

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday, October 16, 1973

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure as a member of an important Canadian ethnic group to introduce to you, and through you to the House, a distinguished group of visitors to Alberta.

Seated in your gallery, Mr. Speaker, is the Honourable Michael O'Leary, the Minister of Labour for the Republic of Ireland, heading the first official Irish trade mission to Alberta. In fact, he is the first representative of the Government of Ireland to visit the Province of Alberta. He is accompanied by Mr. Jeremy Craig, the Charge d'Affaires from the Embassy of Ireland in Ottawa, Mr. John Carey, Irish trade representative and manager for Canada of the Irish Trade Board, and Mr. Kevin Bcnnner, Private Secretary to the Minister.

I would ask these distinguished guests, representatives of a noble race, to rise and be recognized.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome through you, to the hon. members of the Legislature the first French Canadian Scout Troop of Alberta and the first French Canadian Cub Pack of Alberta. They are seated in the public gallery.

These young men have a distinct advantage. They have two working languages, English and French, and one or two even have a little Ukrainian. I think this is symbolic of what our young people are going to be able to do in the future. These are very fine representatives of the Boy Scout movement. They have with them the cubmaster, Mr. Maurice Potvin, and Mrs. Andree Beaudoin, and Mrs. Jeannine Amyotte. They also have parents with them, Mrs. Mariette Amyotte and Mrs. Jeanne Halun. Mrs. Denise Ulliac, the wife of the scoutmaster, is unavoidably absent.

Et maintenant, je parle francais. Nous disons "Bienvenue au parlement d'Alberta."

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, a former legislative member for the beautiful constituency of Banff Cochrane. He is well-known for his ability to represent the area well. Mr. Frank Gainer.

MR. LUDWIG:

Times sure have changed.

MR. YOUNG:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 41 Grade 9 and 10 students from Coralwood Academy in my constituency. They are accompanied here today by their teachers Messrs. Ganson

and Parker, in order to view the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly. I would ask that they rise and be recognized.

FILING RETURNS AND TABLING REPORTS

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table copies of the report of the Coordinating Committee on School Insurance. The report has been signed by nine of the ten members of the committee. A minority report was filed by Mr. Parker, the representative of the Alberta Association for Municipal Districts and Counties.

I might mention that the government will be taking no position on this report or the alternative recommendations contained in it until after the Alberta School Trustees' Association has considered it and drawn conclusions from it at its annual convention in early November.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the report of the Electric Utility Planning Council, which discusses future power generation sites and their opinions on the question of the use of coal versus gas for the generation of power.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

Safeway Case

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. What consultation was there between the federal government and Alberta before the decision was made to settle the Safeway case out of court?

MR. DOWLING:

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member repeat the question?

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. What consultation was there between the Government of the Province of Alberta and the federal government before the decision was made to settle the Safeway anti-combine case out of court?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of consultation with the federal government regarding consumer matters, but nothing relating to the decision by the federal government. It was their decision, to settle the matter with Safeway out of court.

MR. CLARK:

Supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Is the government considering taking any further action in the courts, or introducing legislation, to complement the decision made by the courts regarding Safeway?

MR. DOWLING:

No, Mr. Speaker. The matter of combines is under federal jurisdiction and it is not our position to take any action.

MR. CLARK:

One last supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Then the government is not going to introduce any legislation dealing with the Safeway matter?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question has already been answered.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might just amplify that answer by pointing out to the hon. members of the House that the prosecution was under federal legislation. It was handled by a specially-appointed federal prosecutor and the entire decision was with the federal government, although as a matter of courtesy the prosecutor had, from time to time, been in touch with me to keep me advised of developments.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Attorney General. Was the prosecutor appointed by the federal government from out of the province?

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking followed by the hon. Member for Calgary McCall.

Consumer Warranties and Guarantees

MR. COOPER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Has the Department of Consumer Affairs studied the report on consumer warranties and guarantees in the sale of goods issued by the Ontario Law Reform, upon which a bill entitled The Consumer Products Warranties Act is to be introduced in the Ontario Legislature?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we received several copies in my office and in our branch. We are now in the process of studying it.

I should inform the House that the matter was discussed at the interprovincial conference of consumer ministers held in Quebec City. The position taken at that meeting was that first the matter would be dealt with by the Ontario jurisdiction with the introduction of their green paper, at which time all provincial jurisdictions would then study this submission in hopes of eventually bringing about some uniform legislation throughout Canada on warranties.

MR. COOPER:

One short supplementary. Then the Alberta government is contemplating some action of a similar nature?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's under considerable investigation at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Hay Bank Program

MR. HO LEM:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Agriculture. In view of inflationary increases in the price of hay, is the minister prepared to expand the hay bank program to all areas of the province where serious shortages exist?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, having regard to my answer yesterday to the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, we have expanded the forage production in Alberta in a considerable way. As I said before, we have initiated the hay bank program.

The hon. member might be interested in knowing also about the range improvement programs we initiated last summer and the various other programs we have put into effect to encourage the basic livestock industry in Alberta.

MR. HO LEM:

Supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Minister, because the price of hay has increased over 100 per cent in less than a year, is the government considering some form of price control or government subsidy program in order to stabilize the market?

DR. HORNER:

No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HO LEM:

One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. In view of the extensive purchasing of Alberta hay by Montana, does the minister consider the hay shortage a problem serious enough to request the federal government to place some sort of export control on hay in order to ensure fair prices and adequate supplies for local consumers?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. member is clearly asking for an expression of opinion which, of course, involves debate and is not in order in the question period.

The hon. Member for Little Bow followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

DREE

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

How many applications have been submitted to Ottawa for incentive grants under the new DREE program which you were referring to in your remarks last evening?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the remarks which I have made in the House regarding the DREE breakthrough which the provincial government has made with the federal government, were on the fact that we had that breakthrough in principle. I think I mentioned on other occasions, although I'm not sure if my remarks were directed to this hon. member, that we are now attempting to place the principle we established into a federal-provincial agreement.

I might say that that agreement is very close to being completed. However, we are on the tenth draft, so members will have some appreciation of the complexities involved in getting the principle into a signed agreement. We hope though, that we can do that before the end of this year and that we will then be able to have the flow of perhaps, grants and other kinds of assistance as well, start immediately.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question. Is the government's position in redrafting the DREE program with the federal government that the special areas concept, as we have known it, should be abandoned?

MR. GETTY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it has been the government's position that while the special areas concept actually gave some assistance in some areas, it disenfranchised other areas. This has made it very difficult for other areas to compete. Therefore it has been our position to expand the availability of DREE assistance throughout the province, based on merit.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for ...

MR. BARTON:

Regarding the Lesser Slave Lake area, the DREE agreement now signed with southern Alberta expires December 31, 1973. Does this affect the special area agreements?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is correct that the agreement will run out unless it is extended for some reason at the end of this year. However, we anticipate we will have in effect a new agreement taking over from that one.

MR. BARTON:

Supplementary question then to the hon. Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. Is it true the hon. minister sent a letter to a PC candidate, the hon. Paul Yewchuk, in the last federal election stating that the DREE program would continue to '75?

MR. SPEAKER:

This question is of very doubtful propriety for the question period. However, I would leave the choice or decision to the hon. minister as to whether he wishes to answer.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I just had the name drawn to my attention. He is a member of parliament, and I'm sure, there is considerable correspondence between government and various members of parliament who are interested in the operations of the constituencies they represent in Ottawa.

The member would have to be much more specific and probably should place his question on the Order Paper.

MR. BARTON:

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. NOTLEY:

Could I just pose this supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Could he advise the Assembly what the federal government's position is with respect to the continuation of the special areas concept?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to know what the federal government might do in other provinces but where they have made commitments in a budget amount, they will carry out those commitments. Otherwise, for instance in the Province of Alberta, they are entering into a new agreement which does not contemplate special areas.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Suffield Block

MR. WYSE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would also like to direct my question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. It is in reference to the answer the hon. minister made yesterday regarding the Suffield Block. Will all the gas development in the block be open or be put up for bid?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, there are a variety of actions open to the Alberta Energy Company once they have acquired the Suffield natural gas reserves but I think it would be premature for me to try to anticipate how they might handle it.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question then. Will the Alberta Energy Corporation be in charge of the development but not actually participate in the drilling or, in fact, compete with the industry?

MR. GETTY:

I would only say, Mr. Speaker, that the Alberta Energy Company was designed not to participate in an active way in the oil industry, but as an investment company which would use private enterprise to carry out the actual operations.

I assume that would answer the hon. member's question.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for ...

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question then. Will a large portion of the gas reserves in the block be reserved for our area? I am thinking of Medicine Hat and Redcliff.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, it tends to be premature and it is also within the jurisdiction, of course, of the Energy Resources Conservation Board as to the preservation of gas supplies for Alberta's needs. However, I am certain that within the various regulatory procedures, gas for all areas of Alberta will be provided in the future.

MR. WYSE:

One supplementary question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

We have quite a long list of questioners. Perhaps after we have gone through the first round of questioning we might come back to this topic.

The hon. Member for Calgary McKnight followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Foothills.

Calgary - Child Abuse Centre

MR. LEE:

My question is for the Minister of Health and Social Development, Mr. Speaker. Has he received any representation from the board of the Calgary Children's Hospital, regarding the establishment of a child abuse and neglect treatment centre for the Calgary district to be conducted by a number of Calgary volunteer groups? If so, could he inform the Assembly of his plans?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I believe no formal reply has gone to this point but discussions have been held between representatives of the department and of the group making the representations.

The response of the government in general terms is that we consider the concept to be very valid and should be pursued. We would think it could possibly be expanded to other hospital-based programs of a similar type. I might say the utilization of volunteers is an attractive feature.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Calgary - School Construction

MR. MCCRAE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Education. Will the minister advise the House as to the status of his discussions with the Calgary Public School Board relative to new elementary school construction, with particular reference to the Calgary communities of Dalhousie and Silver Springs?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I had general discussions with the Calgary School Board on this matter on October 5. It is my understanding that that particular board will be giving very close consideration to making submissions to the school buildings board for the construction of a school facility in the general area of Silver Springs and Dalhousie for the upper or lower elementary grades on the basis of a relocatable or modular design, when the new policy which, as I have indicated, is made within the next two or three weeks.

The modifications to the policy will be on a selective basis. I have to say that it is a local board matter as to the exact nature and timing of school building in Calgary. But I would say I have been closely advised by letter by the Member for Calgary Foothills over the past few months as to the situation in the Dalhousie and Silver Springs areas.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Tar Sands Townsites

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether the government is now considering or has considered another townsite in the tar sands region? In particular has consideration been given to developing Fort MacKay as an alternative or additional townsite to accommodate future tar sands population growth?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, it's quite obvious that if the Alberta oil sands are developed in the coming years to their full potential, more townsites than are presently established will certainly be required.

I would say with respect to the amount of energy that has gone into the development of the Syncrude agreement, and Syncrude's desire to use Fort McMurray as their service centre, our attention has generally been concentrated on the Fort McMurray townsite. But certainly we recognize that other future towns will have to be given consideration.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister been able to investigate reports that land is already being purchased by speculators in the Fort MacKay area?

MR. RUSSELL:

I haven't had news of those reports, Mr. Speaker. I must say I am alarmed at the amount of speculation there has been in the Fort McMurray area. Quite frankly, I think the government has moved very dramatically to curb that and control land development in Fort McMurray.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. What steps does the government propose to alleviate the growing housing shortage in Fort McMurray as envisioned by the Reid Crowther Report commissioned by Syncrude?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question indicates it might require a lengthy answer. Perhaps it could be put on the order paper for a full reply. Possibly the hon.

member might wish to invite the hon. minister to make a ministerial statement at the appropriate time.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly would be quite happy with a ministerial statement on this question, or I could put it on the Order Paper.

I wonder if I could propose one final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In light of the growing housing shortage in Fort McMurray and the population growth anticipated, has the government reconsidered its position with respect to the so-called Area 5 development?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the land that is either in the planning stage or the development stage, and some recently sold for home construction, will allow for a population expansion in Fort McMurray of roughly 6,000 persons. That's outside of the additional land the hon. member referred to in Area 5 which is being developed by a firm called Athabasca Realty.

We are fairly confident that in the immediate few years, while some good solid planning is going on for the town, we will be able to accommodate the population expansion as a result of the Syncrude development as well as the additional servicing of service industries which might come along as a result of Syncrude.

I should mention just as a point of interest that the first 135 lots went on sale ...

MR. SPEAKER:

I would point out to the hon. minister that the question, as I understood it, dealt with Area 5.

The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands with a further supplementary, then perhaps we might go on to another topic.

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests with respect to the question raised about possible speculation at Fort MacKay, Alberta. Could the hon. minister advise whether or not speculation is possible in view of the fact that the community is located in a green forest controlled by his department?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, the only possible speculation which could occur would be with private lands in the area, and this would be very, very limited. This would not be possible on the public lands behind the green zone of the Province of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

School Boundaries

MR. GRUENWALD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is also to the Minister of Municipal Affairs regarding the Municipal School Boundaries Committee. Is the committee that the minister set up by Order in Council in July of this year, I believe, now complete? I am referring particularly to the category that represents citizens at large.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, the citizen at large who was appointed was Mr. Fred White. The committee officially started functioning on September 1, and has a permanent office in the Bowlen Building in Calgary.

MR. GRUENWALD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the Interim Report No. 1, that was supposed to be tabled with the Executive Council by the end of this year, be made public as soon as it has been filed with the Executive Council?

MR. RUSSELL:

Well I see no reason why it couldn't be made public as soon as the Executive Council has had time to consider it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Consumer Information

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Has the Department of Consumer Affairs assisted any consumers in their representation before any tribunals?

MR. DOWLING:

Not specifically, Mr. Speaker. They may have been in our offices at some time or other to ask for advice but not specific counselling, legal counsel, or things of this nature.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister advise how the public has been advised that this service is available?

MR. DOWLING:

Was the question: Has the public been advised that this service is available? Yes, I would suspect that anyone who is interested in receiving consumer information and has taken the time to go to either our Calgary office or Edmonton office would be apprised of the services that those offices do give.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister of Consumer Affairs established any boards, committees or councils in an advisory capacity in connection with any of the policies or programs of his department?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drumheller followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell.

Expo '74 - Spokane

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In view of the reply from the hon. Premier last week, I would like to repeat a question. Has the government decided to accept the invitation of the Prime Minister of Canada to join in the construction of a Canadian park at the Spokane '74 world exhibition?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe I answered earlier that the matter would be reviewed by the Executive Council this morning, which it was. The decision of the Executive Council is to participate in Spokane '74, but not in terms of construction of a pavilion.

It is our view that there are other less expensive and more meaningful ways for the Alberta government to participate. We, therefore, have called upon various agencies of government to come back to us with a report as to how it can be done for less public money than an expensive pavilion would involve. We

think that will make a more meaningful representation for the people of Alberta at this important exhibition.

MR. TAYLOR:

I appreciate the answer of the hon. Premier.

A supplementary to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. Is the hon. minister now, or will he be, selecting a number of trees and shrubs typical of Alberta that might be on display at this unique Canadian park at Spokane?

DR. WARRACK:

This is certainly an interesting possibility, Mr. Speaker. It would be in line with the Calgary sport show last year where that exact idea was taken into account and put forward very successfully.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Gasoline Prices

MR. ASHTON:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. I would like to ask the minister how Alberta compares with other provinces with respect to the cost of gasoline to consumers and the amount of the provincial gasoline tax.

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. In a recent report by the Alberta Bureau of Statistics we find we are the lowest in terms of consumer prices of gasoline at the pumps, contrary to statements made in the House. We also have the lowest tax of any province in Canada.

MR. SPEAKER:

The Leader of the Opposition with a supplementary, followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell with a further supplementary.

MR. CLARK:

Has the minister checked the prices at Sault Ste. Marie within the last three weeks?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. These prices indicate that in Toronto and Ottawa they have the fourth highest price in the Dominion.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps I didn't make the question clear to the minister. Did he check the prices at Sault Ste. Marie and Niagara Falls? I could also ask about Montana, although that is out of the country.

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would furnish me with receipts I will make sure those particular pumps are checked.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Ottewell with a supplementary.

MR. ASHTON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is the hon. minister considering giving the Alberta consumer an even greater break by causing further reductions in prices?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's recommendation answers itself.

The hon. Member for Sedgewick-Coronation followed by the hon. Member for Lethbridge East.

Co-ops - Wholesale Outlets

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Is the government contemplating legislation to allow food co-operatives the right to purchase directly from wholesale outlets? This is denied in Alberta, but they have it in British Columbia and Saskatchewan.

MR. DOWLING:

The question was, if I understand it, Mr. Speaker: Are co-ops going to be allowed to buy directly from wholesale outlets?

MR. SORENSON:

Through the province.

MR. DOWLING:

Yes they are now, Mr. Speaker, providing they meet the legislative requirements of The Licencing of Trades and Businesses Act.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary to the hon. minister. Has he had any requests from individuals or consumer groups for the establishment of group co-operatives which can buy wholesale for the purpose of keeping down prices to consumers?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have also granted licences to many of them.

MR. LUDWIG:

I understand that there had been an application ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. LUDWIG:

... a licence for one that came from the university area of Edmonton.

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please address the Chair.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Has the hon. minister granted a co-operative licence to a group from the University of Alberta?

MR. DOWLING:

Not at this moment, Mr. Speaker. I understand there were some requirements spelled out in the Act that couldn't be met by this group at this time. However, they have been informed of these requirements and perhaps will come back with a new proposal.

MR. LUDWIG:

A supplementary. Is the minister considering any legislation which would make it easier for groups of consumers to obtain co-operative licences to purchase wholesale?

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, we are making it extremely easy now. Any who apply and will live up to the terms and conditions of The Licencing of Trades and Businesses Act may now operate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member ...

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER:

Might this be the last supplementary on this topic.

MR. NOTLEY:

Can the minister advise what the present status is of - I believe it is the S.A.C.K. - Food Co-op in central Edmonton which is designed to buy food for low-income families. Can the minister advise what the present position is with respect to that co-operative? It was operating, I believe, under a LIP grant which has expired and it was attempting to find funds from the province to carry ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. This type of question for specifics really belongs ideally on the Order Paper.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lethbridge East followed by the hon. Member for Macleod.

Wholesale Food Prices

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Last spring, and to be more exact, in the May 8 Hansard, the minister indicated he would have meetings with the wholesale food community regarding the current inflation trend. Will the minister please tell the House how many meetings he held with the wholesalers?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we've held two formal meetings, one with the independent wholesalers, one with the major food chain wholesalers, and we have had, I would suggest, very close to a dozen meetings with specific wholesale groups. I imagine that answers the question.

MR. ANDERSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. What action or plans came out of the meetings?

MR. DOWLING:

You must understand, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of the meetings was first of all to acquaint the people of our branch, and the people involved in government, with what exactly we could do regarding food prices. That purpose was achieved.

MR. ANDERSON:

The last supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Are there any more meetings planned?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that many of the people in the wholesale community will be asking me for meetings and, of course, we'll oblige.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Macleod followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Feed Grains

MR. BUCKWELL:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister tell us, has an estimate been made on the number of elevators needed for the storage of feed grain, and how would charges be assessed regarding rent, labour, et cetera by the Alberta Grains Commission?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, those are matters that will have to be worked out. I would expect that a storage charge would be involved. But as I say, the mechanics of how it would be operated will, I rather expect, be done on a regional basis through my department with the Grain Commission in a supervisory role.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Camrose.

Cost of Living

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is with relation to the Premier's proclamation that he is opposed to any controls on prices and wages. In light of the fact that many families are unable to ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. The hon. member's question is complete. The addition is argument.

MR. LUDWIG:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Has the government or the hon. Premier given any consideration to subsidizing those families which are unable to maintain an acceptable standard of living, especially in purchasing food and clothing, because of the extreme inflation in this province?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe I did answer that matter at some considerable length in my remarks of last Wednesday by outlining a very lengthy series of steps this government has taken with regard to matters to reduce the pressures of the cost of living on citizens of fixed and lower income. I'd be happy to repeat the list.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Premier. Is the Premier suggesting that he answered the question I gave him specifically, or did he beat around the bush as usual ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. The hon. Member for Camrose, followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Pay Rates Discrepancy

MR. STROMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is directed to the Minister of Labour. Has the Department of Labour resolved the pay discrepancy between male and female employees in regard to equal pay for equal work at such institutions as Rose Haven in my constituency, Deerhome, Alberta Hospital and Claresholm?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, this question was posed some weeks ago following the conclusion of collective bargaining between the parties indicated by the hon. Member for Camrose.

Several discussions, at some great length, have taken place on this with the principals. The matter is now before the human rights branch for study and interpretation and counsel to the government. When this is concluded, we will make some judgments and hopefully meet with the principals again to attempt a conclusion to this circumstance.

MR. WILSON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister's explanation also apply to the Baker Memorial Sanitorium?

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, in any circumstance where the facts as described by the hon. Member for Camrose apply, one could generalize that the problem would be treated in exactly the same way.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Liquor Advertising

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question today is directed to the minister in charge of the Liquor Control Board. I was wondering, does the government plan to make an announcement shortly that would allow on radio and TV throughout our province the advertising of liquor and beer?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the hon. member will recall that that announcement was made in the spring session of this Legislature.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I think the minister will agree with my supplementary question, which is, when will it actually start? When will the permission be granted?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the decision was announced in the spring session. Now, if I follow the hon. member's questioning, the government said it would work out guidelines with the broadcasters' association on how beer and wine advertising might be conducted. We have had a series of meetings, Mr. Speaker, and the matter has now been placed before cabinet and approved. Therefore, it's up to the individuals in the media to determine whether anybody is interested in advertising and whether they have time in which to sell that advertising.

MR. DIXON:

One further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is there any particular time of day when these ads are going to be allowed? Is there any restriction placed on the advertisers and broadcasters?

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be an excellent idea for the hon. member to place on the Order Paper a request for the guidelines which have been struck. We would be happy then to provide them for him.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Highwood followed by the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc.

Population Studies

MR. BENOIT:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is addressed to the Minister Without Portfolio responsible for rural development. It pertains to the student-oriented research on population shifts in southern Alberta. Would the minister tell the House why the research was limited to southern Alberta on this important question?

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

Mr. Speaker, that particular project originated with the University of Lethbridge. There are other such projects but they are designed with the local area.

MR. BENOIT:

Supplementary. Does the minister plan to coordinate the studies from southern Alberta with those from northern Alberta before the report is made?

MR. TOPOLNISKY:

When the report is in, Mr. Speaker, it will be assessed and applied as we see fit.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc followed by the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake.

Natural Gas -- Exports

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier could advise the House what further course of action, if any, the government is contemplating or has decided upon, relative to the Energy Resources Conservation Board report on the export permit of Consolidated Natural Gas.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Minister of Mines and Minerals has a ministerial announcement on that today under Orders of the Day.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake followed by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands.

Alberta Opportunity Fund Act Amendments

MR. BARTON:

My question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is the minister going to bring in amendments to the Alberta opportunity company, as promised by the Premier, to cover the forest product industry and fishing industry?

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, there is an amended bill before the House now.

MR. BARTON:

Supplementary, does it cover the two specific products named?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Read it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands followed by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

Schools -- Construction

MR. KING:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Education. Has the Department of Education approved the construction of a high school in the new town of Fort McMurray?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, yes. First there is an elementary school now under construction, I think, to the extent of putting the roof on. Some months ago we approved a 480 student senior high school for the town. I understand that the two school boards in the town, plus the town board of administrators will be meeting this week to explore joint plans further. Regarding the site of the school, perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs could give the House further information on that point at this moment.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, there has been some delay in acquiring a site in Fort McMurray because of the great activity there in land transactions. We did have a site lined up which had been agreed to by the town, approved by the town board and approved in principle by a plebiscite which had been purchased in January of this year for \$180,000. When we went to get it in August, the price was \$625,000, so we're presently well into negotiations for an alternate site.

MR. KING:

A supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Education. Can he advise the House if he has received any representations from the new town of Fort McMurray offering, as an alternate site, land which is currently owned by the town and used to provide recreational facilities?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Personally, no. I have not received any representations from the town in that regard, although I understand this may be one of the areas to be explored jointly by the school boards and the town.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff followed by the hon. Member for Drayton Valley.

Suffield Block (Cont.)

MR. WYSE:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. This is a follow-up to my first question to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Now that the government has stated that they plan to develop the Suffield Block, what is the government's long range plan for gas in the block - pipe the raw gas out of the province, export it, exploit it or develop decentralized industry in our area, as the Premier himself announced during the campaign conference?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member's question as it proceeds in its length indicates that it will require a ministerial announcement of some kind to be dealt with adequately.

MR. WYSE:

Just one supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Is the government considering any preferential treatment for the Medicine Hat-Redcliff area regarding the gas itself? Plain and simple.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, there is one major thing, of course, we have to establish namely that there is a sufficient reserve of gas to be developed in any capacity. Therefore when I referred earlier to the hon. member's question being slightly premature in the evaluation program of 77 wells which is just a start, only 27 of the wells had been drilled, I believe. There will be a considerable amount of work still to be done, then the evaluation of it and a determination of how those reserves, should they be developed, might be used within the province.

MR. WYSE:

One last supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the provincial government received verification for our area, that we will in fact share the gas with the provincial government?

AN HON. MEMBER:

It's still part of Alberta.

MR. GETTY:

Again, Mr. Speaker, we're going to have to make sure there's gas to share. I'm certain that all Albertans' requirements are first taken care of under our conservation and other regulatory procedures.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Drayton Valley followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

Calgary Power Rates

MR. ZANDER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities. Regarding Calgary Power's application in Part 2, dealing with continuous service charges, what is the stand of your department, or do you have anything to offer ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member address the Chair please.

MR. FARRAN:

Mr. Speaker, the second phase of the Calgary Power Rate Hearings begins today. The first phase approved an increase of an average of 9.93 per cent to Albertans as opposed to the original 15 per cent, if income tax is rebated in the one year following the year it's levied. If the income tax were rebated in the same year, the increase would only be 3.62 per cent on an average.

Now the second phase is to determine how this approved increase rate is allotted among various classes of customers. The department has no position on this because it's a public hearing where people can make submissions on the proposed rates for various ccsts of service zones and areas.

So, I would say it would be impossible to answer a question put as vaguely as that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Bow followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View.

Consumer Affairs - Food Prices

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs. Has the Minister of Consumer Affairs at any time engaged the services of persons having special technical knowledge to advise him or his department?

MR. DOWLING:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. From time to time I've called on my colleagues.

[Laughter]

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Department of Consumer Affairs uncovered evidence to indicate that Alberta-produced staple foods are over-processed or over-packaged for Alberta consumption?

MR. SPEAKER:

Whether this qualifies as a supplementary may be something entirely different from whether or not the minister wishes to answer.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. What is the government doing to prevent Alberta produced food staples from reaching the Alberta consumer at inflated world export prices?

MR. DOWLING:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that's a fact. As a matter of fact, I don't think it is. We are doing a great deal though I can say, Mr. Speaker, to stimulate additional manufacturing and processing in Alberta and I would perhaps refer that question to my colleague, Dr. Horner.

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. member, if he could get out of the confines of the City of Calgary, would find out that we are expanding production in Alberta in a number of ways. I refer him particularly to the irrigation areas of southern Alberta, and if he wants to move north, to the Peace River country and the expanded production that is taking place there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Calgary-Harradence Inquiry

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is either to the Solicitor General or the hon. Attorney General. Has any request been made by anyone on the Harradence committee or commission for employees of the Solicitor General's department or the Attorney General's department in Edmonton to appear before the commission?

MISS HUNLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I understand that Mr. Harradence and the committee have met with officials in my department and have had discussions on a couple of occasions.

MR. LUDWIG:

The question, Mr. Speaker, was: Has any request been made for these parties involved to appear before the commission in Calgary?

MISS HUNLEY:

Not that I am aware of, but I am sure they would be willing to if Mr. Harradence decides it is necessary.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Millican.

Unemployment Figures

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Labour. The labour report from the federal government states that unemployment has gone up to six per cent and I was wondering what plans, if any, the minister has to combat this rise.

DR. HUMUL:

Mr. Speaker, I will be speaking ...

MR. SPEAKER:

It is a matter of very broad scope.

ORDERS OF THE DAYMINISTERIAL ANNOUNCEMENTSDepartment of Manpower and Labour

DR. HOHOL:

Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak in terms of a ministerial announcement on the matter of unemployment in Alberta.

While the statistics for Canada and the brief statement for Alberta are news as of this morning, it is important for us in the Legislature and in the province to stay abreast of what is happening specifically in Alberta month to month and year to year.

The unemployment declined from 29,000 in August, 1973 to 23,000 in September of this year, lowering the unemployment rate for Alberta from 3.9 per cent to 3.2 per cent within the same period. This rate, along with the similar one of 3.2 per cent for Manitoba, is the second lowest unemployment rate for Canada.

The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate of 4.7 per cent in September represents a decline from August of this year of 5.3 per cent. The September employment total was 700,000, a decline of 11,000 from August. This, Mr. Speaker, was the lowest decline for this period in the past six years, making this statistic officially significant.

Contributing to this particular figure were two factors, one, a male employment total of 461,000. That was a decline of 17,000 from August but less than usual for recent years. The female employment total was 239,000, an increase of 6,000 over August.

Two particular increases in employment levels of subgroups took place in the month of August. Employment of those aged 25 years and over increased from 494,000 last month to 514,000 in August. Non-agricultural employment stood at 602,000 people for September, an increase of 38,000 over last year and a drop of 9,000 from August to a total of 611,000.

The August to September decline is an important figure for this year because it is the lowest in recent years and the indications are beginning to suggest that we are going to have longer term employment in agriculture.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as encouraging as these figures may be for Alberta, based on information available to us over the last few years, the government felt it prudent to be prepared - as we attempted to be in the last two years - in case unemployment was a problem for the coming year. Accordingly, today is a likely day to announce the provincial government's approval of the 1973-74 Priority Employment Program totalling \$12 million.

In its third year of operation, Mr. Speaker, this is a program which provides employment and training opportunities for Albertans who may face employment problems during the winter months. Features of this year's program include direct employment and training opportunities.

Under the general policy direction of a committee of cabinet members on employment, the provincial government itself, through its departments and agencies, will originate employment or training opportunity projects in those areas of the province where job opportunities are required.

In this regard training projects will be entirely job-oriented. So people who get training will obtain the kind of skills they can use for job procurement.

Another part of this program will include water resource management projects for the Department of the Environment. In addition the Department of Agriculture will consider agricultural societies' projects and assistance for livestock facility development projects.

Depending upon the unemployment level this winter, Mr. Speaker, some PEP projects could be underway next month. Similarly the PEP training program could commence in January, 1974.

Based on information, therefore, available to us over the last few years, the government is announcing its program at this time for those who may be

affected by winter unemployment to take advantage of training and employment opportunities in this province.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in commenting on the announcement made by the hon. minister, despite the fact that our rate of unemployment may be the second lowest in Canada, statistics are a very poor substitute for jobs and they don't substitute for jobs for those people who are unemployed.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, as far as the Priority Employment Training program and the \$11 million or \$12 million which are allocated for that project this year, we welcome that announcement. But we note, Mr. Speaker, that once again there is very little, if any, opportunity for local or municipal input into this program.

Department of Mines and Minerals

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I also have a ministerial announcement I would like to make today.

On April 10, 1973, the provincial government requested the Energy Resources Conservation Board to reconsider the permit issued to Consolidated Natural Gas Limited and advise the government on the operations under the permit.

The cabinet has now received and reviewed the report of the Energy Resources Conservation Board and noted the advice that:

1. Deliveries of gas under the permit have been and are in accordance with the terms and conditions of the permit relating to volumes of gas, the fields from which gas may be taken, transportation of gas within Alberta and delivery of gas on interconnection of the pipeline systems of Alberta Gas Trunk Line Company Limited and TransCanada Pipelines Limited.
2. The effects of changes of operation under the permit are in accordance with the terms and conditions of the permit as amended and have not affected in any material way Consolidated operations in Alberta.
3. The permittee has retained control over the physical operations under the permit to the same degree as it would have if the original plan of distribution of gas to markets of an affiliate company in the United States of America had been adhered to.

In addition, the board does not consider that the making of an order under Section 11, subsection (3) of The Gas Resources Preservation Act affecting the Consolidated permit would be just and reasonable under the circumstances.

I would like to advise the members of the Legislature that the cabinet has concluded that no further action is necessary by the government on the existing Consolidated Natural Gas permit, and that natural gas will continue to be removed from the province in accordance with the terms and conditions of the permit.

In addition, I would like to advise that the cabinet has again confirmed statements made by the hon. Premier to the effect that the Alberta government will continue to hold in abeyance those applications by TransCanada Pipelines for permits to remove additional natural gas from Alberta unless and until the pricing provisions and purchase contracts involved are in accordance with the Alberta government's natural gas policy statement of November 16, 1972.

It was noted that the first progress report from the ERCB regarding field pricing of natural gas in Alberta stated that TransCanada Pipelines' prices range from significantly below to marginally below levels endorsed by the Alberta government. It was also noted from the report that the prime reason why the average prices have not risen to the levels endorsed by the Alberta government is because TransCanada Pipelines is only renegotiating a small portion of its contracts and the vast majority of its contracts remain below the pricing parameters.

Department of the Environment

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would also like to make a ministerial announcement.

The government has been working for some time now on devising a code of practice for feedlots and intensive livestock operations. I would like to indicate that this code of practice has been devised and put together through the efforts of the Alberta Commercial Egg Producers Association, the Alberta Cattle Commission, the Western Hog Growers Association, the Western Stock Growers Association, the University of Alberta, and a number of government departments including Agriculture, the Environment, Health and Social Development, Labour, Lands and Forests and Municipal Affairs.

The code of practice itself is quite involved and extensive, and it isn't my intention to read it to the House. But it is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to distribute this code of practice as widely as possible. Each of the MLAs will, in due course, be receiving a properly printed copy of the code of practice and local governments. As well the appropriate agencies and departments of government will be receiving them.

This code will serve as a guide for all levels of government in approving the location as well as the operation of intensive livestock operations. It has been asked for and required by the farmers and the feedlot operators as much as by those who resent the proximity of these operations.

The code will make possible the issuance of a certificate of compliance through the district agriculturalists throughout the province and also the regional agricultural engineering offices.

Mr. Speaker, in making this code of practice public, I have five copies which I wish to table today. Thank you.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, might I simply say that it could well be that this code of practice will be rather smelly business.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Shame.

WRITTEN QUESTIONS

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

What is the total cost of erecting the two poles on the Legislative Building in late June or early July?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, we accept Question 254 and I herewith table the answer.

258. Mr. Wilson asked the government the following question:

What has the government done concerning the following recommendations in the Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada which have been further recommended by the Alberta Citizens' Advisory Board to the Executive Council for action with reference to The Change of Name Act?

The recommendations referred to are as follows:

1. That either spouse, with the consent of the other, should be able to change the surname of the family unit, including that of children under 12 years. Consent would be required from children over 12.
2. That neither the male nor the female need be the "head" of the household or sole initiator of name changes.
3. That in case of marriage breakdown (including separation for a period of at least three years) persons should be able to change their surnames

without consent of the other spouse; in which cases advertising in the Gazette and newspapers should apply.

MR. CRAWFORD:

Question 258 is accepted.

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

1. Has the government provided any direct financial assistance or financial guarantees towards the financing of the construction of the Hog Processing plant, at Taber, which has been proposed by North American Integrated Food Processors?
2. If provincial financial assistance, directly or indirectly, has been provided what is the nature of the financial assistance and the magnitude of the financial liabilities involved on the part of the province?
3. How many hogs per year will North American Integrated Food Processors be allowed to produce using their own facilities?
4. What is the capacity of the plant, in terms of carcasses per year and, what is the current hog production in the area for which the plant will provide processing services?
5. Why have the marketing operations of the plant been exempted from the jurisdiction of the Alberta Hog Marketing Board?
6. What protection against increases in costs of production will be afforded to producers who will have long term supply contracts with the processing plant?

DR. HORNER:

The question is accepted. I will table the answer tomorrow.

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

1. What is the total amount of money paid out, in grants, under the government's new Rural Gas Distribution program?
2. What are the names of the co-ops and companies serving the recipients of the grants?
3. What is the breakdown of grants, grouped according to co-ops or companies, serving the individuals receiving grants?

MR. FARRAN:

Question 260 is accepted and I'll table the answer now.

261. Mr. R. Speaker asked the government the following question:

What special warrants have been passed by the government in the present fiscal year?

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand the reason for this question because the special warrants that are referred to are a matter of public record. I believe the Opposition office receives copies of all special warrants which are passed by Order in Council by the Executive Council.

However, for the information of the members, the total special warrants to date are, I believe, in the neighbourhood of \$48 million. Of that amount, approximately \$9 million has been a recent response to cost of living problems of our citizens, and another \$28 million is in the nature of an investment in land and items of this nature, as well as in the Suffield evaluation that we've spoken of many times in the House.

If the hon. member wishes details, the only thing, Mr. Speaker, I could advise him - beyond giving him the total picture I've just indicated - is that the full details are a matter of public record and should, in fact, be in the Opposition office.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to that and making a comment to that, the purpose ...

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member would probably have to bring his comments within the scope of a point of order.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, speaking to a point of order. The reason for the question was that I well understand this is public information, but in asking for the information from the office of the Provincial Treasurer it was my purpose to ensure that I had all the material together. Knowing that the officers of that department would have easy access to it and would be able to compile it very easily, I felt that the question was legitimate.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the point of order. I think we'd be getting into a dangerous precedent to have matters of public record asked for in questions, because the next thing we could have are examples of statutes being tabled, and especially in the case of a question where it has to be printed. So I would submit that the hon. gentleman who wants the information, if it's a matter of public record in the Gazette, should put it together himself if he wishes to do so.

262. Mr. R. Speaker asked the government the following question:

1. What are the proposed locations of new and replacement hospitals in the Province of Alberta for the years 1973 and 1974?
2. What is the priority list of locations for senior citizens' homes, hospitals, nursing homes and auxiliary hospitals for the years 1973 and 1974?

MR. CRAWFORD:

The question is accepted, Mr. Speaker.

263. Mr. R. Speaker asked the government the following question:

1. How many public assistance recipients are involved in the employment opportunity program?
2. How many citizens' appeal committees are active?
3. What is the location of each citizen appeal committee and the membership on each respective committee?
4. How many meetings has each citizen appeal committee held and on what respective dates in 1972 and 1973?
5. How many cases have been heard by the citizen appeal committee?

MR. CRAWFORD:

Question 263 is accepted.

264. Dr. Buck asked the government the following question:

For the years 1969 to 1973 inclusive:

1. How many licence plates were produced at the Fort Saskatchewan Jail?
2. What was the cost of the production of licence plates broken down into the following categories:
 - (a) metal
 - (b) paint
 - (c) labour
 - (d) equipment
3. What company supplied the paint and what was the cost?

MR. COFITHORNE:

That question is accepted, Mr. Speaker.

265. Dr. Buck asked the government the following question:

For each of the provincial constituencies outside the boundaries of Calgary, Edmonton and Lethbridge:

1. How many projects under the Early Childhood Services program have been approved as of September 30, 1973?
2. What was the amount of grant for each project?
3. List the total grants per constituency.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Miniely, that Question 265 be made a return and be amended (1) in the preamble, by deleting the words "provincial constituencies" and replacing them with the words "school districts, divisions and counties", and (2) in paragraph 3, by deleting the word "constituency" and replacing it with the words "school district, division and county".

I make this amendment, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to instructions to personnel of my department whereby they don't approve or disapprove of programs on the basis of constituency. Therefore, they don't maintain any educational records on the basis of constituency, but they do have records on the basis of school divisions, districts and counties.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order and a point of procedure, I wonder if it would be possible for us to hold Question No. 265 until the hon. Member, Dr. Buck, is back. He'll be in the House Thursday and perhaps at that time, in light of the comments made by the Minister of Education, he would have an opportunity to participate in the discussion.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have my amendment put on the record so if someone else would care to adjourn debate we can leave the Motion for a Return as it now is, in that fashion.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, then I will move adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

I wasn't aware that we were debating the question.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Quit misleading the House.

MR. CLARK:

Who is misleading who?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister's amendment will certainly be recorded in Hansard, his motion that is. I don't know whether it needs to be recorded beyond that.

MOTIONS FOR A RETURN

255. Mr. Henderson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Clark.

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

Two copies of the Gerd-Specht Engineering Study covering the Government of Alberta research project at the experimental greenhouse at Lake Wabamun.

MR. HENDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move Motion 255, standing in my name on the Order Paper.

[The motion was carried.]

256. Mr. Wilson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ho Lem.

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

Copies of all correspondence between the provincial government, its agencies and boards, and the federal government concerning the subject of participation by the provincial and federal governments in the world's fair, Expo '74, in Spokane, Washington.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move Motion 256 standing in my name on the Order Paper.

MR. GETTY:

Mr. Speaker, the government has no problems about complying with this motion for return except for an amendment which I would like to move, seconded by the hon. Mr. Dowling, which reads as follows:

At the end of the motion add:

after having first obtained the approval of the federal government for the tabling of its correspondence.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Perhaps we could simplify the procedure. All those in favour of the motion, as amended, please say aye.

[The motion as amended was carried.]

257. Mr. Wilson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Ludwig:

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

Copies of all correspondence, policy statements, commitments and financial agreements between the City of Calgary and the provincial government concerning the design, construction and financing of the proposed 9A Street North-West Louise Bridge.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move motion 257 standing in my name on the Order Paper.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like this order to stand over until next week.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do the mover and seconder agree to the request of the hon. minister?

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, ... [Inaudible] ... at least some slight indication why the order can stand. I mean he can answer when he wishes, unless he objects to it.

MR. SPEAKER:

Possibly the hon. minister might bring the matter within the procedure somewhat by adjourning the debate.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Mr. Cookson proposed the following motion to the Assembly, seconded by Mr. Harle:

Be it resolved that the Alberta government consider ways of balancing the impact of the DREE program in Alberta.

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to say a few words this afternoon about the DREE program which was initiated by the federal government some three years ago. I would have been happier to have discussed this in the spring session because I think it was more relative and more pertinent at that time.

The Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs in the meantime has done considerable negotiating with the federal government with regard to the discriminatory type of distribution of funds in the province. Hopefully, we will be able to negotiate a better contract and a better opportunity for all people of Alberta instead of specific areas.

Just to give you a little bit of background of the DREE program, which is the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, I have a map showing the establishment of the areas in which DREE felt they had to supply funds. In this sketch of the distribution, the Maritimes were selected as one of the most important areas in Canada. I don't think anyone can dispute that the Maritimes have had some regional disparity, but the federal government has been able to equalize this in many, many ways.

Members opposite are familiar with the equalization formula. I think the Member for Wetaskiwin yesterday touched on some of the discriminatory actions on the part of the federal government initiating, for example, the 40 cent a barrel tax on fuel going out of our country. He mentioned what this could amount to in years ahead. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I really appreciated the comments and the concerns that the Member for Wetaskiwin expressed at that time. He not only talked about the attempt on the part of the federal government to gain control of resources which were supposedly given to our province in 1905, but he talked about the equalization formula which adds insult to injury and provides further funds to supposedly balance the 'have-not' with the 'have' areas of Canada.

However, nothing was mentioned about the DREE program which, in addition to all these other methods of supposedly balancing payments across Canada, is discriminatory, not only with regard to the areas which they select throughout Canada, but also with areas within the provinces.

I can't really rationalize why certain parts of Alberta were selected for the DREE program and other areas in the province were completely ignored. Obviously they had facts or figures - statistics. I'm not sure what input the former put into negotiations or if in fact there were any negotiations at all with regard to the locations and areas into which funds would be poured.

I know it was rumoured at the time that the DREE program was being initiated, that the area between Edmonton and Calgary was the "golden rectangle" and casually dismissed, supposedly as an area that didn't require any type of financial assistance.

So I just want to reiterate that the program, in my interpretation, was discriminatory across the country, also in the Province of Alberta and this has been shown in the statistics.

There's an interesting little pamphlet, the Annual Report '71 - '72, which indicates what the effect has been in Canada with regard to the DREE program over the three or so years it has been in operation. For example, Prince Edward Island has averaged \$156 per capita in assistance through the DREE program. In contrast to that, the Province of Alberta has averaged \$5.50. So when you look at this comparison, - I could quote other statistics to indicate these kinds of discrepancies in the distribution of funds - it's certain that some areas are going to progress much more rapidly than others.

The Lesser Slave Lake area, which the member from Slave Lake might like to comment on this afternoon, was designated as a special area. One of the reasons I was initially concerned about the distribution of funds through the DREE program was because a great amount of money was poured into this area, without question, to help an impoverished area. Perhaps they need to change members up there or something and bring it up to standard.

The point I want to make is that there was no possible negotiation with the federal government even though there were shared costs with the province, even though there were shared costs and that the Province of Alberta and our government has spent considerable money in this area throughout the past year. This special area agreement was signed in 1971, and the federal government made commitments of well over \$6 million in grants or contributions and almost \$4 million in loans. Now this is an area that has approximately 2,500 people in the Slave Lake area proper and upwards of 9,000 in the local improvement district. When you combine the totals of the contribution of the Province of Alberta along with those of the federal government, you wonder in effect whether it might be more economical to simply subsidize the people of the area with a guaranteed income and possibly forget all about attempting to establish some type of industry.

I know there will be arguments against this, and I would appreciate hearing some of them.

The question that crossed my mind was why southern Alberta was selected as one of the areas that was I suppose, a 'have not' area. Federally, the southern part was represented by, I think, one cabinet minister, the Hon. Bud Olson, who was the Minister of Agriculture. I wondered whether politics may have entered into this a little bit. I doubt very much if that occurred, but I would appreciate any comments on it.

The Alberta Bureau of Statistics has a very interesting table on industry and resources for 1973. In that table I tried to analyze just why the former government would supposedly recommend southern Alberta for some of the DREE program.

I was very interested in the comments of the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff this afternoon when he spoke about preferential treatment for Medicine Hat and area because of the abundance of gas there. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think the area has suffered that badly.

The manufacturing industries in 1970 - these figures indicate the revenue in different areas of the province which are divided into divisions. One of these divisions is the Medicine Hat-Redcliff area, which in 1970 paid upward of \$12 million in salaries and wages. Division 2, which represents Lethbridge, Brooks, Taber, Coaldale and other municipalities, paid out \$20 million in wages and salaries.

Now I am unfortunate, or fortunate, to live in an area represented by Division No. 8. When you total the manufacturing industries and the revenue in that area - the Red Deer, Lacombe, Ponoka, Rimbey, Rocky Mountain House area, plus other municipalities - we show a total revenue of salaries and wages of about \$6 million. This is approximately half of that of the Medicine Hat-Redcliff area and a little more than a third of a total of Division 2.

Industry and Resource of 1973, by the Alberta Department of Industry and Commerce has some interesting comments and I might quote one. It says:

About 47 per cent of manufacturing is in the southern half of the province in census divisions 1 to 8. In general, the bulk of production of the food and beverages, the rubber, the transportation equipment, and the electrical equipment industries' output is from southern Alberta.

I ask the question why southern Alberta would be selected for the DREE program. There is an interesting statistic on the value of construction work in 1970-72. This is the period of time when DREE commenced its operation. I just might quote two areas which would be of interest to the members.

Lethbridge had a turnover or value of construction work of slightly over \$6 million in 1961. In 1969 Lethbridge had increased to \$17,640,000. In that same period of time the City of Red Deer which is a comparable city, probably a better city if I may be slightly biased, had in 1961 a revenue of \$7 million and in 1969 this figure had only increased by \$100,000.

If you try to rationalize why certain areas were selected in the province and others were deleted, I think the City of Red Deer and the surrounding area has a legitimate complaint about the distribution of funds.

In 1971 the City of Lethbridge had jumped to \$18 million in construction work. The City of Red Deer was still hovering in the \$9 million bracket. So if you want to try to interpret these figures, they are here and available.

DREE has had the effect of increasing the activity, the job opportunities, and consequently has resulted in a slowing up in other areas of the province. Under the DREE program the City of Lethbridge has received \$1.2 million from February 1972 to February 1973. This 'have not' City of Medicine Hat has received \$1,078,000 in grants. These are total grants given out with very few, if any, strings attached.

The area of Brooks has received \$995,000 and I could go on and list grants for development in areas such as Standoff, Vauxhall, Fort Macleod, Tilley, Barneswell, Rosedale, McGrath and so on. Some people argue these funds don't really do much for the area, I have an article here by someone who wanted to do his thesis, to try and prove a point I suppose, showing that DREE has no affect really in the area. This could be subject to a great afternoon debate.

One of the things which disappoints me in these grants under the DREE program, is that there doesn't seem to be any distinction between Canadian corporations and foreign corporations. I fail to understand, for example, how a packing plant such as Swift Canadian in Lethbridge can receive a grant of \$682 thousand. Swift Canadian is a large corporation and no doubt the purpose was to give an incentive to build in that area. To counter-balance Swift Canadian, Canada Packers, which is Canadian owned, received \$101 thousand. So we seem to be fairly generous to some of the foreign corporations and not that generous to our Canadian companies.

I know that our own government is certainly considering deeply the approaches taken with regard to Canadian ownership and assistance to small Canadian companies attempting to develop.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, in summing up the case for a type of program that would cover the whole province and not be selective and discriminatory, is a survey of executive opinion of Alberta industry and commerce.

I want to congratulate the members opposite in the positive report that has been given to the area of southern Alberta. The report says that the Medicine Hat area, which apparently wants preferential treatment with regard to gas, has been particularly prosperous in 1972, due mainly to better economic conditions with the addition of new industry made possible mainly by DREE grants. Should this government policy continue we expect more basic industry to follow which will definitely provide more employment for our people. So this indicates the area is growing rapidly and well.

A report from the Lethbridge Chamber of Commerce shows that "1972 has been a good year, a year of solid but exciting growth for our City of Lethbridge". I wish I could read the same report for the City of Red Deer, but I haven't run across it.

It says, when you get to the Camrose area, "It was significant that virtually all construction in 1972 was residential, both single and multi-unit dwellings." There was virtually no industrial or institutional construction. So I go back to my original comments, Mr. Speaker. There is no question in my mind that the DREE program in selected areas of the province has had a positive effect.

The original intent of my motion was to encourage our government to go into the areas not having these funds. However, because of our negotiations with the federal government, it is hopeful that in the very near future that these funds,

if they continue, will be spread throughout all the areas of the province and not be restricted to some particular areas.

MR. HARLE:

Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion before us I would like briefly to refer again to the situation at Red Deer. My community of Stettler is in the area which was dealt with by the Red Deer Chamber of Commerce in a presentation made to the Ministry of Industry and Commerce pointing out that as far as they were concerned the exclusion of the DREE program had placed them at a disadvantage compared with other designated areas in Alberta and other provinces.

I am sure that we in central Alberta are particularly pleased to find that the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has been able to reach agreement in principle with the federal minister so as to remove the geographic restrictions on the application of the DREE program. However, this is only one matter that perhaps should be considered by the motion as it refers to the government considering ways of balancing the impact of the DREE program in Alberta.

I think all of us in rural Alberta, and particularly in central Alberta, are concerned with the problem of the small community. I'd refer members to the presentation made by the Battle River Planning Commission, and particularly the preamble to that brief made to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, in which they point out some of the social and economic costs of rapid urban growth, and suggest that it is in the best interest of Albertans that there be more equal distribution of economic growth across the province.

The brief itself makes several recommendations for ways of balancing the impact of DREE. There are suggestions concerning the lending policies of institutions. There are suggestions concerning policies of taxation. There are suggestions concerning utility costs, costs of telephone and power and common carrier costs. There is the suggestion that government should consider what determines the location of industry in the Alberta context. This, I would submit, is unknown at this time and I would think that government could come up with some solution to the problem of the location of industry as it is applied in Alberta, especially outside the boundaries of the two large cities.

The brief also raises the problem of government decentralization. I'm sure members have seen the production by the Red Deer Regional Planning Commission. It also goes, with a great deal of detail, into the problem of small communities right across Alberta. The referral letter to the Minister of Municipal Affairs states,

This research document resulted from the concerns expressed by a number of municipalities of the commission about the rapid growth of Edmonton and Calgary and the slow or non-existent growth of the smaller centres of the province and the result of such trends on the municipalities lying within the area of the commission,

which, of course, is central Alberta.

I'd like to raise some other matters that perhaps should be considered by government to balance the impact of DREE. I would ask the government to consider the principles involved in local development companies. I'm particularly interested in the experience at Olds. I notice that an association has been formed at Olds, I think it is a co-op, which has obtained a loan from the Alberta Opportunity Company for land assembly for industrial purposes. This seems to me to be the concept of the local development company as it is developed in the United States. I think government here in Alberta should consider this approach to communities being able to solve their own problems by making use of a company designed specifically for local development.

I would also ask that the government consider the locations of educational institutions as part of this problem of balancing the impact of DREE, particularly the location of colleges and universities. I'm sure that many of our small communities could well use the facilities of colleges, especially small types of colleges such as community colleges, to which students could come from many areas of Alberta. The problem of the locations of universities, of course, is a much larger problem and at this time it appears that the location or the creation of new universities might be out of the question. However, it is possible that universities should also be located away from the main centres of population.

I would also suggest that government could consider the problem of airports in this whole problem of balancing the impact of DREE. As we progress in this

twentieth century, I think we will find that airports are a very valuable institution. At the moment it seems that we have some problems with regard to the small airports. They are usually run by flying clubs and these clubs are not in a position to go into the developmental aspects of an airport. There is a need for grants to municipalities to cover the operating costs of airports. It's particularly difficult for small communities to get adequate information on the size of their airports, the length of the runways and the weight of aircraft which will be using these facilities. There is the problem of bathroom facilities, waiting rooms, heating providing for radio reception and providing hangars. There is the problem of charter flight services.

All these things are quite beyond the capability of most small communities, yet I am sure that in the future airports will play a very great part in the development of Alberta.

I want to remind members of some of the existing programs which will, in fact, help to balance the impact of DREE. I am thinking particularly of the rural gas policy in Alberta. I am sure this will greatly help the small communities which will be serviced as a result of this program.

I'd also like to refer to the extended area service of Alberta Government Telephones and direct distance dialing. All of these are things which help to make life more agreeable in the rural parts of our province and also help, as far as balancing that impact demonstrated by the previous speaker, in this province.

I would also like to remind members that the Alberta Opportunity Corporation is in the business of financing new businesses within the province. All of us, I think, realize that the need is great for the provision of adequate capital to develop Alberta, particularly rural Alberta.

I'd also like to mention one specific industry which came to my attention recently and which, I submit, needs a great deal of encouragement and perhaps a lot of development. This is in the area of casting of goods which are used in manufacturing other products. In other words, there is a need for a development of some kind of foundry in Alberta for casting metals. In just about every piece of equipment manufactured in Alberta today, some cast parts are involved. As I understand it, there are about three or four relatively small casting businesses, foundry businesses, in Alberta.

There are many, many businesses manufacturing agricultural machinery and industrial equipment which need the product of those in the casting business. It is a specialized business. It is not one that goes along with the manufacture of farm machinery specifically. In fact, castings are made to specifications. It's an industry which uses a lot of scrap metal, and without the ability of the farm manufacturing and industrial manufacturing businesses in Alberta to obtain castings, there is a limit placed on the possibilities of the manufacturing process in the province.

I would suggest that the government investigate what can be done to facilitate the manufacture of castings locally. Otherwise, these businesses, which are quite active at the moment, will be going elsewhere for that type of product, even as far away as South Africa.

The last point I want to bring out in the area of trying to balance the DREE program, is to review somewhat the concept of the new town. I'm sure all of us are familiar with the fact that the new town concept is already in our legislation, particularly in Chapter 258 of the Revised Statutes of Alberta of 1970 called The New Towns Act. This has been applied in Alberta in Port McMurray, Grande Cache, Lodgepole, Fox Creek and other areas.

However, I submit that the concept of the new town has been used as an ad hoc procedure. I feel that it could be developed and made more use of as far as the province is concerned.

I would like to point out some facts - first of all, the report on the proposed new town of Fox Creek, for example, which was done by the Provincial Planning Board in July, 1967, in its evaluation of the evidence and conclusions which were presented at that time to the Provincial Planning Board. From the information received, it appeared to the board that development in the oil and gas fields in the vicinity of Fox Creek was on the increase and would continue for some time. In addition, it was not inconceivable that in a few years time extensive wood cutting would be required in conjunction with pulp mill operations at Whitecourt.

It was suggested that the establishment of a new town would enable the development to occur in an orderly and economic manner that would not be otherwise possible if the various companies involved in the town were left to organize their own facilities individually. However, it was forecast by the Provincial Planning Board that general revenues and expenditures indicated a deficit position.

Another proposed new town was the hamlet of Smith. A feasibility study was done by the Provincial Planning Board in August, 1968. This was a one-company town of Federated Cooperatives Limited. There was little indication of growth in the labour force in that particular area. Every family required effective and convenient sanitary facilities. There was a lack of proper housing and there were no known natural resources within the area. The recommendation of the Provincial Planning Board at that time was that the new town status not be conferred on the hamlet of Smith.

The Provincial Planning Board did a study which was published in January of 1972 of the new town of Fort McMurray with regard to its general plan. It pointed out that the town was based, at that time at least, on two industries, GCOS and Swanson Lumber. The NAR of course, had a railhead there and there were barge facilities available. New town status was granted in 1964 with a population of 1,300 and by 1972 this had increased to 7,000.

There was first of course, a large influx of construction workers. This was replaced by more permanent plant employees and their dependents. Thirdly, there was an influx of retail and service workers into the area. The population consists mostly of younger people in the 20 to 40 year-old group with a high birthrate.

The town had a history of very erratic growth. The Provincial Planning Board stated that population projections or forecasts are an important factor in planning future urban growth and are used in determining land use requirements.

How important it is, Mr. Speaker, that population projections and forecasts be as accurate as possible. Therefore, one of the factors that must be considered in any program to balance the impact of DREE is the development of population studies.

It is interesting to read the various reports of the Task Force on Urbanization and the Future, particularly the report on the general task force committee reports. In that document it is stated that there is an urgent need for provincial policy within which the province's continued growth and development, at both regional and municipal levels, can be sensibly planned in terms of social and economic criteria acceptable to Albertans. The same task force studying the role of regional planning, points out that the review indicated the wide scope of responsibility which has been assigned to the regional planning commissions by provincial legislation.

I think it is important for all members to realize that we have created regional development and yet we have also very strong local government. The impact of the regional concept on the existing towns, municipalities and village structures is important to understand as far as future development is concerned.

The task force report on issues in local government pointed out that it can be said that in Alberta issues in local government centre around a lack of overall provincial policies regarding local government and there is a need for a policy on regionalization.

Again we come back to the problem that regionalization has not been developed to the point where it really fits in with the structures now existing.

The task force report on Choices for Metropolitan Growth contained some interesting statements on this matter. It argued that it is debatable whether the present form of metropolitan growth is the best possible. It stated it would be difficult to prove or disprove without an examination of available alternatives.

New town legislation was, of course, utilized to assist in the development of the town of St. Albert. Decisions have not, by and large, been based on a rigorous examination of regional alternatives. We also have the problem of satellite towns.

The report points out that many European metropolitan areas have, to varying degrees, followed policies of decentralization, through expansion of existing regional towns, for establishing large or small new towns, and through discontinuous development along very defined corridors.

In terms of balancing employment, the report stated the English have pursued a policy of decentralization of manufacturing industry to new towns. By means of incentives and regulation they have generally achieved their planning objective in this regard.

It stated that more recent reviews of the London new town program indicate that if central city concentration is to be counteracted, office and administrative functions have to be attracted outward.

In new towns elsewhere, less strain has been placed on the balance of employment and more on the provision of high levels of transportation connections to the central city, a full range of commercial and service functions, and a high level of residential environment. It's interesting to listen to these when you think of the new town situation we have here in this province.

We should also compare the developments in Ontario. The Province of Ontario has produced what is called Design for Development, Phase 3. In Ontario the emphasis has been on regional development.

The problem of the new town is one which I think should be considered from many aspects, especially the social aspect and the development of the economic possibilities within the town. Of course it's not a new concept, but in practice new towns have frequently been associated with single economic enterprises and fortunes have fluctuated in close sympathy with the oscillations of restricted economic bases.

New towns, of course, have been developed in other areas of the world, in Sweden, Denmark, Finland and the United States. But perhaps the widest application of the new concept is in Britain. It has been a means of achieving redistribution of older industrial activities and in time has become a method, or a catalyst, in the process of reorientating the basis and direction of the economy. It is in this much broader aspect that I submit it should be considered for use in balancing the effect of the DREE program.

The success of new towns in England has perhaps been based on two facts, their ability to attract industrial enterprises and the ability of the development corporations set up to develop the towns to provide annual increments of housing units. How important that is when we look at the situation at Fort McMurray.

Three factors have contributed to attracting industry to the new town in Britain. Some industrial enterprises have deliberately sought out the new town as locations. The new town has been a source of labour and an efficient physical environment. In Britain there has been a deliberate set of complex concessions which industry could obtain by locating in a new town.

British experience shows that other factors have been involved too. Most of the new town inhabitants moved there to escape substandard and overcrowded conditions. The level of home ownership in new towns in Britain is low. Most new town residents are tenants - tenants of the development authority which is developing the town.

It is stated that generous housing policies and practices have been crucial to successful new town development. When one thinks of that statement and looks at the situation in Fort McMurray, I am sure the same thing can be said of it.

In Britain from 1946 there have been 32 new towns developed, some of which were formed on the nucleus of a small village or a small town. The policy behind their creation is mainly to encourage the gradual dispersal of industry and population from congested cities to new areas. Recent development of this policy is the large scale planned expansion of existing towns.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the new town concept in Alberta is in its infancy. We should be looking at this type of policy to encourage the development of the rest of Alberta.

Editorials have appeared recently suggesting that not all of the towns in the province look to industrial development as a solution for their particular problems. If we are to have a development of secondary industry in the province, the question then becomes, where do they locate. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in some instances they will have to locate in new towns. If this is to take place I submit that the present Act needs to be studied with a great deal of care, that there are a lot of improvements needed and a lot of things built into this whole concept. If we are to see Alberta developed I am sure that in the next few years we are going to see new towns developed.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARTON:

Mr. Speaker, talking to this resolution gives me a little bit of pleasure. I have circulated one of the editorials of The Calgary Herald. I had a reporter coming up to search out and find some of the facts. I welcome anybody in that area, and all the MLAs, as I have in the past, to come out and have a look at the DREE program. I am not going to argue whether the province should administer it or not, but it has been successful. It has provided over 3,500 jobs with a maximum of around \$20 million. And I use a couple of comparisons I think are interesting. When the hon. Member for Lacombe spoke he covered quite a wide range of topics, the number of jobs, et cetera. For instance, the \$10 million under the Agricultural Development Corporation provided for only 190 jobs, and the giant proposal for the McMurray tar sands will create only 8,000 jobs. We did that with a small pittance of the money from the federal government in creating over 3,500 jobs in a matter of two and one-half to three years.

I have some reservations about the new approach by the government. I can see some pitfalls in their approach as to the order of merit; that is, which town will achieve a grant, and whether it will achieve 10 per cent participation or 40 per cent participation. Because how is a town like Fort Vermilion going to compete with a town like Red Deer? I don't envy the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs at all in making some of the decisions that will come out of it. Transportation will involve subsidies as to getting the available [products] to market. There is the willingness of the town to cooperate with the provincial government on just that factor, the DREE approach.

I think the hon. Member for Stettler should spend some time in the Lesser Slave Lake area. I'm going to go out of context, as he also did, by taking some liberty here. I commend the Premier on adopting the Alberta Energy Company, because it is exactly what we had four years ago in the Lesser Slave Lake development. But we have a little better deal. We have industry participating, the oil companies, and in the end we own 100 per cent of it through the residents of Slave Lake.

In developing the Lesser Slave Lake Development Company we opened an avenue of participation. In this case we participated in an apartment complex for residents, which we achieved with a loan from CMHC of over \$1,200,000. This is one of the few towns in the North, by the way, with very little participation as far as the local people are concerned. We also achieved an office building, 29,000 square feet of which was graciously rented by the provincial government.

There is an interesting part about that. When you achieve industrial development, you also achieve a lot of interest from outside areas. In this particular bid that was out for office space and rental space, three outside bids were entertained in addition to one by the Slave Lake Development Company. Because of the fact that we had the money and were able to compete with our local funds, our local financing, we achieved a bid. Otherwise it would have gone to an outsider, possibly in Edmonton.

So the readiness of a town is very important in achieving any industrial development. You can give a town anything it wants on a silver platter but it won't work. It can't work, because if the people aren't geared to participate in one way or another you can designate the province from one end to the other. In the early fifties and sixties I recall a belt through northern Alberta, I think it was called a depressed area in which there were some incentive grants given out, in the Barrhead area and Westlock area. I think they tried a few industries. I'm not sure. But the important part is that they were given these benefits but really didn't understand what they were getting.

The approach in the Lesser Slave Lake area is the only acceptable approach. It's been proven, it works for less money, and I hope that the provincial government would consider that approach by hiring regional people within the area who understand the administrative problems in that particular area. I notice Northern Development has taken our approach by bringing in coordinators in each area. It's a great approach. There is no doubt about it. Because it is the grassroots people who make the program work.

But if it's going to be run by - I am saying this with a little malice - by ex-Progressive Conservative party presidents in both, I don't think that's a fair opportunity for understanding that the decisions they make will affect what exactly goes on in a community out of Edmonton. So I think they will have to decentralize their new approach.

In closing, there is no doubt the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs will recall that just before the last federal election - I asked during the question period and he didn't know, so I'll take a little liberty here - he did write a letter to the Hon. Paul Yewchuk. The hon. Member for Athabasca presented it to me in my place of operation stating that the Lesser Slave Lake special area was a five year agreement. They had no intentions of ever cutting it back.

Now I hope that the hon. Minister for Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, Mr. Speaker, will look back in his files and read the letter and the closing date of December 31, 1973 for the DREE programs. I think there is a little bit of misunderstanding or confusion that this is a program for five years. People of the Lesser Slave Lake area who have worked over seven years to get the program in the first place would consider that it's a special area. It's a pilot project. I recommend that he build on it. It's a successful program.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. Member for Lacombe introducing his resolution because it gives thought in my mind to where we are heading in this DREE program. In fact, what has it accomplished?

To me it appears to be another situation of the government, or governments, putting their hot little hands in the wrong place at the wrong time. Now that is not an insinuation that should be taken out of context.

I think, however, that the rationale behind the DREE program, the distribution was statistical, a basis of computer printouts. Reference has been made to the southern part of the province and since I come from that particular area I might mention a few things about it.

Medicine Hat, for instance, had a history of static growth for some 20 or 25 years. It has taken off now and how much, in fact, the government pump priming had to do with it, or how much would have been achieved in any case by the simple fact that they are sitting in a particular area very rich in gas, is something that should possibly be explored.

Interestingly enough, one of these particular government incentive programs - I refer now to the fertilizer plant that was developed under an \$11 million federal incentive grant in the Redwater area - had the effect of undermining the growth of Medicine Hat for a considerable length of time. In fact they did have a fertilizer plant there, Northwest Nitro Chemicals Ltd. As a result of competition from this new plant, Northwest Nitro practically went under. However, the situation has now changed.

There have been many precedents for government involvement. Ireland has been able, because of the aggressive programs they have had, in fact, over a period of ten years, to develop 5,000 industries.

The payoff goes something like this: 50 per cent government grants; 20 years no tax, period. However, I see by a recent press release that they have now changed the rules of the game. So I say, anyone in private industry had better watch very closely when dealing with any government.

Back to the matter of Red Deer and the history of Red Deer in the '60s. I believe it would be a fair assessment to say that it was one of the growth areas of the Province of Alberta. A good friend of mine who comes from there visited me periodically. He also happened to be on the Board of Trade and always spoke so glowingly of how things went in Red Deer. Suddenly this came to an end. Did it in fact come to an end as a result of DREE programs in other areas? In other words, by government intervention?

Their attempts to pass laws and regulations or funnel the channels of trade in the same manner as the Legislature passing a bill to permit water to run uphill and making it the law of the land, did not necessarily mean that water would proceed in any other manner than it did ordinarily.

Another particular area of the world getting no place with regional grants is Jamaica. The government of Jamaica not only will pay 50 per cent but it will give you 100 per cent tariff protection and allow you to sell on the market at any particular price you want, as well as having no income tax.

But, generally, you can conclude that where opportunity exists, private enterprise will seize on that opportunity. I think probably this is the reason

why the private enterprise system is so functionally efficient. Any time the viability of operation isn't determined by the profit and loss statement, it ceases to exist.

You have the outpouring of government funds trying to create environments that do not exist. Despite the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been poured into the Maritimes, you have still not raised that particular part of Canada into a 'have' area. It is still a region that requires additional funds. So in reality, the net result has not been what was intended.

Reference has been made to the Slave Lake area. I think any person who looks at this in a fair-minded manner realizes that not only was there a slow growth situation in the Slave Lake area, but there was a sociological problem. There was a people-problem. There was the process of awakening people and bringing them out and beyond themselves. How can you in any way assess in terms of money the intangible benefits that may well accrue from this particular development? So I would think probably that a program such as occurred at Slave Lake, having regard for the primitive nature of the environment, having regard for the people's lack of opportunity and taking into consideration that they too should have the opportunity to be awakened and participate in the twentieth century, the program in Lesser Slave Lake can not be faulted.

In regard to this new method of the DREE program now coming under the purview of the Government of the Province of Alberta, I am wondering what formula they are going to adopt. Are they going to use labour statistics, the unemployment insurance ratio in certain areas? Are they going to go on computer printouts of the past, or are they going to go the Spiro Agnew route? That is the question I would like to have answered.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. DRAIN:

This is a dangerous thing and I would think that they should follow very closely the procedures for programming that have been laid down and carried out by the federal government, realizing very well, Mr. Speaker, that the computer is a highly over-rated machine. Because, all that comes out of a computer is what you put in it. If you put it in wrong, it spits it out wrong.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, it will be no doubt several months before we know the exact nature of the new agreement on DREE. Nevertheless, in making a few observations on this particular resolution I want to say that I was rather impressed during the last summer when the Western Economic Opportunities Conference took place to observe the discussion on DREE. I thought that that was perhaps one of the more positive discussions that occurred during the Western Economic Opportunities Conference. Part of it was due perhaps to both the loquacity and persuasiveness of Mr. Jamieson, the federal minister. I suspect that he is a skilful enough talker that he might even be able to explain the federal export tax in such a way that the hon. gentlemen across the road might be more willing to accept it.

Notwithstanding that, I felt there was a rather encouraging discussion on both the defects of the present DREE operation, and also the moves that the federal government contemplated to correct some of those defects - particularly the suggestion that there would be a decentralization of DREE administration, and secondly, that DREE would actively seek and identify new development opportunities rather than the tendency to react to propositions which had been put to it by private industry.

Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned, I think we have to deal effectively with the question of regional disparity in Canada. Some mention has been made both last night and even today when the mover introduced the motion, that the equalization formula is perhaps adequate, or at least, goes a long way to dealing with regional disparity.

I submit that it really doesn't. We need to develop programs which go beyond simple equalization formulae to provincial governments, some kind of on-going scheme, whatever you call it. A scheme designed to try to encourage industrial development in slow growth areas is a must if this country means

business when we say that one of our objectives is to deal with the problem of regional disparity.

But having said that, it can, I think, fairly be argued that the DREE setup as it has existed has a number of serious shortcomings. The mover of the motion pointed out that many of the grants had gone to foreign controlled corporations. In making that statement, he summarized, I think, the feelings of resentment held by many people not only in this province, but perhaps even more strongly in other parts of Canada.

When discussion took place on DREE in northern Alberta, I think there was a good deal more criticism of the problems which arose when the boundaries of DREE were extended so that Procter and Gamble were entitled to a DREE grant than there ever was at the original special areas scheme itself. It seems to me there is a good deal of validity in the concern about taxpayers' money in Canada being turned over to foreign-controlled corporations.

I submit that beyond that there is an argument for equity in whatever concern gets the government grant. If we are going to provide a grant of \$1 million or \$1.5 million or \$12 million it seems to me that the promoters of that particular venture should make provision for an equity in the venture equal to the grant.

The point I would like to stress in this resolution debate, Mr. Speaker, is with respect to the question of provincial cooperation into those areas of the provinces which really overlap - with particular reference, of course, to the Peace River country, half of which is in Alberta and half in British Columbia. If the province is going to take a much more direct role in administering DREE it would seem to me mandatory that a pretty clear understanding be arrived at between the Government of Alberta and the Government of British Columbia with respect to DREE programs in the northern parts of both provinces.

We had concern expressed by the Grande Prairie Chamber of Commerce a year and a half ago about just what was happening to DREE. In Alberta we had the minister in this province making some rather unflattering statements about DREE, even implying the province was going to withdraw from the DREE program. On the other hand in British Columbia we had the old government saying that they wanted to bring northern B.C. into the DREE program. Of course people in the Peace River country concerned about industrial development on the Alberta side suddenly found that if Alberta moved out and British Columbia moved in then industry which might otherwise settle in Alberta would go to British Columbia.

So one of the things that must be done if the provinces are going to play a greater role in the administration of the plan is that we must synchronize our approach to DREE at least on those border areas, on the west with British Columbia and on the east with the Province of Saskatchewan.

Another area that has quite frankly concerned me about the development in the Lesser Slave Lake special area is the concept of the growth centre. It seems to me that perhaps we should rethink whether that is the best route to take in really maximizing the social and economic benefits in a have-not region.

As I visit different parts of the Lesser Slave Lake area I find in some of the smaller centres, places like Faust and Widewater and others, at least some resentment that all the benefits of the special areas program are being concentrated in the town of Slave Lake.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that in any kind of program, whether provincial or federal, you have to try to get away from simply centralizing growth, whether it's in two metropolitan areas or in 20 or 30 growth centres throughout the province. I believe we can encourage at least some level of economic activity in the smaller communities of our province. Part of a program like DREE or industrial incentive programs which we sponsor in the province should be directly geared to the encouragement of industry in the very small communities, the hamlets, tiny villages and small towns of our province.

I want to make some comments with respect to one point raised by the hon. Member for Stettler. He raised, I thought, a very good point when he talked about the need to upgrade airport facilities in the rural communities and smaller towns of Alberta.

One of the things you notice as you travel about the province is that outside of Edmonton and Calgary, and to a lesser extent Lethbridge and Medicine Hat, we really don't have that good a transportation system. Twenty years ago rail transportation was readily available to people. But of course today, the day of the passenger train - even between Edmonton and Calgary - is for all

intents and purposes something of the past. I wish that weren't the case, but at this stage of the game it certainly is the case.

One area that can be developed, it seems to me, is a feeder airline service which would fly into the smaller communities. I note the fact that there is now a small airline operating out of Slave Lake, for example, which goes to High Prairie, Peace River and then comes back touching on those communities. That sort of thing should be expanded in other parts of the province.

But, of course, you can't develop feeder airline service to these smaller towns unless you have adequate airports. So one area the province clearly should examine pretty closely, in my judgment, is a recommendation from the hon. Member for Stettler that funds be made available to upgrade local airports.

In general then, Mr. Speaker, the DREE program, while it has not been totally successful, has at least been aimed in the right direction in attempting to deal with the problems of disparity within the country. And as we apply that principle, which is the basis for the national program to Alberta, I don't think we should demand that a dollar spent in Slave Lake should be equalled by a dollar spent in Edmonton, or a dollar spent in Red Deer, or a dollar spent in Medicine Hat. I think the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest quite correctly pointed out that there are some parts of the province that require considerably more pump priming than others.

One can't help, after travelling along Highway No. 2, but agree that the Lesser Slave Lake region was one area that very clearly needed the pump priming of a DREE program. I think it is wrong for us to tie any administration of this concept in the future to the idea that money should somehow be equally applied, because as you travel the province you find that the access to opportunity is by no means equal in Alberta. There are some areas where a great number of services are required in order that the citizens of these particular districts will have the same opportunities that exist for people in Edmonton or Calgary, or even those residents of some of the more established parts of the province.

In general, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the DREE program has been at least a scheme which was well motivated - many shortcomings, yes - but I hope that as we attempt to correct its shortcomings we don't lose sight of the fact that it must be an ongoing policy within Canada to deal with regional disparity, and within Alberta to deal with regional disparity in our own province.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two points on this resolution. I would like first of all to indicate to the mover and the seconder that I appreciated the positive approach they took to the resolution. They didn't spend a lot of time in haranguing the past and some of the things that may have happened.

To the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, I certainly feel that the approach, the direction in which he is going, is the right direction. We certainly need to control and be involved in the development, and particularly the industrial development, of our province. I certainly understand from past experience that he will have some difficulty because we well understand that in making decisions such as this, when the federal government wishes to provide certain funds to a province it wants to have a certain say as to where they will be spent.

I would certainly hope that the minister could make it very clear to the federal government that they want as few strings attached as possible, so that a decision in Alberta doesn't always have to await the decision of the federal minister or a signature of the federal minister. I can say from past experience that that certainly can slow down a lot of industrial development and programs that are good for the future of the Province of Alberta.

I'd also like to make the point that I hope the minister will keep in mind the concept of total resource development, a development of not only the physical resources of our province but also the people or the human resource. I can only recall the development and the situations which occurred prior to declaring the Slave Lake area a special area. I recall a number of Native people and a number of local people from the Lesser Slave Lake area making representation to government and indicating that they did not want just a piecemeal program. We as ministers had four or five different problems that we had noted in the area, and were willing to do something about them. They said to us at that time, "Don't just look at those problems, they are symptoms of something that is even greater." As the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest has recognized, we have social problems as well as economic ones.

I can only recommend to the minister that he place an emphasis on the terms of reference of this program as it affects Alberta, an emphasis on human resource development and the development of the people of Alberta and not just on economic development. Historically and traditionally the Conservative party has taken that particular approach. I certainly hope the new government we have in Alberta examines and redefines their approach to total resource development and places a greater emphasis on the human resource development that is necessary.

The other point I would like to make for the consideration of the minister is with regard to the types of projects that may be supported through a DREE program. I believe that more recognition should be given to projects from individuals, from people who potentially can start a new industry, as an individual or as a small group of individuals. Too long and too often we have provided money for large corporations or for people who already have a large amount of money and borrowing powers that they could use to build or promote an industry in the Province of Alberta. I would suggest that a portion or a percentage be determined as moneys that will go to small industries in the Province of Alberta, or towns or groups of people in small towns, so they can build an economic base that is solid, secure and one that recognizes individual initiative and potential. We should look at \$2,000 loans or \$3,000 loans or \$5,000 loans, because those types of loans can start a new idea and create something very, very great for our province.

So that's the second point I'd like to make to the minister, as I feel it is most important at this point in time in our history. I make the second point because I'm very concerned about the concept of free enterprise as we have defined it in the past and as each one of us talks about it in very light terms or grave terms. We think it is something. But in the Province of Alberta, as in many places in North America, real free enterprise doesn't have the chance today that it had a number of years ago. I think this is one place where we could promote, accelerate and assist that particular concept and I certainly recommend it to the minister in his decision-making.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that if the decision-making and the powers are provided for the province without a great amount of federal government interference, and if there is a consideration for smaller projects and certainly a consideration for a broader base of human resource development in the Province of Alberta, this program can certainly bring about some success.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say one or two things in connection with the bill.

My first comment is that the way DREE has been operated in the past was unfair to many parts of the province because it changed the priority list of essential works. Items within the area of DREE which were very low in priority, would suddenly secure public money for priority, leaving out many items of high priority in other parts of the province. This, I felt, was unfair.

During the early stages of this program when we were in government, this did happen. I saw a highway project that was very, very low as far as provincial priorities were concerned, suddenly receiving money. The comment of our planning engineers and construction engineers was: It's not costing us anything; all we are doing is designing and constructing this and it is not costing us anything. Meaning it was not coming out of the highway department vote. Nevertheless it was costing the people of Alberta and the people of Canada money. Sometimes we put too much emphasis on the vote from which the money comes, forgetting that it is public money.

So the resolution, as I see it, is good. It would give the provincial and the federal governments an opportunity to look at projects anywhere in the Province of Alberta and give them their proper priority. I think this is excellent.

The other point I want to make is that I've heard a lot today about the amount of money that goes into a project. So many millions are going into this, so many millions are going into that. This is a natural procedure, I suppose. But I would like to think that in this program, particularly now, since it has been in vogue for some time, we could use the other approach; to say not that we have put six million in grants and four million of loans into a particular area, but to say, what has this money produced? Has it produced industry that is going to bring far more than that amount back over the next few years? Has it provided incentives that have put people to work where they no longer want to stay on welfare? What is the picture arising out of this expenditure of money?

I think we have to approach many of our projects, particularly as the last speaker said of free enterprise, as to what results we are getting from this when the government is providing an extra amount of money to encourage free enterprise. If it is simply to encourage free enterprise, then, in my view, this would not be a proper expenditure of public money. But if it's to provide the incentive and the green light for an industry to develop, after an assessment of it we are able to show that an industry has developed, that now people will be working in this particular industry for many years, then I think we can say whether the money has been well spent or not well spent.

I believe every one of these projects should have a careful analysis yearly, or every second year, or every third year to see what the result is. If it is simply providing routine jobs for that year and then end, it is not, in my view, the purpose of this type of program. It should be something that in the long-term view, the industry encouraged is going to provide jobs, provide output, provide production for a number of years in the particular area in which it is being encouraged to form and where it is being initiated.

If we can find that the money is bringing a worthwhile return to the community, province and nation, then whether it is \$5 million or \$25 million, I think we can say the money is well spent. If we find there is little or no return coming from that investment then I think we have to say that the investment has not been good and should be discontinued at the earliest possible stage.

Under a DREE program, while emphases and priorities, of course, are given to eliminate disparities, I believe it is very essential that proper priorities for major projects be a consideration so that a minor project in one area does not receive higher priority than a major project that would produce much more wealth and many more jobs in an area that doesn't happen to be in the low income area at that time. I believe that if these considerations are made that we will see more and more public money producing results. Those are the criteria that should determine whether the DREE programs are good or bad.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments on the resolution before us. Let me say at the beginning that I don't have any particular quarrel with the principle contained in the resolution in that the mover and the seconder are recommending that the Alberta government consider ways of balancing the impact of the DREE program in Alberta.

I listened very carefully to the debate by the mover and the seconder and particularly to the mover. I got the distinct impression that he was trying to prove to the House that Lacombe-Red Deer was a poorer area than Medicine Hat. I am a little surprised that any person coming from his particular area would feel so inclined. I talk to many, many people and I have yet to meet one that would want to pursue that line of argument.

But after I listened to him rather carefully I could follow his argument. I have to say that when we start using statistics, it seems to me that we can almost make them mean whatever we want to.

I am reminded of a certain lawyer from the city of Lethbridge I met many many years ago in the old airport here in Edmonton. During the course of conversation he made this statement. He said there are figures that tell the truth, there are figures that lie and then, of course, there are statistical figures. I think that possibly he had a point. Certainly they become very interesting when we try to use them to make the point we want.

Now the hon. Member for Lacombe in moving the motion, made some reference to the original negotiations that went on between the provincial government and the federal government in establishing the boundaries of the DREE area. I have to confess that it is now some years ago since this happened. I was not directly involved in the negotiations but if my memory serves me correctly, the original intent of the federal government was to exclude the Province of Alberta altogether from the DREE program.

The purpose of the Act, as I recall, was to bring in a federal program that would take care of slow growth within certain areas of Canada. It was not the feeling of the federal officials involved at that time to extend the program to some areas of western Canada. They were also taking a very hard look at certain areas in central Canada.

Now, I want to make it very clear, Mr. Speaker, that I agree 100 per cent when it is suggested that the boundaries, as set up, were discriminatory. And

to those who have wondered why the boundaries were as they were in the province, I would have to say that I have never been able to get a clear-cut answer from the federal officials involved in setting up the boundaries. They did consider a smaller area in the original plan and, at the time they made this known to us, one of the arguments I advanced to them was that, in my view, it was wrong.

I pointed, as an example, to the fact that we had had a socio-economic study of the area of Drumheller and the Crowsnest Pass, and that this report had indicated there were some problem areas lying within these regions. I simply made that point to the Minister of Agriculture, the hon. Mr. Olsen, who was involved with the program at that point in time. The best I could get out of him in the situation was, well, they would take another look at it.

The federal government made a unilateral decision. They did not ask us whether or not we were prepared to accept it. They had some discussions with us, but very little discussion. They made a unilateral decision to set the boundaries in the manner they did. I want to say here, as I said then, that I think it was wrong and it did not serve the best interests of Canada or the best interests of Alberta.

The situation we face at the present time is that governments have now determined that they are going to become involved in assisting the development of our economy. I want to say here that I feel it is very, very essential that we look very carefully at the method in which we will assist.

I certainly agree with the hon. Member for Stettler who suggested there are areas in which we could give assistance, such as the development of airports and so on, and there are a number of areas, I think, that could be mentioned as being areas that are responsibilities of the provincial government.

I think provision of social services within areas that are important to the development of a certain industry within the area, The New Towns Act, has worked reasonably well in assisting the development of industry. But when we come into a situation where we have a competition for free funds or, let me put it this way: where we have a competition for the funds that are made available through the general revenue of a province or of a nation, whether it is needed or not, we have a very bad situation developing.

I am amazed at the number of people who come to me now and ask me: Harry, do you know of grants that can be available to us through government? It is not a question of need, but if grants are being made available, we want to jump on the gravy train and have some of them made available to us too.

I think someone mentioned a certain packing plant that went to Lethbridge. Without doubt, the main reason for it going there was to take advantage of grants being made available. They were then setting themselves up in competition with industries that had established themselves on their own initiative and with their own money.

This creates some very, very difficult situations, and I think that as governments, it is very important that they look carefully at the kind of program that is developed so it does not, in fact, destroy an industry that has been established earlier under its own steam by moneys made available from the general taxpayer.

For quite a number of years I have been concerned with the changing attitudes taking place within our society. For example, you will have people who will sit within a certain area and make this kind of statement, "The government owes me a living and they ought to do something for me here at position X." I can recall, and I don't have to stretch my imagination at all, when my parents used to tell me that the main reason they came to Canada was that it offered them opportunities they didn't have in the area where they were born.

I would say that concept is totally changing. Now people are saying, "You must bring the opportunity to me." I think it is wrong. We can overplay the suggestion that as a government we owe it to an area to bring opportunity to it.

It seems to me that within certain areas of Canada that it would have been far better to have provided opportunity for people to make a move, rather than try to provide opportunity where they were.

Certainly we can recognize that there are problems involved within our large growth areas. I think of areas such as Edmonton and Calgary where there has been very rapid growth. I think if we can do something to slow the growth in the major areas, then we ought to do something about it. Maybe there are a

number of areas within Canada in which this situation is true. But again if we try to curtail the development as was done by the federal government through certain regulations applied to certain areas of Canada, then we can, in fact, create problems for all of our citizens by denying growth where it would be relatively available.

Therefore, I think that in looking at this resolution I would strongly suggest that the government give very careful consideration to applying the kind of programs that rightfully would fall into the jurisdiction of government and avoid trying to get into areas of competition where, in fact, they can be a detriment to some area or industry while helping others.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I am not opposed to the resolution as it stands and I certainly hope that it will be given careful consideration so that no area is directly hurt as a result of it.

MR. GETTY:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Assuming it to be 5:30, the House stands adjourned until 8:00 this evening.

[Mr. Speaker left the Chair 5:29 pm.]