

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, April 17, 1973

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I am today pleased to give notice that tomorrow I will be introducing for first reading The Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Act.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I hereby give notice that tomorrow, Wednesday, April 18 I will move, seconded by the hon. Dr. Backus, that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, April 18 at 5:30 o'clock p.m., it shall stand adjourned until Wednesday, April 25 at 2:30 o'clock p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 218 An Act to amend The Alberta Insurance Act

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being An Act to amend The Alberta Insurance Act. The purpose of this bill is to provide against discrimination in automobile insurance against anyone on the basis of race, sex, colour or age, and the bill also provides a penalty for violation of the Act.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 218 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 48 The Alberta Property Tax Reduction Act

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Alberta Property Tax Reduction Act. Mr. Speaker, this is a major government bill and it puts into legislative form the programs which have been previously outlined under The Alberta Property Tax Reduction Act.

The purpose of this bill is to reduce residential property taxes by way of two kinds of assistance: financial assistance to individual Alberta citizens, whether they are homeowners or home-renters; and also assistance to municipal governments by way of municipal assistance grants and municipal incentive grants to be paid to municipalities that are able to exercise certain budgetary controls; and also by means of the provincial government taking over certain social services in the form of increased dollar and financial support.

The bill includes necessary consequential amendments to a number of acts specifically relating to the social services previously referred to, and it also consolidates all kinds of assistance to be given to municipalities or individuals by way of introducing this new act and repealing The Homeowners Tax Discount Act, The Senior Citizens Shelter Assistance Act and The Municipalities Assistance [Grant] Act.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 48 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 37 The Local Authorities Pension Amendment Act, 1973

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Local Authorities Pension Amendment Act, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, the principles of the amendments are important ones and are summarized as follows. The first one has to do with the administration of the Act itself, and the second one, with naming the beneficiary and the amount specified for his pension, which is not currently expressed in that manner under The Public Service Pension Act. The Act will further identify the period of pensionable service required before investing. This is a particularly important amendment. The last one will have to do with the identification of the payment of pensions to a person who had previously worked in the public service, left it and returned to employment with the public service.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 37 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 38 The Trust Companies Amendment Act, 1973

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Trust Companies Amendment Act, 1973.

One of the purposes of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to further restrict the extent to which non-residents of Canada may own shares in an Alberta trust company. Another purpose of the bill is to alter the circumstances under which Alberta trust companies may lend funds. One of the results of that, Mr. Speaker, will be to strengthen the position of Alberta financial institutions. Another purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to make some administrative amendments to the existing legislation.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 38 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 39 The Companies Amendment Act, 1973

MR. KOZIAK:

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill contains two welcome amendments to the present Companies Act. In the first place, the present Act prevents the carrying on of a partnership by more than 20 partners. The amendment would provide that where partners are formed either to practise medicine under The Medical Profession Act, to practise law or to practise chartered accountancy, those partnerships which are presently forbidden to incorporate can exceed the maximum number of 20.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the present Act requires all companies to comply with the provisions of audit under Sections 116 to 118. This includes the appointment of an auditor and the requirement of the auditor to audit the books of the company, notwithstanding the size of the company, its activity or how closely held that company is. An amendment to The Companies Act, Mr. Speaker, contained in this bill would, where all the shareholders consent, eliminate that requirement where the company has assets of less than \$.5 million and where the company has gross operating revenues in a year of less than \$1 million.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 39 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, that Bill No. 39 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

Bill No. 43 The Teachers' Retirement Fund Amendment Act, 1973

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being Bill No. 43, The Teachers' Retirement Fund Amendment Act, 1973. One major amendment would require that the teacher make contributions during all his teaching career but

that the contributions which are after 35 years of service, or after age 65, shall be refunded annually. These continued contributions are necessary to determine the average salary by taking the five consecutive years of service during which the salary was highest; then the pension is calculated on this average salary.

Another significant amendment is to permit the government and The Teachers' Retirement Fund to pay a portion of the cost-of-living increase calculated on the additional amount being paid by the Alberta Teachers' Association.

These amendments are intended to facilitate administration of the Act.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 43 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 44 The Department of Education Amendment Act, 1973

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce two bills, the first being Bill No. 44, The Department of Education Amendment Act. The purpose of this bill is to permit regulations to be made for the purpose of implementing the early childhood services program recently announced.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 44 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 50 The School Amendment Act, 1973

MR. HYNDMAN:

The other bill which I wish to introduce, Mr. Speaker, is Bill No. 50, The School Amendment Act, 1973. This bill contains a number of amendments all of which will result in more effective delivery of education services to Alberta school children.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 50 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

On a point of order, I would like to ask leave of the House unanimously to allow the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development to move first reading of Bill No. 40, The Dental Association Amendment Act, notwithstanding the fact that a day's notice has not been given.

MR. SPEAKER:

You have heard the request for leave by the hon. Government House Leader. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

Bill No. 40 The Dental Association Amendment Act, 1973

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill being Bill No. 40, The Dental Association Amendment Act. Mr. Speaker, there are two matters of principle involved in the Act. One is for the better operation and functioning of the association itself in that it will allow the potential professional liability of dentists to be covered through their association.

The other one is in regard to a matter which will be of principle value both to the upgrading of the profession and, of course, in the long run of significant benefit to the patients at large, and that is in regard to continuing education and the granting of annual licences.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 40 was introduced and read a first time.]

Bill No. 46 The Farm Implement Amendment Act, 1973

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 46, being The Farm Implement Amendment Act, 1973.

Mr. Speaker, the existing Farm Implement Act has been on the statute books of Alberta since 1967. A full-time administrator was named to administer the Act some months ago, and in the course of administering the provisions of the Act, it was found that certain amendments were required to facilitate the administration of the purpose and intent of the existing legislation. These amendments, Mr. Speaker, are designed to do this.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, there are some specific changes in these amendments which are designed to improve the supply and quality of parts and equipment to farmers. Among these very briefly, the manufacture of all new tractors and new farm implements which contain a new engine or a new motor as an integral part of that farm implement will be required to state the belt horsepower on the sales agreement when a sale is made.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the amendments will require that there be a one-year mandatory warranty on all new farm machinery.

A further amendment, Mr. Speaker, allows for regulations imposing duties and obligations upon vendors and other persons with respect to the supplying of emergency parts to farmers.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, the amendments provide for a change with respect to the bonding provisions in the existing Act. In the new amendments, dealers and vendors will be allowed to post security in a form other than a bond.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 46 was introduced and read a first time.]

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister for Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, that Bill No. 46, The Farm Implement Amendment Act, 1973 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Youth, Culture and Recreation, followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly Dr. Max W. Schlereth, a Consul General of Ecuador and one of the persons responsible for planning and construction of the Olympic facilities in Munich. He also specialized especially in the facilities of the village there, as well as the youth village. He is accompanied by Dr. Hans Friedrich Luchterhandt.

Olso es freid me unbandig dass' zu uns auf Bsuaach kema san. Songs am Dr. Ernstberger an schena Gruass und Eahna ois Guate, kemas boid wieda und pfueat Eahna God, auf wiedaschaun.

I would like Dr. Schlereth and Dr. Luchterhandt to rise and be recognized.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly some 29 Grade 11 and 12 students from the Irma School. They are accompanied by Mrs. McRoberts and Mrs. Lidell and I would say that their visit here today will create an even greater interest in the affairs of their community. I would like them to rise and be recognized at this time.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you and through you to the members of the Legislature 43 students from the Lorne Jenkin High School in Barrhead. They are here with their social studies teacher, Mr. Parman. I ask them to rise and be recognized by the Legislature.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce to you today, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 25 Grade 11 and 12 students from the beautiful constituency of Banff-Cochrane and out of a very significant and beautiful area the Springbank area. I would ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly. They are also accompanied, Mr. Speaker, by their instructor Mr. Tillbrock, and Mrs. Sue Campbell. Would they rise and be recognized by this Assembly.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to introduce to you and through you to the members of this Assembly, Grade 7 of the St. James School in the constituency of Edmonton Avonmore. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. R. Soucy and Mr. R. Mooney. I am told that this class includes some of the best athletes of the city. Would they now like to rise and be recognized?

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to introduce some 27 Grade 11 and 12 students from Austin O'Brien High School accompanied by their teacher Mrs. C. Scott. I would also ask that they stand and be recognized.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity at this time to table correspondence between the Canadian National Railway and the Government of Alberta as referred to in my speech of March 22, 1973.

CRAI QUESTION PERIOD

Alberta Opportunity Fund Loans

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I have two questions I would like to address to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, or Industry and Tourism. I wonder if he could advise the House on the first question as to whether employees of the Government of Alberta or companies owned by employees of the Government of Alberta are automatically excluded from consideration for loans under the Alberta Opportunity Fund?

MR. PEACOCK:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HENDERSON:

Second, a related question, Mr. Speaker, in somewhat of a different vein. Since a number of recipients of loans under the Alberta Opportunity Fund have publicly identified themselves, is the government now prepared to remove the cloak of secrecy surrounding the operation of the Alberta Opportunity Fund?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, we have mentioned in this House on many occasions under the regulations, Section 14-2, that we had precluded the right of publicizing the names of those recipients of loans under the Alberta Opportunity Fund. I'm sure that the House understands that. We have also advised on six other different occasions, I believe, that we would review the situation when and as we get around to it.

MR. HENDERSON:

A supplemental, Mr. Speaker. I gather then at the present time that the government has not got around to it, to use the minister's words.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for --

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. minister. Does the minister continue to abide by his previous undertaking to provide any member an opportunity to review any file on any loans made under the Opportunity Fund?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I made that remark in confidence and that still exists.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

Coal Transport

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Has any recent research been carried out on the feasibility of moving coal from Alberta to Ontario in car load lots?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, that really involves a question of transportation that the Minister of Industry and Commerce is more familiar with, so perhaps he would like to answer that.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, yes we have been conducting a number of inquiries into the economics of moving coal into eastern Canada and to the eastern United States. As a matter of fact we're very pleased to announce to this House that McIntyre Porcupine has been successful in obtaining a contract to move coal into eastern United States through the cooperation of the Canadian National Railway and the ARR.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the haulage be done in car load lots?

MR. PEACOCK:

Yes, all the quotations are on car load lots. If the hon. member is referring to unit trains, that is the basis, of course, on which the most economical rates can be obtained. It will be the effort, I'm sure, of the coal companies in Alberta and the transportation companies as well as this government to assist and support the movement of coal into eastern Canada and eastern United States by unit trains.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for --

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. What is the royalty rate on that coal that is sold?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can answer that one. It is 10 cents a ton.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West.

Rocky Mountain Life Insurance

MR. HO LEM:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General today. Have the minister or department officials met with the

executive members of Paramount Life to discuss the possible sale of Rocky Mountain Life Insurance Company?

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister advise the members of this House if the government has received an offer to purchase control of Rocky Mountain Life Insurance Company?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I should say that the story to which, I believe, the hon. member is alluding, has, so far as I know, no substance to it.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What conditions have the government established for the protection of policyholders and shareholders of Rocky Mountain Life for now and for the future?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, that was gone into at great length some time ago in the House and I thought it was very clear to all hon. members then. However, we did say that there was no government involvement with respect to the shareholders' interests. We added that with respect to policyholders the government was administering the policies and would guarantee that all of the policyholders would receive the benefits to which they were entitled under the contracts which they had originally taken out with Rocky Mountain Life Insurance Company. That was the position when I made statements on this matter in the House some months ago and it is still the position today.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Reaction to Universities Amendment Act

MR. GRUENWALD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question will be directed to the Minister of Advanced Education. Has representation been made to the Minister of Advanced Education from the Senate of the University of Lethbridge protesting the proposed amendments to The Universities Act and the reorganization of the Department of Advanced Education?

MR. FOSTER:

I did receive a letter, Mr. Speaker, from the Chancellor, Dr. Jim Oshirio, of the University of Lethbridge, requesting a meeting with myself, to which I was pleased to reply and say that I would be quite happy to meet with the Senate as I have the other senates and boards, but the occasion was not immediately available. The letter of expression from the senate, Mr. Speaker, was not one, to my memory, that was necessarily critical of the amendments to The Universities Act or the department but was more in the nature of an inquiry, and wanting to meet with me to discuss it.

MR. GRUENWALD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the meeting then involve the Senate in making representation to the minister or his department requesting an autonomous commission to serve as a buffer agent between the universities and your department?

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, I would be quite happy to provide the hon. member, or the House for that matter, with a copy of the letter from the Senate. I believe it was made public. As I recall, the letter did express some concern about the autonomy of the institutions. In my reply to the hon. chancellor I indicated that in my judgment the amendments to The Universities Act currently before this

House do not in any way affect the autonomy of the institutions and therefore, there may be a misunderstanding in the minds of some senators concerning the effects of the act, which is, of course, one of the reasons I wish to speak with them.

MR. GRUENWALD:

One final supplementary. Would the minister like to tell us if the other university senates expressed concern as well as the University of Lethbridge?

MR. FOSTER:

I have had an excellent meeting, Mr. Speaker, in this past week with the Senate of the University of Alberta which, I think, clarified a number of matters concerning the legislation before this House and the reorganization of the Department of Advanced Education. I have had, I believe, two informal meetings with the Senate of the University of Calgary going back some time, in which we discussed a number of subjects, not specifically the bill before the House because, of course, it was not then before this Legislature. But I have attempted throughout to meet with these groups when the opportunity became apparent and when they expressed some interest.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise the House whether he has received any formal representation from the Senate of the University of Calgary with respect to a buffer between government and the institutions?

MR. FOSTER:

I think I have received a number of representations, Mr. Speaker, from many groups within the university community, and I think this includes the senate, expressing some concern over this question of a buffer, not necessarily a commission, but the matter of a buffer between government and the institutions.

I know that we have gone into that in some detail, not just in the question period, but, of course, in the course of my estimates and in the course of the bills.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Relocation of Jasper CN Station

MR. NOTLEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. What discussions have been held with federal authorities with respect to the proposed relocation of the CN operations from the Jasper townsite?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the government has just been made aware of that potential move by the federal government and the hon. Minister of Northern Affairs Responsible for National Parks, Mr. Chretien. We have not yet been able to assess fully the context in which he made these remarks, his intentions of going through and what time period and how exactly he would carry out the possibility of removing the CNR station from within the confines of the National Park.

I have had some discussions with the Minister of Consumer Affairs and the MLA responsible for that area. We will be discussing it further and then with the federal government.

Perhaps the Minister of Consumer Affairs may want to amplify this answer; perhaps he may not.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to either the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, or the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Has the government developed any position with respect to the proposed relocation?

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, again as I pointed out just earlier, the federal government's comments regarding this relocation have just been made and we want to assess fully what Mr. Chretien's intentions are before we will be able to take a position with regard to it.

MR. NOTLEY:

A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What steps is the government taking to ascertain local views, including specific meetings with the people involved, including the running trades?

MR. GETTY:

Well, Mr. Speaker, the government, of course, as I mentioned is discussing the matter with the MLA representing those people and it is his intention, he advises me, to give the government the full impact of the feelings of the people most concerned.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall, followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, if I might just give some supplementary information. I do meet with people in Jasper every weekend and have had a considerable number of conversations with many of the railroad community in that townsite.

This flag of the hon. Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development federally has been put up by other ministers of the Crown federally at various times in the past 20 years. I understand that he made a statement in the federal House just recently indicating that if such a move were to take place it would not take place in a hurry. It would be something that would take place over a long period of time.

However, I am in constant touch with the people of Jasper and particularly the railroad community which makes up something like 35 per cent of the population.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Can the hon. minister advise the House what the views are of the railroad community in Jasper toward proposed relocation. Are they in favour of it or are they very strongly opposed to it?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, in a word, Mr. Speaker, they say, "ridiculous".

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary McCall, followed by the hon. Member for Little Bow.

Coffee Price Increase

MR. HO LEM:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs. In view of the recently announced substantial increase in world prices of coffee beans, does the minister anticipate an immediate increase in coffee prices in Alberta?

MR. DOWLING:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the hon. minister investigated the status of the present supplies of coffee in Alberta?

MR. DOWLING:

No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't to this time but if the matter becomes a pressing issue, I am sure we will be after it right away.

MR. HO LEM:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise what can be done to ensure that wholesalers and retailers do not seize this opportunity to raise prices of coffee prematurely?

MR. SPEAKER:

Surely the hon. member can't expect the minister to outline remedies which perhaps might properly fall within the research of the hon. member himself.

The hon. Member for Little Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Bow River Project

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. What steps is the government taking or planning to take to transfer the Bow River project east block from the responsibility of the federal government to that of the provincial government?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, steps are already underway under the Director of Irrigation for my department and in conjunction with the Irrigation Council, which, of course, the hon. member is aware, is a council made up of a number of people from various departments, to have in-depth sessions with each of the individuals in that block during the coming months. Preparations for these individual interviews are now underway.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. What planning has been done regarding continuous employment for the employees of the project?

DR. HORNER:

That, too, is underway, Mr. Speaker, and I would expect that the employees of the project would continue to be employed under whatever set-up is arranged for the east block.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow, followed by the hon. Member for Lloydminster.

Removal of Abandoned Autos

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Will the Department of the Environment assist the Bowness community association's spring beautification campaign in the removal of 30 abandoned cars?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I announced the Litter Check program in the House several weeks ago and this program will be conducted between the end of April and May 6. In conjunction with this program we announced that the Departments of Highways and Environment would assist each municipality in picking up abandoned automobiles.

Now the manner in which the program was set up was that each municipality would appoint a coordinator and that anyone requiring assistance in regard to moving an old automobile, be it a town or an individual, would phone the coordinator. The coordinator would subsequently refer that request to the Department of Highways and then assistance would be provided.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of the Environment. Could you advise who the --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please address his question to the Chair.

MR. WILSON:

Could the Minister of the Environment advise who the municipal coordinator is for the City of Calgary?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I can't right offhand, but I can certainly find out and advise the House. I feel certain that one has been appointed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lloydminster, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell.

Plasticized Drivers' Licences

MR. J. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the hon. Minister of Highways. Can the minister advise the House when we can expect the introduction of the plasticized drivers' licence identification card announced during last fall's session of the Legislature?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we hope to have it in progress early in July.

MR. J. MILLER:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will those people who wish the new type of driver's licence have access to the new driver's licence, even though their current driver's licence has not yet expired?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we anticipate a very heavy demand for the new driver's licence and we are gearing to accommodate those people who require one.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that we will have approximately 100 cameras in the province to take the identification pictures of the recipients.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Sherwood Park Health Facilities

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. Has any further consideration been given to the provision of health facilities for the Sherwood Park-southeast Edmonton area, such as a hospital, an emergency type of health facility or physiotherapy services and so on, and if so, what consideration has been given?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, for some time now the community of Sherwood Park has presented a problem which, in several respects, is unique in Alberta in that it is the centre of a fairly large population and is therefore of a size that, compared with many parts of the province, would have been served directly by health facilities, probably including hospital facilities. However, because of its location right next to some 2,000 odd treatment beds in the city of Edmonton, no step has been taken in regard to that type of facility there. Because of this, alternatives were at all times considered, and through consultation that I, the

hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell and the Hospital Services Commission have had with the Hospital Planning Council, the Medical Association and practitioners in the Sherwood Park area, principles have been arrived at which will chart the future for the Sherwood Park area.

The assessment of existing services in the hands of a very extensive private clinic there at the present time showed that they serve the community well. The Hospital Services Commission is undertaking the expansion, hopefully very shortly into the area of certain physiotherapy services.

The future requirements of the City of Edmonton in that area and of Sherwood Park will be regarded with the intention that if there are requirement for further health facilities, whether they be of a hospital or other type, every consideration will be given, along with the expanding south-east area of the city, to the community of Sherwood Park.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

World Energy Conference

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, I direct my question to the hon. Premier. Will the hon. Premier advise the House if it is true that the First Minister will be attending a conference in Sweden next month to discuss world energy needs?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Does the hon. Premier intend to publish a policy paper regarding Alberta's position at the Bilderberg Conference preceding the visit?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the nature of that conference is that they are not documents that are publicly distributed. The nature of the conference is that there are representatives of a senior nature from the various governments -- I think some 18 are involved. The discussion involves some three days. One of the two subjects being discussed is the subject of world energy, and in particular, of course, because of our vast reserves in the tar sands and the importance of that in the international world picture, I presume that that is, in part, why the invitation has been extended to myself on behalf of the people.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the hon. Premier. Will Alberta be actively soliciting foreign capital to develop Alberta's oil sands?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would think it would be premature to talk about active solicitation of foreign capital. What will be established is a question of increased awareness by the nations in the world, particularly the petroleum-consuming nations, of the very vast reserves of the oil sands in this province. We have become concerned, lately, particularly in Canada but also throughout the world, about a lack of appreciation that perhaps we have in this province the greatest undeveloped natural resource in the world having regard to the critical nature of energy. So it's important that that communication occur.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

Automobile Driver Examinations

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Highways. Mr. Speaker, I would ask to be permitted to preface my question with a brief comment in order that the minister might appreciate the import of my question.

Female Driver Examiners

MRS. CHICHAK:

Mr. Speaker, there has been representation that women driver examiners be hired by the Department of Highways. There is a male-female tension created during examination often causing the woman to fail the examination. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he would consider increasing the number of female driver examiners particularly in Edmonton and Calgary?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, in the future we will be advertising for female and male driver examiners and will be doing it in such a way that there will be no exclusion of either sex. We hope to receive a goodly number of lady applicants.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister be able to advise whether the successful female applicants will receive equal pay for equal work?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, they will be treated exactly the same in regard to receiving pay.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. minister planning a special course for back-seat drivers for females?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, it might be encouraging for the hon. Member for Drumheller to want to review his driving habits.

MRS. CHICHAK:

Supplemental, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister advise whether there has been any experience that there are male back-seat drivers as well?

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps we could get back into the 'front seat' with the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

Elderly Hospital Patients

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development and I will try to do a little better.

Has the hon. minister ordered an investigation into the allegations by a member of the Edmonton Hospital Board that the city's hospitals are discharging elderly patients prematurely?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that allegation has not come to my attention previously. I will look into the making of such an allegation. In doing so, though, I think the hon. member would know, and would want to agree, that the question of the discharge of patients from hospitals, each of which is run by a responsible citizen board, is very much a matter that I would want to know that the doctors, the hospitals and the hospital boards themselves had fully gone into and satisfied themselves upon, without imposing the presence of the provincial government into that field unnecessarily.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Expropriation Procedure

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Attorney General. In view of his public announcement that he is contemplating bringing in a bill to amend the expropriation procedure in the province, is it his intention to bring in a bill during this session?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated earlier, I wouldn't be prepared at this time to make any commitment as to when we might introduce that legislation.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, could the minister advise if the department is actively working on this issue at the present time?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, the issue is being worked on actively.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Calder, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona.

Driver Licence Suspensions

MR. CHAMBERS:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Highways. I wonder if the minister has any statistical information indicating either the success or failure of the merit-point system in driver licence suspension?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it appears that about 90 per cent of the people who receive their first demerit do not show up receiving additional demerits.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona, followed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

The Competition Act

MR. KOZIAK:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether there are any results arising from the discussions with the hon. Herb Gray in Edmonton last week relative to The Competition Act?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the government has had a considerable number of discussions with the federal government regarding the bill referred to in the previous House of Commons as The Competition Act, or bill No. C 256. That Bill caused some concern both in industry and government because of the broadened restrictive measures it proposed to introduce in Canada.

I am pleased to say that through the discussions we had with various ministers of the Crown and the hon. Mr. Herb Gray, who is now responsible for this area following Mr. Andras, the federal government has now decided to split the bill and stage it in the following way. The bill really had two matters in it: one was consumer protection legislation and the other was control of business and abuses and anti-combines legislation. So they decided to split the bill, believing it was too ambitious in its original form, and will proceed now with the consumer protection legislation as a first step.

I think most members will agree that this legislation will probably be very helpful. As a matter of fact they will be working with our own Minister of Consumer Affairs in developing it and some of his own legislation. Then, after the bill and legislation becomes law, should it become law, they intend then to consider a second stage of the business control legislation.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition, followed by the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking.

Grande Prairie Procter and Gamble Pulp Mill

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of the Environment. I wonder if the Minister could advise the House as to the nature and purpose of the 40-acre sanitary land fill area that has been set aside near the Procter and Gamble pulp mill at Grande Prairie. And secondly, could the minister advise as to whether the area in question has been withdrawn from the previously established grazing permit for the area.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, the Procter and Gamble pulp mill will be generating a pretty substantial amount of solid wastes consisting of bark and bottoms from their clarifier. The intent of treatment with respect to this waste was to land fill the material in an area of approximately 40 acres. The actual conditions under which this material will be land filled have not yet been established as the department has not had a finalized submission from the company put before it in order to consider the problem in all its dimensions, as to whether the area would have to be fenced, whether or not the pH would have to be adjusted, and so forth.

As far as the land involved is concerned, I believe it is entirely Crown land, so this would involve the setting aside of approximately 40 acres of Crown land. A tentative site has been chosen. However, to my knowledge, the site at this time has not received any final approval. But as I said, this is Crown land involved and perhaps the hon. Minister of Land and Forests may wish to add something to this.

MR. HENDERSON:

Before the hon. Minister for Lands and Forests responds, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister advise us if the material going into the sanitary fill area is a solid?

MR. YURKO:

Yes, it will basically be a solid. Some of it, particularly from the bottom of the clarifier, may be fairly slushy.

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of any problem in the area the hon. member mentions, but if there is I would certainly be happy to look into it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking, followed by the hon. Member for Wainwright.

Ginter Breweries

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. Mr. Speaker, does the Department of Manpower and Labour plan to review a decision by the Board of Industrial Relations ordering Ginter Breweries to recognize Local 250 of the International Brewers Union?

DR. HOHOL:

No sir, Mr. Speaker. The hearings reconfirmed a prior decision of the Board of Industrial Relations in this matter and the access to a different kind of decision would have to be through the courts.

MR. COOPER:

To the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Could the hon. Minister inform the Legislature if his department supports this ruling by the Board of Industrial Relations?

MR. SPEAKER:

There is a possibility of appeal of that ruling to the courts. It could be quite improper for the minister to comment on it at this time.

MR. COOPER:

A supplementary to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Could the hon. minister inform the Legislature if workers involved in this dispute have been collecting provincial social development payments?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I think that would be a terribly wrong thing for the government to disclose. The people who would be involved would be known in the community where they are and for me to say that they are receiving social allowance, if that were the case, wouldn't be correct at all.

The only further thing I'll say about it is that I don't want any inference to be taken from what I have said so far, that they are or are not, because I simply do not know.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell with a supplementary.

Uncle Ben's Beer

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. the Attorney General. Have any steps been taken with regard to the importing of Uncle Ben's beer into Alberta from other provinces?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, there were no steps taken by the government or the Alberta Liquor Control Board. It is my understanding though that the brewery, of its own choice, is not now importing into Alberta products from its other breweries in western Canada. I also understand that is so because of the cost of the transportation.

Ginter Breweries (Cont.)

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a supplementary question to hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour. What steps are being taken to enforce the award or the decision of the Board of Industrial Relations?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, the matter will be before the Supreme Court of Alberta and that is the place of the final judgment -- the only access we have -- It so happens in this case that the management turned to the courts for the overturn of the decision of the Board of Industrial Relations. We are hoping that the judgment the Supreme Court makes will include a confirmation of an order permitting a board decision to stand and secondly, to require the corporation to return the men to work as specified by the Board of Industrial Relations.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wainwright, followed by the hon. Member for Drumheller.

Albera-Norway Air Service

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. In your meeting earlier this week with Norway's Minister of External Affairs did you discuss the matter of a direct air service between Alberta and Norway?

MR. GETTY:

No, Mr. Speaker, that subject was not discussed in the brief time I met with him, which was in the hosting of a luncheon with the minister and the ambassador from Norway. It may have been touched on by other ministers who met them during the day, but not between him and myself.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, that subject was discussed last year when the President of Canadian air line system, Mr. Hagrup, happened to be here in Edmonton for a visit for just a vacation. We discussed it again yesterday during the luncheon and are going to pursue whatever is necessary to accomplish that fact.

MR. RUSTE:

A supplementary question to the minister. How soon could we expect some further report on this matter?

MR. SCHMID:

Of course I would have liked to have that done yesterday, Mr. Speaker. But we are trying to negotiate and, of course, support the SAS airline system in their obligation to Ottawa to be able to land here since they are flying over Edmonton anyway on the way to Seattle.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller, followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

McIntyre Porcupine Strip Mine

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. the Premier. Has the government made a firm decision that the application of McIntyre Porcupine to strip No. 9 will not be made until after the Crump Report is completed?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think a firm decision has been made with regard to that matter. I believe there have been discussions that have taken place, but I would have to check into the exact status of it, having regard to the Crump Commission having that as an interim matter to look at and other matters including the Energy Resources Conservation Board making an assessment of it. But we are conscious of the timing problem also involved in that situation. So it is a balance of those factors.

MR. TAYLOR:

Would the hon. Premier check that and advise us on it?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to do so.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Canadian Montana Gas Company

MR. WYSE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Has the provincial government given approval to Canadian Montana Gas Company's application for exporting more gas to Montana?

MR. DICKIE:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Electrical Energy from Coal

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the hon. the Premier. What steps are being taken by the government to encourage large volume gas purchasers such as Edmonton Power to use Alberta coal rather than Alberta gas in generating electrical energy?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the first step is to give an opportunity to such purchasers to read the very lucid and effective document made public last Friday by the Energy Resources Conservation Board, a document which I commend to all members for consideration.

MR. DIXON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the Premier. Are there any plans being actively considered at the present time in Alberta for a new large coal fired generating plant?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't answer that without a review. I know there are discussions of that nature in terms of the longer term plans. Frankly, we have been awaiting the report from the Energy Resources Conservation Board which we received on Friday last. I have not had an opportunity as yet in the Executive Council to consider it or to discuss it with the various ministers who are involved.

MR. DIXON:

My final supplementary to the hon. the Premier. In your announcement last year regarding the gas sale and the rebate to Alberta users, are you going to consider giving a rebate to power companies generating power in Alberta using gas?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we specifically said to the people who expressed interest, in particular to the City of Edmonton, that we would not do that.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the government made any study of the cost of reconverting from gas back to coal for industry in the province?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that we have. Perhaps the Minister of Mines and Minerals could respond. I do believe it is a subject, again, wherein we have been awaiting this particular report from the Energy Resources Conservation Board. We wanted to have their assessment of their view as to whether or not we should be using coal or gas and the cost benefit relationships for the question of electric generation. We now have that report. It is a very meaningful one to us and we have to assess it and develop some policy considerations out of it.

The point that the hon. member raises will certainly be one aspect we would have to look at to determine whether or not there is any economic soundness to that report.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Insurance Company Mergers

MR. HO LEM:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct this question to the hon. the Attorney General. Has the hon. minister recently approved the merger of two or more insurance companies, either registered or operating in the Province of Alberta?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether that matter has progressed to the point where I would be free to make any public statement about it. I am prepared to look into it and, if I feel that I can, then answer the hon. member's question.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Proposals of Batten Royal Commission

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. During the visit to Alberta of Mr. Gray, did you have an opportunity, Mr. Minister, to discuss with the federal Minister of Consumer Affairs the implications of the Batten Royal Commission on food costs as well as the current charges against Canadian Safeway under The Anti-Combines Investigations Act?

MR. DOWLING:

No, Mr. Speaker, we didn't get into that detail. But today I received quite a bundle of documents from the hon. Mr. Gray, or his assistant rather. Among them are copies of some new proposed legislation he intends to develop and perhaps introduce, some of the history that has gone into the developing of this legislation and other material I am very anxious to look over. It arrived only this morning.

We didn't have that much time with Mr. Gray. We dealt with other matters of more pressing urgency, I guess, in his mind. I am sure over the course of the summer we will have ample opportunity to deal with these matters in the course of our meetings with his department and members of it.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Are you in a position today --

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please address his question to the Chair.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, is the hon. minister in a position today to advise the House when he will be able to have meetings with the representatives of the food retail industry to consider the proposal in the Batten Royal Commission that there is too much excess space and unnecessary advertising in food retailing in Alberta.

MR. DOWLING:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm certain these are meetings we will be developing in the course of time. I should say I have had meetings with two groups of retailers in the last short time, not the major retailers but some of the

smaller groups. This is just a start and I'm sure there will be some additional meetings over the course of time.

MR. NOTLEY:

Well --

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. I've already recognized the hon. Member for Wainwright and we are running out of time. Possibly we could revert to this matter again tomorrow.

The hon. Member for Wainwright, if we can have another short question and a short answer.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Will there be an increase in the price of farm machinery as a result of the additional requirements under The Farm Implement Amendment Act, Bill No. 46 introduced today?

MR. SPEAKER:

This is the second question we have had this afternoon asking the minister to prophesy the course of the market. It's a questionable question for the question period.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I wish to make a statement with regard to the debate which took place in this House yesterday on the vote on EMO and in particular to the remarks I made wherein I stated that in the event of a major military attack the EMC people would probably be the first to head for the hills.

In light of the fact that several members of the House objected to my remarks, and also in light of the tremendous amount of advice I received from both sides of the House subsequent to that debate, both solicited and otherwise, I would deem it most ungracious on my part, Mr. Speaker, not to withdraw that statement I made about EMO, and to extend an apology to the members of the organization.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

238. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question:

- (1) Does the provincial government use one or more employment agencies for the hiring of any staff or labour?
- (2) If so, what agencies have been used?
- (3) What payment is made to the private agencies for their services?
- (4) Are the persons who are successful in securing government employment which was handled by an agency required to pay the agency directly?

239. Mr. Henderson asked the government the following question:

What were the names and dates of the termination of all employees of the Government of Alberta, its departments, agencies, boards or Alberta Crown Corporations, who have resigned, retired or were dismissed since September 10, 1971, and who were earning in excess of \$15,000 per year gross income at the time of termination?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, with all the noise, it was utterly impossible to hear what the decision or the words of the government ministers were on the questions.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, we have agreed to Questions No. 238 and No. 239.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

240. Mr. Dixon proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Taylor:

That an Order of the Assembly do issue for a Return showing:

(1) All correspondence received by the Government of Alberta from Alberta Appraisers and Valuers regarding the offering of their professional services to the government for appraising projects which have been or are now being considered for loans by the Alberta Opportunity Fund.

(2) All correspondence responding to correspondence received under Question No. 1.

(3) The number of Appraisers or Valuers who are employed or have been employed on projects under the Alberta Opportunity Company.

(4) The amount of remuneration paid to each appraiser or valuator for services rendered under the Alberta Opportunity Company up to April 15, 1973.

(5) The number of appraisers or valuers and name of each appraiser or valuator who has not yet been paid but is presently working on projects applying for loans from the Alberta Opportunity Company.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I move Motion No. 240 standing in my name on the Order Paper.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Minister of Advanced Education that the motion be amended by striking out clause (1) and by substituting the following:

All correspondence received by the Alberta Opportunity Company from Alberta Appraisers and Valuers regarding the offering of their professional services to the company for appraising projects which have been or are now being considered for loans by the Alberta Opportunity Fund.

And by adding the following words at the end of clause (5): "Subject to the concurrence of the parties involved."

MR. SPEAKER:

Just for clarification, is it the intention of the hon. minister that the words to be added at the end are to apply to clause (5) or to the whole question?

MR. PEACOCK:

To the whole question.

MR. SPEAKER:

It has been moved by the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce that Motion for a Return No. 240 be amended by striking out clause (1) and substituting:

(1) All correspondence received by the Alberta Opportunity Company of Alberta from Alberta Appraisers and Valuers regarding the offering of their professional services to the Company for appraising projects which have been or are now being considered for loans by the Alberta Opportunity Fund.

and by adding the following words at the end of the question. The motion, as drafted, says at the end of clause (5): "subject to the concurrence of the parties involved."

Is there any debate on the amendment?

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. minister could clarify why he'd want the amendment. You've actually got the same thing in (1) the way it stands because we're not asking for anything other than to do with the Opportunity Fund. We are not asking for all correspondence from the Alberta Government. I wonder if you would clarify that, Mr. Minister, your reason for wanting to change it.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, as I understand the motion and the amendment that (1) was purporting to indicate that the Government of Alberta was involved directly with evaluations or loans by the Alberta Opportunity Fund, when, in fact, that responsibility has been passed to the Alberta Opportunity Company and the board of directors with the Alberta Opportunity Company, who, in fact, are responsible for that loan fund. And therefore the hon. minister has merely put the motion in its correct context, in that it would be the correspondence by the Opportunity Company having to do with the Opportunity fund.

MR. SPEAKER:

With that explanation from the hon. minister, are you ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I think that we should speak to the amendment because one of the questions the amendment raises is whether the Alberta Opportunity Fund is or is not a part of the Government of Alberta. It's my understanding it's a part of the Department of Industry and Commerce that the board reports to the minister.

The exercise is somewhat one of semantics. Is the government, by this motion, trying to suggest that it does not have any authority over the fund or the operation of the board? And that the wording in the Act that deals with the relationship between the minister and the board is meaningless? Are we surrendering \$50 million in public money to a board answerable to no one?

I think the question of the amendment is fundamental and very pertinent as to what type of creature has been set up by this Legislature for the administration of a substantial amount of public money.

While the wording may not seem particularly significant, I think it should be clearly on record that an exercise such as this amendment clearly does not absolve the government and the minister of any responsibility for the operation of the fund.

Subject to that qualification, I would think that maybe we don't have any particular objections to the amendment but if it is an effort on the part of the minister, as I say, to abandon all responsibility in the matter, then I suggest the members of the House should reconsider it. Because in the Act it says the minister means the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and the minister is charged with the basic responsibility for the administration of the Act.

If the suggestion is that the government is in no way responsible, the minister is in no way responsible or accountable in reporting to this House for the operation of the Alberta Opportunity program, then I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment is not in order. If it is a slight exercise in semantics on the part of the government, because of its sensitivity about the secrecy in the manner in which the fund is operating, well then this is another matter. But I do think we should have the question clarified as to what is the basic purpose and intent of the Act. Is it to abdicate responsibility on the part of the minister and on the part of the government? If it is, the amendment clearly is completely unacceptable.

MR. SPEAKER:

It would appear we are into a debate. I would take it that that's the submission of the hon. Leader of the Opposition with regard to the debate. The hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce previously was answering a question from

the mover of the motion. If the House would agree that that does not exhaust his right to speak, perhaps he might speak on the motion now, since he has indicated a wish to have the floor.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, after listening to the hon. Leader of the Opposition give that drivel about how long we are trying to hide things, you know, it gets just a little disturbing. But on the other hand, allow me to suggest this, Mr. Speaker, that the appraisers and the evaluators make their application to the company, not to the government. That's the reason for the amendment.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, a quick perusal of the proposed amendment, which is a substitution for No. (1), raises just one question: Is all correspondence that comes to the government turned over to the company? If all the correspondence concerning these applications coming to a minister or to the department of the hon. minister is turned over to the company, then the two are very much the same, other than the one point raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. If all correspondence is not turned over to the company then, of course, there is quite a significant difference between the amendment and the original motion.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question on the amendment? Does the hon. Member for Calgary Millican wish to speak on the amendment?

MR. DIXON:

Yes, I just thought that maybe there was somebody who wanted to go before me, Mr. Speaker. No, I think that the --

[Interjections]

We're speaking on the amendment, Mr. Speaker. Section 18 of The Alberta Opportunity Fund Act places full responsibility on the government, and I believe, as a Legislature we should be talking to the government about legislation rather than regulation. I feel that it is very essential that we get as much information as possible, because I believe the hon. minister himself during the debate the other day, covering problems with the Alberta Opportunity Company stated, Mr. Speaker, that they were going to try and get appraisers from all over Alberta to do this work. If you look at any of the appraisal work that is being carried out, some appraisers are from as far away as 100 or 200 miles, doing appraisal work that could be carried out right in the neighbourhood where the project is being built. Of course, we're having a little difficulty in finding the exact location of some of these, but I hope the appraiser doesn't have the same difficulty.

In any case, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that I really have no objection to the amendment, but I think you've got to take a look at the amendment in light of Section 18 of the Act, because it spells out there that:

The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations establishing qualifications for commercial enterprises eligible for loans and guarantees under this act...

and so on. I could read it all, Mr. Speaker:

[b] assigning additional duties and functions to the company;

[c] governing the operation of the fund

[d] governing the granting of the loans and giving guarantees

[e] specifying the boards, corporations, commissions and institutions with which the company may enter into agreements under Section 16.

And "f" which is the most important one: "Respecting any matter necessary or advisable for carrying out the intent and purpose of this act." So I see no reason why the government is anxious to amend the motion because I think it is fairly clear what we are asking for, and any correspondence the Alberta

government received would automatically be turned over to the Alberta Opportunity Fund if this fund is the final authority, as the minister points out, in authorizing appraisers. So really I see no need for the amendment.

Secondly, on the amendment, the last part at the end of clause (5), "subject to the concurrence of the parties involved", there is nothing here. It is not like a company applying for a loan. These are people offering their services. There is nothing confidential about that; they would be glad to broadcast it. I am sure that hon. members who had a business here would be pleased to notice that they are interested in doing business with the government because they are proud of the work they are able to do.

I don't feel it is necessary for the parties involved to give the OK in this case. I think the minister may -- and I may not even agree with him at that -- he may even say, well they are asking for loans. But they are not asking for loans. They are not asking for grants. They are inquiring as to whether their appraisal services can be used in appraising loans under the Alberta Opportunity Fund.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I feel the amendment itself adds nothing to the original motion, and as far as I am concerned, the original motion should stand. But apparently the government thinks otherwise and we will have to leave it to the vote in the House as to whether we want to agree with the amendment or not. But personally I feel it is redundant as far as this particular motion is concerned.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question on the amendment?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The amendment was carried.]

MR. SPEAKER:

Is there any discussion on the motion as amended?

[The motion as amended was carried.]

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Buckwell proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Sorenson.

That the contract between the Government of Alberta and the RCMP be referred to the Standing Committee On Law and Law Amendments to review possible limitations in the contract to guarantee that in the future the RCMP will not be used as a vehicle for investigating private citizens for political purposes.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, as the subject matter of this motion has been mainly dealt with during the estimates for the Attorney General's department, I ask the consent of the House to withdraw this motion from the Order Paper.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it that the hon. Member for Macleod and his seconder have the leave of the House unanimously to withdraw Motion No. 1 on today's Order Paper?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[The motion was withdrawn.]

2. Mr. Ruste proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Sorenson:

Be it resolved that, the Government of Alberta make representations to the federal government requesting that the capital gains on the sale of a farm by parent(s) to their child (children) be exempt from tax the same as is being done on the death of a parent, in order to assist in the preservation of the family farm.

MR. RUSTE:

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that there have been some announcements or allusions to announcements from the federal House on this whole matter, but I feel that certainly those of us in this Assembly can lend assistance to the implementation of that by discussing this resolution and by carrying it to the extent that it becomes, in fact, law.

Certainly I think that in the Department of Agriculture we have had courses on the new Income Tax Act, the laws and so on, and it is rather interesting to tie it in with the capital gains tax and the estate tax and so on.

I came across a quotation as follows: "Estate planning has sometimes been described as a means of passing from this world into the next without passing through the tax department." Now it is not my intention this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, to deal with terms such as that nor definitions such as we see in a recent edition of [Ottawa] Hansard as follows, under [Marginal note] Extended meaning of 'child': (2) "For the purposes of this section, 'child' of a taxpayer includes a child of his child and a child of his child's child."

It is not my intention as I say, Mr. Speaker, to get into that type of detail but I believe it is pretty important that this is discussed here and that the intent of the resolution be carried in law as it relates to the farming public of this province. Certainly with the decline in the farm population as we have seen it over a period of years, at times it is faster than others, but it seems as though there is a consistent decline. When you look at the average age of a farmer, there is 40 per cent over 55 years of age and there are farmers today who are probably active at 75 operating their own farm at that age.

Another factor that gives a lot of concern I believe, is the fact of increase in prices. When you get a capital gains on prices that are inflationary, certainly this has a sad effect when it comes in to the matter of capital gains taxation.

Now I'd like to refer to the Budget speech of the hon. Mr. Turner as related in Hansard of February 19. I'd just like to take the opportunity to quote from that.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to draw your attention to another matter which is of great importance, namely the preservation of the family farm. Under the present rules when a farmer dies and leaves his farm to his children he is treated as if he has sold his farm at its fair market value. In the result there may be a capital gains tax liability.

And he goes on:

For many of our farmers this poses a serious problem. First the value of the farmer's land is often subject to fluctuations which have little bearing on the real value of that land as a farm. Second, most small farmers have little available cash and have already exhausted their credit. Therefore, a tax liability at a time when there has been no real sale may leave the family of the deceased farmer with no alternative but to sell out.

And then he goes on to say:

To remedy this problem, I propose that, effective January 1, 1972, when a farmer dies and leaves his farm to his children, there will be no deemed sale of his farm land. In the result, capital gains tax will apply only if the farm is sold, if the land is not being used as a farm at the time of death, or if it is not left to the family.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that spells out the intent presented at the time of the Federal Budget.

I submit there are rumours of other changes. However, I think in looking through Hansard you will also find, following that, a committee was set up:

...a joint interdepartmental committee -- agriculture, finance, and national revenue -- to review the effect of The Income Tax Act upon agriculture and farmers generally, and that subject, of course, would be one of those that will be reviewed.

I would hope that the government has made representations to that committee and that has probably had some of the bearings that will be, hopefully, reported as a change.

Now certainly, you could get into a lot of legal arrangements that could be made in the transfer of a farm from father to son, or from parents to children. I think there is a need for something straightforward and simple, such as this resolution calls for.

If a person is going to have to wait as a parent until he literally drops dead in his tracks before he can turn the farm over without capital gains to his children, then I submit, Mr. Speaker, there are many that will have operated well beyond their best years of efficiency. And certainly at that time also, many of the family may well have chosen other ways of life, rather than farming.

I would submit that in society today where the retirement age is being lowered, surely it is only fair to expect that a farmer can retire reasonably early, that he can transfer, sell the farm to his family so he will have a continuation of the family farm. In this resolution this would set out and do exactly that.

So I would submit, Mr. Speaker, without going into a lot of detail, a lot of the terms used in taxation, capital gains and so, I would ask that the members of this Assembly support this resolution as it would help to assist in the continuation of the family farm.

Now there are others that could be covered as well in this; many small family businesses could be covered as well. But I believe the federal government has given the exemption in the first case on the death of a parent in transfer and I would ask that the members of this Assembly support this resolution so the intent of it can be carried forward. Thank you.

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion I would like to begin by commending the hon. Member for Wainwright for his very able presentation. His speech before the Legislature this afternoon has been very informative indeed.

I want to mention a few things pertaining to the motion and to farming in general, leaving ample time for others to participate in the debate this afternoon.

Farming is a challenging and fulfilling occupation. The young farmer trying to get started will learn that being young is his greatest asset. If young prospective farmers of today had been born in grandfather's time and had had to contend with the mule and the outdoor water works and the binding and stooking and thrashing they might not have been very interested in farming. Even so, good luck to the young farmer of today. He will certainly need his share of it.

I certainly favour the action cited in this motion. What about the family farm? Does it have a bright future or is it losing the battle? How do farm leaders today view the situation? Well I looked for other people's comments on the subject but found there wasn't a great deal available. While checking at a local bookstore recently the attendant inquired, "What book are you looking for and who is the author?" Well I had no specific book in mind and no specific author, just something on the family farm. But wouldn't it be nice to read an article entitled, "We Have Saved the Family Farm" by our federal Minister of Agriculture, or perhaps something by the United States Secretary of Agriculture, or even by our own Minister of Agriculture. Perhaps he could write, "How We Keep Them Down On The Farm."

But I'm not aware of anyone who has written a positive position on how to carry on the small farm or the family farm. United States farmers are leaving en masse. I noticed a heading the other day entitled, "A Farmer Leaves Every Couple of Minutes." Who is replacing that farmer? Well, perhaps another individual farmer, a corporate farm, a communal farm or a non-resident farmer.

Our federal ministers certainly haven't brought in legislation to stem the flow of farmers from the land. I would like to cite an illustration of which I am well aware. A farmer was farming five quarters of land. He was renting two

of those quarters. He had rented for many, many years and it had worked out very well between this farmer and the man he was renting from. But one day a young man came along to the man who owned the half section and said, "I'd like to buy your farm and I'll pay so much." The farmer thought, "Well, I just can't turn that down." So he went to the man who was renting and asked him if he would like to buy the farm. But the man said, "No, I don't believe I can pay that much." So the half section was lost to that farmer.

In a couple of years the farmer that had three quarters remaining decided it would be a good time for him to pull out. And now just recently the young man who bought the half section here and a half section there and a half section over there also has decided that he can't make the grade. So he will be moving to the city.

What is the situation in Alberta today? There is a farm sale every day in my area of which I am aware. In fact they average more than a sale a day. I visited a farm a week ago Saturday that had had a sale two days previously and I noticed 15 sale bills on the side of a granary. The auctioneers are booked solid.

I remember the last special area meeting I attended and I sat with the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen. A very elderly man gave a report from his particular area. He mentioned how years ago neighbour children would come over and play with his children, he could see lights of neighbouring farms, he could hear the neighbour's dog barking on occasion. But that was all in the past. It wasn't possible anymore. And very seriously he said, "If we're going to raise cats out there we have to keep our own tomcat." And he meant that. The farms are just so far apart.

Much easier it is to write a book entitled, The Great Exodus From the Farm. I have made a list of what contributes to this exodus, and it is in no way complete. But low return on investment would be number one. Difficulty in obtaining suitable farm labour would be number two. I remember last fall how the call went out to townspeople to go out into the farming areas and help the farmer. Some of them did, but it was so cold in my area and the townspeople, perhaps, weren't dressed for the occasion. It didn't help all that much.

There is a lack of long-term, low interest money in the industry; machinery costs are rising out of sight; and long hours of hard work are necessary to make a farming operation viable.

I think of a young man who decided he would like to go farming. He had some farming experience and then moved to the city, but he wanted to return to the farm. His name was Simpson. He hired on with quite a large farmer. It was in the springtime. They started early in the morning doing chores, went out to pick rocks and roots, returned home for supper and went out to do chores again. This went on for a couple of days. One evening as they finished work about 10:00 p.m., he went to the boss and said, "Boss, do you know my name?" The boss said, "What?" "Well, do you know my name?" "Yes," the boss said. "Your name is Simpson." The young fellow said, "Well, yes. I thought you figured I was Samson."

Well, lumber costs are high. Fence posts, wire -- you name it -- and it's all right upstairs. There is the danger of elevator and rail line closures, in addition to taxes and easier living elsewhere.

I took a little clipping from a United States paper that mentions something on this point.

Canada's Unemployment Insurance Commission recently noted over 30 weekly jobless cheques were going to the same swank ski resort. Investigators found the recipients were avid skiers in their 20s, including some in sweaters emblazoned "UIC Ski Team." The upshot: a halt to the UIC's "sponsorship" of the team.

Many young people just find an easier living elsewhere than on the farm. There are many obstacles in the way of a son or daughter who wishes to continue the family farm. But I do want to close on an optimistic note. I think there are exciting days ahead in farming. I note that there are rape processing plants coming in other parts of the province, one in the north. I very much hope that there will be one in the central part of the province. We have a nice spot picked for it.

I think some of the greatest news is in livestock. Here is a report from Montana.

Before the end of the 1970s, beef producers may be able to breed an entire herd in a single day, super ovulation may be commonplace and abortion in cattle may have become a thing of the past, predicts Dr. Floyd Pahnish of the U.S. Range Experiment Station in Miles City, Mont.

As an example, Dr. Pahnish reports that a group of cows treated to produce multiple births at the Miles City Experiment Station resulted in five sets of twins. He also foresees major breakthroughs in crossbreeding. "We are going to emphasize evaluation of performance on foreign breeds recently introduced into this country, breeds like the Swiss Simmental and the French Limousin."

Well, will we win the battle of the family farm? Well, let's try. I think this motion points in the right direction.

DR. HORNBER:

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with this motion it is like dealing with most of the things Social Credit puts forward. It's sort of after the fact and after everything has been done and accomplished.

However, seeing how the mover and the seconder decided to have a little blurb on the family farm, I thought it might be wise to do a little bit of a survey on what, in fact, this government has done in relation to the family farm and how we have helped to preserve it and strengthen it in the Province of Alberta in the past 18 months or 19 months or thereabouts.

In regard to the resolution itself, Mr. Speaker, that has, of course, been resolved, and as a matter of fact, if the hon. Member for Wainwright had been reading the newspaper, it is my understanding that those amendments have been passed by the federal House of Commons and are in the other group of amendments relating to The Income Tax Act previously.

As a matter of fact, if he'd also like to know, both myself and the hon. Provincial Treasurer made substantial representations over the past several months with regard to the question of the capital gains tax and the family farm and the removal of it if it were transferred within the family. And that is my understanding of the recent amendments passed by the federal House. As a matter of fact, I think it was either yesterday or Friday that those things were passed by the federal House.

So that takes care of the primary question of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, but I feel sure that hon. members would like to know or to have a review of the matters relating to the preservation of the family farm and the things we think are important to that preservation.

If I could start by suggesting that one of the major things is the making available to farm families throughout Alberta those kinds of necessities or infrastructures that everybody else takes for granted; the question of the provision of sewer and water; and an adequate water supply for their operation and for their domestic use.

What have we done in this area, Mr. Speaker? I think it needs to be said very clearly, so that we have some review of this matter. In regard to the question of sewer and water there are substantial grants now available under the ARDA program for the drilling of water supplies for livestock operations. There are substantial grants now available under PFRA from the federal government also in relation to water supplies. And in response to our urging, the federal government has reinstituted the dugout program in which they pay up to \$550 in the development of dugouts on the farm.

The other area of sewer and water in which we have made it more readily available is through the dairy loan program which we brought in a year ago and intend to upgrade in the very near future. Under that program, interest-free loans were made available to young farmers and one of the things they could use them for was sewer and water facilities tied into the dairy farm program.

Next let me deal briefly, Mr. Speaker, with the other sort of utilities that the farmer needs to have if we're going to have a similar kind of standard of living to that which they have in the urban areas. We talked briefly with regard to telephones. My colleague, the Minister of Telephones and Utilities, announced in the House recently the expansion of extended area service to substantially lower the cost and improve the kind of standard of living that we require in rural Alberta.

I would point out to my friends that this was a program they started back in '67 or earlier, but stopped dead in, in 1969, and their failure to carry on with this extended area service program and make available telephone service in a proper and reasonable way caused them more problems in rural Alberta than probably any other major thing they did. Instead of that, they bought the argument given them by some top people in AGT -- well, it was the City of Calgary and the other urban areas subsidizing the rural underground program and they really couldn't afford any money for an extended area service.

If they had had some knowledge about what was happening in the rural areas, Mr. Speaker, they would have known that, in fact, what happened was that the rural underground program substantially increased the income that AGT was making because it added a substantial number of subscribers to their list, and this provided them with enough income, Mr. Speaker. And if anybody wants to question that, I suggest that they spend a little time in studying the annual report of the AGT and we'll find that the increase in toll revenues more than pays for the underground that they put --

MR. BUCKWELL:

It couldn't even pay the interest on the debt.

DR. HORNER:

Oh fiddle -- they're paying the interest on the debt very easily and, in fact, the increase in toll revenue, Mr. Speaker, is the remarkable thing if the hon. members have looked at that program.

We move on from the telephone situation to the question of rural electricity; the question of improving and making sure that power is available to our farmers at a reasonable rate, and extending the program we now have to a larger area of the province.

I can announce, Mr. Speaker, in this area that we intend very shortly to bring in a program to cover the necessary additions or extensions required in the areas not now served, in a reasonable way wherein the maximum amount charged will be similar to an average of what others have had to pay under similar circumstances, and the additional amount will be financed. I think the idea was first put forward by the hon. Member for Whitecourt in relation to an interest-free loan under Part II of the Revolving Fund, to make sure that our farmers in those areas, in fact, have access to rural power.

In regard to rural gas, of course, the Minister of Telephones and Utilities will be making an announcement in the near future in that regard. I would just say this, though; after spending four years in the Legislature asking the previous government to set up some boundaries to do something about rural gas without getting any response whatsoever during that entire four years, I find it rather strange that my hon. friends can't be a little bit patient to make sure that we have a reasonable program that will be fair to our farmers.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

DR. HORNER:

And I can assure them that that's exactly what will happen.

MR. HENDERSON:

I wonder if the hon. minister would permit a question?

DR. HORNER:

Well, at the end of my speech, Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to entertain any questions from the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I have a little bit more to go, Mr. Speaker, in outlining the things we have done for the family farm, because there seems to be some lack of knowledge over there in relation to some of these programs, and I thought it might be a good idea to outline them in some detail so they wouldn't lose sight of where we're going.

The major infrastructures I have covered so far, Mr. Speaker, are the question of the provision of sewer and water, the question of telephones, the question of rural power, the question of rural gas. We could go on and talk about rural housing, but I want to talk about that when I come to the general

field of credit and how it can be used and what we have done in that area to improve housing standards and hopefully to improve them even more in the future.

Probably the next most important infrastructure in rural Alberta to the family farm is the question of roads. We went through an expedition in Alberta where, again, because the former government lost confidence in itself, lost confidence in the Province of Alberta to provide the necessary wherewithal to build roads, they, in fact, had a de-escalating program of road building in Alberta. It was going down instead of increasing. Even though our needs and the needs of Alberta were increasing, their road program was going down and down all the time.

In 1966 they had a major program under way, or they had major conferences and they got everybody together to decide what kind of a secondary road program they wanted and that's about where it stayed, Mr. Speaker, until the year before the election. Then there was a token handing out of small sections of road here and there throughout the province in a sort of last desperate gasp to try and get the rural people of Alberta back on their side. It didn't work and so we've had a different approach to the question of secondary roads.

The 900-series roads have now been taken for all intents and purposes into the prime highway system, something that we asked for for years and never got. The amount of spending on the secondary road program has, in fact, more than doubled. The amount of grants to municipalities in relation to road building and maintenance has improved. The entire operation of providing the necessary roads has to be a major factor in the preservation of the family farm. And I might say here, Mr. Speaker, that I don't say for a moment that we have to have a continuing increase in the number and the kind of secondary roads that are built in Alberta if we are going to be really effective in maintaining the family farm in rural Alberta. There's no doubt about that at all, even though we have come a long way, in doubling it within two budgets. It may well be necessary to improve that allocation of funds for additional roads if we really mean what we say in talking about the preservation of the family farm.

I could spend some time, Mr. Speaker, talking about the importance of this, about how, after you have ploughed mud, dust, gravel and rock for a number of years, sometimes in a moment of weakness you throw up your hands and say, well, it's pretty obvious they are never going to do anything for me so I might as well move out. A lot of people in Alberta did just that. They moved off the farm, not because they didn't want to stay there but because they couldn't get any transportation to that farm that was halfway decent.

I want to move on then to some of the other factors that are important in maintaining the family farm and improving the situation there. I think one of the really important things is to provide them with the necessary facilities so they can have proper farm organization meetings, fairs, recreation facilities.

We've had a major program in Alberta in the past two years in regard to agricultural societies. We've made some major changes in who can form those societies. We have become flexible in that regard to encourage people to become involved in agricultural societies, not only for the recreational facilities and the leisure-time activities that this provides, but more primarily to bring back some pride into their area production, to talk about the quality that is required in relation to maintaining the family farm in that kind of situation in which they are producing quality goods. I think that all ties in.

I haven't heard any complaints from any hon. member from either side of the House with regard to our agricultural society programs. As a matter of fact, I have heard a lot of very good things from most of the areas of the province. My hon. friend from Lesser Slave Lake apparently points at him and he says he doesn't agree with this program. Well, he may not in Lesser Slave Lake, but I want to tell him that I know the people in High Prairie do, and they are pretty encouraged by this government's policies in agriculture related to the family farm. If he is not aware of it, he should wander over to High Prairie occasionally and find out about it, because they are looking for him and they don't see him that often.

I want to move, then, Mr. Speaker, to some of the other areas that are important if we are going to preserve the family farm and upgrade it to make sure that we do have that kind of preservation that the resolution talks about. I think then we should talk for a moment about the cost or the inputs that a farmer has in relation to his production and his net income -- the cost of machinery.

My hon. friend from Smoky River introduced our attempt to improve the warranty and improve the necessary provision of parts in relation to The Farm

Implement Act, and my hon. friend from Wainwright didn't mention it in his speech. He tried to ...[Inaudible]... the question, but what he doesn't understand, of course, is the difference between our act and that which Manitoba brought in, because of which the implement companies in Manitoba have decided they require another 4.5 per cent on their prices because of the very stringency of the Act.

We think that with the operation of our Farm Machinery Appeal Board and their recommendations, we can work together with industry Farm Machinery Appeal Board and their recommendations, we can work together with industry to provide our farmers with machinery, at least without causing increases in the price and making sure that the parts are available. We intend to pursue this and make sure that they are.

There is another very important area if we are going to improve the quality of production and improve the kind of return that our farmer gets, and that's in relation to the provision of chemicals in a whole manner of areas, including fertilizer, other agricultural chemicals, some of the chemicals that are involved in the livestock industry. I can say that anybody who feels we haven't done anything in this area should talk to the secretary-manager of the Rural Municipalities Association and let him tell you about the kind of support that he has received from this government and the amount of money they have been able to save their members and the farmers of Alberta last year. It was pretty substantial, Mr. Speaker.

I would want to say something with regard to the fertilizer situation because there is some fear on the part of some farmers and some dealers that major fertilizer companies are diverting supplies to other areas. I want to suggest that if this continues it may well be necessary to deal with fertilizer companies in the same manner that we have had to deal with the farm machinery vendors, and give not only the fertilizer dealers, but the farmers of Alberta some protection so that the fertilizer manufactured in Alberta will, in fact, be made available to them. We are following this area and we intend to follow that up.

Another really important area that ties not only into the farmer's ability to improve his net income, but also into the ability of the farmer to enjoy his life and to get the greatest satisfaction out of it, comes in relation to the field of education. I don't need to supplement what the Minister of Education said last night with regard to his estimates in that area, but I did want to talk for a moment about the provision of farm management courses, the other special courses that have been put on by my department in conjunction with that of Advanced Education in relation to a whole variety of things. Some of them are technically farm oriented and some are oriented to the cultural aspects of living. All of these have been extended in a major way in the past two years to the benefit of our family farms in Alberta.

I then want to come to what I consider to be one of the most important areas and I think that while I have mentioned it before in the House, it probably deserves repetition. That's the question of the provision of credit. As I have said before, the former government, the banks, the federal government in the area from 1967 to 1971 had a marked contraction of credit that was available to farmers. So we have had in the last year and a half, a tremendous demand for this kind of credit. That's talking primarily about the Agricultural Development Corporation's lending procedures. But if you just think about the amount of money that we as a government have put out in the last year and a half in relation to guaranteed loans on livestock and the feeder association loans, this was pretty substantial, Mr. Speaker, something in the neighbourhood of \$48 million.

Practically all of that, Mr. Speaker, was made available to the small farmer, 99 per cent of it made available to the family farm. That is a pretty substantial injection of credit where, in my view, it will do the most good. That is above and beyond or outside of the activity of the Agricultural Development Corporation in which we loaned something like \$8 million last year. That is over and above and beyond the amount of money that may have been loaned by the Opportunity Company in regard to certain processing operations and other inventory financing that is associated with the processing industry. That has to be, Mr. Speaker, a major commitment to the family farm of Alberta, and again I stress, 99.9 per cent of that money in the feeder association lending and in the livestock loan program has gone to family farms because of the way the program was set up and the way it has been used.

Just very briefly, Mr. Speaker, we can't talk about preserving the family farm unless we talk about the end result of the availability of markets and the opportunity to market at a reasonable level. We have discussed in this House

before the question of rapeseed marketing and our dispute with the Canadian Wheat Board in relation to the ability of our farmers to deliver to processing plants within Alberta. Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, under a fair amount of pressure from this government and from farmers who know what the facts are, the Canadian Wheat Board has now declared an open quota for rapeseed both to crushers and elevators. But that took a fair amount of pressure to arrive at. On the other hand, if we hadn't been able to get that open quota we would have lost substantial contracts for processed rapeseed, for oil and meal, particularly in South America.

I want to mention another one that I have never mentioned before that has become pretty important and underlines a necessity that if we are going to do something about preserving the family farm, we had better stop the drain of money away from our farmers in Alberta.

I want to talk for a moment, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question of beer and barley, the question of malt, the question of where it is produced and what it has done to our family farm in Alberta. Generally, Mr. Speaker, we produce about 24 million bushels of malting barley, or there are 24 million bushels used for malting in Canada. Twenty million bushels of that malting barley is produced in Alberta. Our farmers have received a premium of between three and five cents a bushel to...[Inaudible]...good farmers and deliver this particular kind of barley for malting. The maltsters, or the people who use this barley, have had to pay the Canadian Wheat Board on an average an additional 25 cents a bushel as a premium. I ask all hon. members particularly those, and my friend from Macleod to do some quick figuring and you'll find that that 25 cents a bushel means that our farmers in Alberta have been losing on an average of \$5 million a year.

When those who believe that the Canadian Wheat Board is a sacred cow can give me an answer to that one, I would appreciate hearing about it. In my view, we've been short changed, because our farmers who produce the malting barley have had to allow that premium on that barley to go into the general pool to be spread across all the farmers of western Canada, or alternatively, as has happened on a number of occasions, to pay the costs of the operation of the Wheat Board when it was in a deficit position. All it meant was that we in Alberta provided \$5 million that the federal government did not have to pick up because we were good enough to grow malting barley in Alberta.

Those are some implications, Mr. Speaker, of a recent survey that I have had undertaken by the Alberta Grain Commission: that, along with the increase in the export price of barley we were able to negotiate last year in which we saved more money by negotiating the Vancouver price for barley for the people in the Peace River country than they did by building the railroad. This additional information with regard to the question of what we are losing because the Canadian Wheat Board refuses to have a separate pool for malting barley or alternatively doesn't allow the provinces to look after malting barley has cost our farmers substantially. We intend to carry that one forward.

That brings me, Mr. Speaker, and I don't want to be too long, to the other end result. That is the question of marketing, the question of being aware of, and being able to get involved in the marketing situation around the world. I have spent some time in the House on previous occasions in this area, that the worst possible thing that the family farmers of Alberta could do would be to put their heads in the sand and say, "We are not concerned about what is happening around the world." In the final analysis whether or not we preserve the family farm in Alberta really depends upon the kinds of markets that we can find around the world that will take the produce that our family farms can produce. If we are not interested in doing that then we can't be interested in preserving the family farm.

Those are some of the things very briefly, Mr. Speaker. There are a number of others I could talk about that have been coming up directly related to preserving the family farm. As I said we have made our representations to the federal government in relation to the specifics in the resolution. That has now gone ahead and has been passed by the federal House of Commons. I would think my hon. friends should also think about the other things that are so important if we are really going to preserve the family farm.

I appreciate the indulgence, Mr. Speaker, of being able to discuss the general preservation of the family farm. But after the hon. member who proposed the motion wasn't willing to withdraw it from the Order Paper even though the action had been completed, I thought perhaps he was asking for a resume of what this government has done in relation to preserving the family farm, and I thank you for your indulgence.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to speak but like the hon. Minister of Agriculture I think he fairly well welcomed the opportunity to go through his song and dance again. He has a pretty good act. Now a lot of the things he mentioned, rural life programs, say, for sewer and water to raise the standard of living, I don't think anybody in the country or anybody in this Assembly disagrees with him.

But I do not think there were many farms that didn't have the rural telephones. There weren't that many who didn't have power. There weren't that many that, if they didn't have natural gas, could not have had oil or propane. In fact I use propane myself.

But one thing in this respect goes back to the hon. Minister of Telephones, and the hon. Deputy Premier went through it again, that all of sudden these boys or the government are the men on the white chargers coming to the rescue of the people in Alberta as far as extended rural telephone service is concerned.

And when we went back to 1969, Mr. Reiersen was Minister of Telephones and had been pressured on all sides because this was a long program, this buried cable, and a very expensive program. There wasn't the money to do both so he said that until we are underground we are not going to go any further with the extended telephone areas. This is the last year of the buried telephone. The hon. minister says what a bccn putting in the extended telephone is going to be to rural Alberta. I agree that it is. We have embarked on a \$72 million buried telephone program. In 1972, according to your own figures put out by the Department of Industry and Resources, you had 590,000 telephones in Alberta owned and operated by AGT. There are only 800,037 in Alberta and out of these, 237,000 came from the City of Edmonton.

Now we only have 60,000 farmers in Alberta.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sixty-three.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Sixty-three. And you have a program that cost you \$72 million. So what it has amounted to and this is exactly what I quipped back to the hon. Deputy Premier, it has cost on the average to put a phone in a rural farm in Alberta \$1,200. On my farm -- we just got it this year -- I'm paying \$3.65 a month. So I'm not even paying for the interest on the money that put in my telephone. This is what I'm saying. Rural Alberta is getting a good deal because the City of Calgary and all the other urban centres, heavily populated centres, are going to pick up the bill for rural Alberta.

We ran cable in rural Alberta, in the foothills of Alberta, back 30 miles to one farm. You can't tell me that \$4 a month is even going to begin to pay the interest on the money, never mind the stamps it takes to send out the bills.

I don't want to take away from the hon. minister. I think it's his drive really that is trying to put this program over. But this is a way of life, this farming, and it is not only applicable to Alberta, but all of Canada, the United States, even France and Europe, the drain away from the farms. There is no way you are going to stop it unless we get better markets, or unless this easy way of living we have within urban Alberta is going to dry up. As far as I am concerned, the farm or the ranch is the place to be. But then this is my way of looking at it. If I want to make a living, maybe we shouldn't be on the farm at all.

I agree with the hon. minister that he has put up a lot of money for livestock programs and guaranteed loans. There is nothing wrong with this. But if we have to put out money of this magnitude, as far as the gross sales of agricultural products are concerned in Alberta and western Canada -- they have never been higher than they were last year. What are we going to do if times get tough, and we have to pay these bills back?

Young fellows today are trying to buy farms for from anywhere from \$50,000 to \$100,000. The man who is selling it is getting ample for what his place is worth. But at 8 per cent there is no way a young fellow today, over and above his living, can make 8 per cent to pay off his debt. There is just no way he can do it. This is why the older fellows are selling out because they realize that if they stay on much longer they can't make it either. So let's get out while the going is good.

Now this family farm, this buoyancy we are talking about -- I am not going to go into his malting barley; there are a lot of things, actually away off the resolution. But the hon. Deputy Premier's last three words, I think, on that resolution. Something about the -- preservation of the family -- five words, "the preservation of the family farm", so let's give her another go.

I was rather glad in a way that he did. As I said in this House before, and I'll say it again, I admire what he is trying to do. I think it is one of these problems that, if we are going to save the family farm it should get out of the political arena altogether because there is too much at stake to play politics with what is going on.

I think one of the things the hon. Member for Highwood mentioned some years ago was that it is surprising what a man can do if he doesn't mind who gets the credit. As I said, I don't mind giving the credit to the hon. Deputy Premier because when things get bad he is going to get enough knocks as it is, so he might as well smile when he can. But I do feel that he has put his heart and soul into it, and in fairness to the man, you've got to give him 100 per cent for trying.

In closing, I am glad he had the opportunity. I imagine he will probably find another one before this spring session is over to give us the whole load again. Thank you.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly get a great smile when I listen to the hon. Member for Macleod. I think probably it is truthful to say that under the former Social Credit government and under the leadership of the former member for Sedgewick-Coronation -- pardon me, the hon. Member for Wainwright -- I can only understand that if the former Minister of Agriculture had 50 per cent of the drive that our minister now has, I believe the farmers in Alberta would be a lot better off.

But for your information, hon. member and Mr. Speaker, you know I have been on the farm a long time. I have just visited in the past year, and perhaps down in your area also, many farmers who have farm dwellings still heated by the old coal stove, the old Quebec heater. Now you may shake your head, but it is true.

If you have children who are growing up, who are going to look at a parent who has probably been on that farm all his lifetime and still has an outdoor privy, has no running water, and barely has electricity, you can certainly agree with the young fellow who, when he arrives on the threshold of 18 or 19 years, will end up somewhere in an urban society.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation mentioned all these sale bills on this granary. I happened to attend a sale just north of Wetaskiwin in the spring of 1971, and I don't have to remind the hon. members of this House what the price of pork was at that time. I know that it was 18 or 19 cents. This farmer indicated to me that he had built a \$48,000 hog barn completely automated. But he could not afford to put one hog in that barn, because for every hog he put in that barn he would go \$5 in the hole.

Now, Mr. Speaker, maybe the hon. members who are not farmers in this House do not realize the tremendous pressure put upon the farm community and the farmstead itself in the period of 1969, 1970 and 1971. I wager that there wouldn't be 50 per cent or less that made a dollar on the farm. They lived on the depreciation. This is all they existed on. And many of the farmers in that period of time owed tremendous bank accounts, loans.

You remember in the spring of 1972, Mr. Speaker, there was a motion or a question asked in the House: What is the government going to do on the foreclosures now happening in the Peace River Bloc? Well, Mr. Speaker, I spent about eight days this summer in the Peace River Bloc, and I believe hon. members should tour the countryside as I think the hon. Minister of Agriculture has done. He has seen what is going on, and if we are not going to put some effort or some money into the agricultural community we're going to have not 63,000 farmers but 20,000, and those 20,000 farmers are going to dictate the price on bread and butter which the urban people will have to pay.

I think this Legislature and the ministers recognize the seriousness of the situation. But certainly the former government didn't. I think I have to give credit to the Minister of Agriculture who has so much foresight that there has to be some part of society which has to help in order to keep the cost of food down.

Now it's true that the markets were lagging. There was no initiative on the part of the government before to even try to sell a pound of pork. There was no initiative. Nobody went out to make an effort to get rid of the surpluses. Now we haven't got surpluses; now we're looking elsewhere to get our milk and butter.

So, Mr. Speaker, I cannot agree with the hon. Member for Macleod. If it does not pay for the people of Alberta to invest some money in the future of agriculture, then I think you and I who are sitting here in this House today have missed the boat.

Mr. Speaker, when we look at the number of sale bills hanging out today, it is not because the farmers are not getting some fair return on their dollar. Because they are now trying to pay off the debts they incurred in 1969, 1970 and 1971. The picture today is much brighter on the farm than it was back there in 1969 and 1971. However, there is one danger and I think we have to watch it.

A baler in 1969, a No. 12 Massey Baler, was selling for about \$2,200. Today that very same baler is \$3,200. So if the price of machinery is going to creep higher than the proceeds on which the farmer will get a return then I think the final conclusion must come that somewhere down there we must have a look at how farm machinery is being priced, not only in Alberta, but across Canada. It has been proven that Massey Ferguson tractors were imported from England for \$4,000 less than they were selling in the Dominion of Canada. So there must be some means by which we can have an investigation into the price of farm machinery. It is no use for us to try to increase the increased cost of food to the general public, but we also have to work for the decrease in the general use of farm machinery.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I can only agree that today, at least the farmer, not only in northern Alberta, central and southern, back in our constituencies, these people, these farmers, will now have a comfortable living. They have a choice now. They will be able to pay their share to get the same comforts there are in the urban areas. And this is the only way we can entice the young people to remain on the farm.

Mr. Speaker, I can only mention one thing I just encountered here last week. For the past four years a group of people has been trying to get power. You can imagine 22 farmers in the constituency who have never gotten power to date, and I was told by the Utility Company that it would cost anywhere from \$3,300 to \$4,600. After about two weeks of battling we finally came to a figure of somewhere around \$2,800, and I think if we work another week, we can probably get it down to \$1,800. But these are the things many people do not believe, that there are people who do not have the luxury of electricity. There are many homes in Alberta today that still haven't.

Now the hon. Member for Macleod also mentioned that it wasn't paying its way for the people to have underground cable. Mr. Speaker, I happened to be the president for a number of years of the Mutual Telephone Company that was hay-wired from pillar to post -- and this was done by the Social Credit government, too, Mr. Speaker. It was hooked up to an exchange where we were charged 25 cents a month. Actually, we paid about \$15 a year, so we were actually charged 25 cents a month for the privilege of hooking up their exchange. And when the wire fell down, when the storm came up, they immediately cut the exchange off. They said, "Go out and fix your line."

If it is profitable for AGT to operate an exchange and pay people to operate that exchange and tell you to fix the line -- and I think we had something like 300 people hooked on to the exchange, on some of those circuits there were 22 members, this was the party line.

[Interjections]

No, they weren't Social Crediters. They were for a while, but they changed their mind. They have seen the light.

Mr. Speaker, looking back -- and I am not looking back too far, I am only looking back five, six, seven years -- those were the conditions. And in some areas in this province it still exists. I think the hon. members cannot close their eyes to the fact that the people are living below the poverty level right in their own constituencies.

And how can the hon. Member for Macleod say that this is a cost to the rest of the people of the Province of Alberta. The farmers of this province, as well as across Canada, have been delivering cheap food to the general population of the Dominion of Canada and the world. And I think that fact he hasn't

recognized. I think probably the recognition will come, but it certainly can't come from the government that was in there for some 36 years that had not enough initiative to get off their butts to do something for agriculture. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member clarify his remarks on the Mutual Telephone, belonging to the Social Credit government? Because the Mutual Telephone Companies began in 1936 and became the property of the farmers themselves and paid exchange to the AGT.

If your line fell down, this was very poor management on the president's part.

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, may I answer that question?

Mr. Speaker, I will talk from experience. The former Social Credit government and the AGT, I think it must be recognized, came out there. We had some 50 miles of wire lying on the ground, and they said, "If you want a telephone, there it is. You can have it for \$1."

We didn't have that dollar, sir. Mr. Speaker, and this is the point, they wouldn't give us a dollar to fix it. We spent hour after hour after hour and when we got it fixed they put an exchange in there and they charged us two bits. Then when one circuit didn't work, they cut the exchange off and said, fix your line, but still we kept paying the two bits. Now you begrudge us, Mr. Speaker, an underground cable? We have paid for it literally over the past 15 or 20 years.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, in clarification of what I said. I never said begrudge rural Alberta for getting underground cable. It's the greatest advantage we ever had. What I suggested to the Deputy Premier was that what we were paying didn't even pay the interest on the money to put it in. As far as the Mutual Telephone Company was concerned, the government loaned money to fix it up. We didn't live that far back in the sticks that we had 300 miles down. We bought the line from the AGT and we have maintained it since 1936, cheaper than what we are paying now under the AGT.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, the only reason I really get in this debate is that when we find the Progressive Conservative party emphasizing the conservative side of their party, I always enjoy the exchanges that go with it. There is nothing really very productive about it. It's entertaining, and I think that probably summarizes the speech made by the Deputy Premier.

I always have to kind of chuckle to myself as to what tremendous popularity a politician can acquire by the simple exercise of giving away somebody else's money and lending it, you know. I agree, anybody who is giving away public money has got to be extremely popular, and that pretty well characterizes the present Deputy Premier.

I notice though, that when the argument really gets down to brass tacks the government, including the Premier, is usually at a loss to say actually where the action of the present government really in any way accounts for the improvement in the farm economy that has occurred in the last 15 months. I'm not aware, for example, of a single hog that has been sold as a result of the foreign marketing junkets on the part of the Deputy Premier and members of his department. That doesn't say everyone isn't pleased to see the expanded market, but when one stands up, dons the halo and suggests this is the result of the actions of the present administration -- I think, Mr. Speaker, we have to take it in a lighter vein. No one could really take it in a serious vein, because you know, the facts don't quite substantiate that hypothesis.

Similarly when the Deputy Premier talks about what a tremendous job they have done in bringing down the price of fertilizer -- as I recall, there was quite a glut of fertilizer on the market in the last couple of years, and I presume that's the result of the words of the Deputy Premier.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I'm sure the hon. Leader of the Opposition would like to be correct. I didn't talk about the price of fertilizer. I talked about the availability of fertilizer and the price of other chemicals.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, that's another one of the Deputy Premier's exercises in semantics, because the way I heard his words he talked about all this -- we should refer to somebody; he didn't want to talk about it himself. I guess it must be his modesty again showing through, but he talked about referring to somebody that's out -- I didn't quite catch who the gentleman was or who the gentlemen were that he talked to, who would tell them how much money the farmers had saved on the purchase of fertilizer and chemicals and so forth as a result of the actions of the new government.

I'm just wondering how the new government takes credit or blame for the fact that there was quite a glut of fertilizer on the market in the last couple of years. Obviously, Mr. Speaker, in a supply and demand economy this has a very direct bearing on the price. But once again, it doesn't mean to say we aren't pleased the farmers are getting cheaper fertilizer, but I find it difficult to follow that there is any real logic that the surplus was due to any action on the part of the Premier, or the Deputy Premier. It's pretty hard to tell who the Premier is, because we very seldom see him and we've come to recognize the Deputy Premier. So my apologies to the Deputy Premier for calling him the Premier, but I think, under the circumstances, the confusion is understandable.

MR. LUDWIG:

Thanks for the rumour.

MR. HENDERSON:

Then we go on and look at some of the other propositions the Deputy Premier has put forth and once again, I think maybe we have to take them in the lighter vein because when one stands up in this House and makes a suggestion that -- this is the story that came through to me, Mr. Speaker, from the minister's presentation, that the rural people are leaving the farms and flocking into the cities because they had poor telephones, no fuel, no roads and no recreation facilities. This has got to be -- obviously the Deputy Premier has been living in a real isolation chamber. Apparently up until September 1, 1971, he was anyhow. It's only since then he seems to have come out of his shell and found out what's going on. Because nobody in his right mind can suggest this oversimplistic view that the lack of telephone services or the fact that the rural buried co-op telephone program went ahead to keep the people on the farm, or gas co-ops by themselves keep the people on the farm, or that the lack of roads is keeping people on the farm. Because I think it can be argued quite effectively that in many ways it is the other way around.

As far as the tremendous benevolence of the new government regarding the telephone situation, I suggest it contrasts very markedly with the program they had before the election; they were going to sell AGT. So now we find what tremendous fellows they are. They happened to come into office just in the year or two that the buried telephone cable program was ending and the situation was ripe for AGT to embark in new fields and to reactivate the question of extended area dialling. But once again, when I contrast the fact that the Tories were going to get rid of AGT and sell it privately with the statements that are being made in the House now about the tremendous job they are doing and the tremendous foresight they had about improving telephone services, it gets a little hard to take the proposition of foresight very seriously, when we come to listen to the words of anybody seated opposite on the matter of Alberta Government Telephones.

Now the question of gas co-ops. I think the Deputy Premier again has tunnel vision in the matter when he suggested that nothing was done about gas installations in the rural area before September 1, 1971, because he knows full well there were gas co-ops being formed and going into operation before the election. He may have complaints about the fact they weren't going fast enough, but I would like to suggest that other than in one select area lying to the north-west of the capital of the province, the government really hasn't done very much in the area of gas co-ops.

We started out a year ago at this time when we were questioning the Deputy Premier about the gas co-op. Well he wanted to wait and said it was going to

come up later in the session, it was my recollection, and then it finally got around to the fact they realized they had bitten off more than they could chew so they had to do a big study and any decision had to await the study. Then when the study was finally done, the next question we asked them was what were they going to do about it, and they had to wait for the announcement of the government's policy on the export and pricing of natural gas.

So in the area of gas co-ops, once again, Mr. Speaker, we have a good story that the Deputy Premier is telling but thus far it is really a good story. In the final analysis, with politicians' talk it is cheaper than it is ordinarily, but in the final analysis the public is going to judge him on the basis of his actions.

Similarly, you know, when it is hypothesized that it is the poor roads that were keeping people off the farm, forcing people off the farm, I think, Mr. Speaker, anybody who has examined the situation realizes one of the factors contributing to decline of farm population has been the good roads. How many people around the country now live in town and still run their farm? I know countless people that live in the city of Edmonton and still run their farms out in the country. And it is only because they have good roads that they could do this.

[Interjections]

Well, we've been waiting for the Deputy Premier to display a streak of brilliance and tell us what the definition of a family farm is. I can't do it, and he has acknowledged that he is much smarter than I am, but I am breathlessly waiting for his definition of what a family farm is.

When one stands up in the House and tries to lead the people of this Legislature -- I don't expect anybody else is going to hear about the debate anyhow except the members of the House -- but that it has been poor roads that has forced people to leave the farm, I suggest it is good roads that has enabled people to leave. And by his hypothesis we probably should make the roads poorer because it will keep more people on the farm. That is the conclusion I would arrive at.

So as I say, on the other hand I agree with most of the words spoken by the hon. Member for Macleod that the minister -- sure he has a determination to try and do something and he's got all sorts of new thrusts involving a lot of money and a lot of largess on his part. Anybody is bound to be popular when he operates on that philosophy in the political arena.

But I think in the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, that the suggestion that the agricultural community was in a complete state of abandon and disrepair as a result of 36 years of administration by the Social Credit government, of course, it doesn't stand up. Because no government would have stayed in office 36 years if anybody other than the Deputy Premier had really believed that.

In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, we seem to have debated everything but the resolution including my contribution to the debate. The main reason I am speaking, Mr. Speaker, is that I thought it was an injustice to see the next motion come up and leave such short time available for it to be dealt with. The exercise really got down to entertainment, because that is all I could take the Deputy Premier's words as being, entertaining. But in the final analysis, I think we would have to agree that as far as the Deputy Premier is concerned, and this is what the debate seems to have got to be about and not the resolution, he is really going to go down in history as an exceptional man. He is going to go down in history as a man of exceptional foresight, who has done a tremendous job. Or he is going to go down in history as the indication of politicians getting into areas they do not know anything about. He'll undoubtedly share a reputation of being probably the worst disaster that has hit the agricultural industry, but only time will tell.

At the moment he is off and sailing to a good story. He is talking a good tale. I can't really buy all the arguments that nothing happened in Alberta before September 1, 1970. I find it difficult to find any logic to support his hypothesis that the upturn in the agriculture business is due to the foresight and the action on the part of the Deputy Premier. But we do agree he is doing an excellent job of spending a lot of money, and we sincerely hope that his efforts will benefit the people of the Province of Alberta. And ending on a serious note, that is the main thing we are all concerned about in spite of the exchange that has taken place.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would be surprised if somebody seated opposite doesn't want to spend a few words discussing the last 36 years, the last 37 years, in

the Province of Alberta and thereby avoid the embarrassment of having the next motion come up and go to the bottom of the Order Paper after only being dealt with for a matter of 10 or 20 minutes.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, I would only be too delighted to participate in the debate for a short time. Talking about non-constructive speeches and talking about speeches by members who have no appreciation of what is happening in agriculture in this province in recent months, the hon. Leader of the Opposition has once again demonstrated his lack of knowledge of what is going on, not only inside the House, but outside it. He makes the comment, Mr. Speaker, that he doesn't know of one hog that was sold in this province --

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order. I wasn't talking about the farming business, I was talking about the Deputy Premier. I think there is a little confusion. The member was not listening to what I was saying.

MR. MOORE:

Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Opposition House Leader would just sit down and listen for a while, I will point out the number of areas which he touched on where he was completely wrong, and in fact, doesn't even know, Mr. Speaker, what is going on today.

He talked about hog sales. He said that he didn't know of one hog that was sold out of this province as a result of the actions of the present Minister of Agriculture. Now, Mr. Speaker, anybody who has been paying attention to what is happening in the hog business in this province during the past year to 18 months, should in fact know that this government, together with the Alberta Hog Producers Marketing Board and a packing firm in this province entered into a pilot project to export hogs to Japan -- and they exported hogs to Japan. And as a result of the knowledge that they gained from that pilot project, we now, thanks to the hard work of the members of the Hog Producers Marketing Board, have a full-fledged program of forward contracting hogs for export into the Japanese market.

If the hon. Opposition House Leader doesn't feel that that's action in the field of hog marketing, he simply doesn't have any idea of what marketing is all about in this province.

He mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Agriculture was talking the other day about the lowering of fertilizer prices. If he had listened he would know that what the minister was referring to was the fact that this government had a substantial impact on lowering the price of lannate, the chemical that was used to control the Bertha army worms in rapeseed crops last year. The government incidentally will be continuing that program this year and once again farmers will be able to get chemicals, and there's another chemical out too to supplement that one, at a much lower cost than they would if it were not for the involvement of the department and the Minister of Agriculture.

The concern that was expressed about fertilizer, Mr. Speaker, was with respect to the supply of fertilizer. All you have to do is read the farm papers or open your mail and you can see that there are a number of farmers concerned about the supply of fertilizer this spring. True enough we realize the price is somewhat higher than it was last year.

MR. HENDERSON:

What's the minister doing about it?

MR. MOORE:

And it may be well that we should have a look into that too. But, Mr. Speaker, what we are most concerned about this year, in a year when prices for grain and rapeseed and other crops are considerably better than they were during the last three or four years, is that there is an adequate supply of fertilizers so that farmers can produce to their utmost.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Opposition House Leader talked about the secondary road program and how roads should probably be poorer to keep the farmers out on the farm. Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can say --

MR. HENDERSON:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker. I never mentioned the secondary road program; I never even mentioned it. The hon. member wasn't listening again.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, all I can is the hon. Opposition House Leader probably hasn't been out of his own constituency if he thinks the roads in this province are all fit to drive on and that there can be no improvement in that situation.

The Deputy Premier talked about the secondary road program initiated in 1966. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my constituency and in much of northern Alberta all we ever saw about the secondary road program, including the year before the election, was a book about a half inch thick entitled, Rural Road Studies, 1966, or something of that nature. All we ever saw was the book. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in 1971 the Socreds were not even worried enough about the seats in the Peace River country in northern Alberta to come up and spend even a little bit of money in that area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since that time and in the very first year the hon. Minister of Highways has seen fit to go into that area and spend some money on roads. I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is certainly room for much more spending in that area, but we do appreciate the kind of effort that was put in during 1972.

He talked about gas co-ops. Sure there have been many, many gas co-ops formed in this province and we would have been quite willing to go on forming them. But, Mr. Speaker, many of the people who had put down anywhere from \$1,000, \$2,000 and \$3,000 to install gas realized that they had no protection whatsoever with respect to the price of natural gas. It was incumbent, Mr. Speaker, that this government should determine first of all, what citizens of this province, what urban and rural people alike, were going to have to pay for natural gas before we got involved in asking them to spend hundreds of dollars for the installation of piping and gas into their farms and then finding out that the price of natural gas was equally as high as crude oil or propane or some other form of energy.

Mr. Speaker, those are just some of the things the hon. Opposition Leader was referring to. The one thing that perhaps disturbs me more than any other, and we heard some complaints from the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View yesterday, was the spending within the Department of Agriculture. The hon. Opposition Leader made the point that the Deputy Premier is giving someone else's money away. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the spending within the Department of Agriculture and the budget has just been brought down is still something less than 2 per cent of the total budget.

I want to suggest also, Mr. Speaker, that one of the areas where we have been putting the most money with respect to guaranteed loans and with respect to loans from the Agricultural Development Corporation is the livestock industry in this province. Any hon. member whether he represents a rural or urban constituency certainly has a realization of the tremendous benefits that accrue to the entire province, to the economy of the province, to the coffers of the hon. Provincial Treasurer from the livestock industry.

Hundreds and hundreds of jobs are made available throughout the province, in the meatpacking industry, the transportation industry, the field of selling, auction marts and what have you.

DR. BUCK:

Unemployment is the highest.

MR. MOORE:

I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, from some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly from the hon. Opposition House Leader, just what programs in the Department of Agriculture they would like to see cut out of this year's budget. I think the people of rural Alberta, many of them probably in the Wetaskiwin constituency, would like to know whether the hon. Opposition Leader wants to cut out programs involving the development of water and sewer services to farmers; whether he wants to cut out programs involving the lending of money to feeder associations; whether he wants to cut out the guaranteed loan program with respect to the purchase of female beef cattle; and whether he wants to cut out the dairy loan program that establishes young farmers in the dairy business and relieves them of part of the interest for the first three years.

It would be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to know exactly what the thoughts of the hon. Opposition Leader are with regard to those programs in the Department of Agriculture that he would like to see done away with. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that people in my constituency and people in all of rural Alberta would be very interested in knowing just what those programs are so that they can judge, the next time they are called upon to give a vote of confidence in this government, just which way they should give that vote.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest in closing that the hon. Opposition Leader certainly hasn't been looking at or even listening to what is happening in agriculture in this province, in Canada and around the world. I suggest he should take a lesson in it at his earliest opportunity.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to make a few remarks on this motion, I am quite convinced that there is nothing so indignant and so furious as a Conservative who is told that there were a few things done here before he got here. Of course the Conservatives don't believe it. They have been listening to each other so much they are beginning to believe some of the things they have said.

I am surprised that with all the inflation the Deputy Premier is exposed to he could stand sticking around here. I am surprised also that they don't petition someone to make a bishop out of him.

When I hear the hon. members opposite speak, it reminds me of a little poem:

You can tell a barber by the way he parts his hair.
You can tell a dentist when you are in the dentist's chair.
You can tell an artist by his delicate touch.
You can tell a Conservative, but not very much.

[Laughter]

That has been the history of this place now. All of a sudden some of them know even more than they did when they were in the opposition. I thought they knew everything then. The surprise now is that they know more. They have a surplus of knowledge and they don't know what to do with it. The big problem is to convert all that energy and all that --

MR. YOUNG:

A point of order, if I may. The point of order is that that poem was apparently written especially for Social Crediters -- in that they can tell a Conservative, but not very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sit down.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, that is a typical Conservative point of order. If that poem was written for Social Crediters, it wasn't written by a Conservative. I've got another one for the Deputy Premier. I hope this wasn't written for the Social Crediters also. But with my humble apology to some author whose name I can't recall at the present time, as far as the Deputy Premier is concerned I would say,

What he is saying, everybody knows.
What he stands for, nobody knows.
The time flows, the money goes
And nobody knows.

Yes. They all know everything and they can bask in their glory. So let's roll on the next election because they might have convinced everybody that they are all-wise, all-knowing and all-seeing. They hate to admit that a little bit of hindsight, now that they are in, has perhaps put them in a favourable position in some circumstances.

I believe one can't take away from them the fact that they are trying. But they also have to be honest about it and put their hands on the table and admit that perhaps there were just a few little strips of paved roads in this country before they got here; there were a few small hospitals, they weren't very big, but they were paid for.

The farmers had some debt even when Social Credit was here, but they didn't have nearly as much as they will when the Conservative government gets through with them. And it seems to be a major stroke of diplomacy, tact, and good management when the Deputy Premier can stand up and say that "we" are going to provide credit for the farmer.

We're going to get the farmer into more debt than he has ever seen before or ever been in before, and hope that all things go well because it isn't hard to get a farmer into debt with government guaranteed loans. That's the easiest thing in the world to do. It requires very little intelligence. I'm not saying that program isn't good. The trick is going to be whether the Deputy Premier can assure that we'll have prosperity for the next 15 or 20 years so that they don't miss a payment and start worrying themselves as to where the next buck is coming from.

It's alright to talk about selling hogs to Japan. Japan needed hogs. I understand Manitoba now is also cashing in on the goodwill done by this government. And I'm not taking anything away from their efforts to sell but we have to be reasonable, we have to, just for a change, tell it the way it is.

When I look at the telephones program, there is no doubt that it is expensive and many people like it. But I wonder if they can stand up and justify that this thing is going to last. Somewhere down the line there is going to be a day of reckoning, \$72 million here, \$40 million there, are just nice round figures but the remark made by a previous speaker in this House, that somewhere down the line, I think the more concentrated city areas are going to pick up the difference.

Now with the government sellout to Edmonton, that Calgary, perhaps Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Red Deer, and a few other major centres are going to have to carry the difference. The cost of telephones per capita to AGT services is going to be spread out over a much smaller number of people than could have been done had this government had the courage to buy out Edmonton Telephones as was recommended by a very competent committee that was set up to study the issue.

It is still unbelievable that in this province one can stand up and say that we sold a losing proposition to Edmonton for -- well who knows how much -- they don't know yet. I think they'll find out some day but I doubt whether we'll get it the easy way. We'll have to keep fighting for information that we are entitled to.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that it is fair on anybody on this side to try to belittle anyone on that side for what they are doing because we have to recognize when they are trying to do something, they are using public funds to do it, they should recognize the taxpayer once in a while.

But for goodness sake, you're not fooling anybody at all, Mr. Speaker, when some hon. members get up and say that they've inherited the wilderness and before they implemented any policy whatsoever, the wilderness was transformed into one of the most progressive provinces, the most well supplied with major highways, the province is supplied with more public works, capital projects paid for than perhaps any other part of the North American continent -- and all this happened in a matter of a few weeks.

Even the hon. Premier stands up and says, well things are great in Alberta, we're sure going ahead. Revenues are increasing, but we're thinking of changing policy; we're going to implement some new policies. He admits in a speech in this House that nothing really has developed from any change in policy but it will and we support some of their policies, but it takes a magnanimous person to admit that there was something here even a little bit before they got here.

So I for one am getting rather amused and a little disturbed at the fact that they can keep on and on and on saying there was nothing here, nothing was done, everything was dead. But we came along and lo and behold the sun broke through, the clouds dispersed and there is joy and happiness in the province of Alberta, prosperity forever, long live the Premier, and longer live the Deputy Premier. And they all stand up -- and I'm surprised I don't see them bowing and saying Allah. Allah be praised!

MR. SCHMID:

On a point of order, there is only one item that this government was too late for and that is the spoiled view on the Calgary Jubilee Auditorium that the hon. member, across here, approved.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, if that's a point of order then the hon. Horst Schmid has a pointed head. So now that I have brought joy back to the Deputy Premier -- he was awfully sour and rather bitter today -- I believe that I will perhaps continue and I hope that I can send him home rejoicing. After all, that's the least I can do for him after what he's been through the last two days.

[Interjections]

I can't ignore him entirely because I have to say, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes down to spending money the Deputy Premier deserves a lot of credit. He can really show us how. We were pikers compared to him and you ain't seen nothing yet, I am sure, because if he gets praise for the way he's blowing the bundle this year and he believes he is doing a good job, Lord help this province next year.

But whether he is right or wrong, he's got 48 people on that side of the House saying, "Go to it, Horner, you are right on the track. We'll support you. If you want twice as much next year, we'll vote for it." Yes. And as I stated, Mr. Speaker --

MR. GHITTER:

No, we won't. We will not.

MR. LUDWIG:

I hope not. I hope somebody has enough sense on that side.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to hear that response. I hope there are at least one or two on that side who have enough intelligence to see that this man is breaking this province and in a very short time.

As I stated yesterday, and it's relevant to the remarks of the Deputy Premier, he has a budget. The slogan there is now "Have budget, will travel". With \$1,500,000 for travelling expenses in this province, he thinks he is a good manager. I suppose if he spent \$3 million on travelling he'd be twice as good a manager. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Premier's attitude appears to be -- as I have stated before, but it is relevant to the remarks he made on good roads and travelling -- he thinks that the more he can get for travelling and the more he has his department travelling around the province, that that creates the impression the department is going somewhere.

It may be going somewhere, but so is the taxpayer. The taxpayer is rather concerned that maybe his income is increasing. Inflation has something to do with it, but it will never increase as quickly and as rapidly in size and cost as the Department of Agriculture.

I believe in that case I'll go along with the hon. members opposite, that the Deputy Premier is second to none. He has outstripped everybody when it comes to enlarging his department and when it comes to spending more.

Mr. Speaker, I know some members feel that I am not on the resolution, but who was until now?

[Interjections]

Who has been until now?

MR. HENDERSON:

Adjourn debate.

MR. LUDWIG:

Give him a chance to reply.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter this debate, but I was unavoidably absent for a while and just got back for the remarks by the hon. Member for Mountain View. Not having heard anything coherent or intelligent, I'd like to read Hansard before I enter. So I'd like to --

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member entering the debate? Does the hon. member wish to adjourn the debate?

MR. RUSTE:

Is he adjourning debate on No. 2 on the Order Paper today?

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it that was what the hon. member has suggested and what the House has agreed to.

The rules concerning relevance have suffered considerably this afternoon. It is the expectation of the Chair that the hon. members would want the Chair to apply them more stringently on a future occasion.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair at 5:29 o'clock.]