

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Monday Evening, March 5, 1973

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8:00 o'clock.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and the Assembly resolve itself into Committee of Supply to consider the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

[The motion was carried.]

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 8:01 o'clock.]

* * * * *

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Miniely, pursuant to Rule No. 46,

(a) That four subcommittees of the Committee of Supply be established, with the following names:

- Subcommittee A
- Subcommittee B
- Subcommittee C
- Subcommittee D

(b) That the membership and chairmen of the respective subcommittees be as follows:

Subcommittee A:

- Dr. McCrimmon (Chairman)
- Hon. Mr. Crawford
- Hon. Miss Hunley
- Hon. Mr. Hyndman
- Hon. Mr. Foster
- Hon. Mr. Russell
- Mr. Ghitter
- Dr. Paproski
- Mr. Lee
- Mr. Purdy
- Mr. Young
- Mr. Clark
- Mr. Ho Lem
- Mr. Gruenwald
- Mr. Speaker
- Mr. Benoit
- Mr. Wilson

Subcommittee B:

- Mr. Cookson (Chairman)
- Hon. Dr. Horner
- Hon. Mr. Yurko
- Hon. Dr. Warrack
- Hon. Mr. Dickie
- Hon. Mr. Copithorne
- Mr. Moore
- Mr. Batiuk
- Mr. Trynchy
- Mr. Hansen
- Mr. Appleby
- Mr. Doan
- Mr. Strom
- Mr. Buckwell
- Mr. Mandeville
- Mr. Ruste
- Mr. Sorenson
- Dr. Buck
- Mr. Notley

Subcommittee C:

- Mr. Harle (Chairman)
- Hon. Mr. Leitch

Subcommittee D:

- Mr. Chambers (Chairman)
- Hon. Mr. Getty

| | |
|------------------|----------------------|
| Hon. Mr. Schmid | Hon. Mr. Miniely |
| Hon. Dr. Backus | Hon. Mr. Peacock |
| Hon. Mr. Adair | Hon. Dr. Hohol |
| Hon. Mr. Dowling | Hon. Mr. Topclinisky |
| Mr. Farran | Mr. Ashton |
| Mr. King | Mr. Stromberg |
| Mr. Zander | Mr. Jamison |
| Mr. Koziak | Mrs. Chichak |
| Mr. Fluker | Mr. Miller |
| Mr. Ludwig | Mr. Taylor |
| Mr. Cooper | Mr. Anderson |
| Mr. French | Mr. Barton |
| Mr. Dixon | Mr. Hinman |
| Mr. Drain | Mr. Miller |
| Dr. Bouvier | Mr. Wyse |

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask leave of the committee to make one change. Where I have stated "Mr. Farran", it should be "Hon. Mr. Farran" in Subcommittee C.

I think this matter has been discussed between both House Leaders and in the caucuses of the various members of the Assembly, Mr. Chairman accordingly, I don't feel any further debate is necessary, although amendments, of course, are possible on the motion as it now stands.

MR. DIACHUK:

Question has been called, are all the members of the Assembly agreed to this resolution?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I now move, seconded by the hon. Attorney General, that the following portions of the Estimates of Expenditure 1973/74 be referred to the respective subcommittees as hereinafter set forth for their reports thereon:

| | |
|----------------|---|
| Subcommittee A | Vote 25 -- Health and Social Development Vote 24 -- Health Commissions Vote 13 -- Education Vote 30 -- Advanced Education Vote 21 -- Municipal Affairs |
| Subcommittee B | Vote 11 -- Agriculture Vote 29 -- Environment Vote 18 -- Lands and Forests Vote 20 -- Mines and Minerals Vote 15 -- Highways and Transport |
| Subcommittee C | Vote 12 -- Attorney General Vote 32 -- Telephones and Utilities Vote 28 -- Culture, Youth and Recreation Vote 26 -- Public Works Vote 14 -- Executive Council |
| Subcommittee D | Vote 31 -- Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs Vote 27 -- Treasury Vote 16 -- Industry and Commerce Vote 17 -- Manpower and Labour Vote 19 -- Legislation |

MR. DIACHUK:

Any discussion or questions?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Chairman, since the basic objective of going into the subcommittees is with a view to trying to expedite the affairs of the House, we are concerned in

one particular vote, mainly in municipal affairs, with the number of major policy areas which are to be dealt with in the estimates in this particular department. We think there would be some merit in keeping that particular appropriation in Committee of the Whole.

So I would therefore move, seconded by Mr. Clark, that the motion be amended under the part reading "Subcommittee A" striking out the words "Vote 21 -- Municipal Affairs." I assume, Mr. Chairman, that would keep Municipal Affairs in Committee of the Whole.

MR. DIACHUK:

Any discussion on the amendment?

[The motion was carried.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Any discussion on the motion as amended?

[The motion as amended was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Chairman, I move the first resolution be reported, and the second resolution be reported as amended.

[The motion was carried.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

[The motion was carried.]

* * * * *

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.]

MR. DIACHUK:

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration Resolution No. 1, as moved by Mr. Hyndman, seconded by Mr. Miniely, and reports the resolution carried. Resolution No. 2 was carried as amended. The Committee of Supply begs leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Mr. Miniely moved, seconded by Mr. Dowling:

That this House approves in general the fiscal policies of the government.

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Getty]

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, before the supper break I was outlining the substantial support that had been directed to the citizens of the metropolitan centres of Edmonton and Calgary in this budget: their share of the Property Tax Reduction Plan, as well as \$54.2 million -- and after considerable consultation with the municipalities -- their share of the increased municipal grants totalling \$48 million, the increased transportation grants of \$16 million....

I mentioned also the support to Edmonton for the Commonwealth Games which will allow Edmonton, Mr. Speaker, not only to build a coliseum, as so many have commented, but also to build a new olympic-standard swimming pool, other facilities, and, even more exciting, if managed well, Mr. Speaker, I believe

they can construct a football stadium capable of being covered. So, Mr. Speaker, it will give Edmonton facilities unmatched in Canada for amateur sport.

Calgary, of course, Mr. Speaker, has a new provincial park. I found it interesting that the opposition, who were unable to develop a single urban park in 36 years, now sees one in 18 months, and their only response is to complain about the manner in which it was announced, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HENDERSON:

Don't be too sure. He's jumping to conclusions.

MR. GETTY:

I've noticed, also, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members opposite get particularly uncomfortable when we talk about the new strength of agriculture in Alberta. I guess it's because they are puzzled that so much has been accomplished so quickly. They get even more uncomfortable, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the man who is mainly responsible for that, the Minister of Agriculture. Their discomfort is so obvious that I think I'll do it, too. We just happen to be, on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, admirers of the Minister of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, we particularly admire the way in which he has fulfilled his commitments to rural Alberta. I can remember many times discussing his concerns about agriculture when we were in opposition. Also soon after we took office and he had made a fast assessment of the situation he faced, he said he knew it had been bad but he really didn't realize what a big job there was to do, or that it was as urgent and as serious as he found it.

So, Mr. Speaker, it was necessary and it is true that there have been significant increases in both money and people in agriculture. But these programs have been necessary to do a big job, and the beautiful part of it, Mr. Speaker, is they are paying off already. There are today statistics on Alberta's agricultural economy that I would like to draw to the members' attention. They are in the Alberta Bureau of Statistics Business Trends.

The latest estimate of Alberta farmers cash receipts for 1972 indicates a 14 per cent increase over 1971 to approximately \$914 million. Of this total, cash receipts from crops contributed \$369 million, or 40 per cent, while receipts from livestock and products amounted to \$512 million, or 56 per cent of the total -- in the livestock sector increases were registered in all areas with hog receipts showing the greatest dollar change despite decreased marketing.

Mr. Speaker, my comments in dealing with agriculture are normally relatively restricted, but I would like to present a few observations as to the future, because I have heard in this Legislature and outside from members or people in farm organizations, that they are going to wait and see if agriculture is successful under the hon. Dr. Horner. They say they will wait and judge him then and determine whether or not he met the challenge he accepted in that job.

Mr. Speaker, I don't accept that theory, because in my judgment that is not where the challenge now lies. In Alberta today I think we can say we have a situation where this government, the cabinet, the Premier, the Minister of Agriculture, and, if I read them right, most members of this House are committed to the support of agriculture.

The resources are being provided; the markets are there. People and money are available to help, and under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I believe the challenge now lies on the other side of the equation. I think the challenge is now with Alberta's farmers. There is no longer a need to worry. The opportunity is now there. So, Mr. Speaker, this is one city member who is waiting to see if the farmers of Alberta come through. I happen to think they will, because I have travelled in Alberta and rural Alberta and noticed that as the pace and excitement quicken in those areas, as their hope and their confidence grow, under the leadership of Dr. Horner, I believe that Alberta's farmers are going to accept the challenge and really do a great job.

There has been mentioned, Mr. Speaker, both in the Throne Speech and the Budget Speech, a new era for energy in Alberta. I know the people recognize this and they are certainly pleased, because they now have an aggressive management of their energy resources. They have policies that provide a balance between production and value and protection for the future.

But I think it would be remiss of me not to mention that this new era is being managed so effectively today by our Minister of Mines and Minerals, the hon. Mr. Dickie. He took on a strange job, a staggering job, and has handled it

beautifully. He inherited resources that were pouring out of this province. Every day he needed to assess their value, assess the royalty income from them and to use his judgment to obtain a fair and equitable return but keep this basic industry growing.

Today we had an hon. member say that this was a government with a greater reliance than ever on the oil industry. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is nice to know if you are leaning on something that it has never been healthier in its life.

The hon. Mr. Dickie has had to come up with a new oil policy, a new oil royalty system, new drilling incentives, new gas policies, new gas royalties, a new tar sands policy and new tar sands royalties, and many other things that fall within his responsibility. As a matter of fact, in doing this, he has learned the business as he worked at it, and has now earned the respect of people in Alberta, the industry across Canada and governments throughout our country.

This is a confident budget, Mr. Speaker, and much of that confidence is instilled by ministers like the hon. Bill Dickie.

I have mentioned briefly both agriculture and oil and gas since these are the existing foundations of our economy. All members are aware, I know, that we have said many times that we must use these strengths to provide the additional base of industrial growth in our province. Much of that can be done from within with government policies such as the Agricultural Development Fund, the Alberta Opportunity Company, and aggressive industrial development under the Minister of Industry and Commerce. But as well as these internal policies, there are national problems to be faced in developing Alberta's industrial growth. There are national policies that have traditionally worked against the west's industrial development.

I haven't yet touched on intergovernmental matters, Mr. Speaker, but they are involved in combatting these national policies. I have noticed that the opposition hasn't mentioned intergovernmental affairs either. I am not sure why, Mr. Speaker, but certain facts are apparent because Alberta and the West are now recognized, as never before, in Canadian history on national affairs.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh!

MR. GETTY:

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that our government has had a leadership role in this development. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to talk about the people in my department. While it isn't a big one, I consider that it is an important and hardworking one, and they have been doing a good job.

I want to talk about them because they have only really had a full staff in the department since late June of 1972, but they immediately were plunged into, and have been involved in one of the heaviest rounds of intergovernmental activity that has ever been recognized in Canada. They have had the odd problem. Every new department has them, but they are working at it and we can see the results now. It is a job where they don't make a lot of noise, they don't trumpet, but I happen to believe that they don't get the recognition they deserve either. Their role is not easily seen. I like to think, though, that they are a big part of the reason that Alberta has become a leader in Canadian affairs.

I know the House will recall last year our Premier and our government made a commitment to move Alberta into the mainstream of Canadian life. It was our goal to exert greater influences on national issues and policies that have such an impact on our province. Well, how have we done? I am sure that it will take future years to make a complete assessment, but there are some indicators now.

Inasmuch as my own view might be considered slightly prejudiced I would like, Mr. Speaker, to present those of a few neutral observers. One I would like to draw to the House's attention is from Winnipeg, Manitoba, and another is from Ottawa. I think it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, to get in intergovernmental matters some kind of a reading from areas across the country. But here is a person from Winnipeg writing about his assessment of Alberta and intergovernmental matters. He is talking about Ottawa in this case:

Federal government officials now find themselves confronted with Alberta government spokesmen who press with a new forcefulness for a greater provincial emphasis in federal-provincial dealings.

And everyone, but particularly eastern political leaders and industrialists, have been made to sit up and take notice of the new Alberta.

One matter in which we have concentrated is natural resources.

Within Alberta natural gas prices will be effectively kept low by a system of rebates. This will be a major inducement to industry to locate in the province.

It is seen as a means of counter-acting the forces which have historically made for a concentration of industry in Ontario and Quebec. When the new policies are in effect, Alberta will have the means to make the province a stronghold of industry which will not, as has traditionally been the case in the West, have to take second place any longer to the industrialized east.

That is from Manitoba, Mr. Speaker. Without taking too long I would like to bring to the attention of the House the views of a travelling Albertan in Ottawa.

An Albertan in Ottawa gets plenty of attention these days.

I've been drifting eastwards into the capital off and on since the late '50s, and never before have made-in-Edmonton policies stirred up so much curiosity, interest, irritation and concern.

The reason, of course, comes from men like Hugh Horner, Don Getty and above all --

[Applause]

I didn't want to censor anything.

[Interjections]

-- and above all Peter Lougheed. Hardly a week goes by it seems to the people in Ottawa, that Alberta isn't advancing a new policy initiative or strengthening an earlier one.

The results have produced an awareness of Alberta that hasn't existed here for many years, and at times a certain measure of annoyance. Ottawa is used to being hectored and badgered by the have-not provinces to its east.

It is also used to the steely professional-to-professional encounters with the big boys of Quebec and Ontario. It even became accustomed to...B.C.'s Wacky Bennett, although better things are hoped of Dave Barrett.

But the federal politicians...are not yet used to the new Alberta aggressiveness or its shrewd sophistication. Here suddenly is a mini-province, small in terms of population, flexing maxi-muscles in terms of energy, with no signs of relenting.

Moreover, more of Alberta's positions are purely economic, be they related to higher natural gas prices or lower freight rates...

Ottawa for decades has grown more and more comfortable in its relations with Alberta at both the political and civil service levels. Now, at the political level the relative passiveness of the Manning-Strom era has been replaced by the Lougheed willingness to do battle on several fronts. Moreover, Alberta's new government has appointed key civil servants who have made relations at intergovernmental level less automatic.

Mr. Speaker, I don't read that to get any particular pleasure in pointing it out to the members. I do it because there is some difficulty in assessing where you are going in intergovernmental affairs. It is difficult to know if you are making the thrusts in the right directions. I happen to think that these kinds of articles and the awareness that people in Canada are paying to Alberta show that this government is going in the right way.

There are some other indicators that the members, I am sure, have recognized over the last few months. For for one thing traffic flows have

changed, Mr. Speaker. We now have federal officials and cabinet ministers coming West to Alberta. The oil companies, gas and pipe line companies, are coming West to Alberta. The Premier of Ontario has come West to Alberta. This summer, if all goes well, the Prime Minister of Canada is coming West to Alberta. The federal Throne Speech --

MR. LUDWIG:

How about Stanfield?

[Interjections]

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to refer to the Member for Calgary Mountain View, but I may have to do that. I've noticed that in one of his contributions so far in the House he told the House of a decision he'd made. I think the words were, "He is now determined to stay alert". Mr. Speaker, I am sure all the members

[Interjections]

All of the members, Mr. Speaker, I am sure appreciate the considerable effort that will require.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Throne Speech this year was a great indicator of new attention to the West. I found it particularly significant because it almost directly quoted the statements of our Premier on Western needs. They almost lifted entire statements, either from federal-provincial first ministers' meetings or other statements on national issues. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, a historic shift, I think, is now possible and many Western Canadians are watching and eager.

AN HON. MEMBER:

So are you.

MR. GETTY:

Because what is happening in western Canada is revealing. Alberta ignited a spark in September, 1971. Premier Lougheed provided the leadership and suddenly we found that not just Albertans, but western Canadians, are coming alive. People always hoped that someday things might change. We realize now that they can, and Alberta is showing them how. What was a spark is now a full scale forest fire. There is, in fact, in our country a social and economic upheaval, under Alberta's leadership, that will change the face and make-up of Canada. I appreciate that it is just really starting. The battle is not over. Some would say it has hardly begun, and there is much work to do. But now the opportunity is there. It's a challenge, and we have accepted it.

The challenge is to take events, like the Western Economic Opportunities Conference, and make them more than just another get-together to rehash old western problems. The challenge is to make that type of conference come up with commitments and decisions which will forever change the traditional problems of Western Canada. Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that we have the wisdom and the judgment and the support of Albertans and western Canadians to not just temporarily satisfy western discontent, but to actually come up with the real solutions that will build a stronger Alberta, a better Western Canada, and therefore a better and stronger Canadian country. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

So are you!

MR. DRAIN:

I wonder if the hon. member would answer a question please?

MR. GETTY:

Sure.

MR. DRAIN:

The implication of your remarks is that the land of milk and honey has now finally arrived for the farm community. I presume now that you are prepared, or your government is prepared, to guarantee --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is debating.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out the significant increases in Alberta's agricultural economy. I also should say to that hon. member that I found it amazing today to hear him in this Legislature making all the old eastern arguments they have traditionally been making. I feel that perhaps an indication --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please, the hon. minister is also debating.

MR. CLARK:

Question?

MR. DRAIN:

I feel I'm being attacked by the hon. minister. But the point I was trying to make is, Mr. Speaker --

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's opportunity for making points is not now. If there is a point of clarification, if the hon. member wishes to ask a question concerning something which has already been stated by the hon. minister, that is in order, but not something that raises anything new, either in the question or in the answer.

MR. DRAIN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. minister if he does not consider he misconstrued my remarks and misquoted them.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I really hope I misconstrued them and misquoted them because we need the support in this battle of all Albertans.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the minister. Would he be prepared to table those two clippings he referred to, please?

MR. GETTY:

Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I bet you would.

MR. GRUENWALD:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to throw out just a few thoughts on the government spending and government programs as I would see it affecting a number of Albertans.

First of all I'd like to add my words of congratulations to the new Minister of -- what affairs is it now? --

AN HON. MEMBER:

Consumer Affairs.

MR. GRUENWALD:

-- Consumer Affairs, Mr. Dowling. Certainly with his background as an MLA and formerly as a school trustee, that fits him well for any position he would take, and I congratulate him. Of course, I also congratulate Mr. Farran on his new appointment as well. Now, the rest of the ministers in the government, I would like to congratulate also, and I do. However, the last speaker did a very adequate job of that and I'm sure that's enough for the evening.

Now when we look at certain benefits for Albertans, Mr. Speaker, I like to look at them and wonder whom we're trying to help and how much help we are giving, and how much to the right people.

First of all, I'd like to talk about the benefits to senior citizens, as we generally know them. First of all, I would make it very clear for the record that I have no hesitation in supporting any program for senior citizens, and in particular those in need. But the thing that bothers me a little bit is that as we look to the future, and we talk about continued support and help and assistance for our senior citizens, the time may approach when we may have to define these people. After all is it -- you know, a retired person at age 60 or 65 -- this type of thing? In other words, when we hear the talk that we do hear about lowering the pension schemes to full benefits at age 60, relief of taxes and all this type of thing, I think it would be appropriate if we would think in terms of who senior citizens are going to be in the future because, you know, the cost could be tremendously high.

I think it's important that we not only recognize the needs, not only of senior citizens, but all Albertans. Recognizing them is one thing, we certainly must translate these needs into action. And I conclude and recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the government is making an attempt to do this in many areas; a very good attempt and a good effort.

But as I say, I subscribe to benefits for those in need -- and I would have to underline the word 'need'. I think this is important.

But there is another group that, in some ways, is sort of a forgotten group, Mr. Speaker. It is a group which I think is having great difficulties in the Province of Alberta and all over the country, as a matter of fact, and that is the young-marrieds. I think that our young-married couples, trying to raise families, have difficult times nowadays. I really and truly do. Many of them, not all of them but many of them, are working at relatively low salaries and they certainly are facing many, many difficulties.

Many of them are trying to borrow themselves rich which just can't be done. They are faced with high rents, with high down payments on homes, high interest rates, interest on homes from 10 to 12 per cent for periods of 25 and 30 years. Land costs for housing is prohibitive. The servicing of land, I think, has become almost out of reach for the ordinary individual, for a young couple starting out. Furnishings and equipment for those homes and houses, when they have to borrow to do it, and many of them do, at interest rates from 15 to 25 per cent -- I think this is a real burden for some of these people. Add this to the high cost of food, the high cost of clothing and other necessities, I submit that they do have a struggle.

Now I don't suggest that we have hand-outs, certainly not for the younger people, but maybe there should be some control or some possible assistance regarding interest rates or municipal assistance regarding land purchases and land services. I think something in this area would be worth looking at as it affects our young people trying to get started in life.

Now another example I believe that has an effect on the young people is the health insurance program and is just a suggestion for our very gracious Minister Without Portfolio in charge of Alberta Health Care. I know we have a good program now, but any insurance program, I believe, should have adequate and many options in it.

I realize that the health program does have some options now, but there is an area where I feel another option should be added, and that would be in the field of dental care. I realize that this can be expensive; I realize that it has probably been looked after, but it should be given further consideration because I have had young people or mothers phone up. They have been to a dentist and the message comes back there is some orthodontic work that has to be done. It is going to cost \$1,000, \$1,500. I submit, Mr. Speaker, they just don't have \$1,000 or \$1,500 for this type of thing. So my suggestion would be that possibly some sort of an option in the program might be worth considering, possibly with a deductible, possibly with some maximum, but available to those

who want it and not imposed on every one. I believe that this is worth considering.

Another group, besides the young-marrieds who I think need some assistance, are the renegades who are running out on their wives -- neglected wives or abandoned wives. I think we see many cases of separations where a settlement is made through Family Court, where it seems almost impossible to be able to hold the husband down to the court decisions that were made and the poor mother with the kids is really having a struggle. Just how we are going to solve that, I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, but it is a genuine problem for our young people growing up, and there are a lot of suffering young mothers and neglected wives who really need some sort of reinforcement and some sort of help because they have a very difficult time.

I was going to mention something about the insurance program and I was glad to see the Attorney General handed down a statement the other day where he instructed the insurance companies to reduce the insurance premiums on motorcycle and skidoos by 20 per cent, in particular, the motorcycles area. I am sure the insurance companies were clobbering the young people, absolutely clobbering them without mercy. When you consider that a young beginning driver with a little 50cc motorcycle, which has about 5 horse power, 8 at the most, is faced with anywhere from \$88 to \$138 for insurance it is absolutely inexcusable. There is no excuse for that whatsoever. Being in the business, I know a lot of the young drivers are a cause for high premiums, but to start some of them out as high as \$320 as a starting premium gives us some reason to have a look at the program and to put the insurance companies in check to see that they are not taking undue advantage. I'd like to see our insurance program have more and more no-fault features. I believe that would be a step in a good direction.

I'd like to congratulate the government, incidentally, speaking of insurance. Last year in the budget debate I mentioned that I thought all MLAs should be provided with an accidental death benefit. I thought this was a responsibility of the government. I still believe it, and I'm glad there was an insert into our mailboxes the other day indicating that the government has that type of program now. I think it's a good program, I think it's a responsible program. I think it's something that if the government has any feeling for the people or for the servants of the people, it is right and proper. I'm all for it and I congratulate them.

Another program I think is of concern -- it's a good program, but a difficult program -- is the one on student loans. I think the student loan program -- and the Minister of Education is not here -- but if he ever had a tiger by the tail, I think this is the program. It's a very difficult one to administer. I know it is. I've had a lot of calls on student loans and it's a real problem.

In some ways, I believe, it's almost too available to many students. They borrow themselves into debt so deeply that I just wonder if they will ever thank us in the future when it comes time to pay these loans. I think it's something we should really take note of.

I'm concerned in this area that parents today are really not prepared to make sacrifices for the education of their children. This is part of the problem. I know it is. They say, "Why the heck should I do it? Let them go and borrow it." I'm just wondering how serious they are about trying to repay some of these loans. Students of course, are to blame, we are partly to blame, governments are to blame -- we've spoiled them. They want the loans for education, plus all the luxuries of life at the same time. I really think there has to be a tightening up. When I think of the availability of the loans, which can run now from \$3,500 to \$4,500 per year, with a maximum of \$10,000 to \$15,000 in total -- with a possibility of this going up as high as \$19,500, I hear if the government goes ahead with some proposals -- which I understand from the Student Loan Branch they are thinking of -- it really makes me wonder how they can handle a debt like that over a ten year period. I have some serious concerns about that.

I believe that we should be much more interested in helping and assisting and advising our young people, showing the pitfalls of becoming over-encumbered, rather than try to bail them out after they are in trouble. I think this is a way in which we should be directing our attention and our energies. I think we should try to spare them a life of poverty if we can.

In some ways I think we should try to help them. I want to see us, if we can, help our young people to own their own homes. I know there is reference to a housing program in the budget. I'd be very interested to hear the details of the program. I'm sure there will be something good there for our young people.

But if we are going to have wholesome families under wholesome circumstances, I would like to see as many as possible of our young people have homes of their own, where they have a little green grass in the back yard where they can go out and kick around rather than being brought up in concrete jungles -- stacked up and almost colonized. I don't think it is conducive to good living.

In the matter of education finance, I have looked at the program in some detail. I've been in touch with the Alberta School Trustees' Association on two or three occasions this last week. Various school boards are concerned. The main problem with the program on educational finance, I think, is its vagueness at this particular time. It warrants some explanation. I'm not saying that it isn't good, but I'm also not going to say that it isn't bad. I think it is kind of dangerous to try to out-guess what a program really is; it can get you into trouble.

It reminds me of a story, Mr. Speaker, where there was this little fellow who came out of his house. His mother had sent him with a basket to deliver to his grandmother. He had only gone half a block when his friend came along and said, "Hey, where are you going with the basket?" He says, "I'm going to my grandmother's, I'm going to take this package to her." It was all nicely done up, looking real nice, so he asks, "What's in it?" He says, "I can't tell you what's in it, I want it to be a surprise when I get to my grandmother's." So the little fellow was overcome with curiosity and says, "I bet I know what's in there, there's some cake." "No, there's no cake."

So they went a little farther and his curiosity was more and more aroused and he said, "Well, if there isn't cake in there there must be various sorts of cookies and this sort of thing for your grandmother." He says, "no," there isn't various sorts of cookies and things like that in here for my grandmother."

So they went a little farther and it wasn't long before a juice started dribbling out of the side of the basket the boy was carrying. So the fellow who was walking beside him licked it and smacked his lips. "Ahah," he said, "Now I know what's in it, it's pickles."

And the little boy says "No, you're wrong again, it's puppies."

So, if you try and guess wrong you might just find yourself in trouble.

So I would say that the per-pupil grant in educational finance is a step in the right direction. We like it, the school boards like it, that's an improvement, there is just no question about that. I believe we have to continue to give more support for private schools and I will elaborate more on this when we get into the estimates. But the only way you are really going to do the proper thing, in my estimation, for private schools is to get onto the voucher system. They are entitled to it. I believe that it's right, we shouldn't be afraid to think that education is such a sacred cow that it should be excused from competition. This is the one way in which this can be accomplished, and it's a fair way. I would like to see it tried.

I would also like to congratulate the Minister of Advanced Education, particularly as it applies to the Lethbridge Community College Board. The very fact that that white elephant, the Science Building in Lethbridge, is being used for other services -- it was empty, but the fact we are using it for other government offices certainly is a good idea rather than to leave the building sitting empty just because it can't be used for educational purposes. Certainly this was a good move and I hope the government will continue to utilize government buildings for whatever purpose is required, regardless of why they were built.

In the interest of local autonomy for school boards, I believe in the principle that local governments must have the right to collect taxes and they should also have the right to spend them. I think this is basically sound. Because of the controls that are on municipalities or school boards, as far as local spending is concerned -- I am just thinking now of the school boards in the southern part of Alberta who have been unable to settle their salary disputes, which has resulted in a 73.9 per cent vote in favour of the strike -- would this by any chance be a direct result of the finance formula and the inherent constraint imposed on school boards because of the control features with respect to supplementary requisition? Many of the school boards feel that maybe they could go a bit further and settle these potential strikes if they had a little more leeway as far as a local requisition is concerned. And it's a point I believe the government would be well advised to take into consideration.

I am concerned about the 7.5 per cent guidelines. Again, it is something that needs some explaining. It's on instructional portions only, I understand.

I believe it also says that in the Budget Speech, but school boards still have had extreme difficulty trying to decide how they separate the two. Now, probably the government knows. Probably the Minister of Education knows, but the school boards don't, I submit, not at this point in time. I am simply saying that it is necessary to get some more explicit information out to our school districts on educational finance.

I was more than pleased to see in the budget a 26 per cent increase for the schools for the retarded. If we want to talk about need, Mr. Speaker, there is a place where there is need, and no one will ever deny that. There isn't any amount of money that you can spend there that you will ever be criticized for; you are helping these kinds of people because they are handicapped not through their own fault, or through their carelessness, but through something they had no control over. If any government, any department, wants to feel they are doing something for the unfortunate, for goodness sake, let's not forget those.

Now I believe that as far as the local governments -- and this is a fault in them -- when I say local I am talking about municipal governments or school boards -- expecting senior governments to provide them with excessive amounts of money, you know, pour the money out and review the spending and still expect local autonomy -- this is strictly for the birds as far as I am concerned. After all, the man who pays the piper calls the tune. Generally speaking, I think we can expect that.

And as far school districts are concerned, any further centralization that goes into any school districts certainly should be left at the sole discretion of the school board. I really don't think the provincial government or the Department of Education should in any way dictate the amount of centralization that should go on within a school district. They should do their centralizing and let them worry about how they get their kids there.

To the Minister of Highways, I will only make a very short comment now. I will be talking to him during the estimates, but I wish you would just do two things, at least. Update your speed limits across this province; there is no reason there should be such a variance for the same types of roads. Again I talk about the one from Edmonton to Calgary. If anyone can convince me of the reason why there should be a different limit between Edmonton and Red Deer and Red Deer and Calgary, I would love to know it, -- maybe so the Minister of Education can get home faster to Red Deer from here than he can from Calgary -- I don't know. And then, this business of signs on highways relating to places of interest, business enterprises, and this type of thing -- I mentioned this last year and it is just as important now as it ever was. I know the minister has promised a review of that but I hope he doesn't review for too long a period I would like to see some action on this.

There is one final point -- the RCMP. They are going to have their centennial this year, Mr. Speaker, and I have a lot of respect for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, I have a lot of friends there, and I know they do a tremendous job, and I know it is wonderful to have a 100th birthday, but I submit that \$2.4 million is a pretty expensive party.

MR. LEE:

Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks I would like to extend my congratulations to the Provincial Treasurer for a budget which reflects some real initiatives in this province, initiatives expressed in the Throne Speech but now expressed in dollars and cents.

Congratulations also to my two colleagues, Mr. Farran and Mr. Dowling, for their appointments this afternoon. I think we all know they are going to do just one heck of a job.

This evening I want to speak fairly specifically about one particular area, the needs and effects of the budget on the citizens within my constituency of Calgary McKnight. I agree with Mr. Getty that sometime during each one of these sessions, we have to stress very specifically those needs we do have in our home constituency. As he has done, I would like to use this opportunity now and also at later times during the session, to reflect on some other areas.

One of them I look forward to is speaking on some of the areas that the hon. Member for Olds-Didsbury has commented on -- some of the misconceptions he has left with us in the areas of education and advanced education. He was talking about local autonomy, and I think we all remember he was the one who foisted a plebiscite on educational systems in the province, not a 7.5 per cent increase per year, but a 6 per cent increase. So, he is a strange one to be talking about local autonomy.

I also look forward to discussing a little bit about advanced education and the nature of consultations that might be carried out there. When the universities and colleges commissions were developed in the first place, I don't know with whom the dialogue was at the time, but I suspect it may have been restricted to a great extent just to the people who ran those institutions. In the development of our program of advanced education I know there has been a dialogue with the people of Alberta, along with the people in these institutions. I think we are looking now specifically at some of the problems we have had in advanced education and education during the last few years reflected when a student, for example, going to junior college after two years must go to a United States university to gain a degree, to get any kind of credit for those two years. It's kind of strange, though, when this same student comes back with a masters degree he ends up teaching at our universities. This problem of transferability was never tackled and possibly couldn't be with the lack of integration between colleges and universities competing with very little co-ordination of their programs.

So these are some of the areas I look forward to discussing on the bills related to advanced education, and education, later on in the Estimates.

Turning now to Calgary McKnight and the budget and its effect on the citizens in that area. I would like to just generally point out some of the areas in the speech which I think have an impact for the city of Calgary and more specifically Calgary McKnight.

The announcement of an urban policy had an immediate effect, as we all know, in Calgary with the designation of Fish Creek as an area in which a provincial park will be planned.

We do have another area in the north end of the city called Nose Hill. This is an area which a lot of people had hoped would be developed as a provincial park. The fact of the matter is that the provincial government can only do so much, because there are other centres in this province which do need this assistance. But I was delighted to hear our mayor -- Mayor Sykes -- comment at the news conference that this would now release the city to develop parks in that particular area. It's going to have a direct effect because the city is now released for a park to be developed in that particular area. I know it has an effect on the Calgary North Hill constituency also.

Early childhood education and its beginnings in Alberta are of particular delight to me and to my constituency. It's one of those areas that I have had a number of representations from individuals, especially in Huntingdon Hills area, where there is just a mass number of children with very little facilities for early childhood education. In fact, in order to get any kind of kindergarten at all, they had to bus their children to a community nearby. I'm also delighted because this is a resolution I was pleased to bring forth last year. It wasn't debated as extensively as I would have liked at that time, but it certainly was well accepted in the city.

In fact the City of Calgary, as you all know, announced last week they were going to make available universal optional kindergarten. I look forward to Calgary being able to utilize a considerable amount of these funds in support of early childhood education. Calgary is one of those areas that has taken the initiative in past years in presenting kindergarten to those areas of the population which, perhaps, would have been disadvantaged without this, and it certainly will help that city.

The 45 per cent increase in grants for transportation facilities will have an immediate effect on Calgary; this is a problem that we have in Edmonton and Calgary.

Consumer Affairs is one of the issues I have had more feedback on than anything else in these last two years. The development of a Consumer Affairs Department, and the placement of a Consumer Affairs Bureau Office in Calgary are welcome additions in Calgary.

Community-based services for handicapped children and adults, with increased facilities at the Alberta Hospital, will have an impact on our communities.

And finally, an impact on all of our communities, the Alberta Property Tax Reduction Plan has an immediate effect for the property owner, and especially in my particular area where most of the people do, in fact, own their homes or rent homes.

During the last year, it has come home to me, one of the things we talked about during the election campaign, and this is the whole concept of open

government. My initial experience, probably as a rookie MLA, was somewhat of a disappointment because having been elected as a Member for Calgary McKnight, I really expected a deluge of phone calls, a deluge of expressions as to what we should do on policy and legislation. I did initially have a number of calls, just as I'm sure all of you did, concerns that people had about a particular approach to government and I was happy to deal with a considerable number of these. But this sort of phased out and after a while not too many people did give input regarding policy and legislation.

I feel it is important that the citizens of the province do let us know what they want to see in legislation and policy and I had felt there must be some vehicle that we could use in order to tap this type of information. I think a lot of you write articles for your community newspapers. Some of you send out written information in brochure or tabloid form. Many of you have established offices within your constituency, advertised your availability, your phone number and so on, and have made visits to citizens in your community. Some of you have been involved in open hearings with various committees. I have with these too, but this response still didn't come. In fact, I remember writing an article every month now for all of the communities within my constituency, and right at the bottom I always said, "I urge your expression of concern, your information" and so on. I only got a couple of calls from that, but this year I still feel it's important because I am sure that there are a lot of people out there who do want to tell us how government affects them and how it should run. And I've hit on one method that I'm delighted with.

This year I sent out a survey questionnaire to all of the households in my constituency. Whereas I had only got something like three or four dozen calls regarding policy and legislation in the past two years, I have received now -- as of today -- 514 responses to this survey questionnaire. I am delighted about this because in the questions I have asked in the questionnaire and the responses that were made, I believe I will be better able to represent the people in Calgary McKnight. Some rather humorous occurrences did result from the questionnaire. I noticed a lot of them wrote on the front and back and they talked about a number of things that concerned them. One woman sent in a letter attached, and scribbled right across the whole page, she said, "My opinions do not coincide with any of those just expressed by my husband. Would you please send two questionnaires."

I want to tell you briefly a little bit about the survey because 514 people did respond to this questionnaire. I owe it to these people tonight, and also later on during the session in the spring and in the fall, to express their views as they have expressed them to me, to reflect some of the concerns they would like to see in policy and legislation.

First of all I designed the survey around four main areas, and these were areas on which I had had concerns expressed verbally before: motor vehicle insurance, parks and recreation, consumer affairs and censorship. And, finally a last statement, "Would you list the three most important issues facing you as a citizen of Alberta and of Calgary?" I would like to give you a quick idea of what did occur. Of the 514 responses I received, approximately 50 per cent of those people gave me their names and addresses. I'm glad they did because now I'll be able to send to them the results of the questionnaire and a statistical breakdown of the responses.

In regard to automobile insurance the questions asked were as follows: first of all, should automobile insurance be compulsory? 97.5 per cent of these people said yes, it should be; 1.8 per cent said no; and there was no reply to 7 per cent.

The next question: should there be a penalty against drivers not holding insurance? 96.4 per cent said yes, while 2.3 per cent said no. What should the penalty be? Well, 29.6 per cent said that it should be a fine; 49.3 per cent felt that there should be a loss of licence or a suspension of it; 7.5 per cent felt that the person should be jailed; and the other 13.6 per cent replied with combinations of those three.

The next question was, should poor drivers pay more insurance than good drivers? -- in other words, a direct relation to no-fault insurance. And the answers were as follows: most of them said yes, the poor drivers should pay more; 85 per cent said yes; and 9.9 per cent said no.

Then the next question was, are you familiar with no-fault insurance? And I was surprised that actually 60.1 per cent of the people said yes, they were familiar with no-fault insurance, while 37.1 weren't.

And finally, how do you feel the insurance industry is serving the public in respect to motor vehicle insurance in Alberta? There was a four point scale: excellent, good, fair, and poor. Of the responses, 3.4 per cent felt that the insurance industry was doing an excellent job, 22.5 per cent said good, 38.5 per cent said fair, and 29 per cent said poor.

Incidentally I might add that this portion of the questionnaire was pretty well set up by a friend of mine in the insurance industry.

Then they were asked to give the reasons for their response, and this is the interesting part of the questionnaire and one which is hard to tabulate. But probably the main responses with regard to the insurance industry were related to the effect of insurance on those under 25, the effect on those under 25 who are good drivers, who are not involved in accidents, but are penalized because they drive a certain kind of car or because they are a certain age.

The next question is related to parks and recreation. I asked, what steps would you like to see the province take with regard to urban parks? And I restricted it to urban parks because of the recreational aspect of it and so on. The answers, once again, couldn't be tabulated too extensively, but here are some of the comments that were made.

Most people wanted more urban park space, not only because they wanted greenery about them, but because there is a crying need for recreational development in the areas. In my particular constituency, one of the areas, Huntington Hills, has a prime need for some type of parks development. And, of course, we hope that Nose Hill will be developed as a park area, at least close to that particular community.

A number of people wanted small recreation areas within the city. Others wanted green-belt development surrounding the city. An extensive amount felt we should utilize more land in its natural state and develop this as a park, stating that the rivers should be developed in this way; and, of course, an extensive number said that Nose Hill should be developed in this way because it does have a certain natural quality to it.

A significant number of people said that recreation should be facilitated for enjoyment of parks, making statements like, "please walk on grass, parks are for people." Also, parks should have extensive facilities such as barbecues, picnic areas and playgrounds, so that people can enjoy them not only for their beauty, but also as a place where one can participate in various activities.

And of course, a lot of them did talk about Nose Hill because it is right next to my constituency, and they do want to see development in Nose Hill. I might point out that in addition to funds released by our participation in the Fish Creek area, there are funds available through the provincial government, I'm sure, for recreational facility kinds of development also. And I look forward to this kind of assistance in that area.

A number of people said that maintenance was definitely important, stating that they had gone to a number of parks where weeds had been allowed to overgrow, and where there was garbage on the ground. They hoped that this would be part of park development. Most of them said that we should plan right now and purchase the land as soon as possible in order not to pay over-inflated prices.

I was amazed at the concern reflected in this questionnaire regarding crime in the City of Calgary. A number of people expressed a concern right here in the parks and recreation question about security, especially at night, security to enjoy a stroll through a park without being mugged in the evening hours. And finally it was mentioned that transportation accessibility to urban parks is very important. If we put an urban park, such as Fish Creek, at the edge of the city, it has to be accessible to those people on the north tip by some type of transportation.

The next question that I asked was: Do you feel that consumer protection is adequate in Alberta? If not, what steps would you like to see the province take to increase this protection? I might say, first of all, that the overwhelming concern expressed in all parts of this whole question was for consumer prices and the effects of inflation. I found, through this question that many people are not aware of the jurisdictions between the federal and the provincial governments regarding consumer affairs. In expressing the opinion that the provincial government does have a responsibility in this area, well, maybe they are not aware of the jurisdiction, but I am sure delighted now that we have a Consumer Affairs Department, and will have a Bureau in Calgary, to respond to this need of my constituents.

On censorship I asked: Would you comment on the censorship laws in Alberta? Would you change them? How? Once again, I guess I wasn't overly surprised that most people weren't aware of the present legislation. They were, I think, hazily aware that there was some form of censorship in Alberta, but they weren't really sure what it was and there was no real consensus. I couldn't determine one way or the other whether people would want a particular kind of censorship. There was a real balance here about a concern regarding restriction of freedom on the one hand --

DR. BUCK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Would you care to speak to yourself or the other members of the House? We would appreciate it.

MR. LEE:

I missed the punch line.

DR. BUCK:

I say, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member seems to be speaking just to his caucus. I think he should be addressing the Chair and the other members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member seems to be following the usual custom of directing most of his remarks in the direction of his microphone.

[Interjections]

DR. BUCK:

I was just talking to you guys.

MR. LEE:

Your point is well taken, Wally.

One concern that was expressed though, in the censorship section was the effect of legislation on regulations related to drive-ins. A significant number of people in this question did express a concern that they couldn't take their children to a drive-in, that they couldn't find a family movie on a Saturday night, that there were mostly restricted adult movies. I would hope that we could perhaps take another look at how we can provide this kind of entertainment, because for a family with small children on a Sunday evening there are few additional things to do after dark in the cities.

Now, finally, the last question, the one that I found the most enlightening and the one I expected the most from was the question which asked: Would you list the three most important issues facing you as a citizen of Alberta and Calgary? I got something like 50 different concerns expressed, but there were a number that popped up over and over again. The first of these -- over double the number of responses to this one -- was the cost of living, the effect of inflation, the cost of housing and food specifically, and the effect costs have in the city.

The second one, in order once again, was taxes -- the effect of property taxes, the extent of taxation and the effect of taxation on the citizen.

The third one was pollution -- protection of the environment and the environmental effect related especially to automobiles and some other variables common to the city itself.

The fourth one was parks and recreation development. There were various comments related to that.

The fifth one -- all kinds of concerns related to education. These were the top five as far as concerns in my particular area. I'm kind of delighted, too, that with these top five concerns we have been able to bring initiatives in this Budget Speech. The cost of living I have talked about already. We have a Consumer Affairs Department which can start working in this area.

The Alberta Property Tax Reduction Plan has an immediate effect on taxation. In pollution we increased a double budget for the Department of the Environment which will answer this particular concern.

Parks and recreation development -- I've already spoken about the very welcome developments in urban parks policy.

And finally, within education, early childhood education, and a new finance plan for basic and advanced education.

Just quickly I will read the next seven, because it's significant, I think, that these were expressed by something like 60 responses for each one of these. So these were the major items affecting our citizens, and here they come:

The sixth one was the crime rate -- and it did surprise me, but there was a real concern in the cities about crime and the effects of drugs -- not only with crime itself, but also with the nature of judicial treatment of offences.

Seventh, urban growth and planning -- quality of life was mentioned a number of times here, and the often haphazard development of planning in the cities. Eighth, foreign ownership and influence; ninth, unemployment and job security; tenth, welfare policies and abuse; eleventh, urban transportation policies, and finally, twelfth, concerns relating to conservation of our energy resources and our energy resource management.

These are just 12 concerns expressed, with approximately 60 people to each one of them, in this questionnaire. As I mentioned, there were another 50 that were also indicated.

Now, I personally feel these are significant results. I feel they are significant because they all, for me, have provided a vehicle by which I can tap the concerns of my constituents. I think it's a method which I'm going to use over and over again, to ensure citizen participation in the policy and legislation of our government. These are the concerns and the opinions of the citizens of Calgary McKnight, and I have been pleased to present them to you tonight. I anticipate utilizing these same responses in later debates in this Legislature.

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to begin by congratulating the hon. Provincial Treasurer on an excellent presentation of the budget. I thought it not only was clear and explicit, but also it carried with it a real feeling of encouragement for everybody in Alberta.

I'd also like to offer my congratulations -- and sympathy -- for the new members who have been given the added responsibility of a portfolio.

Initially, I would like to speak about my constituents. They are certainly very happy with the decision to restore the Alberta Resources Railway. I wish again to congratulate those involved with the job, because I think they did a splendid job of negotiating with the CNR.

DR. BUCK:

Good framework.

DR. BACKUS:

They are also very pleased with the increased interest directed towards the northwest portion of the province. Several of the smaller communities have received real help and encouragement in developing their recreational facilities. The senior citizens and the physically and mentally handicapped have shared with the rest of the province the help that has been directed towards them. Specifically, we have had a sheltered work shop constructed which is now open and serving a very important function in the community. We are looking forward to the opening of the holding centre in the very near future.

There is still a lot that does need to be done in this area. The west half of my constituency has that cut-off feeling that the whole Peace River had until recently, and it is my desire to encourage activities on the part of government in this area that will correct this feeling and give them the sense that they are an active and important part of this wonderful province.

Expected developments in the area of Hythe in the way of provincial facilities will go a long way towards this. Also, many young farmers in my constituency feel they require more positive help in the purchase and establishment of a farm. Whether this is partially because of the degree of crop failures in the area, and despite the fact that a great many of the loans from the Alberta Development Fund have, in fact, gone to young people, it is

nevertheless my intention to see if further ways can be found to help these young men in their efforts to establish a family farm. I look forward to the young farmers' program that is being developed this year.

The people in my constituency feel that a road south to Grande Cache and Hinton will be of real benefit, not only to the people in that area, and to improve the way of life for those in Grande Cache, but also to all the people in the northern half of the province. It will be my intention to persuade the Department of Highways to place a higher priority on this highway.

Finally, I would like to stress a real need for an improved psychiatric service. I realize the southern half of the province undoubtedly needs the priority for psychiatric care, but we in the north also do have some emotional problems, and we would appreciate having a better psychiatric service provided in the area. I hope that the Department of Health and Social Development, with its new thrust in this direction, will direct it in our direction.

I now wish to speak about another group of people in this province, the medical profession. There are many who may feel these people do not require any support, but from the comments often made about this profession, both here and in the media, and from the legislation that has been enacted in this House increasing the controls on this profession, I feel it is time that some comment was made.

The chief criticisms made are the rising cost of medical care due to the increasing demands by the profession; it is even suggested that doctors are over-charging for their services and are providing unnecessary services. Secondly, that doctors are not giving the same personal service they used to give. Thirdly, it is hard to get to see a doctor, and therefore there must be a shortage of doctors. Fourthly, that doctors are not prepared to serve remote areas.

I agree that the medical profession is not what it used to be. The days of the country doctor and the family doctor who was an institution in the community and could be called any time, and who would come day or night and spend long hours bringing comfort to the sick and advice to the family -- this type of doctor has almost disappeared. There are many who regret this change, and among them are the doctors themselves. Having watched this transition and tried to preserve what was good in the old way, at the same time as trying to adopt what is demanded today, and having seen what happened under similar circumstances in Britain, I believe the root of the problem is not in the failing profession. The answer was given by the profession many years ago when they said that if Medicare is introduced it will destroy the doctor-patient relationship, and it will cost much more to provide the same standard of medical care.

I think when we realize that when the medical profession practised outside Medicare -- they used to write off from 30 to 40 per cent of their bills and expected to give their services for nothing when they were in a position to decide which patients required that type of service -- one can realize why one can expect even for the same type of medical care that there will be an increased cost.

We may study many ways of holding the cost of medical care down, and there may be suggestions of things that the government might impose that would be thought to affect economics. But may I suggest that the more government interferes or imposes itself in this field, the greater the costs will be. And the more the government can give the responsibility for medical care back to the patient and the doctor, the quicker an economic solution will be achieved.

The role of government should be to help where help is needed, to give incentives for a wider distribution of medical care and to provide leadership in preventive medicine. I think a way in which government might consider bringing more local autonomy in this field, instead of centralizing their Alberta Health Care Insurance Program to one city, would be to provide offices in a multitude of centres where the administrative staff would have a much better idea of the problems that are being met in that area. They would be able to deal much more satisfactorily with them than can be dealt with centrally here in Edmonton.

I am not suggesting the scrapping of Medicare. With the present attitude of the federal government this is impossible, but I am suggesting that ways to reduce government intervention, rather than greater government controls, should be sought. Greater responsibility should be given to the individual and to the medical profession. There are many other factors such as increased utilization, increased demand for more exotic investigations and treatments, and the fact that huge strides have been made in recent years in medical science, the implementation of which leads to increased costs.

But it is therefore with real pleasure that I see the greater liaison that is developing between the Minister of Health and Social Development and the Minister in charge of Alberta Health Care Insurance on the one hand, and the medical profession on the other. I hope that this will achieve a better understanding of the problems.

Within the Department of Public Works it would seem there is some unhappiness on the other side of the House that there are questions which are not being given an adequate answer. I would therefore like to take this opportunity to answer some of these problems at greater length than is permitted in the question period.

As a result of a question raised last year, a careful investigation was made into the existing cafeteria policy, and a new policy has been put forward for consideration by the Joint Services Commission, which, when approved, will provide a more uniform cafeteria service throughout the government buildings.

I would draw to their attention the fact that the Court House, the Museum and Archives and the Legislature Building do come into a special category, as should be obvious to the most ill-informed and should be even more apparent to the hon. member who was the minister at the time of the conception -- the plan -- for the Court House when the cafeteria was developed for the use of the public and judiciary rather than for the employees in the building. Lounges were provided for the staff to have their bag lunches and these lounges have rarely been more than half full. However, since the complaint was raised, additional coffee facilities have been provided in the Court House.

While we are on the subject of court houses I would like to confirm that the work on the Calgary Court House steps was completed within a few days of the question being raised in the House, and that facilities were provided for wheelchairs to get into the foyer of the Court House. Further, the dead tree mentioned was to have been replaced by the landscapers who had the contract for the area. It has now been removed and I just wish it were as easy to remove other deadwood from the Calgary area.

These answers I hope will indicate that we take very seriously the suggestions made from both sides of the House, and I hope we will continue to get these intelligent, positive contributions, so obviously expressing the concern of the people of this province.

The Department of Public Works has continued to try to develop policies that will remove criticisms of bias and preference, and has recently modified its leasing policy, which although slightly more cumbersome, will ensure that a fair bidding practice is implemented. The department will continue to streamline its operations and to assess its quality and efficiency by job cost analysis and by comparison experiments with the private sector.

The suggestion from the Member for Olds-Didsbury that we should tender early is noted and I think it's a very excellent suggestion. I can remember making it to my deputy not more than 18 months ago. However, I do note that there are some reservations.

We are already developing long-range planning, but any expenditures are, of course, dependent on the approval of Estimates. Therefore, many of our programs cannot begin until after the Estimates have been approved.

Also that the department should commence its capital works at the same time as the private sector, and so accentuate the same peaks and valleys that are already present, seems to me to be an unreal approach to the unemployment situation. We are therefore looking to a program of increasing our winter activities with an increase of labour requirements during the winter months when, in fact, the private sector is not employing as many people, then having the laying off of this labour in the spring when the demand for labour is being made by the private sector.

In this way we hope to achieve some levelling off of the peaks and valleys, having a more constant employment of construction workers throughout the year. These jobs would primarily be inside jobs, but at the same time we are looking to the private sector to develop economical methods of building in the winter. They have certainly gone a long way towards that and are coming up with competitive methods to develop winter construction with shielding and heat being laid on. In the last year or two we have found that we can conduct much more work during the winter months than used to be done previously. It is therefore felt that this spreading of the construction work is far more effective than trying to compete with the private sector in the summer months.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the whole of this side of the House and my constituents that I have talked to have been very buoyed up by the budget and the Budget Speech and I hope that we can go on giving them this encouragement in the way that this government is trying to participate in bringing a real good life to Albertans.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate, I want to express my appreciation to the government for the very fair treatment that I have always had from all the ministers. I was not able to be here to hear the hon. Provincial Treasurer present the Budget Address but I have read it and certainly it measures up to what I would have expected him to do.

I was delighted to hear of the two new ministries. Having worked with the hon. Mr. Dowling on a committee, I appreciate very much his enthusiasm, his ability, and his plain common-sense attack on the problems he has to face.

I'm not going to make another speech against consumerism. I think if I had been the Premier, it might have been one of the last departments I'd have set up, because I see so many dangers in it. However, if we are going to have it, I'm delighted that we have Mr. Dowling for the minister.

I'm also delighted to have Mr. Farran on the front bench. I have had conversations with him and I have always been impressed with his quickness in getting at the root of things. And being Irish, I suspect that he will keep this thing brewing and we will have some good -- if not fights -- at least some word battles that will keep things going right along.

Now, to get closer to the budget. I was a little bit amused by the approach of the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and I was thinking when he was reading those plaudits from the East, how great they would have sounded had he had his head in an empty water tank. However, I would suggest that nobody takes these things too seriously, because I can remember when I was in the East that once in awhile somebody thought I had some sense.

And I can remember, particularly, plaudits that used to accumulate to our premier of so many years. That doesn't say that the hon. members opposite don't deserve the same kind of treatment now. Another thing I have observed, however, is that having subscribed to the Conservative membership, doesn't seem to be the equivalent of a degree or 30 years of experience.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Here, here!

MR. HINMAN:

We have been asked why we don't defend the old government and its actions. Well, it doesn't need much defence. But I will say this, that if in 35 years the affairs of the province deserve the same kind of treatment that the last 35 years have always elicited, then I hope I will be here to congratulate the hon. members.

I'm going to treat the budget in just a few areas. I was very, very disappointed in one thing and that was a lack of new benefits for us poor old fellows.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed, agreed.

MR. HINMAN:

I could be imaginative enough to have improved it immensely. First, I would have permitted us old fellows to use purple gas in our own automobiles. Then I would have decentralized the Censorship Board and given us all tickets to the censorship showings, especially us old men.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed!

MR. HINMAN:

I think we should have some travel grants to see how the rest of the world lives and perhaps learn the rudiments of the language of perspective agents.

But last of all I was very surprised that no provision was made for an expedition to search for the fountain of youth. The only encouragement in it is that if we finally decide to give up our pride and admit our growing mental defectiveness that there are places where we can get free treatment.

Now the budget starts cut with a review of progress and performance. And I go along with it. I'm an admirer of Dr. Horner too, I've said something about senior citizens and I think he is doing an excellent job. He reminds me, though, of the old veterinarian who just discovered what he thought was a sure cure for spavin, which was a horse disease or horse ailment in old days, and he sold it in five gallon cans. He had a phone call from a farmer way out in the country who had a spavined horse, so he sold him five gallons and his instructions were to apply it copiously every two hours. Late that evening he got a phone call and the fellow said that he'd applied it twice and the horse was still lame and the swelling was increasing. So he said, well put it on thicker. Next morning, another phone call, no improvement. Well, he said, put it on twice as often -- still no result. Finally, he said, "Well just go ahead until you've used up the five gallons then shoot the horse." Well, I just hope that all these remarkable attempts the minister is making to save the family farm and improve the condition of agriculture won't in the end lead to the necessity of shooting the horse. I may treat that subject a little bit more if time allows.

The treatment for the handicapped and the mentally ill, I think deserves all our sympathy. It's one of those very ticklish subjects. I've been very closely associated with it both individually and as an educator, and I'm impressed with some of the problems that face us in this regard. I remember when I first got the statistics and how few psychiatrists there were at the mental hospital at Ponoka, and I was a little upset about it until I went down and talked to the doctor in charge. He explained to me that these are not in the main people who can be helped by daily ministrations by a psychiatrist. I became aware that sometimes just to hire more people isn't going to solve these problems. And when I have watched what has gone on at some of the schools for the handicapped, I become aware, too, that there are limits to what we can expect. I think we ought to spend every dollar and we ought to get the best people we can get, and we ought to enlist the help of all the individuals we can to do everything as long as there is some show that we are making progress. But I think I have to remind you that in many instances just short of semi-custodial care is about all that is possible. I don't want us to be stampeded into spending a lot of money attempting to do what may be impossible.

The Alberta Opportunity Company -- I am very much in favour of the intent of it. I think the economists might tell us that it isn't likely to accomplish as much as we hope, because proverbially those people who borrow from government are those people who have not established credit worthiness to get the support somewhere else. Consequently they require considerable supervision, and we require a considerable amount of discernment in not making loans which will not in the end help them, and can only cost our people money. But at the same time I am certainly behind the government in the intent of this act and I think if well administered we will see some good results.

The unemployment programs. Well, I've expressed many times lately my opinion that full employment is not necessarily what we want. I think the more leisure we have the better, if we learn how to use it. And one of the ways of having it, of course, is to have a lot of people unemployed. As long as they have the means of living, they are travelling, doing things that are worthwhile. And so, as I say I am not so concerned that we try to employ everybody.

I looked at the figure of \$8.3 million and I did a little calculating. If you took \$4.4 million out, you could give \$4,400 to each one of those people who got employment out of that program, and you would have enough money left over to give \$1,083 to each trainee.

Having watched the programs at work in the south, I became aware that many of those who took advantage of our training program had no real intent to use this training to make a living. They were sort of restless in the winter; they took advantage of it; I hope it did some good. But to spend money just to make employment, maybe it's time we took a new look at it. Maybe what we ought to do is make sure that people have the income on an annual basis which will assure them the right to live at the standards that we have learned to accept today, but not to be so concerned that every one has a job all the time.

But then I get over to the next page and I see a new term "cash requirement". I used to think that was a deficit. At any rate, it simply means the amount we have to borrow to balance the budget. Perhaps it is all right. But I think most of you are aware that my philosophy is that not only has the government a duty to provide things for its people, but it has a duty to make the people pay for these things when they can so easily pay for them.

We took \$51 million off the property tax. In the end I suppose the municipalities will have little choice but to pick it up step by step as they go along. But it doesn't mean that our people are \$51 million better off by any means. When we borrow \$131.9 million we have simply taken one big step to keep inflation going. We left it with the people to spend. As they spend it prices go up, and deficits have certainly been one of the major causes of inflation for which we are all responsible. Well, I am not going to say much more, except that I think that in times when taxation is taking less of the optional incomes of the people, we oughtn't to be in a hurry to keep taxes down, because some day down the line somebody is going to pay the whole bill.

I mentioned last year in the House that if you take the number 70, and if you divide it by whatever interest rate you wish to use, you will find approximately how many years it takes to pay double. In other words, if the interest rate is 7 per cent, in 10 years you pay double, if this is compounded.

Another thing that bothers me a little bit is the credit that some people want to give the government for the more buoyant economic expansion in Alberta. I want to give them all the credit they have coming, but I want them to remember, too, that Alberta would not have had this buoyancy without some pretty wise government in the past.

I take a look at Special Warrants and somebody points out here -- not somebody, it was the Provincial Treasurer -- there were only \$30.9 million as compared with \$94.9 million the previous year. Now these figures don't really mean anything unless you look at what the warrants were for. If you have a year of extreme fire hazard, you are just going to have some warrants or you're going to let the timber burn.

AN HCN. MEMBER:

Paper money.

MR. HINMAN:

All I am saying is that these figures in themselves do not reflect any particular credit or any discredit on the government of the time. They simply mean that in that year there were less or more expenditures which seemed justified to the extent of providing funds by Special Warrant.

I do like point four. And I certainly congratulate the Provincial Treasurer on an excellent job of using those management techniques which have saved us a great deal of money. That is accelerating the billing for the grants we have coming, getting them back, getting them operating, using the funds that we have in store. It is a very fine job of management and I certainly congratulate him on that aspect of his Treasury.

When I look at page 6, I notice that personal incomes have increased by 10 per cent, while consumer expenditure has gone ahead by 15 per cent, I'm inclined to ask what has happened to the other 5 per cent? There is only one evitable answer. This is also credit. This is also inflationary -- people spending the money they don't have. Generally, they have to pay, and in the process, we encourage prices to rise.

The hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs pointed out this terrific expansion in exploration in the oil field, and said it was all because of the incentive of the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals, but when I talk to some of these people, they don't seem to think that's the reason at all. I remember we used to try to take credit for things like that, but there are many factors involved. I think the incentive program the hon. minister proposed was good. I think it will be effective, but I don't want anybody to get the idea that I personally would swallow the idea that that accounts for the total increase. One of these days it will drop off in spite of that incentive, or any others.

I talked a little bit about the creation of new job opportunities and I'm certainly all for it. We created, we hope, 24,000 jobs in 1972, and just 11,000 jobs in the preceeding year. Now here again, the creation of jobs can be of several kinds. They can be the permanent development of industry, creating jobs

which will continue. They can be such as I just mentioned, where we spent \$4,400 to give work to some people -- government money. We can't continue to do it forever. We've got a buoyant economy; things have been growing, and I hope they continue to grow. But let's not get the idea that government can be responsible for creating any particular number of new jobs. We will have spurts, we will have plateaux, and I will be the last to criticize the government if sometimes things reverse a little bit.

I notice in the last paragraph, "The major strengths in 1972 were consumer and government expenditures." That last is pretty significant. We are at the point where we will be taking 40 per cent of the gross national product in taxation before 1980. It was 37.7 per cent in the last figure I looked at. When you take all the earnings of all the people -- I know the hon. Provincial Treasurer understands that very few people know what the gross national product is -- but if you take in general that it's the earnings and production of all the people, and if you take away from the individual his right to control less than 60 per cent of what he takes in, maybe we're going too far in government. If we are, it will lead eventually to the kind of socialism we don't want. It will lead to a dependence on government to such an extent that nobody will dare to vote against the government because each one will have too much to lose.

That's fine if you have a good government. But invariably somebody comes along who is a good talker and a good salesman and is actually a good confidence man, and gets control of the government, and then we have what happened in Chile. They persuaded the people to elect a Communist government. We had our trade commission down there very recently, and I'm sure they came away understanding that things aren't good in Chile. When you have an inflation of 169 per cent in three years, you don't have much stability. We don't want that to happen to us. So I say that the persistent spending by governments may seem politically wise, but it will not be economically wise.

We have the mention here of opting out of some government programs. I'm all for it. I'm not very concerned that we should try to change the Constitution of Canada. Every time I re-read all those acts that establish our Constitution, I think how wise those people were. I'm not sure that we wouldn't be much wiser simply to insist that both governments live up to the responsibilities of the Constitution, and don't get too excited about changing it. Let's let the federal government run their responsibilities and let's run ours.

The most serious danger that develops in our type of three level government is that the local governments to whom the people can complain too loudly and clearly and frequently, invariably resist taxing the people for the very benefits the people demand. It is automatic for them to say to the province, "You help us." Under the Constitution we are responsible for education, and so we have to make a decision. If we give it to those people they should be responsible for raising most of the revenue, and we certainly ought to give them the tax field in which it can be done. Only when they have to raise the revenue, only when they have to face their people with this responsibility of taxation, can we expect them to give sane and wise administration.

What argument has a school board today against paying additional costs when somebody can say to it, "Well, the province provides it, you can get it from them"? The costs of education today are in no small measure due to an error of the past government, the error of collecting more and more of the money centrally and distributing it to these people so they did not have to be responsible to their citizens for it. I am a little bit concerned about all this.

On page 7 there is some talk about the main priorities. And I support the government's priorities. I think they chose wisely. One of these priorities is, "To realize a greater return to all Albertans from the sale of our natural resources." I'm glad the word "sale" is in there, and I want to draw it to your attention. The revenues we are getting in royalties and from the sale of leases are sales of our resources and when we've sold them they're gone. This implies that we have to be pretty smart in their management. Now that doesn't mean we can't use them. I look at the development in the coal fields, I think of the resource railroad, and I think that I cannot be contradicted when I say that had the previous government not built the resource railroad, this government would have done so. Maybe we weren't wise where we put it, or maybe we built it prematurely. The hon. Member for Grande Prairie seems to think it is a good idea, and I hope it will be. But it might force on us something that we don't want to be forced on us. It might make us decide, for economic reasons, that we have to develop that coal industry a great deal faster than we are currently developing it. And in developing it we may make that railroad pay, and we may get the northern development which could very well come out of it. And that is

not too serious as long as we reserve some other areas of coal for the future. Fortunately we have great reserves.

To establish long term financial and program planning procedures designed to ensure a few good things, the provincial expenditure commitments are consistent with the financial and economic capabilities of Alberta. I like it, but I say that we are capable of paying our way, and I go back to the term, "the sale of our resources." I tried to establish with the previous government the fact that the sale of these resources is capital and not revenue forever. Maybe we should have devoted a great portion of the income from royalties and resource sales to capital works, so these could be a heritage for the people of the future to stand in place of the resources which we sold and which are no longer for them. All it does in our budget, if you take this revenue out and apply it to capital, all it means is that the -- what's the term? -- cash requirement or the deficit is applied to operating instead of to capital. If it is applied to operating then I think the government has a responsibility to make our people pay while they can pay.

I look at the summary on page 8 and I am not unhappy with what is going on, but I do want to say this, that those people who think that out of thin air you can say it is safe to borrow up to a certain percentage of the gross national product of a province or of a country, have little background. It is true that if we never borrow more than 20 per cent of the gross national product, we could pay the bill. It is also true that, in the process of paying it, we could very well ferment a revolution.

On page 9 there is a new term. It says, "Since receipts from the issue of public debt are excluded from budgetary revenues . . ." Maybe I am too dumb to understand it but it seems to me that all that is saying is that when we borrow money we don't put it in as a revenue. That is fair enough. It certainly isn't a revenue. But if you think the debt repayment is not an expenditure, then you come from a different school of economics than I do.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. HINMAN:

And I would have been much happier if this had been included in the budget. But in the end it doesn't make that much difference.

In addition to the government's cash requirements, our financing plans will take into account the net cash requirements for the Alberta Municipal Financing Corporation, the capital needs for Alberta Government Telephones, including a maturing debenture issue of \$20 million, and \$50 million maturing debenture debt of the Alberta Resources Railway..

Well, these are things you just have to face. There is nothing wrong with it, but as I say, the loans for the telephones are good in that they are self-liquidating. If we had them under private management, we would pay the sum, in rates, in another way. I have no objection to that.

Alberta Finance Corporation -- it is true that many municipalities could not possibly from current revenue pay for the capital things that they want. But many of these are self-sustaining, so I don't object to that. And I don't object to the Alberta Resources Railway.

One of the things the hon. Minister of Agriculture has, I think, impressed the people with, is if we can make the agricultural industry more viable, if it can bring in more funds to the province, that the whole province will benefit. We have to look at the Resource Railway in the same way.

But I am thinking of some other things. Nobody around here says much about Social Credit anymore.

AN HON. MEMBER:

About who?

[Laughter]

MR. HINMAN:

Well, Social Credit was a pretty wise old man. It is too bad he is gone.

I come back to the fact that the Treasury Branches were something that you inherited from the old government. The only province in Canada which had the foresight to set up such a thing, and it grew out of the philosophy that perhaps we can manage our own money. People used to say to me, "Why don't we get a bank charter?" And I used to say to them, "We don't want a bank charter, because then you are subject to the Bank of Canada Act, and you can only lend 12 times as much money as you have got." At the Treasury Branch we can lend 80 times as much as long as the government is behind it.

I have an idea that we could have lent \$50 million or \$100 million from the Treasury Branch to municipalities without even worrying about the credit. We might have had to go to the banks to get it, we might have had to dip into some reserve -- but I don't think so, because that is not the way the financial system works. We could do some other things. Nobody has ever argued before a banking committee that it isn't possible simply to issue credit. Suppose the government of the province, through the Treasury Branch, was to say we have two kinds of loans we will make to you people. We will lend you dollars if you like, and the rate will be eight per cent. We will lend you some non-transferable money. In other words, it isn't legal tender. It will only be three per cent, and the government will take it back for any payment which is to the government. If you started out slowly, in a very few years you would find that you would have a \$100 million out doing that work and it wouldn't hurt the government a bit. If it came back in non-negotiable transfers, it is nothing because it cost us nothing when it went out. A lot of it would come back in dollars but we would be just as well off as we are.

Now whether you think Social Credit is outmoded or not, I defy anybody to argue successfully that this isn't just what is going on today, only we don't get the benefit of it.

The Alberta Property Tax Reduction Plan -- well, this wasn't a new idea. It started in Saskatchewan with those confounded NDPers. They were smart enough to realize that if you ever want to help the taxpayer you either have to limit the taxes by legislation, or you have to give something back to them, they chose to give it back. Then British Columbia did it, then we did it. Even the Conservatives down east are thinking about it. It's a great political gimmick, even if it isn't good business.

Now when it comes to giving the renters \$100, for the life of me I can't see why we don't just give everybody who lives in a house, rented or owned, a certain amount of money. Nobody can tell me that the renter doesn't pay all the taxes on the apartment or the house he lives in in the rents. I've been a landlord and even I'm smart enough to get that worked into the rent. Why should a homeowner get \$216 and the fellow who can't own a home only get \$100? There are approaches to this which could be a little a better, and I'm sure the government will do this in the next year or two and everybody will be happier. Maybe we can figure out a way of using social credit and do away with taxes.

Early childhood education -- I suppose this can be debated forever. I'm not against it, as long as it's on a voluntary plan. But I would like it to be subject to plebiscite or something like that, because you have a very vocal little group of people who want these kindergartens at public expense -- not necessarily because they will do something for the child, because there is ample evidence that by the time they are in Grade 3 you can't tell who had kindergarten and who didn't. This is a wonderful device for leaving a mama free to work while her children go to kindergarten. It's true they learn a few things, just as they learn from Sesame Street. They can count but they don't know what to count means.

While I'm not against it on that basis, I would like to carry with it the necessity of the community to carry the majority of the people who are going to pay the bill.

Educational finance plans -- well, it's a real conundrum. But I would remind those people who think nothing was done for education until September 1971 that in the old days we were the first province to devise a system of giving high school education to rural students. We were the first province to do school busing, and we did it in old sleighs and wagons with a box on the back and the kids didn't complain a bit. At first they had to walk three miles to catch the thing, well, even we weakened to the point where we went right to the door so mama could see them get on. That's all right, it cost quite a bit of money, but nobody seemed to kick.

We were perhaps the first to build the centralized school, and then the first to recognize that the small centralizations did not serve the purpose. We went all out for the kind of school which gives a very broad education. We were

the only ones who retained our agricultural colleges, and they served a very good purpose; we converted some of them to community colleges.

Our university programs were the envy of all Canada, and, in fact, of most of the United States. Of course, we over-estimated sometimes. I know we built some schools that are now not going to be used. I don't know how you can avoid, it but I'll touch it just a little bit.

When it comes to highways, I'm a great supporter of this little rancher friend of mine. He knows something about roads and what is on them and what they are all about. I have one hope and that is that this Police Lake Road -- I notice we are going to build roads to parks and things -- and we have the Police Lake Park down in the extremity of my constituency and boy, do we need that road overhauled. Somebody is going to get killed before his liquor runs out. We are going to have a primary highway to Fort McMurray and I'm all for that. It is a tedious job to get up there and see how they are doing. I've got a \$100 debenture at stake up there, and I'd like to see what's going on.

And assistance to the cities for transportation is something that we just have to deal with. I'm not going to say much more about Manpower and Labour. I found it a little difficult to understand why we needed two additional deputy ministers, but maybe we do. Maybe it takes more of the kind of people that we have nowadays to do the same job.

I think I have to go along with the 3.6 per cent for Special Employment Projects and Manpower training. We have to do something. The experience we had previously, when we retrained the people in the areas where the coal mines closed, tell me that we need to tread softly. We retrained a great number of those people, only to find that 15 per cent of them used the retraining. The rest of them simply went out and found other opportunities for making a living.

Now to culturalism. You know, I have some Indian people down in my country, and they absorbed the long hair and a lot of the culture of the white man. Then, when they talked to me about their culture, I said, "Now you've got it all wrong, you should talk about your lack of culture, you didn't have any, you had some old habits you wouldn't go back to for any price." And when you talk about multi-culturalism, I'm all for it. I don't know what culture is exactly, but I really think it's that heritage of things which people enjoy -- music and dancing and dress, the things that gave them a quality of life and which they would not like to lose, and in that sense even the Indians have some of it. I'm all for keeping it going, and certainly the government preceding this one was the first to set up a Department of Youth and Culture. And, as I recall, the budget went up year after year so some assistance could be given in this particular aspect.

We will be giving some money to the City of Edmonton. Well, it's a darn good excuse. About the only reason anybody can see for trying to get the Games, is that some city is going to get the white elephant. We're going to give them money to build a lot of these things, and then we have to support these things forever after. Now, they will only be white elephants if, after it's all over, the people of Edmonton do not support them and do not create those programs which can use these facilities fully. If they don't, they are going to pay dearly for the cost of maintenance and use, and for something which might have been ill conceived.

And so we need that continued encouragement, which I am sure the Minister of Youth and Culture will give them, to keep these things going after we get them. How much the province should put into it, just for Edmonton, I don't know. The last government built the two auditoriums, and the people in my area weren't too happy about it because they said it isn't likely that more than ten percent of the people of this constituency will ever go to the auditoriums. But benefits go on and on, and many of the cultural things which have been brought to these auditoriums certainly carry out into the field. And, I am certainly not against it.

I want to say just a few words about decentralization. I'm not impressed with the idea that we are going to put the agricultural development headquarters in one spot and something else in another spot. To me this isn't decentralization at all. We would have decentralization if we said to the people in each municipality, "Here is your share of this, you run it. Let's see what you can do." All we have done is to make people confused about where they go to get help. It ought to be good for AGT, because we'll have multitudinous telephone conversations between the hon. minister and the people down there running this show. And, that's all right -- but I want to repeat that this is not true decentralization. And you will find in the end that it is not good management to try to put departments away from the central area. It's only when

you give the responsibility to the people in these areas that you truly have decentralization.

Well, I'm getting to the conclusions, and I'm going to conclude too. But I just want to say a few things about city growth control. It's been tried and tried and tried, and it's never worked. For example, planning acts are not new at all in Europe, and they have as many problems as we. I often wonder, if you want to do something about housing, if it isn't time that we said to the cities, we don't want you to develop any more land right close to your borders. We want you to develop satellite towns. We will go out and buy the land that is available at agricultural prices. And we will keep it at agricultural prices so that the cost of lots will not be extreme. The engineers tell me that it isn't any more expensive to develop the utilities and the services of a satellite town than a new sub-division in the city -- many times less expensive because there is no question of having to increase the capacity of the trunk systems. Maybe we ought to try something like that. It would be one of the means, I think, of taking something outside. I'm not sure that we are going to have much success getting manufacturing industries to go to small towns. If we can, I'm all for it, and I'm not going to be critical of any attempt the government makes to try it.

I'm just going to say this about my constituency and then I will be quiet. We have benefitted tremendously from the parks, the little municipal parks along our highways, and thousands of visitors from the United States commend the government, both the last one and this one, on the very proper way they are kept and how useful they are. We have a pretty good road system down there. We were fortunate in that we were on the way, as you might say, between those areas to the south and the capital cities and the parks in Alberta, and so we got some of those first.

I think we gave considerable leadership in schools. We took full advantage of centralization. We took full advantage of the hospital plans, the senior citizens homes.

One area where I'm a little bit disgusted is that my town of Magrath made some applications for winter works program help and got flat refusals. I am unable to figure out just why, and I'm going to be taking it up with the appropriate ministers to see if I can get some support. Either I'm wrong or I'll get the support, because as I say, they've always treated me very fairly in that regard.

We have plenty of REAs; we have good telephone systems. But I am still concerned that no rural telephone exchange be established that does not permit the subscribers to reach the basic services without paying tolls. When you can only call the neighbours, you can't even call a garage, or a hairdresser, or a doctor or hospital, it is a distinct disadvantage and we need to overcome it some way.

We need some bus service in my town of Cardston. And we're working with the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to try to make it work. I hope we will be successful and I appreciate his help in that regard.

There is one spot that has worried me a little bit and that's the very little work that is being done at the branch of the mental hospital in Raymond. I think the over-centralization in Claresholm may in the end not be good, and I hope that the government in its planning for new facilities will recognize that in Raymond there is the nucleus of a very fine service, that we have hundreds and hundreds of patients who could as well be there as anywhere else. This is a very vital thing to little towns, and if we are going to do something for them this is one of the areas which we may include.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I have not been unhappy with the record of this government. I have found it very easy to converse with them about any problem. The ministers have always been very kind and I hope that if I have been critical, it's with the idea that my philosophy is perhaps a little bit different. But I'm sincere about it, and only when the philosophy is different am I going to be critical and that not in the light of attempting to hurt anybody's feelings. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. HOHOL:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

Has the hon. minister leave to adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 10:21 o'clock]