

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday Evening, March 26, 1974

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

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to revert to Introduction of Visitors.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member have the permission of the House?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

## INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (CONT.)

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and the Members of the Assembly, the 28th Edmonton Scout Troop, ages 12 to 14, seated in the public gallery. They are with Mr. Frank McCoy, their scout master, Mr. Kent and Mr. Jack Milligan. I wonder if they would stand and be recognized by the members of the Assembly.

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Second Reading)Bill No. 2 The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1974

MR. MINIELY:

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 2, The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1974.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 2 was read a second time.]

## GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (CONT.)

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted for the sixth time in my political career to get up in this House and speak either on the Throne Speech debate or the Budget Speech debate.

It is very unfortunate indeed, Mr. Speaker, that the Throne debate had such a short life. That, in my estimation, lies squarely with the opposition. When I was in opposition, Mr. Speaker, I delighted in giving the government of the day hell. And one of the ...

[Interjections]

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. YURKO:

... and one of the greatest media ...

MR. LUDWIG:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Point of order, sit down.

MR. LUDWIG:

... rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Quiet.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it was ruled in this House that we are not to get into the Speech from the Throne debate, and I would like to ask the minister whether he has any responsibility in this House with regard to government motions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, if I might continue. I want to first address myself to the Provincial Treasurer and express to him my delight and also convey to him the congratulations that I know are in every one of our minds in regard to the really tremendous budget that he brought into this House last week.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet I would also like to express appreciation to a man who's not in this House today. He is the leader of our government. I want to indicate, even in his absence, my great pleasure in serving with him on this government team. I think that every single one of us is a leader. Not only the cabinet ministers, but every single MLA is a leader of his community, a leader of his constituency, and must in every case behave that way.

But we have amongst us not only a leader, but a leader of leaders, as I have had occasion to use that phrase before.

AN HON. MEMBER:

So be it.

MR. YURKO:

I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I firmly believe in the last two years Alberta has had good government. But good government can only be sustained if there is a good opposition, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. YURKO:

I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I have observed the performance of the opposition, with all its multiple heads, in the last two and one-half years and have to suggest that I am terribly disappointed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. YURKO:

Because I don't see how we can continue to be good government ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

We wonder too.

MR. YURKO:

... unless we have good opposition, Mr. Speaker ...

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hurrah!

MR. YURKO:

... and I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I have observed the performance of the opposition, with all its multiple heads, in the last two and a half years, and have to suggest that I'm terribly disappointed. Because I don't see how we can continue to be good government unless we have good opposition. And it's a sorry state that we have in this House as an opposition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had a story that I was going to tell you with respect to the opposition, but I don't have enough time because I have many things to say. I haven't even begun my talk and six minutes has gone by.

MR. STROM:

Doesn't the hon. minister have unlimited time?

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, my main purpose today is to speak basically on three topics. I hope to speak for a few minutes on Canadianism; on the union and the strength of this nation and the role that Alberta and the government have been playing in this regard, particularly with respect to the one area that I understand best, and that's my own portfolio.

The second area that I do want to touch upon is, to me, one of the most exciting policies this government has in fact brought forth, and that is the policy of balanced growth across this province and how it relates to the quality of life. The key, Mr. Speaker, is balanced growth, quality of life, resource management - all great characteristics of this government.

The third area that I will touch upon very briefly, if I have time, is worldwide inflation as the Provincial Treasurer has mentioned it, as it is synonymous today with world monetary instability.

Mr. Speaker, in regard to Canadianism, the strength of our nation, each MLA has a responsibility to this nation to make it grow, to strengthen national unity, to make this confederation sounder and stronger, and each of us took an oath in that regard. Even though we have been, can be and should be the toughest of bargainers for our part of the nation, we must nevertheless always work together towards unity. My own personal stand in this regard has been well documented.

I am one of those who writes most of my speeches, except this one, Mr. Speaker ...

MR. CLARK:

Who wrote it?

MR. YURKO:

I'm ad-libbing most of this one, or trying to, Mr. Speaker. And as a result of this documentation I would just like to use as an example my stand in this area and reiterate to you what I said on two different occasions.

One occasion, Mr. Speaker, was when I had the opportunity to be the guest speaker on a Wednesday night for the Man and Resources Conference in Toronto, a conference that had about 1500 delegates from across Canada, all identifying with the strength of this nation, the growth of this country, its vitality, and the beautiful place in which we have been privileged to live. I said on that day:

The "Man and Resources" program has been a truly remarkable national success in participatory democracy. You have here set down many stepping stones leading to the future well-being of Canada and Canadians. Governments can do no less than take note of what has been said and written here. Governments can do no less than to heed the advice and guidance that has been freely offered here. Governments must plan and act in accord with what has been distilled here as being in the Canadian interest. I

believe that it shall be so, for you have said that what we must build should not be so controverted, so inward looking, that it makes us forget we are an integral part of a finite earth.

While developing a national conscience, and a national ego, we must equally develop a global patriotism geared to the humanity of all mankind, structured in a fragile world that is being increasingly sickened by the abuses of man. Our standards of humanity, our standards of planetary patriotism, our concept of nationalism, need be so magnificent that all nations shall seek to tailor their fabric in recognition of ours.

We have the means. This nation is stronger and bigger than any of its parts, greater than the dreams of any of its leaders, beyond the grasp of any of its politicians. And yet, the nation must respect and nourish its respective parts. It is the diversity and strength of these parts that give this nation power and vitality. If one part of this nation subjects another to economic or social bondage then the whole nation suffers and is weakened. A nation to be strong must permit each sector to grow and mature without artificial, imposed restraints.

But I would like to go back even further, Mr. Speaker, in my political career to a night that I am sure you remember, the night of the lost ballot box when my friend behind me was also a candidate in the nomination for a federal constituency - May 13, 1968. On that occasion I had this to say about Canadianism:

The very foundations of our nation are quivering. Unstable because of the lack of a common Canadianism. We live in a land divided - divided by geography - divided by origin - divided by wealth - divided by beliefs - and divided by desires.

There is growing in our land a fungus; a fungus called "Separatism". And we have two varieties ...

And I am speaking in 1968, Mr. Speaker.

... an Eastern kind and a Western kind. Each of us must recognize that this fungus must be eradicated from the face of our nation. We all sense the need for service under only one flag, with only one anthem, to recognize only one "Canadianism". A "Canadianism" which is broad enough and flexible enough to embrace all our cultures, and more than one language if necessary; all our beliefs, and all our hopes. A "Canadianism" which will result in a nation of power. A powerful nationalism which will be a moving force in the international community.

To the development of this type of "Canadianism" I will dedicate my effort if I am "Your Choice".

And I wasn't.

Mr. Speaker, you may be wondering how I'm relating to the budget, but have patience.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of this government, I must disagree violently with those who advocate separatism, Balkanization or the dismemberment of this nation. Their talk is designed, in my estimation, to destroy, to tear apart and to unsettle, instead of to build and to improve. They are those who scavenged the riches of this land and now wish to tear it up for further gain. Their point of view, though freely expressed - this nation still permits that, thank Heaven - is the attitude of those, in my estimation, who have become drunk with the riches of this land.

Their attitude is not Canadian, their attitude is not Albertan, and such an attitude must be rejected. At a time when the world is convulsing with narrow nationalistic thinking, entrenchment along cultural barriers, Balkanization economically, we need the greater view, the wider horizon, and the more magnanimous vision - world patriotism, as I have said before.

That is why I personally enjoyed perhaps my greatest moment as a cabinet minister when our government earlier this year voted \$1 million for aid to international development. This was a gesture of human concern on the part of a government. We should do more, and our riches permit us to do much more.

From where I see the picture we have an enviable record as a government in building a stronger Canada. I was proud to represent Canada at the Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment. I am humbly grateful to have been chosen as the incoming President of the Canadian Council of Resource and Environment Ministers, dedicating my efforts to strengthening Canada locally, regionally and nationally, to build and to expand and not to constrict and destroy. We in Alberta have initiated cooperation and discussion in every direction. We suggested the Mackenzie River Basin Advisory Liaison Committee and that has

become a reality. We have initiated discussions and set up committees with British Columbia and our neighbour on the other side with respect to many areas of concern.

From my point of view, management of the Peace River, border definition, forest management, wildlife management, all these matters have been discussed with our neighbouring governments and accord and cooperation has been brought to fruition. We have called the western ministers together to lead in many directions, in water management, in litter control, in standardization of pollution criteria, and these are just a few of the areas. But I know that most of the other ministers have done the same.

The Prairie Provinces Water Board, I must say, is very healthy and alive and it's an instrument of the previous government. Our conservation authority has held hearings in Saskatchewan in regard to the Peace-Athabasca. I would say that if one examines the record, one will find an enviable record of success by this government in building a more diverse Canada through building Alberta, a stronger Canada through building a stronger Alberta, a stronger Canada through building a stronger western part of this nation, a Canada which will be the envy of all nations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me speak briefly about perhaps one of the most fundamental policies of this government, perhaps the primary policy of this government, and that is balancing growth across this province and the government's thrust in that direction. I might say that every single one of these policies was formulated before we were blessed with a very healthy treasury. Alberta is at a unique point in its growth as part of a world civilization. We really are at an interface, an interface between our time which has come for industrialization and the post-industrialization era which in fact is becoming prevalent in the United States, and we happen to be in both at the same time. So the constraints and the reservations and the difficulties before us are doubly magnified.

I believe that not very many people or new governments that come in will remember us for some of the things that we've done in most of the areas, but I believe that we will be remembered in some areas. I wish to enumerate from my own beliefs some of the policies that I think will be remembered.

I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I may be biased. As the Minister of the Environment and look after this portfolio, put together a reasonably good department ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not you.

MR. YURKO:

... that's functioning very well ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Never.

MR. YURKO:

...that's giving excellent service to the public ...

MR. TAYLOR:

You're too modest.

MR. WILSON:

Tell us more.

MR. YURKO:

...so I may be biased from my point of view in speaking about those policies I think the public will remember ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Never.

MR. YURKO:

...that are associated to some degree with my area, also with respect to some of the other people. I think, Mr. Speaker, that our greatest task as a government is not to limit growth, not to fear it, but to manage it, to contain it for the good of all Albertans and Canadians.

Let me just read what I also said in Toronto to the Man and Resources Conference. It's not long.

Nevertheless, much of your discussion on growth was significant and in tune with the thoughts and queries of many elements of our society. One of your briefs states that the only legitimate purpose of economic growth is to enhance our collective quality of life, a noble objective. But [by] what or whose yardstick is the collective quality of life to be measured? The work force is constantly expanding. The majority still want and need meaningful employment and the primary process for generating those jobs has been growth. Until a new acceptable solution is found, growth will continue as a needed objective of our society. Nevertheless, growth and conservation, growth and the quality of life can and will be brought into better balance.

This is the challenge before Alberta during the next decade. Growth is assured. In fact, it is explosive, as the Minister of Industry and Commerce will tell you. What is not so evident to all is the will and the desire and the means to manage this growth, to program it, to phase it in and to tailor it such that the collective quality of life of all Albertans is enhanced - and I mean all, Mr. Speaker - in fact, such that the quality of life of all Canadians is indeed enhanced because of the blessing of this land and the resources that it possesses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what have been our most dynamic policies in terms of assuring a quality of life and conserving our environment, those policies which are long-lasting and will have a profound effect on Alberta?

First of all, I would list balancing growth across the province. One of our most fundamental policies [includes] reviving our towns, bringing in water and sewer and roads and parks and extended area service and rural gas, providing government decentralization, bringing into these communities people who can stimulate desire and stimulate anticipation - trained people - and industrial decentralization. And I know that the Minister of Industry and Commerce has spoken to you somewhat on this topic. We will assure a water supply for each and every town. We intend to have water and sewage systems so that all our smaller communities can enjoy the amenities of life. That's our first policy that will be remembered, Mr. Speaker. We are casting aside conventional wisdom that says you must pile everything into one area, into one spot, one city, as a result of which the American society found itself in such great difficulty.

Our second area of real concern, and one for which I think we will be remembered, is in regard to land-use legislation and policies. Mr. Speaker, this government put a freeze on development on the eastern slopes for three years, an almost unthinkable policy in terms of any government, a freeze so that we could think, so that we could stop and think as the hon. member suggested the other day. We have had hearings on this vast area, this most beautiful part of Alberta. We have asked the public, and the opposition to tell us what they think. There is a resolution on the Order Paper. We will see and gauge the quality of their debate in regard to that very vital area of this province. And I dare every one of them to get up and tell us what they would do with this vast part of Alberta, how they would manage it, what they would permit and what time frame they would put before government for development of this vast resource.

The Land Surface Conservation and Reclamation Act is unique in all of Canada. Every single jurisdiction is interested in this legislation and the regulations governing surface disturbance, coal mines and pipelines, oil and gas, general regulations and environmental impact assessment. The land-use forum, Mr. Speaker, recognizing that indeed there are problems ahead with respect to land use - some new provincial planning concepts which the Minister of Municipal Affairs has put before all the public in Alberta for input.

The third area is land purchasing, Mr. Speaker, buying land for future use. Last year we bought some \$12 million. This year we have \$2 million budgeted in the Department of the Environment. There is \$20 million budgeted under the new Land Purchase Fund. I believe that the new Land Purchase Fund is truly an instrument of the future, an instrument that will permit this government, in concert with its people, to do some planning on a longer-term basis.

Mr. Speaker, the fourth area is metropolitan area growth. We consider that the provincial government has very definite responsibilities in terms of managing metropolitan growth. That's why some of our policies are new and forward-looking in this area. As I said earlier, we have rejected the conventional wisdom of the United States in regard to city growth. We find exciting policies in new directions in the following areas: urban parks, metropolitan recreation programs and patterns, metropolitan green belts and metropolitan utility and transportation corridors and systems. There are dramatic policies geared towards crystalizing new mass-transit systems, and the Minister of Highways and Transport will come forth with that before this session comes to an end. Regulating major industrial locations - the Environment Conservation Authority has been programmed to conduct hearings in regard to the location of major industrial complexes

near large urban areas. If I had my way, not very many would be located next to our main urban centres. I'm talking about the large industrial complexes.

Mr. Speaker, protecting the river valleys - we are examining the use of the restricted development concept to protect the river valleys and the ravines leading into both our major metropolitan areas.

Mr. Speaker, there are some very substantive environmental policies which might be summarized as follows.

[Interjections]

Well, I have this as insert number four and my time seems to be going so quickly.

The first is a policy of being preventative; the second, a policy that all environmental information is public information, and third, a policy of using public hearings to engage the public in the widest possible degree in terms of future planning and future direction.

Centralized responsibilities for pollution control and environmental management - our government has adopted the 'polluter pays' concept and a most dramatic example of this is The Beverage Container Act. It might be said that the United States is shooting towards zero discharge of pollutants into their waterways by 1984. We, in Canada - all governments - still consider our rivers and waterways an economic resource. Nevertheless, the stringency of evolving standards is being programmed to prevent overshooting the available assimilated capacity of any of our waterways.

Mr. Speaker, number seven. By way of deliberate government policies, environmental education is now being sponsored at universities, colleges and technical schools through the supply of information, literature, referral systems, seminars and conferences. There is a major environmental conference planned for this spring. Mr. Speaker, the entire environmental awareness has as its goal the generation of jobs and meaningful employment and not the reduction in employment as propounded by some. This objective is one of the very basic policies of this government because through environmental awareness, through environmental policies, we can generate employment that has a meaning to it. We are moving in this direction as much as we can.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most exciting new direction towards improving the quality of life has been made by the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. I don't mean in the area of dirty movies or, for that matter, a greater number of booze outlets. I refer to the minister's multicultural programs, his archeological and historical preservation programs, his policy of artistic promotion, and the \$1 million artist guaranteed loan program which is vastly overdue.

Mr. Speaker, riches don't bring happiness. Involvement and recognition for meaningful endeavour does. I believe that, as Albertans, our pockets are full. If they're not full they will soon be full. But our minds are still not overly attuned to culture, beauty, art, knowledge, nature, philosophy and religion. Leisure still hangs heavy on our hands and herein lies, for Albertans and Alberta, the direction of perhaps our greatest endeavours in regard to the improvement of the quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended to say something about world-wide inflation, the instability of the world monetary system and the effect that instability has on rising prices; and on the demand for resources and the fact that these resources are more vital than the dollar bill today, more desired than gold, more desired than any single commodity in this world. Resources are the key to future prosperity for any nation. I had intended to touch briefly on the situation in regard to the resources of our neighbour to the south, but I fear very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that my time has run out and I shall have to make that speech another time.

Thank you Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member rising to ask a question?

MR. LUDWIG:

No, I was rising to speak, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Pairview.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting act to follow. If I wanted to give the hon. member who just spoke a compliment I'd be hard pressed to avoid violating the rule of repetition, Mr. Speaker. He has done such a good job that I will just simply state that the more he talked, the more I was convinced that his modesty might work to his disadvantage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question.

[Laughter]

MR. LUDWIG:

I'm just waiting for the laughter to die down, Mr. Speaker.

The hon. minister touched on one issue when he started speaking and he wound up on that same issue, namely inflation. He wanted to tell us all about it; he took a lot of time telling us that he wanted to tell us, but he ran out of time and didn't have a chance to really give us his views. I'm sure they would be very interesting and probably very appropriate.

We have an interesting political development in this province. We've just heard the budget brought down and I'm a bit amused at the fact that almost without exception there seems to be almost an indecent sort of haste, a great desire to take credit for all that's good, for all that inflation brought to us which makes it look like we're big spenders, like we're big providers, like everybody's making lots and everybody's pockets are full. But nobody wants to talk about the adverse effects of inflation. Everybody wants to talk about how big everything is, including the budget.

If we knocked off the top of this wonder if, in the last three or four years we knocked off of the top of this budget the amount of increase in the last three or four years that is inflationary alone, say 25 or 30 per cent, I wonder if the budget is all that great and the people who are getting it are going to be all that happy. I think one interesting thing that happened during this session is the fact, I believe, that even though the hon. ministers and the back-benchers backing them up are so anxious to take credit for everything they've done, the impact of what the opposition has been saying, prodding them - and sometimes a little harder than prodding - is beginning to show.

I believe that when we deal with municipal financing, municipal spending, the government had to take a second look, try to recover some of the ground lost and sort of pre-announce the budget by saying, we are going to yield to the demands of the municipalities and remove the 7.5 per cent ceiling on spending. Because it was indeed a very unwise move on the part of the government.

It was unwise for more than one reason, because when the government brings in a budget, even though it's inflated by other causes than just the figure itself, it's pretty hard to preach economy to the municipalities that have the same problems of inflation we have and then turn around and try to make it appear that we are generous, we've managed well, we got the money through sheer good government and we're going to loosen up. So I believe that the opposition has made its mark in that regard, and we will continue.

It is interesting to note that minister after minister and back-bencher after back-bencher will take time in this House to tell us how great they are, how efficient they are, how things could never be better except under them and then turn around and long before the opposition has had a chance to make any pronouncements in the House, try to downgrade the opposition. I suppose if that is part of their responsibility, then they are discharging their responsibility.

One of the saddest developments politically in this province, since the Conservatives got in, is that dealing with the government advent into business.

I am going to preface my remarks in this regard by what the hon. Premier used to say when he was trying to get into office. Here is his picture and it says, What Do We Stand For. I am quoting from one of his brochures. It says:

We believe that a provincial government should not just preach free enterprise but should also promote this system by creating an atmosphere consistently favourable to it.

This is a remark of the hon. Premier.



This requires an acceptance that the free enterprise system may have defects but that it is by far the best economic system for the people of this province. It requires the avoidance of unnecessary government interference with our citizens.

This is what they said and he winds up that paragraph by saying,

It thus requires an obligation for constant investigation of every new measure introduced by provincial or state administration in North America. It requires the acceptance of the position that the economy is stronger by maximizing the number of our citizens controlling their own economic destiny.

I believe this is something that the Social Credit Party preached, lived by and practiced. With all due respect to those who feel that things started happening in this province on September, 1970, it was a pretty good economy, and we have probably come a lot further than any other province in Canada under the competitive-enterprise system.

When the last election was over it appeared that the Conservatives, by preaching the same policy - advocating the same things we did, only more so - had managed to displace Social Credit in that area, private enterprise, for which it always stood. But as time went by, the Conservatives did something that once more makes the political scene in Alberta very interesting.

They have very clearly, very obviously and quite openly side-stepped to the left. I am saying that now there is only one political party in Alberta that stands for the competitive-enterprise system, and that is the Social Credit Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. LUDWIG:

I know that there are some ministers and some hon. members on the other side who still like to profess that they are private enterprisers, but I am saying that they have done things, said things and advocated things that are incompatible with private enterprise, the competitive-enterprise system.

I believe that the arch-offender in this case has to be the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. You can't be buying into businesses. You can't be setting up competition. You can't be setting up corporations to go into business even though there may be reasons for taking that position. I'm saying that the end does not justify the means at all - that the means do not justify the end as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker. Because we have problems with Ottawa, and because Ottawa has moved to a certain extent into competition with business, with private enterprise, a Conservative government cannot do what Ottawa is doing in relation to business in Alberta and then still try to create the impression that it is still a competitive, free-enterprise party.

I believe they have 'negatived' that position. Even though they may still wish to profess that they are free enterprisers, much business, industry, and many people in this province simply do not believe them. They have said this over and over again, and if they are not hearing the message from business, that somehow the hon. Premier and his government have abandoned their principles, the principles that got this province this far, they are simply not interested in what's happening. Once and for all they have indicated that if it's expedient they will go into competition with business, they will do it when it suits their purpose, and they are doing it as quickly as they can manage.

When the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce set up his Bill No. 50, the Alberta Opportunity Fund Company warned him that that was a bill set up to provide opportunity for the government to go into business. The minister denied this very vehemently, but some time later when the NDP took over British Columbia, Premier Barrett copied Mr. Peacock's bill almost verbatim. It's a sad reflection on a government that professes to be conservative, professes to be a private enterprise kind of supporter, when the NDP is copying our legislation.

In looking at the budget, many things have been increased. I believe that one of the main problems confronting municipalities - which are, by the way, the same people who are governed under the provincial government - is that they are pleased with the removal of the 7.5 per cent ceiling on spending, but they are concerned about a proportionate amount of money by way of grants. I mean proportionate to what the government is now taking through windfall revenues from the petroleum industry.

We have a lot of things that we could mention in this debate, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to touch on a few, starting with the Department of Public Works. I believe that the decision to extend the court house in Calgary by four floors was a mistake. That court house was designed almost 20 years ago, 19 or 20 years ago. There was much criticism of that design. The opposition had a heyday in blaming the government for having done a poor

job of designing the court house. That court house became inadequate in size some years after its construction. The government now is going to extend the present court house by adding four floors to it. We are still going to have an old type of design for a court house, and I'm saying that when it's finished in 1976 a few years thereafter that court house will not be adequate for the needs of Calgary. Calgary is growing as rapidly as 20,000 people a year. There is every reason to believe that this will continue.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Ten thousand last year.

MR. LUDWIG:

If this continues, if that city is 200,000 greater than it is today, we will not have enough space in that court house to be adequate for the needs of the City of Calgary. It isn't only the City of Calgary that benefits from that court house but also a great surrounding area. As commerce increases, as business increases, the litigation in that building and the use to which that building is put is so great that we will be short of space. It did not require much foresight to know that we should have put that building to some other use and perhaps built another court house. That would have been a look into the future, having faith in the fact that this province will continue to grow.

The other department that I'd like to touch briefly on, Mr. Speaker, is the Department of Telephones and Utilities.

We talk about price controls. The Conservatives in the East are advocating price and wage controls, and although they are very divided on this particular issue, nevertheless they have been consistent. This government, the Conservative government, is vehemently opposed to price controls. But I am saying that it was rather unfortunate that they should pronounce, go up and down the province, and state that they don't believe in it, it can do us no good, but when it is politically expedient to impose price controls, this government will.

The hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities is aware of what happened under his legislation with regard to propane. That was a complete and obvious act to control propane prices. I wonder why this government will create the impression that it is opposed to price controls and then very effectively bring in a bill that states, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary, these certain companies better roll their prices back, or else.

I was amused when I heard the hon. minister speak on the air and state that if they don't voluntarily roll back their prices he threatens to bring in legislation. I have never seen anything more ridiculous. He's telling them that if they don't roll back their prices - you used the word "voluntarily" - we'll hold the gun to your head, and we're either going to force you to do it or we are going to expose you. He said he was going to name them. That was a threat; it was a little bit of political blackmail, and eventually the minister had threatened to bring in the bill.

Now I'm not quarrelling that this was not necessary and that it wasn't perhaps in the best interests of the people involved, but, Mr. Speaker, how can you stand up and say that we are not in favour of price controls but if it's politically expedient we are in favour of them? A sad reflection on the attitude of this government, that it can so openly do one thing, deny it, and profess to have integrity with the people.

I believe that the public is well aware of what this government is doing, that there has been a tremendous loss of faith, loss of trust in the government's position that it is still a competitive-enterprise type of government, that it will not bring in price controls, that it believes in those very things that a private-enterprise government or party would stand for. So there has been some disappointment in this regard, and I believe that the people are aware of it and they're judging the government accordingly.

I thought that when the hon. Member for Lacombe, Mr. Cookson, spoke, he stated that Alberta belongs to all the people of Alberta. But after watching this government operate, I believe that he missed a very significant development, that since the PCs got in I believe that position has been shifted a bit and in some instances it appears that to the victors belong the spoils.

The hon. Minister of Telephones and Utilities likes to talk about his riding, Mr. Speaker. It's a constituency next, north, to mine. The people are very much in the same income bracket - a lot of old people, a lot of working people, a lot of people from different ethnic groups, different countries all over the world, the type of people who form the backbone of any city. And the hon. minister states how he represents them and has much concern about them.

I think that we have to set the record straight, that when we talk about the removal of the education tax from property, it's strange that in the constituency in which the

hon. minister resides, somehow the residents are getting a much bigger discount, a much bigger grant from the government under this program than the people in his and my constituencies.

Don't let anyone think that the people are not aware of this injustice, Mr. Speaker. They are aware of the fact that somehow this government had, in its concern about the affluence of the people and its concern about trying to get some money back to the home-owners, provided a much bigger grant from the general revenue of this province to those who are wealthier, those who may have a number of homes, those who have wealthier and more expensive homes, than they did to the average workingman, the average man who has a smaller home, even though probably more of them have homes paid for than people in more affluent areas. But the minister is misleading the people of this province when he says he is concerned for them but there is no program in the budget, there is no program anywhere from the government's side says we are going to equalize those grants.

We have been criticized for paying so much, \$75 per home-owner. But when I look back - the time has come when we should pay every home-owner a flat rate in lieu of education taxes and if you want to pay the top level of taxes, give it to everybody. It's not the fault of a lot of people who live in these workingmen's areas that they were not able to acquire as much wealth as some other people. But why should we penalize them now by not giving them a fair break of the money. As one member said, all the money belongs to all the Albertans equally. But it doesn't, Mr. Speaker. They are distributing this money unequally. It is discriminatory and those people, including the riding and the hon. minister, will be told. They are aware of this, they're complaining now, and I hope they will remember how this government treated them as second-class citizens in the distribution of dividends or the wealth of the province, and vote accordingly.

The people in my constituency in particular, and I believe in several others, are very grieved about the fact that somehow those who live in wealthier districts are getting so much more. This is an injustice, anybody here can see it, and I am sure that many hon. members in this House are aware of this. It just requires someone with courage enough to stand up and tell them they should equalize it somehow.

I would like to recommend that if the government can't pay every home-owner in this province an average amount of tax discount, if they can't afford it then cut the amount and pay everybody an equal amount. I believe this is fair, it is logical and it would have public acceptance.

I believe you can talk in this House until time runs out and some of the hon. members on the other side who have a lot of poor homes and whose constituents feel this injustice, will not stand up and speak up for them.

The issue of inflation has been mentioned a few times in this debate already, Mr. Speaker. Certainly it's a problem that is being debated in the House of Commons in Parliament. It is a problem that concerns us here and one that I believe this government can't solve entirely. But it can make a contribution towards at least alleviating more of the problems caused by inflation. I think that when you look at a budget that is \$1,900 million - and this isn't all, it could be higher, this actual spending could be higher - we should wonder whether some of it is not inflationary. The increase in our civil service, the increase in government services has to have been inflationary if you add up all the levels of government in this country, that's Ottawa, Alberta and the cities. So we are talking about the good things we have and how great everything is. The hon. minister who just spoke stated there will be pockets full of money for everybody but I believe that he probably did not assess his thinking very carefully when he said that.

It isn't everybody who is benefiting from inflation. I have stated on numerous occasions in this House that a lot of people in this city - which is one of the more affluent cities in Canada - in Calgary, throughout the whole province, and in small towns, are suffering from inflation. It's the workingman who gets hit first because, as one member of parliament, a Conservative, stated in the House of Commons in the last few days, while the wages on the average went up 6 per cent last year the cost of living went up almost 10 per cent, Mr. Speaker. So the workingman is being hurt and we are still talking about the great prosperity we have, but we are not really addressing ourselves to the plight of the workingman, the plight of people on fixed incomes and the plight of the senior citizens.

We are adjusting. We are making it easier for them to live with the devalued dollar. We are not actually solving their problem because instead of being one jump ahead of the problem we're one jump behind the problem.

I notice the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs is not in his seat tonight. I wanted to mention something about the announcement that we are going to reduce gasoline taxes. We on this side take some pride in the fact that we kept pushing the government on this issue. We believe that perhaps at least we brought forward the date when this measure, reduction of gasoline tax, would be implemented. Why do they leave an announcement like that up in the air? Why didn't they announce to the people of this province whether this

deals with diesel fuel, whether it deals with all these different aspects of energy, the use of gasoline and oil and petroleum-manufactured products? Why didn't they give us the whole picture? Why don't they tell us that if the industry should raise the prices, they will make adjustments to keep their prices at the present level?

It isn't enough for us, in this province, where oil is found, produced and processed to reduce the price of gasoline by five cents and then hope that is all we need to do. That is not enough.

We want to be assured on this side that if prices should be forced up so as to cancel or eliminate the five cent per gallon reduction, the government would move immediately and reduce the gasoline prices again.

I believe that under the circumstances with all the windfall revenues, even though a year ago we requested a five cent per gallon decrease, in looking back to what happened in the last year, that five cents a gallon is not all that great a decrease any more. Bearing in mind the extra revenue that the government got, will get and knows it will get, the five cent per gallon decrease in gasoline and other fuels is really not that much of a break for the consumer of this province.

The members of the Legislative Assembly, the Social Credit members from Calgary had requested the government, some time ago, to arrange to subsidize the consumers in certain necessities of life, certain commodities, in order that they not be hurt as badly as they are due to inflation. We didn't receive any response except that this government started pushing Ottawa to subsidize milk buyers and subsidize the purchase of bread. This was good policy, but I believe that this province alone can afford to subsidize the consumers in certain fields better than any other province in Canada. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we on this side feel that the government is talking about big spending, it's talking about all that it is doing for the people, and I think that we have to express a disappointment in the fact that they have, as I have stated in their budget, a chicken in every pot and two for the rich.

They have not dealt fairly with the poor people of this province, and therefore I wish to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the hon. member for Calgary Bow, as follows: that the government be apprised that the members of this Legislature deplore the government's failure to take any effective action to alleviate the very real disadvantages forced on many unfortunate people of this province by the rapidly accelerating devaluation of the dollar.

It's a motion of nonconfidence.

Yes, it is an amendment, an amendment to Motion No. 1, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

We know that Albert.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You can finish your speech now Albert.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He was finished long ago and time ran out on him.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion moved by myself as read and seconded by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, Mr. Wilson, I wish to state that it isn't sufficient for ministers to get up and tell us of the problems of inflation while they're boasting and telling everybody what a great budget we have, how big it is, how much extra revenue we have, but ignoring a great portion, the greater number of our people in the province, by not helping them in the plight in which they find themselves, faced with almost galloping inflation but not an additional income to meet their needs.

I've got a quotation here, Mr. Speaker, dealing with the definition of "inflation". It's about the best that I can find, although I've heard so many reasons for inflation that I believe this one, which is written Henry Hazlitt, one of the top economists. It states as follows:

Inflation, to sum up, is the increase in the volume of money and bank credit in relation to the volume of goods. It is harmful because it depreciates the value of the monetary unit, raises everybody's cost of living, imposes what is in effect a tax on the poorest (without exemptions) at as high a rate as the tax on the richest, wipes out the value of past savings, discourages future savings, redistributes wealth and income wantonly, encourages and rewards speculation and gambling at the expense of

thrift and work, undermines confidence in the justice of a free enterprise system, and corrupts public and private morals.

This is a definition dealing with inflation by one of the outstanding authorities. Although we often have to proclaim the benefits of inflation, we have not come to grips with the problems as they affect our people, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to state further that when we boast about what inflation has done and how great everything is in this province, I would like to quote further from the book written by Henry Hazlitt, in which he states that,

The real evil of inflation is that it redistributes wealth and income in a wanton fashion often unrelated to the contribution of different groups and individuals to production. All those who gain through inflation on net balance ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Filibuster.

MR. LUDWIG:

You know, Mr. Speaker, all those hon. ministers who are now beginning to heckle me knew all the answers ten years ago. They knew all the answers when they were the opposition. How come they can't come up with a single answer right now? How come they are all so wise now, all-knowing and all-seeing? But they haven't got a single proposal, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I'm obliged to remind the hon. member that his time has run out.

MR. LUDWIG:

But, Mr. Speaker, I moved a motion of non-confidence and I believe that permits me to speak another half hour.

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate I just might mention that there's no seconder to these motions. I would just like that understood so that is not a precedent. I have no objection to the hon. member giving his performance though.

MR. WILSON:

Thank you, to the hon. Minister of Education.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You should have said ... performance.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is the hon. member rising on a point of order?

MR. WILSON:

No, Mr. Speaker, I was rising to continue the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

I have previously recognized the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak to the ruling that you made. If a member makes a motion in this House, he's entitled to one-half hour of time on that motion under the rules - I believe under Rule 28, Mr. Speaker. I did move a motion of non-confidence and I'm being deprived of the right to speak to that motion, Mr. Speaker. I believe that I'm entitled to speak at this time.

MR. SPEAKER:

I'm not aware of any rule or interpretation which would support the submission just made by the hon. member. Without wishing to create a precedent I would say that for this occasion and subject to looking into the matter further, the hon. member's time has expired, whether he chooses to move his amendment at the beginning of his speech or at the end of it.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, rising to take part in the discussion of the amendment:

That the Government be apprised that the Members of this Legislature deplore the Government's failure to take any effective action to alleviate the very real disadvantages forced on many unfortunate people of this Province by the rapidly accelerating devaluation of the dollar.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the wording of the resolution, I'm going to have to support it. I think that in terms of literary content it will never win the Pulitzer Prize, but notwithstanding that, there's a good deal of validity in the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, there is really no doubt that Alberta is entering a stage of extremely rapid growth. I was interested in listening to the hon. Minister of the Environment tonight talk about balanced growth. I really hope, and I think most of us in this Assembly hope, that in the years ahead we will have balanced growth. But there is certainly growing evidence to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that this province will see a boom of an unparalleled magnitude with rampant inflation as an unfortunate consequence.

Why do I say that? Well I think, first of all, if we look at the likely development pattern of the tar sands where there is already a pretty substantial investment under way and clearly a number of large concerns interested in moving into the tar sands, when we consider the very likely possibility of the Mackenzie Valley pipeline, when we consider many of these major capital items going at approximately the same time, the impact that this is going to have on the economy of the province, as well as the economy of the country as a whole, could be extremely serious and could really fuel the fires of inflation. So the amendment moved by the hon. member is timely because it isn't good enough, as members of this Legislature, to pat ourselves on the back for a boom which is going to hit us regardless of which party is in office.

I think the test of the government and the test indeed of all of us will be on how that boom is handled. I think the government will be judged on three critical criteria: what steps are taken to protect the quality of life, what steps are taken to control the size of this boom and channel its effects, and finally, how the government windfall will be allocated.

Because, Mr. Speaker, the amendment deals specifically with the question of inflation, I'm going to deal with that now and when this amendment is dealt with I'll take an opportunity to speak on some of the other issues that I wanted to touch on tonight.

I read over the Provincial Treasurer's budget remarks and I have to confess some concern at the fact that the Provincial Treasurer seems to be passing the buck to Ottawa. The suggestion is made that, really, inflation is something too large for the Province of Alberta to deal with. Well, no one argues, Mr. Speaker, that there aren't factors fueling inflation which are beyond the capacity of the Province of Alberta to cope with, but I think it would be an unfortunate frame of mind for this Legislature to adopt in somehow assuming that there really isn't much that we can do, that the matter of accelerating prices, the devalued dollar and what have you is really a matter beyond our competence and beyond our ability to cope. I don't think that kind of defeatist attitude, Mr. Speaker, is the sort of leadership which the people of Alberta expect from this Legislature and especially from a government which proposed such an exciting campaign theme three years ago.

I think that passing the buck is just not good enough. I say passing the buck because when I look over some of the proposals for dealing with the problem of inflation, I have to confess disappointment. For example, in the area of housing we're going to have some money set aside for the purchase of a land bank but it would appear from reading the budget, Mr. Speaker, that the bulk of this money is going to be consigned to the Fort McMurray area. I can certainly appreciate the need for a land bank in the Fort McMurray area, knowing as I do a little bit about the accelerating housing costs and the extravagant prices that people have to pay for lots in that area.

But surely if a land-bank concept is of any value for the Fort McMurray area, why don't we expand the same principle and develop land banks around our two urban centres - two rapidly growing cities - and in some of the smaller communities adjacent to Edmonton and Calgary that are also growing?

I believe that if we are going to deal with the cost of housing we also have to take a look at a punitive tax, a tax which is designed to deal with speculative profits made by land speculators who buy up land relatively cheaply from farmers, are able to hold on to it, and make windfall gains of huge proportions when they sell it for development purposes. In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, that kind of gain is really unconscionable, and I believe we have to have a tax which will zero in on it. As I recollect, one of the taxes that we used to have in this province, brought in many years ago by the old United Farmers of Alberta government, was the unearned increment tax. Now, some may have objected to that tax, but nevertheless it certainly would have gone quite a way to picking up the inflated profits that land speculators make.

Mr. Speaker, the question of housing then sees a government which is doing really very little on a long-term basis to cushion the impact of inflation.

What are some of the more significant announcements in the budget with respect to inflation - or at least positions which the government claims are significant? Well, we've got the reduction in the gasoline tax of 5 cents a gallon. We have the \$11 million allotment for rural people. I have to say, Mr. Speaker, representing a rural constituency, that I am pleased the government recognized the wisdom of the advice presented by the opposition and brought in this commitment to farm fuel as well. I certainly think that is a step in the right direction.

I have to question why we have the difference between April 1 and May 1, because, presumably, in listening to the hon. Provincial Treasurer yesterday answering this question, the problem, or the difficulty it appears, is in getting the mechanics of the operation set up. Surely the government must have been contemplating this program for some time. I find it a little difficult to understand why the mechanics weren't ready, why they weren't in place so that the farm fuel program could have been introduced on April 1 along with the gasoline tax reduction. There will be a lot of farmers in this province who will find, when they try to order fuel during the month of April, that there will be virtual chaos in the market place because nobody will really know - unless the government is prepared to make the program retroactive for the month of April - nobody will really know whether this program operates or not. I think it is going to cause some real hardship for rural people in the province.

I suspect I hear a little bit of heckling across the way. But I suspect that some of our back-benchers in the country are going to have a little bit of difficulty in explaining why we have this deferment.

We have heard a great deal in this House, Mr. Speaker, about the incompetence of Ottawa in not bringing in the beef subsidy in the proper way, and rightly so. But I suspect that the hon. members will have the same kind of critique thrown at them with a good deal of force by many of their constituents who are going to be more than a little annoyed at the runaround and the confusion that will result for the month of April over this delay in the farm fuel program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, dealing with the principle itself of reducing the gasoline tax, no one really argues that reducing the gasoline tax is a bad thing if that reduction is passed on to Alberta consumers. But, Mr. Speaker, on April 1 we are going to have an increase. We don't know what it will be yet - it might be \$2 a barrel, it might be \$2.50 a barrel, it might be \$3 a barrel. But in any event, whatever that increase is, it's going to result in a higher price at the gas pump. Well, Mr. Speaker, the people of Alberta are really going to wonder what kind of Indian gives we've got in this provincial government. It gives out a tax reduction of 5 cents one day, and then the next day the wholesalers increase the price by 8 cents or 10 cents or 12 cents a gallon.

I would recommend to the hon. members that if they want to make this program work they would be well-advised to support the private member's bill that I have introduced in this Assembly. They'll have an opportunity to speak out in favour of it on behalf of their constituents on Thursday.

Nevertheless I reject the concept of a gasoline tax reduction unless we are going to make sure that it is passed on to the consumers of gasoline products. I think, Mr. Speaker, that when you look at the profits presently made by the oil companies, especially the profits in the Province of Alberta, the most recent statistics from Oilweek show that last year the oil companies took \$1,160 million more out of Alberta than their total investments in the province.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I find it a little hard to understand why it is that we can't ask the oil companies to cushion the prices in this province rather than simply reducing the gasoline tax and in effect transferring \$35 million for the gasoline tax from the public treasury to the treasury of the various oil companies, plus another \$11 million for the farm fuel program. As I say, if we can be sure that this is going to be passed on to Albertans and not simply lapped up by the treasuries of the oil companies, fine, but I suspect that all it is going to be is simply sleight of hand which will further enrich the

industry and which we will be paying for as taxpayers. What we gain as consumers we'll be losing as taxpayers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, dealing with another method that the government might have adopted to cushion the impact of inflation, I would like to suggest that the most straightforward approach would have been to reduce personal income taxes.

With the enormous amounts of money that we have coming into the province at the moment, with the anticipated revenue from the export tax, that export tax which was so reviled two or three months ago and which will now bring in close to a billion dollars this year, the fact that we are in a relatively good position financially surely places the government in a position to reduce the income tax. I say income tax because I think it's important that we use whatever mechanism that is administratively feasible to get money into the hands of low-income people. An income tax reduction in my judgment is that way.

Now, we have heard a great deal about the government taking over the 28 mills. Somehow this is going to offset the rising cost of living, et cetera. I have to confess, Mr. Speaker, that for a long time I personally supported taking over the entire cost of education met by the property tax. I felt that there were arguments, largely administrative, in favour of that kind of approach. It would cut out a lot of the red tape. I also felt that education was not related to property, therefore why should property be taxed to finance it. But the more I have considered it the more it seems to me that what we should be striving for, Mr. Speaker, especially at a time of inflation, are tax cuts which provide the greatest reduction or the greatest cut to low-income people who need them.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. NOTLEY:

What is the point of tax cuts or tax incentives or what have you to high-income people who are able to take advantage of inflation anyway to further increase their wages, up their fees, make higher profits or whatever the case may be? It seems to me that what we've got here with this particular program is a bit of Robin Hood in reverse.

For a senior citizen who has a home in a place like Rycroft, for example, where the assessed value may be \$2,000 or \$2,500, that person gets a maximum or a minimum of \$100. It would be a little less than that if it hadn't been for the change made after the program was announced. But on the other hand for some wealthy tycoon who lives in a \$200,000 house the reduction is going to be \$1,500. Mr. Speaker, frankly I think any kind of across-the-board program which hands out huge amounts of money to people who don't need it at a time of inflation is not really the wisest way of helping the little people of our society who need some help to offset the rising cost of living.

Now I have said this before in the House, Mr. Speaker, but I don't mind saying it again. A far better approach would be to adopt the tax credit system of the Manitoba government where the tax credit is highest for the low income people. As a person's income goes up then their tax credit goes down. Mr. Speaker, that kind of approach places the money where it's most needed, to low-income people who are being caught by the pinch of the rising cost of living.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one can't really deal with this particular amendment and not make some comments about the Department of Consumer Affairs. I certainly regret that the hon. minister isn't here tonight because his department is one which is going to be increasingly under attack by members of this Legislature - I suspect in the House by the opposition members, but I hope in caucus by the government members, because to date we really have seen very little action by this department. It seems to me that the motto of the Consumer Affairs department is still let the buyer beware. We had a good example in the question period the other day of whether or not prosecution would take place of those people who increase the price of antifreeze.

Mr. Speaker, I would be interested in knowing - and again I regret that the minister isn't here - I would be interested in knowing whether any prosecutions have taken place as a result of action by the Department of Consumer Affairs. I would be very interested in knowing whether one single prosecution has occurred, or whether all we have is more studies and more studies and more studies - you know, studies of almost everything but profits. When it comes to profits we have to wait for the federal government to come out with their taxation statistics.

When one looks at rising consumer prices that sophisticated monitoring system we heard so much about is Beryl Plumptre's Prices Review Board. Well, poor Madam Plumptre has, in my judgment, been something of a disaster as Chairman of the Prices Review Board. If the best we can do is prop up our department with a discredited federal agency, then it's



clearly time for this government to spruce up its commitment to the consumer and put some meaning into what was said a year ago when the department was created.

Mr. Speaker, I also have to make some comments about programs that directly affect low-income Albertans. In a time of inflation the quick and able and the well-placed are able to take advantage of an inflation. There has seldom been a boom any time in history when a lot of people haven't, with their skills and ability, been able to make a good deal of money.

Mr. Speaker, the responsibility of a government in a time of rapidly escalating prices is not to further open opportunities for the able and the educated and the alert and the quick. Surely it is to make sure that those people who are less able to cope with inflation are able to live a decent and useful life - the low-income people, the people with inadequate education, the culturally deprived. Mr. Speaker, it will be a real test of this government's ability to see whether or not we are able to deal with that problem.

We aren't starting out very well. We had the \$10 a month for pensioners on the guaranteed supplement announced last summer to great hurrahs by all the government members. Then just shortly after Christmas we had the announcement that senior citizens' lodges are going to be allowed to increase their rent by \$20 a month. So the government gives \$10 a month with one hand and allows \$20 to be taken away with the other.

Mr. Speaker, that was bad enough but when I heard the reasons that the government gave the other day when the hon. Member from Lacombe got up and said, oh well there was a deficit, all these lodges have a deficit you know so they had to increase the monthly payment. Well, that's true they have a deficit, some of the people renting both the lodges in my constituency came to me about it and I said, well, it's a crime that you people should have to increase the rates when we've got this money coming into the provincial treasury. What the province should be doing is picking up those deficits ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

How about inflation.

MR. NOTLEY:

...not forcing the people who live in the lodges to pay an extra \$20 a month. What a scandalous approach, how mean-minded can we be that we're forcing the senior citizens of our province to pay an extra \$20 a month when we've got a budget surplus of \$20 million.

Mr. Speaker, when this government talks about doing something for the disadvantaged, I really have to laugh. Last year, when there was a deficit, we had great sound and fury about the program for Native Albertans. We were going to have the million dollar program for Metis housing. We in the opposition thought it was inadequate but we voted for it. Then we were going to have the program to install not running water, but uncontaminated community wells throughout the province. Mr. Speaker, I have to tell you that I remember the debate of the estimates of the Department of the Environment on that particular program. The minister suggested that it would take approximately \$7 million to install the program at every Metis colony of the province and last year we allocated something around \$600,000 or \$700,000 to get the program under way. Well, Mr. Speaker, I notice there has been a little increase this year in the estimates. I see \$808,000 but it's still going to take us nine years - nine years to complete a program which in my judgement, with the funds that we've got, ought to be done in one year.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have to laugh when we hear all this talk from a government across the way about what they're doing for low-income people. Mr. Speaker, it's obviously clear that we have a government which is acting in a typically Tory way, a right-of-centre government concerned about piling up still more money for those well-to-do people.

I was a little interested, I must confess, in some of the comments made on this side about the government getting into business and that somehow this represented a departure from free enterprise. I would suggest to my honourable friends on this side of the House that actually if one reviews the history of the Tory party, what they have been doing in the last few months is completely consistent with Toryism. You know the Tories have always used the government to back up large vested interests, whether it was the British East India Company, whether it was the Hudson's Bay Company or whether it was the CPR. There has always been a close working relationship between Tory governments on one hand and big businesses on the other. So the fact that they are using public funds to once again prop up a few vested interests, Mr. Speaker, that's not new, that's as Tory as apple pie is American.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hurrah!

MR. NOTLEY:

... certainly welcome this opportunity to offer a few positive notes on some of the shortcomings of this administration, that is with respect to one area, inflation. When we have an opportunity to get back to the major thrusts of the budget debate I have another set of comments I would like to give at that time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

We have had a number of speakers from one side of the House and perhaps we should alternate. The hon. Member for Smoky River followed by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, now that we've had an opportunity of listening to a fairly lengthy dissertation from two of the most effective speakers on that side of the Legislature, I think it would be well to review the motion that was put before us by the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. It suggests:

That the Government be apprised that the Members of this Legislature deplore the Government's failure to take any effective action to alleviate the very real disadvantages forced on many unfortunate people of this Province by the rapidly accelerating devaluation of the dollar.

AN HON. MEMBER:

It was badly written.

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, yes it was badly written, I had trouble reading it. I think it is well, Mr. Speaker, that in light of that amendment to the Budget Speech, which incidentally has not yet been touched upon by the speaker since that time, we should review some of the things contained in the Budget Speech handed down by the hon. member Mr. Miniely last Friday night.

The amendment, Mr. Speaker, suggests that there is nothing being done to provide alleviation to the people who are on low and fixed incomes and are suffering most from the devaluation of the dollar.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. MOORE:

Might I start, Mr. Speaker, by just reviewing the reductions in costs and taxes which are contained in this budget. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the price rise of gasoline and oil in Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan or elsewhere in Canada has no bearing on our desire and determination to provide a five cent reduction in the gasoline tax, which was put in place by the previous government and raised at times when they had tremendous surplus incomes in this province. I am referring to the raises that occurred on numerous occasions since 1959 from about 8 to 10 cents a gallon, up to 15. That tax, Mr. Speaker, is being reduced from 15 cents per gallon to 10 cents per gallon and will, regardless of what the price of crude oil and what the price of gasoline is at the wholesalers station, result in a 5 cents a gallon saving to every motorist in this province who buys gasoline from the pumps.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, there is a place in this budget [for] a reduction of 5 cents a gallon by way of the payment of transportation costs for farm fuels and heating oils. I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, I did not hear any tremendous thundering requests from across the way, either last fall or during the course of the Throne Speech debate, for that kind of consideration. That kind of consideration came from the government side of this House. That was a policy, Mr. Speaker, which was put in place to alleviate those increased costs that might occur to farmers who are charged with the responsibility of maintaining a reasonable price for the food products we all need.

Mr. Speaker, it is also important to recognize that that 5 cents a gallon transportation allowance covers heating oil too. Anyone who lives out in rural Alberta and in some of our small towns knows that the cost of heating oil as compared to natural gas today is equal to about \$2.15 per 1,000 cubic feet. If those people don't deserve, if those people don't need the kind of breaks that are contained here with this 5 cent reduction, then I suggest that you haven't thought very much about who the unfortunate people are in this province.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, there's been a removal of education tax, an additional removal of education tax over and above what was ruled in 1973. That indeed, Mr. Speaker, is important. It involves not only people who live in urban Alberta, who are homeowners and renters, but people in rural Alberta who own farms.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, some of the members have suggested we haven't done anything with respect to lowering income tax. I suggest to you that on Page 10 of the Budget Speech as handed down by the hon. Provincial Treasurer last Friday night, there is an item called Health Care Premiums and it says, "Effective July 1, 1974, \$1 million will be utilized to further reduce costs to Alberta's senior citizens, 65 years of age and over, and their dependants". That's with regard to health care premiums.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many of those citizens 65 years and over will be helped by the reduction in provincial income tax that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview talks about. I suggest very few, if any. If that \$1 million were put into the reduction of income taxes instead of the reduction of health care premiums, it would go to those very wealthy people who the hon. member insists are not entitled to be a part of this province either.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, there's been an indexing of personal income tax. Surely if we're going to look at what we should do with regard to personal income tax we should look at the cost of living and we should look at the system that was devised and which we passed along to people in Alberta of indexing the personal income tax so that we have a rise in the personal exemptions as the cost of living rises. We can all recall - it's only two years ago - when the personal exemptions were \$1,000 for an individual, \$1,000 for his wife and \$300 for each child. That came to a total of \$2,600 if you had two children in a married household. That, Mr. Speaker, is certainly not enough these days, and that rises as inflation rises and exemptions for personal income tax is something that was passed on by this government and wasn't passed on by every provincial government in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I haven't begun to get into the area of disadvantaged people. When you get to Page 11 of the hon. Mr. Miniely's speech you will see that the item under Priorities in Programmes for People says, Assistance to Persons on Fixed Incomes. The assistance that is referred to, Mr. Speaker, is with regard to the Workers' Compensation Board's payments. The payments have been raised to \$4.4 million from what was \$1.2 million. Mr. Speaker, there was a good number of disadvantaged people in this province, as the hon. Member for Drumheller would well know, and he's made the statement many times in this House - who have been suffering from hardships caused by low Workers' Compensation Board payments. Those payments are being increased to help those people out, and I ask you, how much would they be helped by a reduction in personal income tax?

Public assistance payments are payments, Mr. Speaker, in the large part - some 83 per cent - to people who there's no possibility of employing. There are payments to widows with dependent children, there are payments to people who are, some means or other, either physically or mentally handicapped. Those payments, Mr. Speaker, have been increased by some \$20 million to \$104 million. How many of those people, Mr. Speaker, who receive public assistance payments would be helped by an income tax reduction? Not one single person out of that whole group.

I haven't even begun, Mr. Speaker, to read the things in this Budget Speech with the addition to the assistance that there is for those people who might be affected by spiralling inflation and who cannot afford to meet the devaluation of the dollar.

I can go on now, and look at housing, and surely, Mr. Speaker, one of the main points under housing is the provision for 12 new senior citizens' lodges in this province. Those 12 lodges, plus some extensions to additional lodges, will provide accommodation for about 1,000 senior citizens - 1,000 senior citizens who, in spite of what the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview might say, will be paying no more than \$100 a month for accommodation, which is considerably less than they could possibly expect to spend if they were providing their own accommodation.

Just to go a little farther, Mr. Speaker, with the provisions with respect to senior citizens. Surely any hon. member in this House who has thought how we provide for senior citizens must realize that when we can and do provide a senior citizens' lodge where the clothing, washing, food, laundry, a good many things including accommodation, entertainment and so on, are taken care of, those senior citizens there have not too much need for any further expenditures. If you think about the situation with regard to senior citizens, say six years ago, in relation to the kind of money they got on their federal pension plus the guaranteed income supplement, and then you think about the situation today and the increase of \$10 per month that was given to senior citizens from the public funds of this province, you will find that the senior citizen living in a senior citizens' lodge today and paying \$100 a month has more disposable income than he did five or six years ago paying \$70 a month.

Those are the facts, Mr. Speaker. Those are the facts that the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has been trying to twist and distort because he doesn't know where else to attack this budget.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at a budget that has almost \$19 million in it for the construction of 550 urban and 225 rural public housing units, surely, Mr. Speaker, the people who are going to come into the public housing units are going to be the class in this province that are the least helped by a reduction in personal income tax.

It's sad, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members opposite can find nothing else to attack in this budget except to say that the personal income taxes should have been reduced to help disadvantaged people.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on at some length ...

MR. LUDWIG:

No, you're finished.

MR. MOORE:

... about tax reductions, I could go on about a lot of other things.

I'd just like to close by saying that throughout the course of the Budget debate, Mr. Speaker, we've had the odd member on the opposition side who has risen in his place and attacked this inflationary budget and said we are spending too much money. I'd like to know which one of them has the courage to stand up and say that in a department - and a good example is the Department of Agriculture - what should we cut out? Should we do away with the expenditures of the irrigation division? Should we do away with the efforts that are being made with regard to a comprehensive and real crop insurance program instead of what we had in place in this province some two years ago? Should we do away with the \$3.5 million that is being spent in weather modification in the central part of this province? Should we do away with veterinary services when we have a shortage of veterinarians and we have a need for veterinary services to maintain a viable livestock, beef cattle and hog industry? Should we do away with the \$50 million funding the Agricultural Development Corporation?

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that if the hon. members wish to stand up and talk about the things that are inflationary in this budget, then they ought to have the responsibility to put a finger on those. For a member, Mr. Speaker, to stand up and say we're giving too many grants, I'd like to know to what community? I'd really like to know, Mr. Speaker, what rural community has received a priority employment grant under the Priority Employment Program for building an arena, for instance. Which one of those should be chopped out? That's the kind of thing, Mr. Speaker, that should come from an opposition that suggests the spending is inflationary and too high - some positive facts about where to reduce and how we do it.

Thank you.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the amendment to the Budget debate, I think it would be fair to acknowledge that not everything this government has in this budget is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the hon. members opposite, in their own modest way, will draw attention to those good things and perhaps they would be ably assisted by the legion of press release writers that they have on staff and so on to draw those good points to the attention of all and sundry in Alberta. But, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the new-found wealth that this government has, there still are individuals and businesses being strangled in Alberta. There are still those who feel that they are being choked to their knees, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, come on.

MR. WILSON:

They don't need, Mr. Speaker, all the restraints, controls and red tape being imposed on them as residents of Alberta by the regulations which are becoming more and more plentiful. They also don't need the expanding and expansive bureaucracy which we are experiencing in Alberta.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the government bureaucracy is growing at a faster rate than the inflation in this province. Government spending does contribute to that inflation and it

brings more hardship to those who are least able to cope. For example, Mr. Speaker, when this government took office there were approximately 19,000 civil servants in the employ of the government. I see now that after their third budget they have hired, or budgeted to hire, a total of 28,500 civil servants.

[Interjections]

Well, Mr. Speaker, with an increase in the bureaucracy of approximately 17 per cent per year, if that rate were to continue, by the year 2000 every able-bodied person in the province would be employed by the government. But, Mr. Speaker, that won't happen because the roof will cave in long before.

Mr. Speaker, one of the basic problems with this government is their belief that they can buy their way into heaven. You know, Mr. Speaker, we in the opposition are ready for the challenge to guard the gates to see that that doesn't happen.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Race you.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hallelujah.

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, another thing that concerns me considerably about this government is, either by design or mistake they definitely are discouraging the community and private sector roles in delivering the desirable social goals. I cannot understand why this government insists in case after case after case in replacing the private sector roles in social goals with bureaucracy.

In business this government is interfering as no one would have dreamt possible of a Tory government. Private enterprise is not only finding that it is being loaded up with more red tape, more bureaucracy, that it has to pay for, Mr. Speaker, but is also finding that it is having to compete with the government. In some cases it finds that it is having the government as a business partner.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker, that is of considerable concern is this government's decision to abandon the principle of sanctity of contract. The backlash is already being felt by this government, Mr. Speaker, in their civil service pay negotiations.

Another area that is of concern, Mr. Speaker, throughout the province, is that of loss of investor confidence. This government is now doing something, because of that loss of investor confidence, which no one would have dreamt possible three years ago, that is, the government is paying companies to do business in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, another area that bothers me is the indiscriminate giveaway programs in some cases.

Then we have the centralization policy of this government. They talk about decentralization and practice centralization. This can best be measured by the legislation, wherein more and more power is given to the minister or to the cabinet or Executive Council. Then they tell the people that they practice decentralization because they open a branch administration office in some smaller area. You know, Mr. Speaker, that's not decentralization, just because you open branch offices to do secretarial work in smaller centres throughout the province, when the real power is being put more and more in the hands of ministerial discretion or in the hands of the Executive Council.

So we find, Mr. Speaker, that this centralization of power is leading to dictatorial power. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say that either a Fascist or a Communist would enjoy the dictatorial power that they could inherit in Alberta, given the opportunity.

Meanwhile, inflation rolls on. Yet the government does not seem to heed spending restraints. Government spending is a crucial role. There are ways that governments can use funds without contributing to inflation and others that certainly do contribute. These sorts of things, Mr. Speaker, are sad because of the colours that this government ran on during the campaign.

Now another major area where this government said one thing and is doing another, Mr. Speaker, is in the area of municipal autonomy, and perhaps we should just remind some of the hon. members opposite what they stood for during the campaign. For example, I have a brief quote here from The Calgary Herald of August 20, '71. It says in part that Conservative leader Peter Lougheed today promised there would be more authority and

financial autonomy for local governments under a Tory administration, and that he would end provincial government interference in municipal affairs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that certainly hasn't happened under this government's administration. Here's just another short quote from the South Side Mirror in Calgary on August 26, '71, and I quote:

Under an Alberta P.C. government, Mr. Lougheed said, authority and financial capacity would be returned to the local governments of Edmonton and Calgary.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this government hasn't done those things that they stood for. They rode to power on the promise of municipal autonomy, but in effect are crushing the voice of municipal autonomy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to briefly close with a constructive suggestion for the government to consider, one wherein they may be able to make better use of the situation and the funds that they have. The municipal governments are often said to be closer to the people than the provincial and federal governments. It's often said that the municipal governments are regarded as children of the provincial government. Perhaps we should change that attitude, Mr. Speaker, and recognize the municipal governments in a different fashion.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government consider inviting representatives of the municipal governments or their associations to appear before the Legislative Committee on Public Affairs on an annual basis. The municipalities' case would be made before the whole Legislature rather than behind closed doors. Then, Mr. Speaker, all would know what their goals and desires were. This should be done in the fall before the budgets are completed as far as the government is concerned, so that it could take into consideration some of the requests of the local municipal associations or the municipal governments. Then all members of the Legislature would know exactly the basis on which the budget was prepared for those areas that affect the municipal governments.

Here's a further thought, Mr. Speaker. There has been precedent for other seats in a legislature. Perhaps we would have three extra seats here, Mr. Speaker, so that the mayors of the two major urban centres or the representatives of the other associations of the municipalities could appear and participate from time to time in the Legislature and make their cases known or ask questions they may have from time to time.

I think that if imagination was applied it would be readily understood that there is precedent for such a situation under different circumstances. We may then be giving our municipal governments greater respect and a greater opportunity to participate and carry out their roles within the overall structure of Alberta.

MR. FLUKER:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to express some of my views during the Budget debate. First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate sincerely the hon. Provincial Treasurer for the outstanding achievement he has come up with in this year's budget. I realize, of course, that all members of the Executive Council, as well as many people in the administration of each government department, have had to spend a tremendous amount of time and planning in this budget. I think they are all to be congratulated, Mr. Speaker, for their fine effort.

As I study the budget, Mr. Speaker, I note that many things are being provided for, which continue to show the interest and concern that this government has for the future of all the people of Alberta. One feature of this budget that indicates this concern is the substantial increase in revenue being allocated toward the many areas of health-care services. I think the emphasis of total health care as a community concept is an excellent direction for us to be moving into. I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I have always had a great personal concern as to why large sums of money were spent on remedial health programs and much less on preventive programs. Surely, Mr. Speaker, if we can provide programs to recognize and anticipate health problems before they become serious, then this is a direction in which we should be going.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is very gratifying for me to know that a new health-care facility is to be built in Elk Point in my constituency of St. Paul. This would be one of the first ventures into the concept of total health care in Alberta and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, it will serve as a model for similar community health-care centres in this province.

Mr. Speaker, another thing I note from the budget address by the hon. Provincial Treasurer is the increase in funds provided for the care of the handicapped, including both the mentally and physically disabled. I think, Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way in Alberta in the last two and a half years in recognizing the need and right that these people have every possible consideration as fellow citizens of our province. I am

pleased, Mr. Speaker, that northeastern Alberta is served by a mental health sub-unit situated in St. Paul and staffed by a group of highly qualified people.

When we speak of health services, Mr. Speaker, I might also point out that there is a great need for an increase in this type of service in the western end of my constituency, and I appreciate the fact that the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development, with the Hospital Services Commission, is investigating these needs. I sincerely hope that some announcement will be made shortly regarding this matter.

Mr. Speaker, in my constituency we have a considerable number of Metis and Native people, and I assure you that these people too are concerned about health services and are appreciative of the directions in which our government is moving to improve these services. Many of these people are located close to Vilna and are actively involved in trying to have health services there improved.

I note as well, Mr. Speaker, the expansion of assistance for a municipal sewer and water installations in rural growth centres, and I feel without a doubt, Mr. Speaker, that northeastern Alberta has a tremendous potential for overall development in industrial processing of agricultural products as well as other types of industrial growth.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is highly necessary that rural centres be well serviced by sewer and water systems, and I feel this program which is being promoted by the hon. Minister of the Environment is one of great importance in this respect.

Mr. Speaker, I note that estimates of the hon. Minister of Public Works provide for a number of new provincial buildings to be built in Alberta this year. The increase in funds for this purpose is substantial. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the hon. members of this Assembly that they might well be interested in a project that is under way in the town of St. Paul where a public works building is being built by private enterprise on a lease-plan program for provincial offices. I believe this is one of the first such projects in rural Alberta that is being built on this plan.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the programs in the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation that are clearly tuned in to the needs of this province under the very capable direction of the Hon. Horst Schmid. The new grants structure has been very well received indeed.

Also, I would like to note that the forage programs are thriving and expanding continuously, and this speaks well for the encouragement they are receiving from the hon. minister.

Mr. Speaker, there are many new and exciting programs in this budget that will foster the growth and improvement of rural living. One such program is that introduced by the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport. In addition to the extensive primary and secondary road programs that are projected for this year, the assistance in paving and oiling of town, village and municipal roads is of great benefit to rural residents.

However, Mr. Speaker, I might suggest to the hon. minister that, if possible, he reveal the criteria for allocation of such grants, because in northern Alberta we have vast distances of roads to be serviced, particularly the school bus routes. For this reason allocation of grants on a per capita basis creates a hardship in these areas, because in some parts population is so sparse. Perhaps if the distribution of oiling grants was tied in with school bus routes it would be more equalized.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to commend the Minister of Municipal Affairs for removing the 28 mills education foundation tax levy and for increasing grants to municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal of discussion about energy in this province for some time. This is a very important topic because today it vitally affects the lives of all Albertans. I say this because what we do now holds the key to our future. I do not intend to comment further on energy, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that the interests of this province are being very well looked after by some very capable people in our government, directed by our hon. Premier himself. However, Mr. Speaker, I am just a farm boy myself, and because of this I have always kept thinking that here in Alberta many, many years from now after all our non-renewable resources are used up, agriculture will still be the industrial base of this province and Alberta's agricultural production will be of extreme importance to many parts of the world.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think the emphasis that has been placed on agricultural production and agricultural products processing in Alberta in the last two and one-half years is something that has been vitally needed in Alberta for many years. Without doubt the new directions and encouragement that have been placed on agriculture in Alberta by the hon. Deputy Premier and Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Hugh Horner, have brought Alberta to the front in the eyes of the nation and many other parts of the world as well.

Mr. Speaker, this type of encouragement and development has gone on throughout the province. In St. Paul we have built a cheese factory that produces 17 tons of cheese a day. Also we are promoting a dairy co-op under the new milk-shed concept. But these are only examples of what have gone on in many other rural centres. Alfalfa dehydrating plants, rapeseed plants, slaughter houses and many other types of agricultural industry are being promoted in many locations. And all of these, Mr. Speaker, mean jobs, jobs with a future for rural Albertans.

Mr. Speaker, we are just near the end of one of the most severe winters Alberta has ever experienced. Old-timers tell me that it compares to the winter of 1920 and, Mr. Speaker, they also tell me that there was feed shortage in that winter similar to what we have now. In fact, Mr. Speaker, some of the early settlers in the Ukrainian settlements of northeastern Alberta tell me that they removed some of the thatched roofs from their buildings to feed their livestock.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that we have to remember is that weather and climate are controlled by nature. However, through our interest-free loans, through freight assistance and fodder-feed programs and other programs, the Alberta government has tried to offset the weather conditions in many ways.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things in this budget that I could speak about, but one thing is very clear to me and that is this budget shows that our government recognizes the responsibility it has and it is in tune with the people in Alberta. It has fulfilled a large number of policies from the last election platform of the Progressive Conservative party and it is clearly indicated that under the direction of this party the future of all citizens of Alberta is very bright.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Taber-Warner followed by the hon. Member for Whitecourt.

MR. D. MILLER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to this amendment. I will try to stick to it. In doing so I would like to acknowledge all those who have contributed to the debate thus far. Some of the anxious announcements that we have heard are startling at a time when Canada as a nation has problems of supply, especially with energy, problems of providing heat, light and transportation, all of which are brought about by world conditions which neither the government nor any party had anything to do with. It was an international problem.

Mr. Speaker, as strange as it may seem the destiny of this part of Canada was planned perhaps a hundred years ago by eastern politicians and business magnates, who said that it was confirmed that the West should be an agricultural area to feed the East and the rest of Canada. As the years have rolled on, western statesmen have pointed out the resources of the West, the water power, the coal, the oil, the gas, an abundance of available energy. But our story fell on deaf ears. Surely we were entitled to some action and some consideration and acknowledgement of the industries that we had in the West. But eastern Canadians held to the tradition of the past, that of our fathers who planned the Canadian economy. The die was cast and nothing can be done about it - the West remains agricultural, at our prices, eastern prices.

So, Mr. Speaker, in 1973 a great awakening took place. Alberta found a place of importance in the Canadian economy because of an abundance of natural resource energy and our ability to produce it in abundance. Because of this great realization in the East, Alberta's future is bright if a delivery system can be extended to the market centres.

Mr. Speaker, it is lamentable to think that when western energy is so desperately needed in eastern Canada, the delivery system is so inadequate that it cannot relieve suffering and avoid disaster. Surely the national ministers of transport will make immediate preparations and correct such inefficiencies even if they were trying to get along without western energy, which seemed obvious till this time.

Transportation problems are not new to us. The West has always had them. We have been complaining for a lifetime about slow delivery of agricultural products to the seaports and to the world markets. Mr. Speaker, it all smacks of hope - opportunity at this time, prosperity for Alberta, more than we ever dreamed could happen in such a short time. This has been a tremendous awakening for everyone. All at once our oil and gas, of which we have been coaxing markets to take more, area in demand and there are windfall returns, not because of any miracle on our part but because of a world condition. When conventional suppliers inflated the price of oil and rationed the amount of sales then prices increased.



Further, Mr. Speaker, 1973 proved to be a year of crop failure, especially in coarse grains in several countries. A demand for western products inflated the price of Canada's agricultural products. With these increases all production got the urge to escalate, including labour demands, and away we go into a general upswing into prices to the consumer, resulting in what we call inflation. This is the situation as I see it and we look to the provincial government in power for a solution. But have we found it? There is no mention of it.

Mr. Speaker, someone said - I believe the Deputy Premier, I'm sure it was him and if it wasn't I stand corrected - this government intends to provide the highest quality of life for all Albertans. Let me remind the hon. members that we cannot provide quality of life for anyone unless they work for it. It cannot be provided by grants, loans or giveaway programs; nor can you fight inflation with giveaway programs - all you do is contribute to it. When one has a bumper crop, a successful year in business or in government, or if he has exceptionally good health, that is no time to go on a spending spree. That is no time to make enemies of our neighbours and friends who have problems and perhaps are struggling for survival. No, we cannot provide quality of life for Albertans because it is a personal thing, an educational experience, an appreciation awakening. There is an awakening of values, the things to do and the things not to do which will develop stout-hearted men and women who will fight for the rights and the cause they adore. Not giveaway programs resulting in a fat, soft, permissive society - in my book, that is not providing a quality of life.

Mr. Speaker, all that has been said by the government when it brags of lush resources, an abundance of everything and the land of opportunity - opportunity for what? Is it to take our Canadian countrymen like they took us? Are we going to reverse the Canadian energy image and have the Easterners feed the money into the image in the East and us take it out in the West? Surely we are bigger than that. Mr. Speaker, I say no, let us not lose sight of the circumstances and not be unreasonable. Let us spend less and save more and be prepared for the days ahead when there will be more mouths to feed and more shelters to provide.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TRYNCHY:

I beg leave to adjourn debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 10:15 o'clock.]

