

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Tuesday Evening, October 29, 1974

[Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair at 8 p.m.]

GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

3. Hon. Mr. Hyndman proposed the following motion to this Assembly:

Be It Resolved That the hon. Premier report to the Assembly respecting the operations of government during the period of the adjournment of the Assembly for the summer recess to October 23, 1974, and that the said report be received and concurred in.

[Adjourned debate: Dr. Horner]

DR. HORNER:

I know, Mr. Speaker, that there are those from some areas of Alberta who might not want to hear what I have to say, but ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yeah, the farmers.

DR. HORNER:

At the same time I think it's rather important in the total context particularly because of the developments that have taken place in the past number of months, and the fact that the Department of Agriculture, whether others like it or not, is still a major factor in the economy and life of this province, and indeed, the life of Canada.

Alberta produces, in fact, a fifth of the total agricultural production of Canada and yet we represent only eight per cent of Canada's population. Therein lies a message that all of us should be aware of: that we are a food producer, that we require markets outside of our province, outside of this country and that if we ever tend towards the easy solution of becoming inward-looking and saying that our people should only be producing for Alberta or for Canada, there would be really serious consequences for our province and our people.

I would like to start, Mr. Speaker, by talking about some things in agricultural policy generally, to review some of the things we've done through the summer and hopefully, if time allows, to review the activities of the department in a brief way. I want to say initially, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things that keeps me going and helps me to do as good a job as I can do is the tremendous loyalty and the tremendous capability of the staff I have in the agricultural department in Alberta. I would like to say to hon. members, it will more than match any staff in any department of agriculture in Canada including the federal one. The unfortunate thing for Canada, Mr. Speaker, is that [the] latter is the least of their accomplishments.

The situation in agriculture has, of course, been one of trying to achieve some balance and some stability. At any given time in the past two years, one segment of agriculture has been up and the other down. We have gone through that kind of situation in which we had to provide incentives and encouragement to a variety of parts of our industry. We had to do it because as a provincial government we had some responsibility to our producers.

I would remind you that this government's objective initially was and is to provide a reasonable standard of income to the people engaged in agriculture, and that standard of income should be on an equality with others in other walks of life. If we don't accept that objective, and unfortunately there are many in this country who don't, we will not have in Canada, or indeed in Alberta, the kind of food that we do have.

It's really kind of remarkable because even today [with] the inflation that is upon us - as one of my groups headed by a very aggressive young lady tries to tell consumers in

this province - by five o'clock on Monday most Albertans have been able to earn their groceries for the week. That's pretty good in this day and age.

I did want to say a word or two about our relationship first of all with the federal government and some of the problems that we have encountered, and when doing that, to say a word or two about how we have been able to cooperate with our neighboring provinces in a general way, even though ideologically we have some restraints. The interesting thing - again I would like to keep giving these little pearls to my friend from Spirit River-Fairview to contemplate - is the fact, of course, that the minister for Saskatchewan and I have been able to collaborate and work together very well indeed. The minister for British Columbia, when he gets away from certain other members of his cabinet, is also able to operate on a rather different plane. We, too, have been able to cooperate particularly in the hon member's area, and to do some things we think are worth while for the people in the area, notwithstanding ideologies. I think that is important.

We have recently gone through a number of meetings with other ministers including the summer annual meeting with all ministers from across Canada. Indeed a special meeting that was asked for by a number of western ministers was called for Regina. We encouraged the federal minister to attend, but he didn't feel that was appropriate or worth while, so he didn't attend.

The interesting thing about that particular meeting was that it was attended by my colleague, the Minister of Consumer Affairs in Alberta, and the other consumer affairs ministers in the four western provinces. Out of that meeting came the realization, I think, on both parts that we in agriculture had a responsibility to our consumers. Indeed the consumer affairs ministers appreciated even more that they had a responsibility to make sure that we maintained production in western Canada.

I can't help but recall an interesting development that took place just today before another board of my colleague, the Minister of the Environment, who is holding hearings with regard to pesticides. I am rather intrigued by the representations reported in the press by a gentleman from Peru about nature, pesticides and people, and I recommend his paper to all who might be concerned. As there has to be a balance in our own industry, there surely has to be a balance in how we work with nature to provide the food that people in the world require.

If I could then just deal briefly with the situation and the federal government in relation to several matters. I think, because it is current and important, that the people of Alberta and indeed the members of this Legislature appreciate Alberta's position with regard to the so-called egg scandal. The situation as we see it in regard to CEMA - a number of hon members will remember the debate that went on with regard to Bill C-176, the Agricultural Products Marketing Act, which was eventually passed after a compromise in which we finally said, well, we will agree but we are going to restrict it to poultry. That was one of the more fortunate decisions, I think, for Canada. We have now seen what we suspected would happen in the first place, that we would have a rush to produce a thing that is relatively easy to produce to increase your provincial quota in the next go around. That's what happened to CEMA.

We, in Alberta, were the last signers. We were, in fact, reluctant signers. We did so under pressure from our own producers who wanted to give it a try. We have given it that try.

At the same time, insofar as egg production is concerned in Alberta, we've been able to manage that in a much more effective way because we made some moves to remove people with up to one thousand birds from both quota and levy, allowing them to market those eggs in a traditional and indeed, in some ways, an innovative way. I'll have something to say, hopefully, with regards to farmers' markets later on.

The situation in fact in Alberta is simply this, Mr Speaker. We have not overproduced. We have not contributed to the situation with regard to CEMA and its particular problem in rotten eggs. As a matter of fact, while they were having difficulty getting rid of those eggs, our processing plant, the only one in western Canada to make manufactured egg products, was short of product to process. That's the kind of thing we get into in this balkanization that C-176 was all about.

I would like to suggest to all hon members that this is just the tip of the iceberg. Continuing pressures will come now - after they try to bury this fiasco - from the central provinces, that they become proficient in the production of a variety of agriculture goods whether or not they have any natural advantage to do so. Some of my friends from eastern Canada might get a little upset - as some of them did last night as I spoke to the grains council - that if we're going to be a part of Confederation, surely being part of Confederation means we should have the right to produce those things we can produce with that natural advantage which is ours.

I think it is particularly important, Mr Speaker, that all of us appreciate the role our federal minister has embarked upon. The one saving grace of those rotten eggs is the fact that this is going to slow him down. That, Mr Speaker, may well be worth much more than the protein content, which wasn't really that great in any case, in the amount involved. But I'm firmly convinced - there's no doubt in my mind whatsoever - after having discussions with the federal government and the senior federal civil servants over the past three years, that they're dictated to by the needs of Ontario and Quebec, that they will carry out programs only if they are going to serve those needs, and that, well, those people out in western Canada should really just be growing wheat anyway - that's all they really know about agriculture in western Canada.

I put that before you because it's relevant. The CEMA problem by itself is strictly one of management and putting it together, if you want to do it that way. But the import

of what happened under CEMA is in fact what could happen if you allow that kind of federal legislation in this country, with hogs, with cattle, with any agricultural product you want to mention. There are all kinds of other factors involved, of course, in some of the other products. But the day we start to do that, the day we start to have a provincial quota of production, is the day I don't want to be in the position I now hold, because I wouldn't be of any use to the farmers I try to represent.

Mr. Speaker, on that kind of background I have to say that the kinds of meetings we've been able to hold with the federal government, particularly since the federal election, were extremely disappointing. I had some hope that because they were now a little bit more secure as a government, they would be willing to sit down and negotiate in a fair and equitable manner, having regard for all of Canada. I have to report to this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, that that is not the case. They are not concerned with what happens to western agriculture or, indeed, if anything happens to it. They are concerned only with that block of people who are involved in the votes that gave them the power. That's a sad commentary on our political system in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have to call on my colleagues, as I have in the past, in the cabinet, indeed within government, to provide agriculture in Alberta [with] much greater support than has ever happened in the past. Indeed I am concerned that we shouldn't have to do that, but there is in my view no other way if we are going to maintain the kind of industry we should have.

I was not concerned but interested, that the Leader of the Opposition should take as the special warrant the one having regard to the snowed-under crops; that as a farmer he could tell me those who were going to be able to get their crops off this April and May and those who weren't, and that we should have been able to estimate much closer. I admire his ability to try to estimate because it's better than mine. Having gone through some falls and springs that I have not been able to estimate, I leave it to his imagination as to how he could estimate better.

I would like to say a word about the other important situation, as I view it, with regard to our particular concern within the department. As I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, we produce 20 per cent of Canada's total agricultural output; we have 8 per cent of her population. The number of people each of our farmers feeds goes up every year and the kind of thing we can do to help them surely has to be worth while.

I look around at rural Alberta today, particularly this fall. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, all of us will concede that the outlook is much better than it has been for a couple of years. Indeed throughout the province it is better. I can report as of today that for all practical purposes we have had a total harvest. That's new and different over the past three years.

There's another important thing that has happened. The open fall has allowed those people in northern Alberta, from Edmonton north particularly, to do some fall work. This has tremendous value. I don't know how you can put a real dollar figure on it for next year's crop, but any of the people who have been involved in farming in the grey wooded soil will tell you very quickly that if you can't get that fall work done, unless you've done some summer fallow, it's not going to be very worth while putting it in in the spring. So we have had a good fall.

We have had some problems. Indeed if you ever have an agricultural province like Alberta that stretches from the country of the hon. Member for Cypress up to the country of the hon. Member for Peace River and all the variations there are in between - I know that the hon. Member for Cypress has gone through what I have gone through, in relation to what is happening in each of those areas. He can appreciate it when I say that it is an intriguing job. It's interesting.

I think I get my greatest satisfaction, Mr. Speaker, when I take the city media, as we have done the past two years, and try to get them from one place to another in a hurry and show them the differences and yet the similarities that are there. That's really the intriguing part of Alberta agriculture.

I have a great many figures I could spout. I don't think that would really accomplish very much, except maybe to point out the other thing I wanted to stress; that if we could ever get every segment of agriculture going ahead at the same pace, and at a reasonable pace - as I have told the Premier, and I really mean it - I think I would give my resignation because I would have reached the ultimate, and that would be it.

At the same time I must say this: as the Premier said the other day, the net cash income has gone from \$270 million in 1970 to our estimate this year. The Premier was his conservative self and said \$850 million. I really believe it will reach as high as \$1 billion in net cash income. That's really very good. I would hasten to advise my urban friends that they must appreciate, of course, that at the same time that was happening, all of the costs our farmers experienced [had] gone up as well: farm machinery up 40 per cent; other products tripled in price; baler twine, three times. We've done a review of each of these products and have a very useful relationship with Unifarm in monitoring them. I hope people would appreciate that baler twine is a product of agriculturalists in other countries and they, too, have to have a return that's worth while. We have looked around, of course, to take advantage of the best price we can get, but the sisal growers in some of the underdeveloped countries are just now putting their land back into sisal because it wasn't worth while before.

These are the complexities and the intricacies of agriculture. As I said, if we could get that balance, if we could get the livestock man going ahead at the same pace as the grain farmer, [all] would be very well indeed.

It might be interesting to note that our estimate for this year is \$2 billion gross farm receipts. For the first time we estimate that grains will be more in returns than livestock. That has to do of course with the value of grain as opposed to livestock. But traditionally in Alberta we've been a 60-40 split, with livestock being the primary producer of revenue. We're now in that position where grain will in fact provide more income for farmers than livestock.

If I could move very briefly, Mr. Speaker, to a review of what we've been trying to do within the department. As most hon. members are aware, we have three segments in the department: the core, if you like, of production; the family farm division, under which we have the Agricultural Development Corporation, our co-op branch, our farm engineering section, and people who are providing extension and other services to the individual farmer; and then on the other side we have the marketing section and allied to that is the export agency. I will hopefully have time to say a word or two about that because there have been some rumors going through the trade that need to be put to rest.

I want to say initially though that I guess the criticism I've heard as often as any, and particularly in certain areas, is that we've had too many programs; that we have tried to do too much. I accept that criticism. Perhaps we shouldn't respond that quickly or that often. But I feel very strongly that if we're going to have what we set out to have - a diversified agriculture in which farmers are not going to be reliant upon one particular segment of agriculture - we have to have those kinds of programs and we have to have the ability to put them in place effectively and in a reasonable time span.

We've had our programs, and I don't want to take the time to go over them. We are dropping those we don't think are effective. We will bring in some other ones when we think they are needed. Our water supply program under ARDA has been a tremendous success all the way from Foremost in the south to High Level in the north. Farmers have taken advantage of this system - 5,500 of them. I've been intrigued in visiting the various regions, talking to our regional directors and hearing about the number of farmers who are still bailing water out of the well with a pail; and that our program has allowed them to have pressure systems for the first time in their lives. I think that kind of program is worth while.

We helped 7,000 farmers last winter with our livestock facility program. We put 5,500 young people on farms this summer to help the labor situation. I hope that I'm allowed to smile a little smugly when I read stories from Ontario about their great student program in which they got 200 students out on their farms, when we can say we put 5,500 out. I think there's something there.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, talking about young people, I've got a challenge I would like all of my friends from rural Alberta to take up with their young people, particularly the dairy people. We've had a very interesting relationship with Japan and some of the other Far East countries over the past two years. We have tried to initiate an exchange program of our students. We have nine young Japanese people here on our dairy farms, but so far I haven't been able to get any courageous young Albertans to go to northern Japan, which is very beautiful, into Hokkaido to work on dairy farms in that country. We have now stepped up our subsidization and I welcome nominations from all MLAs as to those young people who would like to go ...

AN HON. MEMBER:
Young people?

DR. HORNER:
... and become ...

AN HON. MEMBER:
Charlie Drain ...

DR. HORNER.

... a really worth-while - I know the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest might like to go, Mr. Speaker, and I wouldn't want to be very nasty to him or anything, but I was going to suggest that maybe one of his grandsons might want to.

One of the things of course that has happened is the shortages in relation to our production generally. We are in short supply. We are going to be in short supply in regard to fertilizer, and it's strictly a matter of demand. With the kind of prices we can receive for grain, people are using more fertilizer - three times as much as they did. We don't have the capacity to provide it. Not only fertilizer; some hon. members have asked me with regard to Avadex and Treflan. Again, a year or so ago we were treating something like sixty thousand acres. The acreage that we're now going to be treating for wild oats, even this fall, is up over 400,000 acres and is pretty substantial. I would say to all of you that this is an indication of the kind of expansion we require and the kind of production and the manufacturing process that the Minister of Industry and Commerce and I have been talking about to provide our need.

In the fertilizer situation we have simply said very straightforwardly to those people who want to manufacture fertilizer in this province that one of the criteria is going to be their ability to provide fertilizer for Alberta and Canada, and their ability to provide those fertilizer ingredients that we don't have in Alberta or in Canada as a quid pro quo for our nitrogen. I might also add, we intend to use our ability to produce those kinds of fertilizers as a lever to protect the markets for our agricultural products. I don't think it's worth while or reasonable that other countries should expect us to ship

them fertilizer and then put barriers against our agricultural products going into their countries. It's as simple as that.

In regard to irrigation, and I know my honorable friends opposite are interested in this. I read their report out of Lethbridge and I couldn't help but wonder where they had been. I want to say to them that we congratulate the people in Bow River, particularly, who have taken over that district and who are doing a good job running their own affairs. I want to say to my friends from that particular area that the people have responded to the challenge of looking after their own irrigation district, and we intend to expand our irrigation in southern Alberta. Our priorities are for expansion of irrigation within the existing boundaries, then we will look at new ones. I think that is reasonable. I think that's the way we should go.

We will, as a government, be spending and are committed to spending well over \$100 million in the next 10 years in the expansion of irrigation in southern Alberta.

I want to ...

MR. STROM:

I wonder if the hon. member would just permit a question on irrigation. It's not to trick him, but I would be interested in knowing if he is planning on going ahead with the highline, inasmuch as you have mentioned now.

MR. FOSTER:

Mr. Speaker, before the hon. Deputy Premier continues, I rise on a point of order to request the unanimous consent of the House to have Dr. Horner exceed the time limit and continue his remarks.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are hon. members agreed that the hon. minister may exceed the time limit?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Interjections]

DR. HORNER:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I shan't be longer than an hour.

[Laughter]

AN HON. MEMBER:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

[Laughter]

DR. HORNER:

I had hoped that I might get to the question of the breeding of race horses by then and my honorable friend from Whitemud and my honorable friend from Calgary McCall might be interested.

However, I did want to say to my honorable friend, we are going ahead with the engineering that might be required on highline, in collaboration with my colleague, the minister of irrigation. We would do that though only after we have looked at the question of the connecting channel, the question of the farmers' involvement in the area, and after we have expanded the irrigation district to its own capacity before we go outside it. I appreciate this is an area in which we can have additional water fairly quickly, provided the - I'll try to get my term right - canal between the two is effective. We are concerned about that. We will be starting in a small way, doing it a small block at a time.

Of course, as my honorable friend knows, irrigation has changed as other things in agriculture have changed. No longer are we, as they used to say, putting it under the ditch. It's now putting it under the wheel, and it is a very different type of thing.

I think it would be useful if I said a word or two with regard to veterinary medical services in the province and what we have been able to do. We have had an agreement with the federal government with regard to building government clinics. We have reserved those clinics really for the marginal areas. My response to a great many communities coming to me and saying, well, we really need a government veterinary clinic, is to say to them, are you sure you want to go that route. We will make loans available to you, to build your clinics as businessmen and farmers in your area. Then, for heaven's sake, have a lease option with the veterinarian so you tie him to your community and he can't just pack up his little bag and leave. That's the way we'll build veterinary practices in this province.

In addition to that, we have start-up grants for veterinarians in other areas. We've given out these grants in a great variety of areas: Coronation, Oyen, Edson, Grand Centre, Athabasca, Consort and Sangudo, to enable young veterinarians to establish practices. We have built veterinary clinics in Edson and High Prairie. We will be building them in Manning and Valleyview. We are making loans for a great many more. I think the total is close to 25 now throughout the province. Again I say I hope even [in] the government

ones, that there would be an option available to the veterinarian to buy the facilities so that he would be a part of the community and be involved.

The other important thing is, I think, that a year ago the hon Member for St Paul took through this Legislature The Meat Inspection Act. I think it is useful that members know that once getting into place the meat inspectors which were required, the kind of classification that we required for those abattoirs, the volume that these smaller plants are doing has tripled. They are now expanding their sphere of influence in marketing, and are really a very useful and a really worth while development in providing a market and in providing the consumers in this province with high-class meats from local establishments.

I could go on at some length in regard to what we are doing in the product development section, in regard to the nutrition and food marketing section, all of the activities which have been going on and are ongoing. All of you have seen something of Agriculture Week, of Alberta food products, of Agri-Prom and the Taste of Alberta promotion. I only say that the young lady who heads nutrition and food marketing in my department has been so active and aggressive under Agri-Prom and Taste of Alberta that she literally has the food processing industry in Alberta paying 50 per cent of the costs of that promotion, and [is] doing what I think is a tremendous job in that particular area.

The other area that I would appreciate comments on from hon members is the question of the school lunch program, particularly the pilot ones we have run in the cores of both Edmonton and Calgary. The unsolicited letters I'm getting from the school principals are revealing indeed with regard to the question of nutrition and how it affects our youngsters and their ability to function, in those kinds of schools. I invite the comments of honorable gentlemen in that regard.

Mr Speaker, if the House would indulge me just a few more minutes, I would like to say a word with regard to our relationship to the export market, how we should develop that market, whether we should be there at all - I'm sure there are some who will say we shouldn't be.

Again I go back to those figures I quoted you initially. We produce 20 per cent of the production generally. In some commodities it's much higher than that, of course. I think of honey production in Canada, and I can say to the House that 42 per cent of the honey produced in Canada this year will be produced in Alberta. I can say in regard to beef production that we are within 35 to 40 per cent, that the slaughtering of beef animals is higher than that, and that we are a major factor in the beef markets of Alberta and western Canada. Similarly with hogs, and we could go down the list.

I say that because we have to develop those markets. Up until a few years ago the concept of marketing was to look after your domestic market and if you had a little bit of surplus, you dumped it on somebody else's market. It didn't really matter where that market was, whether it was in the United States or in Japan or wherever you could dump it. That, of course, isn't a very good idea for the longer term, and much more work has to be done than that.

Out of that came our concern for having an important place, in those markets that we can effectively reach, for a variety of agricultural products. So my colleague, the Minister of Industry and Commerce and I put together the Alberta Export Agency. It has had some growing pains and it has had some problems, but it's done a pretty fantastic job for [a group of] neophytes who were all of a sudden tossed into competition [with] the Exim Bank of the United States of America with billions of dollars to spend in export credit, in competition with the European Economic Community in which they are providing some of these countries with 2 per cent money over 30 years.

That's the kind of competition we're in. That's the kind of world we live in. And for that group of very dedicated people who have worked extremely hard to have the kind of record that they have - and that record is something like this, Mr Speaker in actual cash dollar sales that we can keep track of, well over \$40 million, in joint ventures of processing plants in this province on an ongoing basis, over \$200 million of commitment. I think that is a pretty tremendous kind of advance and it goes along with our idea that we should process our products here.

There is one particular area that has had some concern for me and still has some concern. We have a tremendous opportunity around the world to provide breeding stock for both dairy and beef cattle. We have asked our breed associations to try to lead the way. Unfortunately, in the cattle industry as in others, there are all kinds of little nuances and little things that go on, like, you know, I'm a Hereford breeder and I don't talk to you because you have black cattle, and I don't talk to you because you're a Holstein producer, and so it goes. Unfortunately, all of these people are sincere and trying to do their best. We have now adjusted to that and are going to be making sure that the breed associations themselves are looking after the purebred sales that are available. At the moment we are looking at sales to countries like Czechoslovakia, Mexico, most of the South American countries, Korea and a great many more.

But really the opportunity for us is in another area and that is in the commercial type of beef cattle. Countries like Korea, northern Japan and other areas in Asia particularly can take advantage of our extremely good commercial breeding stock with straight lines, as they call them in the industry, of breed characteristics. We are looking at this. I am going to be going to my colleagues again to suggest that we can't compete with the Exim Bank in the USA without some export credits. We are going to need that if we are going to be a meaningful participant in that kind of trade.

Indeed, for the first time in a number of years, we have stopped the decline in dairy cow numbers in Alberta and our dairy heifers are up. Hopefully we will be able to improve

our own dairy production and meet our own domestic needs and at the same time have some dairy cattle to sell in most of the countries in the world

Indeed most of the Far East, South America, Korea and all of these countries are looking for our kind of dairy cattle. So we do have a real challenge and a real ability to sell there. We are going to need those things. But most of all we are going to need the dedicated people we have put together in the export agency to continue to do the kind of job they have done, the kind of job that means spending a lot of their weekends working, entertaining people from Ecuador, Guatemala, Argentina, Korea, Czechoslovakia and other places - doing it with the real kind of zeal that I am very, very proud of, for they never complain. They have done, in my view, a tremendous job.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for its indulgence in allowing me to continue over the line. I, of course, could go on for some time talking about some of the other problems that we do have in agriculture. They are there. They are inherently there. It is my view that we have to have that kind of ability not to overreact but to react so that we can try to get that stability and that balance that is so necessary in agriculture if we are going to have a viable rural Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, just in conclusion can I say to the hon. members it used to be said that you couldn't change the rural-urban shift. Mr. Speaker, I make the statement today that we have changed the rural-urban shift. In fact, it's now the other way around, our rural areas have never been so vibrant or growing as well. And that's part of agricultural policy.

MR. SPEAKER

The hon. Member for Lethbridge West

MR. R. SPEAKER

Mr. Speaker, could I have permission of the House to ask the minister a question for clarification purposes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS

Agreed

MR. R. SPEAKER

In light of the minister's commitment to irrigation expansion and his appreciation of the new Bow River board when he made both of these comments, what funds will he see available or what plan has the minister for the drainage of the west block of the Bow River development program, that is, the drainage of Lost Lake?

DR. HORNER

Both my colleague, the Minister of the Environment, and I have met with the board and with my irrigation division and the Minister of The Environment's technical people. We have come to a solution we think, at least on a temporary basis with regard to Lost Lake. When I say "temporary", we're talking about a 10-year thing. In the intervening years we'll have a look at the question of whether or not we should have a permanent drainage canal from Lost Lake down into the Bow River, which at the moment would be very expensive. But there may be some other engineering alternatives.

I think we've got a temporary solution that both our departments have authorized and I say "temporary" on a 10-year basis. We'll look at a longer-term situation with regard to a permanent drainage canal.

MR. GRUENWALD

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to just make a very few brief remarks regarding the debate that is now going on.

I would like to congratulate the Minister of Agriculture on the talk he has given. It certainly has been enlightening and helpful, I'm sure, to the total Legislature.

The remarks I want to make are only highlights of problems, of situations and of requests that have been brought to my attention as an elected representative of Lethbridge in southern Alberta. I say they are highlights only, certainly I will not be dealing in detail.

First of all I would like to indicate very clearly that the motion I made the other day [and that] we talked about on Thursday afternoon regarding the expansion of Indian Battle Park or a new park on the Oldman River was one on which I was extremely serious. It was not just a publicity stunt. We are really serious about expanding Indian Battle Park - having it made large enough so it will qualify as a provincial park and expanding and preserving the river bottom near Lethbridge for that purpose. We think it's an important type of facility that we really need, not only Lethbridge but the [whole] of southern Alberta.

The next and probably the most important thing I would like to bring to the attention of the government is a concern we have in Lethbridge - and I'm sure it's not unique in Lethbridge - regarding mortgage funds for new homes. Lethbridge is growing fast, I suggest in some ways maybe too fast for our own good. We just can't handle the situation as far as housing is concerned. Mortgage funds are no longer available to any great extent. We would hope that through the Alberta Housing Corporation possibly some assistance could be forthcoming.

Now this is a real grass-roots problem. Let's put it this way. I think that good housing for a young family is conducive to good family living. It's just that important.

I know that there is government subsidized low rental housing that is available from time to time. This is not the most desirable type of facility but it's better than none.

It would be interesting to know Mr. Speaker just what the percentage of single family dwellings [is] today in relation to the number of families we have in the total province of Alberta [compared] to what it was, say, 20 years ago. It just isn't keeping up at all. A young family starting out today, building a new home, finding a down payment and being able to pay the interest rates that are required and the monthly payments - it's almost out of reach. It just looks so far beyond his reach that, you know, he just gives up. I think this is really unfortunate because it's so important that young families have a home to live in.

I was glad to notice that the Minister of Education - I see he is not here tonight - made reference to some increase in educational finance. The only thing I want to say is I would hope the Minister of Education and the Minister of Manpower and Labour will do everything they can to make sure, now we are involved in trustee-teacher salary negotiations, that every effort is made to avoid [a] teachers' strike. I am totally convinced in my own mind, while there's no way I'm going to suggest the right of teachers to strike be taken away, that certainly very little if anything is accomplished by such action. It's an unfortunate thing that does nothing for the image of the teachers, and I think it does very little for their pocketbooks as a matter of fact. So I hope that if any of them go on strike, it won't be because funds are just not available. I think it would be unfortunate.

Also I would hope the minister, through the school buildings branch, would have a look at the criteria for school cafeterias. If we're not going to build more schools, if we're going to insist on greater utilization of our schools in the areas [where] students are going to have travel a little bit farther to the school, we must provide cafeterias in our high schools. We have a very serious need particularly in one of the high schools in Lethbridge, Catholic Central High.

I'd like to mention, too, senior citizens' homes. This has been brought to my attention by the foundation in Lethbridge. Number one, we should have a new lodge there. We should have an addition. I think this is something the government is well aware of. We're extremely grateful for the programs that are in progress now. As a matter of fact I am pleased with the additions and the new facilities that are being built in all of southern Alberta, outside of Lethbridge. I am thinking of Milk River. I think it is really great for these small areas to get their senior citizens' home.

Also, I think the Minister of Health and Social Development should take note. It would appear to me - and I'm sure it does to him by the several complaints I know he has received, copies of which I have received - there is a tendency in our nursing homes, and a little in our senior citizens homes, [for] the service to leave something to be desired, to say the least. I realize there are two things we have to consider.

Number one, it's pretty easy, and we shouldn't think it's beyond operators of these homes, to take advantage of senior citizens, whether they are well or whether they are in the nursing home concept. At the same time, I am well aware of the emotion involved when members of their families complain about their treatment. I know you have to take a balance between the two. Nevertheless I'm concerned, because of the number of complaints I receive, that maybe some of these people are being taken advantage of. I think we should pick up the challenge and check into it from time to time. I think there is some cause for complaint.

Centralization of hospital services seems to be something that is on the go to some extent. I'll speak only of Lethbridge at this time. I see nothing wrong with the centralizing of the laundry services in Lethbridge and southern Alberta, even though we did have a little trouble during the construction of that facility. Nevertheless we came through it all right, Mr. Minister. I think the centralization of lab facilities is okay. But I would want to be cautious, and caution the minister that I don't want to see a complete centralization and melting-in of hospitals in Lethbridge. I'll be very specific. I would never want to see the identity of those two hospitals given up. I think those choices should be there and there still should be two separate hospitals under separate administration. I believe they are entitled to that.

I believe that the new government offices in Lethbridge, in the Professional Building, really haven't got going yet, but from what I can gather I think they have the potential of being helpful to people of southern Alberta, just on the basis of giving out information alone. I think we forget, you know - and MLAs are well aware of this in the calls they receive in their constituencies - but life is pretty complicated for a lot of people, Mr. Speaker. They just don't know where to go. They really find themselves in a bind. They find themselves lost as to whom shall we go and then how to get through that wall of bureaucracy.

One of the big jobs, I feel I'm called on the most frequently for is to help constituents find out where they can get their service. I think it's more important to set them up with interviews or tell them where to go than to do the job for them. They get a great satisfaction out of phoning a minister or a department and, as long as they have the right one, solving their problem. I think this is very important.

But, as I say, a great number of our people find life complicated because of the many, many departments that there are. There's a home-owner's tax discount. My goodness, I've had many calls on that. Workmen's compensation - a lot of people don't know where to go. Social assistance - they usually find their way there but they still have problems once they get there. Loans of all descriptions. It's information, and that doesn't mean I want to see a greater blizzard of paper going out, because we don't look at what we're

getting now. But I think the phone numbers where they can get hold of these people - that's what's important.

A very popular topic of conversation, almost throughout this whole province, is the surplus funds the Province of Alberta seems to have. I know when I was small I was always told that Santa Claus lived at the North Pole. Now, not only young people, but all people in Alberta are being told that Santa Claus lives in Edmonton.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. GRUENWALD:

I think we really have to be careful because of the amount of surplus funds and the way people are talking. They feel there's a relentless or miraculous pitcher pumping up money all the time.

A very irresponsible attitude is prevailing and creeping into our society, and I say that seriously, Mr. Speaker. It's an irresponsible attitude. People really don't care if they achieve any more or not. I have known people with loans who say, I'm really not that worried. They've got lots of money up there, why should I worry. I don't like it when I hear people on social assistance say, why should I work. I can make more money on social assistance than I can if I work.

Well, I think this is a sad state of affairs and it's not good for the total morale of our society or for this province. I'm simply saying that I hope the government doesn't slip into the trap of being too soft and just handing out one thing right after another simply because there may be more money there than they have ever had before. I think this is important.

I believe one thing that I could really seriously recommend is a reduction in provincial income tax, because I firmly believe that too much income tax is an incentive-killer. A lot of people talk that way. I know people who say, why should I work more days, I give it all away and that isn't healthy either.

I think one of our problems, too, in our society is the amount of waste that we have. We are a very wasteful society, not only in Alberta and Canada but on the whole North American continent. The Minister of Agriculture tonight mentioned the eggs, and we've all heard about this twenty-eight, or I don't know how many, million eggs that were wasted. It's easy for people like the federal Minister of Agriculture to say that on a percentage basis, it didn't really amount to that much. I have a hard time justifying waste or rationalizing in that particular way. I think waste is waste. When we waste recklessly and carelessly someday there has to be a day of reckoning on that. I just can't subscribe to it.

I think all people will recognize that money is a great thing. It helps us through our problems. In many things we just can't do without money. But it isn't everything.

The area that I got into is one that I hesitate to get involved in - it's some of the social services that I feel and see the public is continuously demanding; ones which the government could become involved in without carefully investigating first.

One of the serious problems we have in our society now is the single-parent family. I think most people will recognize that. I believe the first step in providing help for the children of single-parent families, and I know this gets into this area which I'm known to be sceptical about, is the day care type of situation. I know there's a need for a place for these kids, but I would first of all like the private sector to be encouraged to provide the facility, if possible. Then the assistance that is required should go to the individual, to the recipient of the service, and not to the institution itself.

I just can't help but think this is a sounder type of approach, because as we soon as we start getting the government involved in, say, these baby-sitting services - and they run everything from six-month babies up to the preschool age - we find parents trying to utilize those government-subsidized types of institutions for their luxury. They just can't wait to farm their kids out whether there really is a need for it or not.

I have some pretty serious doubts and questions about the values of some of our psychologists and family counsellors who recommend that the children be put out into these types of facilities over and above the home. I just wonder what they know about real family living. They can give you a lot of textbook answers but I'm wondering about the value-type of situation.

At the same time I don't want to tar them all with the same brush because I know there are a lot of psychologists and family counsellors who are doing a real service in this province. I have referred people to them and have been thanked very graciously for doing so because they can help a lot of people. A lot of people really need help. There's no doubt about that. But I think the emphasis should be, for once, on responsible parenthood. I think that's worth considering, rather than just trying to figure how to get the kids out of the home situation.

I think it's for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I'm a pretty strong proponent and believer in a good family-life education program within our schools; one that carries with it values, and I mean moral values as well, in every aspect. There's a real need for that because we have to combat the false propaganda that is flying around, particularly related to family-life, sex education, family planning, abortions and the whole bundle. The story that is being told in our society by many of our agencies is not the story I would want told and taught to my children. I believe in that type of program, but my big problem is I don't trust very many people with that type of program. That's the whole problem. So much for social services.

I do hope the government, and I'd just very briefly like to mention, will consider some alternatives to rail abandonment in southern Alberta. Now I'm not so naive to think that all the railways put in many years ago to service the small towns in southern Alberta can be maintained. I don't think this is realistic, but I do believe it is realistic to provide some alternatives to the abandonment of those. I refer particularly to some of the side roads - if we just had bridges that would carry heavier trucks for hauling large amounts of grain from elevator to elevator.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to point out that we in Lethbridge are quite pleased with the assistance we've been getting from the government in various departments. The bridge going across to west Lethbridge will be ready for traffic possibly sometime in December and development in west Lethbridge is proceeding. There are about seventy-five homes there.

Also I remind the members that the Canada Winter Games are coming up in Lethbridge February 11-13 next, and we look forward to, and welcome, all members, any members, coming to Lethbridge if you want some real western hospitality. I'm sure you'll experience it there. We're also grateful for the assistance from the federal and provincial governments to make this exercise possible for Lethbridge. It's a big project for a small city like Lethbridge, but we believe we're going to do a real good job and everyone in Alberta and Canada will be proud of the show we're going to put on there.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to follow so many excellent orators as I have heard on this particular address on the Motion No. 3 by Mr. Hyndman, in which the Premier outlines the processes and achievements of government.

Certainly Alberta has been cast in a golden glow of prosperity and this is so. Everyone is happy about it. We are happy in a situation where we can export inflation, and I would think that we certainly do in the matter of our agricultural products and in the matter, to a lesser degree, of the oil.

I could not help but wonder when all the hon. members on your right, Mr. Speaker, and some on this side, applauded so loudly when it was indicated that the net productivity of agriculture in Alberta had gone up from \$270 million to \$850 million, and this is good. I started to think of the people in the third world who have an income of less than \$100 a year, in many countries that have to buy these products. You know, I don't think any of us thought about that and probably we shouldn't. Maybe we should shove thoughts like that under the table and live within our own complacency. I certainly realize that there is a large dimension to this problem and one that cannot be solved very easily.

Touching on the matter of the local situation, the improvements on Highway No. 3 going through the Crowsnest Pass have eliminated one curve which is worth more than a million and a half dollars in damage claims to the insurance companies. This will go a long way towards helping out in this particular area. It also means that - and this used to be a common custom when I was in the construction business, Mr. Speaker. I'd get phoned up by the police about 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning and have to pull some truck up this hill at Burmis. Now this is also eliminated. So if the Minister of Highways saw smiles at this particular time, the smiles are deservedly so because it was a very important progressive step insofar as the Crowsnest Pass and Highway No. 3 are concerned.

There is a question in the minds of the people at Pincher Creek as to where they are going with the hospital; what is going to be done in regard to improvements or changes in the hospital situation. They are wondering what is occurring. They are asking questions. Why, with all this vast pile of money they have in the province of Alberta, can something not be done.

This, of course, is something very unusual in the manner of governments to have huge piles of money. In fact a person has to go back to mythology, back to the time of King Midas, to find a parallel where there are huge piles of money like this. Now we find in the world that there is a situation occurring as a result of the OPEC organizations and the increased price of oil. The seats of power, as far as money is concerned, are flowing into very undeveloped and unsophisticated areas of the world, areas where possibly it would be very difficult for them to process and utilize this money and recycle it. I don't think they have the physical facilities to do so.

The result has very serious implications in spite of the fact that the province of Alberta, to some degree, has benefitted by this and, in fact, has quite a little bit of the stuff piled up; enough in fact, to have an important impact on the money situation in the Dominion of Canada and the credit situation.

These are some of the things that are major concerns and I don't think, have been dealt with adequately by the Premier in his 'state of the nation' speech.

There have been implications of a fantastic expansion in the economy of Alberta insofar as labor is concerned; the realization that there will be a shortage of a vast number of people. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one way you could go towards overcoming this particular shortage would be to create the physical plant for people to live in.

I have had my phone ring quite incessantly lately, from people who are looking and are desperate for housing. Just put yourself in that particular situation for a moment and think about it. It is really a situation that is serious. So I suggest that the acceleration of the boom and the expansion of the province of Alberta should be geared to the amount of physical plant in the matter of housing, health facilities, schools and all of the services that are so essential. Certainly you can't pull people out of thin air

and haul them into the province of Alberta and say, start working on some plant or physical development.

I personally see the economy of Alberta at this time as running flat out to the point where it is going to become a very difficult situation to control. We see an increasing demand for labor and materials. We see shortages in all areas. We have a situation where the Minister of Public Works introduces a bill that permits him to hoard materials in direct competition with private industry. This, of course, is private enterprise at the finest, as the government sees it at this time, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. DRAIN:

I'm going to propose to the Legislature that a look be taken at petrochemical industries from a different light than has been approached hereto. As the Premier announced the other day, there is a great limitation on the amount of oil that we have available in this province. The implications of his remarks were that there will be a diminishing oil supply, at an accelerating rate, and that 10 or 12 years down the road this could conceivably be quite serious.

I could point out to the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, the experience of South Africa, which as a result of the boycott - and I suppose good comes out of everything - has been able to develop a petrochemical and oil industry based on coal to the extent that they are now self-contained. So it would be unrealistic for me to suggest, having regard to the supply situation in Alberta, that we proceed on the basis of petrochemical development in the matter of oil, when you have in front of you a thousand-year supply of coal.

Another thing that intrigues me when I'm on the subject of coal, which is an extremely black subject, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a situation where the federal government is spending \$400 million at Thunder Bay to build terminal facilities to handle coal. On the other hand, we have no correlation of policy between the federal government and the provincial government as to where this coal is going to come from. We have no firm policy yet established in the province of Alberta as to whether in fact we are going to produce any coal. Apparently the right hand does not know what the left hand is doing.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. DRAIN:

Insofar as the prosperity and economic stability of the province of Ontario is concerned, there is a distinct possibility that American supplies of coal will not be available over a five-, six-, seven-, eight- or nine-year period, to fuel the steel furnaces of Ontario; that the nine or ten million tons of coal which are presently being imported will be required in the United States.

I believe it would be a reasonable to surmise at this time that relations between Canada and the United States conceivably could be slightly less harmonious than in the past. For one thing, we find pressure developing in the matter of a reduction in our exports because of a depletion in supply and a developing squeeze on the American customer in the matter of accelerated oil and gas prices and non-agreed continuity of supply. Quite obviously this could all lead up to a situation where an America-first policy would be certainly acceptable. So I believe a position that would force a curtailment of American exports of coal to the United States would result in a very serious economic situation developing in the province of Ontario; a situation which, if Alberta was not prepared to meet the demand, would create increasing pressure on the position of maintaining our natural resources in the situation of a national crisis in the heartland of Canada.

I wanted to touch briefly, Mr. Speaker, on the matter of Pacific Western Airlines. I note the emblem on the airlines is colored red over blue and I, of course, suggest this is only a coincidence. I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that this government is now going to hoist the red banner of the workers on the ramparts of the province of Alberta, or anything like that. I realize that probably it was an overreaction to a situation that was developing. I do question, however, certain aspects of the deal.

From the standpoint of a member of the Legislature, I feel policies, general policy, should be made in this Legislature. I don't say it was wrong that the cabinet and government moved in the direction of buying this, or any other particular subject. But certainly a policy should have been set by this particular Legislature in this particular area. This would be responsibility. In reality, Mr. Speaker, if the power of spending money is taken from the Legislature, the traditional power that goes back to Magna Carta - further than that, to the time of Henry VII and the ... What the hell is it. That thing ... whatever it was... The Court of Star Chamber, Mr. Speaker. I remembered that in spite of ... I am speaking without notes, remember that. We have a Star Chamber situation developing here in the province of Alberta where the Legislature of the province is ignored, where the rules of The Financial Administration Act, passed by this government, are thrown out the window by an order in council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame, arrogance.

MR. DRAIN:

Not so much in the matter of arrogance, I think. I wouldn't be that unkind. I would say in the matter of a person bringing into this Legislature the fundamental background he started out with in the world. So the hon. minister of commerce has started out as a businessman and he said, well, let's get out there and get 'er done. This would be my attitude also.

However, this is not what democracy is all about. Because if this is the direction this government intends to take, Mr. Speaker, I suggest all the backbenchers on both sides of the Legislature go home, thereby saving the people of the province of Alberta thousands of dollars in Hansard costs and so on. This is one thing I'm concerned about.

So in this deal the Legislature is ignorant...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right.

MR. DRAIN:

... ignored. Probably ignorant too.

[Interjections]

Daj boshay!

Out the window goes The Financial Administration Act. The five-year profit proviso is torn up. The Provincial Treasurer is conned into buying a proposition where he'll get a net yield of 2.8 versus a yield of 10.5 on a tax-free situation. How could he rationalize that, Mr. Speaker. How does he go to sleep at night knowing he is charged with the responsibility of looking after the people of the province of Alberta. These are some of the things that bother me.

Now another thing, I say it's an emotional reaction. Why shouldn't we have an airplane. We buy the airplane because it flies by and makes a noise. I think this is about as much rationale as anything else.

[Laughter]

To have the Minister of Agriculture come out and talk about hauling pork chops to Greece and Turkey - even the Minister of Industry and Commerce knows better than that.

The fundamentals of transportation in the province of Alberta and the way to crack our markets is by revision of the rail freight rates, [by] increasing efficiency of the rail, and by the Minister of Highways developing a better type of road that you can haul more material on.

To think you're going to go flying around with PWA ... Unless the sophistication of industry in Alberta becomes a lot greater than I anticipate it will - I can visualize a Boeing 707 loaded with wrist watches, for instance, if we're prepared to make wrist watches or optic instruments or some highly sophisticated product. That technology is considerably farther down the road than we would anticipate.

Mr. Speaker, these are my concerns in this particular area. I would certainly think some revision should be made in the rate of provincial income tax, that gasoline tax as such would certainly merit some readjustment and there has been readjustment. But I might point out that a great inducement in bringing people to the province of Alberta would be to give a reduction in income tax, because in reality people work for bucks on the table.

I couldn't help thinking about this. The way the labor market has been in the province of Alberta this year, a lot of young people went to work - young boys 14, 15, 16, school drop-outs. The first thing they discover, Mr. Speaker, is that they're paying five or six hundred dollars a month income tax. You know, I think that's unfair pool. The ones who are not joining the labor force are riding on the backs of these poor kids. They're sitting by enjoying all the opportunities of education and all the subsidized programs. Therefore, in fairness, the young people, up to 24 or 25 should be held tax free. This would give them the possibility of developing their own business. An unorthodox and different thought, possibly, but something that would bring a position of fairness into the thing.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. DRAIN:

I don't believe in one deal for the poor and another deal for the rich. I believe that all people should be treated with a certain amount of equality. I urge a go-slow situation for industrial plans because, as I said, the economy cannot expand any faster than the physical plant and the people that you have to develop it. I urge caution in the government program of investment. I can point to the sad results of Churchill Falls, the heavy water plant in Nova Scotia, the involvement in the development of an automobile where in fact no one knows where they're going and the province is locked in a situation. They are pouring millions and millions of dollars into something that may or may never pay. These are the things that have to be guarded against, Mr. Speaker.

I can also point to Micro-Systems that in fact was given so many government subsidies - Quiet, Henderson! - that they went broke from the total weight of packing the money to the bank. This is about the essence of what this has concluded.

So with these brief remarks - and I hope that I have contributed something to the debate, Mr. Speaker - I see PWA ... I'm not objecting to it on ideological grounds. I am not objecting to it on the basis of the money that is spent although I did point out to the Provincial Treasurer that he is getting 2.8 and less instead of 10.5. I also note, in passing only, that the price of shares paid by the Alberta government for this acquisition has been higher than the highest market price put on the PWA shares, even in the golden era of the '60s when everything was worth twice as much on paper than it actually was.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BENOIT:

Mr. Speaker, I don't profess to be an informer, educator, entertainer or elocutionist. But I have two or three things I'd like to say.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. BENOIT:

I get a lot of agreement, off the cuff.

For a long time I've been informed that the opposition traditionally and philosophically is supposed to be negative, and supposed to take a critical attitude. And I've particularly been informed of that in the last two or three years since we've sat on this side of the House. It kind of goes against my grain to be negative and so, Mr. Speaker, what I'm going to say I'll say negatively as positively as I can.

I want to speak a little bit about the Premier's comments on Motion No. 3 and then throw in a little bit of my own thinking with regard to the whole current situation. When the Premier was talking about the cabinet moving around the province, he talked about that as being something that was fairly new and significant. I don't want to knock it, because it's a good idea. But it's been carried on for the last six or seven years. While it may not be unique to this government it is unique to Alberta. For this I think we can take some credit in Alberta.

When we talk about the improvement of the Alberta hospitals in Deerhome and Red Deer, as the Premier did, I think we need to acknowledge that it would be normal procedure to improve these facilities. They need to be kept up-to-date. They are always deteriorating. But I think we need to do something else too. I suppose and hope that the government will be thinking about [the] matter of extending some kind of mental health care on a reciprocal basis with other provinces and probably with other countries. We do have this type of situation when it comes to Alberta Health Care Insurance. Whether you are in the States or in another province, if you are ill and have to go to a hospital or get some doctor's services, they are paid for according to the rates we have in Alberta. But when people who travel to other parts of the country outside of the province are taken hold of with mental illness, there is no such arrangement. This is probably one of the costliest types of illness to cope with, and I know people who have had these kinds of treatments outside the province and found it very costly. So I would hope that we could look into some type of situation that would provide assistance along this line.

The Premier made something of the proposed water situation in the Red Deer-Calgary corridor and I suppose that it is a good idea. But he did say he was surprised that the previous government, having been in office for 36 years, hadn't thought about that. However, he has been in office for some seven years in this Legislature as a legislator, and I don't recall that he ever said anything about such water development in that corridor. He acted as though he was surprised at the type of report that was handed to him concerning that matter.

Now I might suggest that the previous government, when it came in, had a total budget, in the first years of \$3 million, \$4 million and \$5 million a year. Now we have 400 times that much as a budget. And no matter how much time you have there is never enough time to catch up with everything. There wasn't the dire need of water in the Red Deer-Calgary corridor in those days, there wasn't the money, there wasn't the time, there wasn't the desire to socialize all the activities of Alberta's citizens like there seems to be now. And, as I said before, even the Premier, in seven years in this Legislature, hadn't talked about that until this year.

Something else that I'd like just to touch on. It's been touched on before, Mr. Speaker, but I think it's important to touch on it again. The Alberta Opportunity Company is valuable providing it serves the type of clientele it was intended to serve, as is the Agricultural Development Corporation. When I heard that the average loan in the Alberta Opportunity Company was \$131,000, and it said it was proud that the average was that small, I could think of a lot of small businesses that could have been helped a great deal with only a fraction of that amount. Now I realize that the Alberta Opportunity Company is making small loans to numbers of places. But it is also making loans of a quarter of a million and half a million in other places. I have questions in my mind as to whether these amounts should be put in this type of loan.

Likewise, the \$46,000 average loan in the Agricultural Development Corporation for farms does for some larger farms, and I don't mean large farms as we think of large farms in Alberta, but some larger ones; whereas if we want to diversify and decentralize and go into mixed farming and family farms, I think the smaller loans will do adequately for putting people out on the small type of farm.

I think we may be better served by encouraging small private businesses and small farms, smaller than these loan averages indicate. We talk about an economic unit and our

economic units have to be pretty large units according to a lot of people these days. But a small unit can be an economic unit if all the facilities that are used to operate it match the size of the unit.

I notice that the hon. Premier made something of the heavier load limits that are permitted on trucks these days. To speed up commerce and industry and carry the loads that are required, probably we need to increase it. But heavier loads on trucks mean heavier loads on the roads. The faster and the heavier the loads, the harder the wear and tear on the roads. Some of our roads are getting some pretty rough usage these days. As the hon. Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest said, we might be better to go a little slower and let it last a little longer. It's going to be a very costly process to rebuild the roads that are worn out by heavier loads travelling at the rates we're travelling.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Drumheller knows that when he was Minister of Highways I was one of those who pressed very hard to increase the speed limits on the excellent highways we have. But since that time I've changed my mind. I realize after some of the experience countries have gone through, both in the Second World War when we had our speed limits reduced considerably and in the United States when the energy crisis created a situation where they decreased the speed limits on the roads there, that it's not only a real saver of lives, but also saves money and energy to go slower. It creates a great deal of safety.

I can think of nothing more disastrous so far as the use of our land is concerned, Mr. Speaker, than putting up a four- or six-lane divided highway with wide ditches, with nice slopes and then having limited access to those roads so that we have to have a service road on either side of those big highways the whole length of the highway to provide so-called limited access, so that we have as much road on either side of the big highway as we used to have for all the traffic that we carried.

I know we have to advance with the age, but if we went slower on our highways we wouldn't have to have the limited access and we wouldn't have to have the service roads. It would be a great saving in a good many respects. I think it's worthy of consideration that we think about going just a little bit slower for the sake of the future of our country.

I'm not going to say much about PWA. Plenty has already been said. But I would just like to say that for all the snow job we received, with the piles of papers and reports on the first day of the fall sitting of the Legislature, still no answers have come as to why the government took over private industry secretly and quickly without notice at such a high price.

I think of whose money it was that was spent in order to do this, and without legislative approval. If we had answers to those questions we might be able to look to justify some of this action, although I doubt the principle could ever be approved by governments that claim to be private enterprise.

The government has done some things in the Highwood constituency for which I would like to convey the thanks of the people of that constituency. I would be remiss in not doing that. I have some letters that even commend the Minister of Highways and Transport for some of the things he has done too. I think probably that highways is one of those areas in government that is most notice[d] by the people. These are the physical things that people are in touch with every day and they notice every mistake as well as every improvement.

Mr. Speaker, I must convey again to this Legislature, and particularly to the government, not only my disappointment but the disappointment of a lot of people in the area that I represent, in the delay in tabling a new planning act.

We have had some propositions for this and we have talked about it for two or three years. At the last request I made for information, it was indicated to me that they didn't know whether there would be a new planning act or whether there would be amendments to the existing planning act. When I asked about a time frame for it, it was indicated to me that there really was no time frame for that yet and that the whole thing hinges on the reports from the Land Use Forum.

We have to begin somewhere, Mr. Speaker. I hope that somewhere along the road we might be able to take the first steps and then work from there. If a new planning act comes in and it isn't exactly like it should be, we can do as we do with all other acts and amend it after some experience. But certainly some action has to be taken, and soon, in order that we will be prepared for the implementation of the Land Use Forum reports when they are set before the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, speaking momentarily on a philosophical basis, when I see the shortage of laborers in some fields in our province, and when I see the number of people who are on various types of social assistance, I think that there is a need for a revival of the work-ethic philosophy. Not only [do] we need to work for a living, but also the quality of our work should be improved. A consciousness and pride should be taken in the type of work that is done.

I think we need to consider types of social assistance programs that do not reward laziness and failure and immorality, but instead encourage and develop industry and success and moral fibre. This isn't easy. It is something to which I think every legislator needs to apply himself diligently, seeking some ways by which we might improve the situation.

I realize that in Canada, under our system of government, our provincial efforts are tied inextricably to the federal programs. Sometimes it is not easy to go it alone on some of these things, but there are areas where we can make improvements at the provincial level. We should try everything we can to encourage people to return to the old-fashioned

work-ethic philosophy and to do as much for themselves as they can and to depend as little as possible on the government.

Having said that, there is something I want to say that I'm not certain I can express and be properly understood.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. BENOIT:

Well, I'll try.

The previous government, those of us on this side of the House now, are very strong for private enterprise and free enterprise and that philosophy which opposes socialism - is also the present government, which sits on the right hand of the Speaker today, but both have been guilty, in my understanding of the situation, of introducing and encouraging socialistic programs that have taken us a long way down the road towards socialism.

AN HON. MEMBER:

... at ever greater speed.

MR. BENOIT:

The federal government has been helping along there and in fact, in some instances, pushing us more than we wanted to go. But the fact of the matter is that we still have to face the fact.

I think the time has come when somehow we ought to find out the feeling of the people of Alberta as to whether they want to go the socialistic route or whether they want to remain in the free enterprise system.

If they want to go the socialistic route, we ought to begin now to plan to phase into it in a systematic way that will provide for a certain amount of democracy. Otherwise, we will just drift into it and lose all the freedom we have. If the people of Alberta say they still want to remain free enterprise, we definitely should turn about in some of our programs and go that direction instead of drifting toward the socialistic trend. I think we need to be doing that very soon, because there is no use just drifting into it and claiming that we are free enterprise when in fact we are not. I think, when the question is put to the people of Alberta, they should be faced with the alternatives of the results of whichever direction they are going to go.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for permitting me to speak and for the attention of the House. I would like to close on the same note as I opened.

I think that regardless of the way things have been going in Canada we still have the greatest country in all the world. I am proud to humbly say that I believe Alberta is the best province in that wonderful country. I say that because I hear people say it's the province that Social Credit built. But the foundation is good and so far the trend has continued fairly favorably. We hope that it keeps on going. I like to give credit where credit is due without knocking too hard. But I'd like to see both Canada and Alberta remain at the head no matter which side of the House I have to sit on. I'm interested in government, and in our present system of government it takes an opposition as well as a government to keep going. But that means that government should be by legislature and not by cabinet or orders in council. The more difficult the government becomes with taking away the freedom, the more essential it is that Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition continue to exist for the purpose that it was designed for in the first instance; to guard against any possible erosion of democracy and any tendencies toward arrogance on the part of the government.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that we may be able to work on both sides of the House in a way that will be beneficial to the people of Alberta and of Canada, no matter which side we sit on.

Thank you.

MR. ANDERSON:

I find, Mr. Speaker, in talking to people that there is more concern about the state of our economy than has been expressed for years. The government's plan to assist renters has evidently backfired as far as the city of Lethbridge is concerned. The Hon. Dave Russell, in charge of this program, said he hoped or expected that the money saved by the taxpayers would be passed on to the renters. Well, I can assure him that this is not the case. Rents in Lethbridge are from 10 to 20 per cent higher than similar accommodation in Calgary and Edmonton. This is not good enough, and I sincerely hope the government will come up with a solution to this vexing problem.

I hear complaints because the price of gasoline is higher in Alberta than in Saskatchewan or Manitoba. This came out in The Lethbridge Herald around October 1. People are asking me why this is so when Alberta is Canada's largest oil-producing province.

Many are really concerned over the way the government is spending the oil windfall revenue and the questionable investment in Pacific Western Airlines. We do not want waste or extravagance at any time in the administration of the affairs of this province. Mr. Speaker, one has but to read the report on the Manitoba Conservative party's investment in the timber complex in northern Manitoba, or the heavy water plant in Nova Scotia to be fearful of the ability of any Conservative government to manage public affairs.

The city of Lethbridge is known as the irrigation capital of Alberta. Irrigation means too much to southern Alberta. The food products help Canada and the world. In light of the prevailing food supplies and of increased world demands for food, I suggest that this government should make capital available for the requirements to ensure improvements necessary for the proper development of our irrigation in southern Alberta. I suggest that irrigation and the proper conservation of our water resources should have top priority at this time.

Another matter of concern is inflation. All three levels of government, municipal, provincial and federal, which spend around forty-one billions of dollars a year are seriously affected by inflation. Taxes are continually rising to provide revenue to cover these inflation costs. Billions of new tax dollars will be required just to maintain present levels of service by the levels of government if inflation is not held in check.

Mr. Speaker, I know this government cannot be held responsible for inflation in Canada. But they can express their willingness to assist in the fight against inflation. It is not good enough to blame Ottawa or other governments if we are not prepared to assist in the battle against inflation. I would like to point out that those on pensions, fixed incomes and low wages suffer the most. What about Alberta government pensioners. Are they being protected. I would like the government to make a statement on their position in this matter. Yes, Mr. Speaker, inflation in my opinion is a serious threat to the social and economic well-being of Canada and the world.

I must point out that the Liberals and the Conservatives have for many years told the voters of this country that Social Credit was just another name for inflation and would destroy everything.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

MR. ANDERSON:

Well, Social Credit never brought the deflation and depression of the '30s nor the prevailing inflation. Social Credit cannot be blamed; the responsibility rests with the old line parties which have governed Canada for over a hundred years. Mr. Speaker, people are fearful that our social and economic progress is in danger. Let us all work together to maintain progress and keep Alberta in the lead.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I want to say one or two things in this debate. I am going to use the time to deal with some items in the Drumheller constituency. I certainly am not going to be able to deal with all of the items in which the people of that area are interested, but I do want to deal with three or four of the major items.

Before doing that, there has been some discussion about how we should use any windfall profits the province should find itself with. I listened to some very able debating in the mock parliament in this Chamber a few days ago when the high school students in the province, headed by St. Francis Xavier High School, had a parliament. I noticed some of the ministers were present, also the hon. Member for Stettler, and I was most impressed with the calibre of debate we heard.

Before dealing with the one item that impressed me very greatly, I would like to commend the government and the Clerk of the Legislature for permitting the use of this Chamber to the high school students. For many years, this Chamber was considered almost sacred ground and no one could enter foot in it except the MLAs and the regular Legislature.

I adhere to the thinking that we should this Chamber. It's a beautiful room and we should use it to the utmost degree. I'm sure you too, Mr. Speaker, must have felt gratified when you listened to the debates here the other day and realized what that might mean in the lives of those young people in the future. I would like to see this Chamber used for that purpose more and more. I think it's [a] far better use than having it sit idle. Certainly there was no damage done. It was orderly and it was simply making use of a facility that is already here. So I want to commend the government for permitting that.

One of the resolutions discussed was what to do with windfall profits. Throughout the country people are beginning to get the message that I think the press is spreading; that the Government of Alberta has more money than it knows what to do with. I don't think that's a good philosophy to spread. I don't think there is any government that has more money than it knows what to do with.

We may have windfall profits but there are always the lean years that follow. And any government that is responsible is going to take a pretty careful look at any excess or windfall profits they happen to have at the present time in light of what might be tomorrow. Whether that particular group is the government at that time or not is immaterial. I think there has to be a responsibility in the proper use of that money which belongs to all of the people and which also belongs to the future generations, when it's coming from a depleting resource.

I think that is the nub of the whole thing. We in this period of time do not have the right to use up the full value of a resource that is going to disappear. If we can replace that resource with industry, jobs and facilities that future generations can use, I think we would have fulfilled our responsibility.

I favor using money of that nature in a capital way for bridges that will be there 50 and 100 years from now, for buildings and hospitals and schools that will be there many many years from now too. I think that is one aspect that the government should give

pretty careful thought to if and when it has a large sum of money of which it wants to make sure the future generation get its share.

However, the idea of investing the total sum of that money now, whatever it is, whether it is \$50 million or \$100 million or \$200 million or \$1 billion and living off of the interest only was a thought that was advanced by the high school students in their mock parliament. And they debated it very well. I believe the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation also heard part of that debate. I was impressed by the sincerity of those young people in wanting to make sure that the generation that comes after us is going to have a fair share of that resource that we now have and that may be depleted in the forthcoming years.

Their suggestion was that the total revenue from that resource be invested and only the interest be used by this generation. Now I'm not so sure that I can go along with that entirely. I think it has a lot of merit. I think this generation is entitled to more than just the interest. But I'm not sure we would not be wise to, say, take some percentage - and what percentage I think would have to have a lot of study to decide what it would be, whether it would be a third or 50 per cent or 60 per cent or more - to be invested in projects that would not only provide jobs but would give a sure return for many many years, and then use interest from that amount only for services in this present day and age. I believe has a lot of merit. I think it would be an inspiration to our young people if we did something of that nature; to say, here's some money we could spend now, but we are not going to spend it. We are going to invest it and live off the earnings. What an example that would be to each and every one of our citizens if we could each save something of what we earn; not blow it all and be broke three days after payday, as appears to be the habit of many many Canadians, but invest some of it for a rainy day for the future. I think that has merit.

At this time I am not going to go any further in regard to what should be done with surplus coming from our depleting resources, other than to say I think one other suggestion should receive merit too. This was mentioned by one of the young people the other day; that is, investing it in energy of some type so that if we are using up the energy from depleting sources of oil and gas, we are using some of that at least for the development of another energy resource such as coal. Maybe atomic power isn't too far out of the way, too.

It's a pretty sound thing, I believe, to replace one source of energy with another source. If we can be developing this and carrying out the research before the depletion of one resource, we are going to be in an excellent position down the road when that resource - say it happens to be gas or oil - disappears. We'll have something to replace it, not only jobs and money coming from some of the investment. We would have the research done so we could then simply move into the next era of using that resource and then trying to replace some of the income from that in the development of another.

I think this has a lot of merit. I would like to see some very able men in this province give a detailed and analytical study to see just what can be done. Perhaps the department of the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals is doing that now. If not, I certainly think it's something that really should be done.

I noticed an article in the paper last night that said the government was considering the idea of wiping out the debts with some of this windfall money of all municipalities. I don't believe everything I read in the press. As a matter of fact sometimes I believe very little of it. But if that has an authentic source, I think some very careful thinking has to go into that type of program.

If we simply undertook, which was the impression I got from reading article, to pay off the debts of every municipality that has a debt, the thought immediately occurred to me, what about the municipalities that have been living within their means, that have been going without this, going without that. Surely the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, in considering that project, would have to give some thought to the municipalities that are not in debt, that have lived within their means. I think that would certainly then have some merit.

I think if we provide the means and climate for municipalities to repay money they have borrowed, it is far better than simply saying we'll take over their debt. Because then it's somewhat on an equality with the municipalities that have gone without, that have denied themselves and their people in order to live within their income. That is always commendable, although sometimes that self-denial appears not to be paying off.

The next thing I would like to mention is something I know the hon. Minister of the Environment has been giving a great deal of study to; the matter of water. What better thing could we do in this province at this time than to make sure that future generations have an adequate supply of water. There are places in the world where they did not conserve their water supply, and today their land is not productive. It's wasting away. It's simply a wasteland or desert, all because there wasn't enough careful thought to make sure that the water was going to be there in the years ahead.

There are a lot of communities in Alberta that do not have adequate water supplies. I have a number right in my own constituency, and I want to mention a few of those tonight - not that I would expect a policy designed to assist any one constituency, but if we're going to work out policies, a water policy for the province with some priority items in it would certainly be a program well received by most of the people of this province. I look at the village of Hussar, a very excellent village. But the school found out that it does not have a water supply that is consumable. The town finds it doesn't have an adequate water supply to meet its needs. Surely the councillors there are quite responsible when they say, we will not go to the extent of putting in all of the pipes and the other

requirements for running water until we are sure there's an adequate water supply. I think that is being responsible, even though they have to take a lot of guff from some people for an attitude like that. I appreciate the attitude of the minister in recognizing that there is an importance in getting an adequate water supply, before you go into the idea of spreading water.

In that same area there's Dead Horse Lake, a lake covering four sections of land, but it needs water. There are engineering plans, and I believe the department has given a great deal of study to the idea of moving water to that area via pipe. I think this has a lot of merit because it would not only ensure that the village of Hussar would have an adequate water supply for all time, but it would build up a tremendous recreational area that would be of benefit to that entire area and tremendous population. That recreation area itself, I think, would in time pretty well pay for the costs of installing that.

Now we have the village of Munson - not very many people, but they still don't have a water supply. They are hauling their water from the city of Drumheller, eight miles away. They are unable to find a well. They can't put in a system of running water until they find an adequate water supply. I'm hoping that the expertise of the Department of the Environment can be used to help towns like that find an adequate water supply.

Now, of course, we have places like Carbon, and places in the valley where there's been no running water, where they are still using sand-point wells and outdoor privies. The medical health officer in that area said a few years ago, he's amazed that there hasn't been an epidemic, because almost every square foot of area behind each house has, at one time or another over the last 60 years, been the site of the outdoor privy, and the sand-point well is sometimes downstream from that, not very far from it. His only explanation is that the people there have built up a resistance to whatever germs are in the water and we have thereby avoided an epidemic. But the doctors are very careful to tell mothers with newborn babies to make sure the new babies are not suddenly put upon this water because they say it would mean death to the child.

Last year the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs provided an engineering study for the hamlet of Nacmine, which has about probably two [or] three hundred people, and there's a bill of at least \$600,000 to provide water for that hamlet. It's a lot of money. And when you multiply it all over the province it's a tremendous problem.

But in this day and age I don't think it's right that we should be taking a chance on the health of our people in any area, not only in my constituency. The hon. Deputy Premier, when this problem was placed before him and the cabinet committee in Drumheller a few days ago, was quick to say that he would look into the possibility of even providing water via the disaster services avenue if that was feasible. The people certainly appreciate that kind of attitude. It is a very serious problem. But the point I'm trying to make is that water is a most important item. Perhaps in every constituency in the province there's a need for an adequate water supply, a need for recreational facilities, a need for making use of that water. So I'm going to suggest to the government, when they are looking over their program for use of money that isn't required immediately, that the water supply for the province be given a high priority and a lot of consideration.

I was quite delighted tonight when I heard the hon. Deputy Premier and Minister of Agriculture say that Alberta had not contributed towards the 28 million rotten eggs. I wish I had known that before, because a number of farmers have come to me and said, how did we ever get into this mix-up. I was certainly not proud of it and I certainly felt there is a responsibility in Ottawa for the thing rather than in Alberta. But I didn't know the facts. Now when I'm able to tell them that the Alberta situation was such that we could have used those eggs, that none of our eggs were included in 28 million rotten eggs, I think Alberta will become the envy of every province in Canada. I wish this information had been given on the CBC broadcast two or three Sundays ago when the Hon. [Eugene] Whalen was listening to complaints from all across the country, including Alberta.

There is tremendous concern about this wastage of food. I'm sure everybody's delighted that our crops have been taken off throughout the province this year, because there are a lot of hungry people in the world and whether we like it or not, we are our brother's keepers. We should do everything possible to see that food isn't wasted. It's too hard to produce. I'm hoping that the loss of that protein, through the information that came out about these 28 million rotten eggs, will never happen again; that we've learned our lesson and that the marketing boards in the other provinces will take the steps necessary to make sure that our production, whether it's eggs or meat or whatever, is used to feed our people and the hungry peoples of the world.

It's a most important item today when we talk about a shortage of food. Some are saying that if [production] stopped today, the world would be hungry in just a matter of 14 or 28 days. We would all be hungry. This is almost impossible to realize when we sometimes waste more at our meals than the kids of Korea, China and India get in a whole week. Sometimes we waste that much at every individual meal.

I think there has to be an awakening to the fact that food is becoming a valuable asset and the more we can produce in this country, the better it is. That's why, Mr. Speaker, I feel very very strongly inclined to say that the food production in the province of Alberta, the land that produces that food, should be very carefully guarded to make sure it is not going to be wasted or get into the hands of people who have attitudes and instincts different from those of Canadians and Albertans; to make sure that we do use our tremendous soil and topsoil to the greatest possible degree for the production of food to keep the world from starving and to feed the hungry peoples of the world, including ourselves.

The next item I would like to mention has nothing to do with the surplus funds. Another problem in my constituency is the matter of hospitalization. We have an excellent hospital in Drumheller. As a matter of fact we have three. We have a senior citizens home, we have an auxiliary hospital and we have a nursing home. They work splendidly together. On the outskirts of the Drumheller constituency, there's the town of Bassano where they have an excellent hospital. There has been a decision apparently, to enlarge the hospital in Bassano and transport the people from the Blackfoot reserve down to Bassano to use the facilities there.

There has also been a very strong movement in the Strathmore area to have a hospital built in Strathmore. This has been given some study by the hospital commission but they haven't yet reached the stage where they are prepared to recommend apparently, to the minister, that a hospital be built in Strathmore. When the hon. Deputy Premier and the hon. [minister], Mr. Foster, the hon. [minister], Dr. Warrack and the hon. [minister], Mr. Adair were in the Strathmore area, the hon. Deputy Premier emphasized the fact that he was very pleased so many people had come out, particularly the senior citizens, to show their real need for some type of nursing or hospital facility in that area.

It was most impressive for an early morning meeting, for many of these very elderly people, some over 80 years of age, to come. And I was most impressed with the suggestion made by the hon. Deputy Premier at that meeting. It wasn't a commitment and it wasn't a promise. It was simply a suggestion that we should look at the possibility of not building just active beds as I have to admit I've been advocating, but rather [of] building a structure that will have some active beds, some nursing beds and some auxiliary beds. This makes sense to me. It appealed to the people there and I'm hoping that the hon. minister will be able to consider that type of complex. I think we've been specializing too much really, when we think about this, in getting all of our active beds in one place, and these all have to be active beds.

In the village of Strathmore there is a senior citizens home. When one of them takes ill he has to be moved to Calgary or Drumheller, miles away. Calgary is only 30 miles; Drumheller is probably 60 or 70 miles. But they are taken away from the people they've lived with all of their lives, and they almost think they are being taken away to die. That's the feeling many of them have told me they get. That's not, of course, the thought that is in anybody's mind. The thing is to take them away so they can continue to live and get better medical care.

But, Mr. Speaker, how much better it would have been, if in our area, we had enough active beds and some auxiliary beds and some nursing home beds in one building with the same heating facilities, the same laundry facilities. It makes sense to me. I hope the hon. Deputy Premier will follow up that suggestion. I think it's one of the most excellent suggestions I've heard in regard to this type of facility for many many years. It's something that appealed to the people of Strathmore and I think would appeal to any area today that doesn't have health facilities.

I don't want to say anything at all to hurt the enlargement of the hospital at Bassano, not a bit. They have given the people from my constituency, the Indians from the Blackfoot Reserve, excellent care. I'm sure they will continue to do so. But it would certainly be much better if they could get a closer facility in Strathmore.

I think also that if a hospital of this nature with all three types of beds was built in Strathmore, which is within driving distance of the medical men of Calgary, it would be quite an asset to the city of Calgary and might even relieve some of the congestion in the city of Calgary. I think the matter of some type of health facility in a place like Strathmore is certainly well worth looking into.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for the few moments I have had to speak on these items. I make no apologies at all for spending time to deal with some of the items brought to me by the people it is my privilege to represent.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Talk to your leader.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

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

[The House rose at 10:20 p.m.]