to \$10 million...

MR. GHITTER:

How about the court house cafeteria?

MR. LUDWIG:

... the Calgary health sciences system or the the Calgary medical school, \$25 million, a program initiated by Social Credit, well under way providing employment. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Mount Royal College, \$16 million; programs started by Social Credit, implemented by Social Credit, providing much work. This is all in Calgary, Mr. Speaker. The university in Calgary at that time had a capital grant of well over \$10 million. All these programs, Mr. Speaker, were brought ahead, and were implemented to provide employment.

I asked the hon. Minister of Public Works the other day if he could tell me one major project which they are going to implement. I drew a blank. The answer is: either they haven't got any or he doesn't know.

[Interjections]

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that these hon. ministers opposite will try to rejoice at anything to distract from the mess they found themselves in. When I said this session is historical, this is the first time; I believe, we have had ministers of the Crown committing a foul deed, confessing, and then putting the most professional plea for mitigation of penalty I have ever heard in all my life; and then they are rejoicing and saying that they will do it over again. This is a sad reflection on the type of people we have running our government today, and I can say, Mr. Speaker, that it will only get worse instead of better.

MR. DICKIE:

On a point of order, I would like to submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that debate was resolved last night. He is now dealing with the amendment that took place last night and it shouldn't be raised again in this House.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, the hon. Member for Vegreville was on last year's debate for a good 20 minutes.

[Laughter]

MR. SPEAKER:

The rules of relevance are perhaps the most difficult of all the rules to apply, and under the circumstances I wouldn't know specifically how to apply them here to the hon. member's remarks.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the hon. ministers and the hon. members opposite would like to hear no more about it, but I promise them that I think they will probably never forget what transpired in this House in the last two days and elsewhere. So they may object all they like, but I am sure that this issue will have to be decided and determined and not merely laughed off as the hon. members seem to feel that they can get away with it.

MR. FARRAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I refer this time to Beauchesne, 170, paragraph 5:

Members should be extremely careful in moving their amendments on the Address in Reply because otherwise a House having given its judgment on the various points that are brought forward then, if later other amendments are moved which touch these very points which have already been decided, upon any similar amendments, they should be declared to be out of order. Statement by Speaker Beaudcin.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, no wonder the hon. members opposite are saying it is a toss up between Farran and me as to who gives Lougheed an ulcer first.

[Laughter]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please! The hon. member for Calgary North Hill has probably a valid point and the Chair will listen closely to the further remarks of the hon. member.

MR. LUDWIG:

All I ask, Mr. Speaker, is an opportunity to speak without being interrupted by some of the non-entities on the other side.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of the Environment -- I put a question to him today -- and I raise an important issue. He is the person who was set up by the government as being the man to pursue all problems dealing with pollution. I complained to him about the Robin Hood flour mill --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. It is out of order to debate or refer to a question and answer put during the question period.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, with all due respect I will take your ruling, but the issue was not resolved to my satisfaction or to the satisfaction of anybody else.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to shift to another idea dealing --

MR. FOSTER:

That's a good idea.

MR. LUDWIG:

I'll leave the hon. minister in his reverie and his dreams about pollution.

One of the problems we are confronted with in Calgary and area, is the matter of closed road allowances. The hon. Minister of Highways is not here, but this issue is erupting and becoming one of serious contention, and it is not resolved. The fish and game people are of the opinion that the hon. minister may, in fact, own land upon which are enclosed road allowances. I also would like to ask the Minister of Highways to come into the House, make a clean breast of everything, and tell us emphatically, and in a responsible manner, whether he owns any road allowances which are illegally or legally closed, and clear the air for the people who are concerned about this matter.

I believe there are several issues in Calgary bothering the Social Credit MLAs. I can tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative voice in Calgary

is a dead voice. We have talked about the law faculty, we have talked about other serious matters, but the support is not forthcoming and I doubt whether it will be, because I believe they get their instructions from other sources than their constituents.

One of the serious problems that took place in Calgary not too long ago, was an incident in Spy Hill. I believe the hon. Attorney General ought to get up and tell us that he has a construction program in mind that will increase facilities for prisoners. They all admit that crime rates have gone up. But facilities have not been increased, nor are there any plans to increase facilities. This is a serious problem and they cannot pass the buck. It is their responsibility now. Even though the Remand Centre will take the pressure off a little, the increasing number of prisoners in this province has taken up the slack entirely and present facilities are not enough. They are far from adequate and the time to implement a program to increase these facilities is now.

I have had many phone calls from mothers, parents -- including the Indian Affairs Department -- about the crowding in Spy Hill Gaol. I doubt whether anybody will deny this. It led to a serious attack, and a knifing of a man, a 16 year old boy, in fact. I believe we cannot just shrug this matter off, this concerns everybody.

There is one other problem that has become urgent. And when the Attorney General gets an opportunity to do so, I wish he would perhaps make a statement about the Court House in Calgary. When they were in the opposition, I remember the hon. members from Calgary made this an extremely urgent issue two years ago. This was a matter of great urgency two years ago, today it is no longer important. I believe the main court house facilities -- at the main Court House in Calgary -- are not adequate. And there should be something on the books, this year's budget, to start planning and building a court house this year. Because if it takes two or three years to provide an extension of space at the Calgary Court House, we will not be serving the best interests of the administration of justice in this province. I am surprised at this issue. I was beleaguered by justices, lawyers, and MLAs when I was Minister of Public Works. Since then apparently everyone has become quiet. On this issue also, the voice of Calgary Conservatives appears to be silent.

I would like to recommend to the hon. Attorney General that rather than increase the height, the number of floors in the court house, that he try a request for proposals for the provision of space for the court house. This is something that the PCs took up very seriously when we raised it. Since they got into office the whole issue seems to have died.

One other matter that has not gone away, and I am sure that the hon. Minister of Advanced Education would like it to, is that the request and the demand for a Law Faculty in Calgary is growing. The students want it, and they are entitled to it. Calgary is not a city that has stopped growing, like some others I have heard about. It is a progressive city. The population is growing, and we have a good university -- a university that the Social Credit built -- and what do we get now? We can't get any support from the Conservative MLAs, including the ministers in the front row, for a Law Faculty. It is all right for the hon. Minister of Advanced Education to say, "Well, try and get it. If you prove there is a shortage of lawyers, I'll consider it." That isn't good enough.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, that is not my statement, nor have I ever made that statement.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, the statement does reflect his attitude, Mr. Speaker, whether he made it or not. And if it doesn't, then why haven't we a Law Faculty started in Calgary? There is nobody against it but the Premier, I suppose. I suppose it is up to the Premier though, at least to admit to the people of Calgary that he does come from Calgary, and to stand up and be counted. That's a problem he hates to face. Yes, I asked him a question -- I was here last night and I have never witnessed a more discouraging and despicable performance, if you want to know.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is not entitled to reflect on the proceedings in the House in that fashion.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order also, any speaker is entitled to speak in this House without a lot of cat-calls.

[Interjections]

MR. LUDWIG:

Since I didn't name anybody in particular, I can hardly withdraw a statement, can I? But I will name somebody if I need to, and you know it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Would the hon. member please continue to direct all his remarks to the Chair, and continue with his speech.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. In dealing with the law faculty, Mr. Speaker, correspondence from students, phone calls, discussions by parents, indicate that we do need one. Calgary students need to spend \$6 thousand more if they want to enroll in law by going to the University of Alberta in Edmonton, or to other universities beyond our province. If the hon. members opposite feel that there is not a shortage of lawyers in Alberta, then I would like the hon. the Attorney General to tell us how many lawyers are practising in the province at the present time who are from outside the province. That would be an interesting figure, to see whether we should train lawyers in this province or permit them to come in from other parts of the country.

One of the issues that has created serious concern in Calgary is the Kananaskis Highway.

MR. STROM:

I'm sure, for the information of the hon. member, it doesn't appear that his voice comes through the public address system when he speaks directly to you. I thought it should be brought to his attention.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, they want a replay. I would tell them rather than rejoicing at any problem like this, that they make a contribution and send yesterday's Hansard to all of the high schools in the province of Alberta, and I think that will keep them quiet for a while. If it doesn't, it should.

In dealing with the Kananaskis Highway, it is rather interesting that there is a conflict of views expressed by the hon. Minister of the Environment, and the hon. Minister of Highways as to the input they got from the people concerned about what should be done in this regard. It is my view that this highway will knife through one of the finest wilderness areas of this province, will become an area crowded with facilities, crowded with traffic, and perhaps create hazards to the area which we can never reverse.

One of the issues I would like to raise, Mr. Speaker, now that the hon. Premier and the hon. Minister of Telephones are in the House, is the matter of the Alberta Telephones. It is my candid opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the government, that is, the hon. Premier and the hon. Minister of Telephones, have avoided giving any publicity or any figures or facts to Calgary on this issue whatsoever. I could appreciate their attitude here, the hon. Premier is smiling; but I think he could table the releases he made on AGT in Calgary and it wouldn't take long to read them.

It must cause him considerable embarrassment that an issue of such importance to the people of Alberta has been quietly, but effectively, suppressed -- as far as the rest of the province is concerned. I am not hitting his integrity now, I'm just attacking his method of operation. It's rather a slick performance, Mr. Speaker, when you can sell a good portion of a Crown corporation and keep it quiet in your home town, especially with a leader who is so anxious and just bursting to tell the people everything about all the good things he does -- oh, well, so long as he is happy. He has releases going by

the ton almost, mailed all over the province; this one is quiet -- I know why, and they know why.

I assure you, Mr. Speaker, there will come a time when they will be challenged in Calgary and they will have to tell us just whether this was a bona fide deal, or whether it was a swindle, or whether it was a pay off --

DR. HORNER:

Hey, it's 5:30!

MR. LUDWIG:

They know it, and they can laugh, but the people of Calgary are anxious to hear this, and there isn't a Conservative with enough gumption to talk about this issue in Calgary, and if there is, let's hear them.

MR. GHITTER:

Call it 5:30.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we will have to extract information dealing with the AGT sale to Edmonton Telephones, bit by bit, by questions; but I am sure we will probably get answers in time to reveal what, in fact, did happen.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. We have looked with some concern on the ruling from the Chair, that matters raised in Question Period can not be referred to in debate, and I wonder if the Chair would mind stating his reasoning at the next day's sitting.

MR. SPEAKER:

That is too broad a statement of the rule, but I will check the reference. I don't recall it from memory and I'll supply it to the hon. Opposition Leader.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Could we have a copy as well, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 5:32 o'clock.]