

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Monday Evening, November 4, 1974

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

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

Bill No. 79 The Real Estate Agents' Licensing Amendment Act, 1974

MR. DOWLING:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Real Estate Agents' Licensing Amendment Act, 1974.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, has been jointly designed by the real estate agents of the province of Alberta and the Department of Consumer Affairs. It is not our purpose or our intent, Mr. Speaker, to allow this bill to proceed to Royal Assent during this fall session, but to let it die on the Order Paper. The reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is to provide members of the Alberta Real Estate Association and members of the real estate fraternity throughout the province and the private sector, including the consumers of Alberta, [an opportunity] to react to its contents to the Department of Consumer Affairs. We will then reintroduce it in the spring.

The bill is designed, Mr. Speaker, to provide further protection for the consumer as well as those legitimate real estate agents who operate in our province.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister have the unanimous leave of the House to revert to Introduction of Bills?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

[Leave being granted, Bill No. 79 was introduced and read a first time.]

GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS  
(Third Reading)

Bill No. 63 The Land Titles Amendment Act, 1974

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 63.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this bill on third reading, it is with some regret that I have to take the position that we are not ready to really proceed with this bill at this stage of third reading.

The hon. Attorney General has failed to answer some very proper questions particularly on subsection (5). He sat there and he did not reply. Now certainly when one sees the direction in which this government is going, the opposition has a serious responsibility to request that any bills which extend power to a minister to exempt certain lands or certain people from the operation of the act which was brought in for a specific purpose - we should have an explanation as to why this is done and a very good explanation at that. Just giving an excuse that there might be a reason for excluding some lands and some people from the operation of the act, which is passed by the Legislature, is telling the House we want to let the minister have the power to decide in his own discretion what

should be included in the monitoring of foreign ownership and what ought not to be included.

This is not a light matter. In fact, there was a report today in The Province, the west coast newspaper, that there has been a leak in the committee report on regulations in this province. The article points out very clearly that this government has a tendency to go towards taking unto itself power through legislation which lets it govern and gives it the power to suspend legislation. This has happened in this province on several occasions and the opposition must take some blame for this happening.

It isn't very long ago that the hon. members who are sitting in front were very seriously dug in, in this Legislature, in opposition to government by regulation and government by the cabinet's making decisions; the cabinet spending money without letting the MLAs know, by way of voting - spending without bringing it to the Legislature for debate.

I think this has gone rather further with this government than ever before. I think the hon. Attorney General should, even at this late stage of the bill, the third reading, stand up and tell us what is the main reason, give us some kind of credible explanation why subsection (5) ought not to be struck out. We attempted to move an amendment. It was ignored.

The hon. members on the other side apparently don't care how much power this government takes unto itself. It doesn't concern them, but that cannot always be looked upon on the basis of partisan politics. We have an adversary system, an opposition system in our parliamentary system of government. We have to stand up and insist that unless legislation can be explained properly, unless the reason for departing from the usual type of legislation where we decide what the government can and can't do - there must be some very urgent reasons presented, not merely excuses as the Attorney General attempted to give us.

I think we would be remiss in our responsibilities if we let this thing go by without urging that the Attorney General stand up and give us some acceptable explanation. It isn't good enough to state that we have sixteen or so, professional people in the cabinet, and have a tremendous body of legally trained men to come and say that it doesn't matter how much power the cabinet takes unto itself, we trust them.

Our side is different. We ought not to trust any legislators, any executive council to play down the role of the backbencher, of the MLA in this House, and that is exactly what is happening. We're pushing that way. We are gradually eroding the powers of this Legislature. That is just a couple or three years after there was a tremendous stand taken by the very people who are now playing down the role of the MLA, telling us they were going to reverse the trend of the previous government of governing too much by cabinet decisions and orders in council, and spending money without bringing the votes to the Legislature.

So that's the position I take and I think we will continue to take the position that as long as the minister can sit there and ignore everybody and say, I don't have to answer to you, that is the kind of thing that ought not to be tolerated, not only by the members on this side, but by the hon. members on that side because many of them will not be there that long. Either the government will not last indefinitely or some of them may quit the Legislature. They will have to be accountable. They will have to account for what they did in this regard because the parliamentary system is a good system but it has to be defended. We could not permit this government, a very powerful cabinet, a cabinet with a very subservient back bench ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. LUDWIG:

... to just walk over what has been established in the system through hundreds of years.

I can say in reading the debate in Ottawa that if the Liberal government tries a stunt like this, the Conservatives are champions of the cause. They fight against erosion of the MP's role in decision-making and spending, but primarily in preventing the cabinet from ruling without the knowledge or support of the legislature.

So we are confronted with an interesting situation where the Conservatives in this province are, in fact, at odds with the stand taken by some outstanding Conservative parliamentarians in other jurisdictions, and I'm talking mainly about Ottawa. I don't know what more we can say except to keep digging in and exposing this kind of legislation. This is a flagrant example, not so much of bringing this legislation in, but virtually thumbing one's nose at the public.

I'm not at all concerned about somebody feeling that perhaps I'm wrong. I have the right to speak my mind and this is the position I'm taking. You're not snubbing one MLA or the opposition or anyone else. You are in fact thumbing your nose at the public. You tell them that this system is no longer good enough for us. We're going to work faster. We're going to take things into our own hands. We'll spend \$100 million if we need to, to buy anything we want. We don't have to talk to you. We will amend anything we like. We will suspend legislation.

This has been done, Mr. Speaker, in this House. That's the trend. The opposition has a bounden duty - and I wish to go on record as taking my stand that we should not tolerate this. We will continue to oppose this type of attitude on behalf of the government, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, during second reading I indicated that I would support this bill.

Despite the failure of the government to make changes during committee stage, I still intend to vote for it on third reading. The major reason I propose to do this is because I feel, even with the shortcomings which have been discussed at considerable length during committee stage, it is still necessary, if the Land Use Forum is complete its work, that this legislation be on the statute books.

That is not to say it is not important to remind ourselves that the Legislature has still not received from the Attorney General a reasonable explanation as to why subsection (5) is retained in this act. I concur with the previous speaker, who made the point, and made it very well, that a provision which allows enormous latitude in the hands of one minister is certainly not consistent with, I think, the important fact that members of the Legislature should be making the laws, setting the limits, setting the guidelines, and not abdicating our responsibilities and delegating them almost holus-bolus to an individual minister of the Crown.

I can visualize in the time ahead that the Attorney General will find himself in a good deal of trouble and under considerable pressure as a result of various groups who will try to obtain exemption under this provision of the act. In most cases, no doubt, the claims for exemption will be valid, but there will always be those where the proposal will not be valid. They will be able to use the exemptions given to other groups as a lever to try to pry out an unjustifiable exemption in their case.

I think it was a point well made during the committee stage, Mr. Speaker, that the one area where there is genuine concern throughout this province about foreign ownership of land is with respect to the corporate purchase of land. Yet this is the one clause where we have maximum latitude given to one individual. Mr. Speaker, I would hope, even at this late stage, that the government would reconsider subsection (5).

Also I should express some concern at subsection (2), which exempts the operation of this bill as far as mineral transfers are concerned. Now admittedly, Mr. Speaker, in 90 per cent or more of the cases, any transfer of land will not involve the transfer of the mineral rights because the Crown owns a vast majority of the mineral rights and the CPR and Hudson's Bay own the bulk of the remaining. Nevertheless there will be some transfers where the mineral rights will be transferred from one owner to another.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we're going to have a proper monitoring of the alien ownership of land or otherwise, that monitoring should also include any transfers of mineral rights. Even at the present royalty rates for mineral rights holders, that can be an enormous advantage and an enormous gain. Again, this is the type of information which the Land Use Forum should have at its disposal when considering its final recommendations to the cabinet.

In concluding my remarks on third reading, Mr. Speaker, I have to say that I wish the government had changed subsection (5), reconsidered subsection (2), and that they had presented to this Legislature amendments which would have permitted us to assess areas of discretion much more clearly than simply delegating it to a minister of the Crown. Unfortunately they have chosen not to take that course and the bill is weaker as a result.

But having said all that and expressing my views as strongly as I can, I think this is short-circuiting the role of the Legislature. I agree with the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View when he says that were this kind of legislation introduced in the House of Commons, one could already imagine what the Members for Prince Albert, for Peace River and for Crowfoot especially, would be saying and what the Member for Jasper-Edson in years past would have said. There would have been an articulate presentation made, standing up for the rights of Parliament, and properly so. As a matter of fact I think most of us, Mr. Speaker, as we view the actions of our members of this parliament in the House of Commons, may frequently differ with the points of view they express, but at least we can recognize that they are fighters for the rights of Parliament. I wish we could say the same thing about the hon. members opposite.

I think would be worth while indeed, Mr. Speaker, if we could get some of our MPs in to offer some advice on the rights of Parliament to the members opposite, so that they too could have as strong a commitment to preserving the supremacy of Parliament as our MPs do.

Mr. Speaker, because we have an important job ahead of us - the Land Use Forum and the work it is doing is of such vital importance to the province - despite the obvious shortcomings of this bill and the unwillingness of the government to make the necessary changes, we have to get on with the job. Because the Land Use Forum has asked for this legislation, I propose to support it on third reading.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two remarks with regard to this bill. I would have to say that certainly in this province with the changing attitudes toward land accumulation, land purchases by corporations and foreign interests, we need excellent information upon which we can make land use policy and land use legislation in the years that face us.

That won't be very far ahead. Within two or three years I predict we will have to consider some legislation that two or three years ago many of us would not have tolerated in this province. In light of that, Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to support the earlier position of my colleagues that all information that can be gathered through the process of The Land Titles Act should be collected and made available to this land use study.

I feel that allowing the Attorney General, in the act, to make certain types of discriminate decisions in determining whether something is collected or not, not only

places him in a very difficult position, but also places the people who need information in a difficult position. Because the Attorney General, in situations, can stand between them and information they may need.

Now our Attorney General in Alberta may be tolerant, understanding and very open to considering what the land use study committee requires. That's all right. But who knows what can happen down the road next spring, a year or maybe two years from now, or with a shuffle of cabinet that may be imminent in this province. Who knows what can happen. Because at that time new individuals and new people make these decisions.

I certainly would like to have seen this legislation left open so that all material could be collected and used for a period of time. If we did need the change in principle in this act to be able to close the open-ended legislation as it is, so we could discriminate what material we need and what we don't, we could pass that in the spring Legislature without any problem. That's my preference.

However, I certainly would like the Attorney General and this government to consider an alternative to that. If it is possible - I'm not sure of the answer to this particular question - that the information classed as information not required, and where the Attorney General has made a decision that it is not required and is not accumulated, that type of information be listed in the Gazette as areas where they are not collecting information, so the public is aware of the decisions of the Attorney General. Certainly that would protect him and would also pass on information to us as legislators, in the period between now and the next session of the Legislature, as to the types of decisions he is making and actually has to make. Certainly I would like to suggest to the Attorney General that he consider it very seriously, because this information just isn't the run-of-the-mill information. It is very very important at this point in time.

I can only conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying certainly in principle the collecting of information is right. But I think the public, the MLAs must know what is exempted if information is exempted. If not, all the material we can collect should be made available.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in third reading of Bill 63, I make my remarks this evening - not really the kind of remarks it's my nature to enjoy making. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because it seems to me Bill 63, The Land Titles Amendment Act, is likely the most important piece of legislation we're going to be dealing with at this fall session of the Legislature.

I think it's important to repeat once again that the request for this legislation came from the Alberta Land Use Forum, a forum which was established by resolution of this Assembly, I believe two years ago. The request is that we now become involved in the monitoring of land transactions in this province.

I, like my colleagues who have already spoken, am going to support the bill on third reading. But, Mr. Speaker, we're in a situation where we're being asked to support the bill and at the same time give the Attorney General, through subsection (5), virtually the power to undo what the Legislature is doing, by the discussions we've had up till now, the vote that will follow this discussion and the Royal Assent which will be given when the Assembly concludes.

I say once again, Mr. Speaker, this is, in my judgment, perhaps the most important piece of legislation we're dealing with this session. Yet we're being asked to approve a section in this bill that gives the Attorney General the power to exempt from the provisions of this act information that's really going to make this monitoring successful.

I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, hon. members will recall that we asked the Attorney General during committee if he could give us concrete illustrations of where he was going to need this power. If I recall the comments the Attorney General made - I'm sure he'll correct me if I'm wrong - he talked about some religious institutions and he talked about the transfer of pipelines and powerlines. But nowhere did we have explained to us the difficulties these were going to cause.

Members on this side of the House made at least three different suggestions as to how we could perhaps get around having subsection (5) in the bill. My colleague, the Member for Cardston, talked in terms of leaving this section in but getting a commitment from the Attorney General that the regulations which would be approved under this section would cease to have power a certain number of days after the spring session started. We got really no response from the Attorney General on that. Several other members on this side made suggestions as to how we might do this. Finally the members on this side of the House moved that subsection (5) be deleted and this was turned down by the Assembly.

I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that once again we're dealing with the question of the power of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, in this case the power as it is vested in the Attorney General. These remarks don't come easy for me, Mr. Speaker. One of the reasons members on this side of the House become very concerned about this particular section in the bill is that we're dealing with a situation, with a government, and in this case with the same Attorney General who two years ago refused, during question period in this Assembly, to commit himself to an investigation of the operation of lower courts in this province. Then, after the Assembly had adjourned, woe betide the government announced an investigation into the operation of lower courts in the province. I think that says something about the attitude ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Open government.

MR. CLARK:

... the present government and the Attorney General have toward this Assembly.

Then I go one step further, Mr. Speaker - and I say these things aren't particularly pleasant for me to relate here once again this evening. But we're in the same situation, the same government and the same Attorney General who was involved in the very unfortunate affair in the Slave Lake area which, at the most charitable, was an abuse of the powers of the Attorney General.

We go on further, Mr. Speaker, and I need not remind members about the Dr. Craig affair where the Attorney General's department laid charges. In one case the charges were dropped because of a mishandling by the lawyers involved. Another charge was dropped because the evidence was improperly handled.

So you really can't blame members on this side of the House for having some very real questions about passing a piece of legislation like this, and then giving the big out that is involved in subsection (5) of this bill.

The fifth point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, deals with the question of what's going on in Ottawa right now. We have the petroleum administration act being fought, and I might say fought rather well, by the MPs of Alberta and Saskatchewan who are pointing out that by the petroleum administration act, we're giving the federal government in council the power to set the price for oil and gas that originate in this province. Every member in this Assembly agrees that's, if you will pardon the expression, none of the cotton pickin' business of the federal government. But in this Assembly we're being asked to approve the kind of blanket subsection (5) which gets involved in the regulations and, in our case here, in the exemptions.

The last point I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is simply this. I would like to read from a document, and I quote:

We believe that public laws should be made in public. This principle must be protected against the comfortable drift to government by cabinet or through Order in Council. It must be applied to open the doors of federal, provincial or any other conference whose private decisions today profoundly affect our future. The public has a right to know.

I would like to just re-emphasize one of the points: "This principle must be protected against the comfortable drift to government by cabinet or through Order in Council." This comes from a rather bleached-out edition of "What Do We Stand For?" with the Premier's picture on the front. It's a bleached-out edition I have in my hand, but it's a bleached-out edition we're dealing with on this particular bill, when we're being asked to approve a bill with subsection (5) in it.

In my best judgment, we should vote for this legislation because of the need of the Land Use Forum and of governments of the future, for the information. I hope that, come the spring session and the fall session next year, the Attorney General has chosen not to use subsection (5) of the bill. If he has done that, frankly, my faith would be somewhat restored in the Attorney General.

MR. TAYLOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make two points on the bill. I support the bill for the simple reason that it is giving the government the authority to monitor the extent to which persons other than Canadian citizens are acquiring beneficial interest in our lands.

I am reasonably satisfied with subsections (3)(d) and (4) now that the amendments came in. Anything that is done in those two sections will be done by regulations and consequently made public.

I'm not happy with the fact that the government would not accept the amendment to exempt "any corporation" and confine that to "Canadian-controlled corporations". For the life of me, I find it difficult to understand why that was turned down, because the whole purpose of the bill seems to be to get information that is going to be valuable to Canadian citizens and find out what foreign interests are buying lands in this province. So, if there are going to be any exemptions, I would think it would be for our own and not for those outside, even if the outside organization was a religiously controlled organization as mentioned by the hon. Attorney General.

I would not be surprised if, during the course of the next few months, the Attorney General and the government had second thoughts in regard to this Canadian-controlled corporation and, if they can't exempt the section entirely, at least brought back an amendment at the spring session, making this exemption for corporations apply only to Canadian-controlled corporations.

The main reason I wanted to say a word or two on this, however, is a point that I believe was not covered by the other speakers. That is, in my view, the bill does not go far enough. The bill is monitoring. From it we will find out what foreign corporations are buying land, getting title to them, et cetera. In my view that isn't going far enough. I think there should be a further step where we check into the objective behind foreign corporations particularly, buying land in this province.

I mentioned during the second reading of the bill that in some provinces already, foreign corporations have taken over recreational lands. Canadians can't even find a place to enjoy those recreational areas on some Sunday afternoons or holidays. The American flag is occupying almost every space. We don't have to go too far in eastern Canada to see that. I have nothing against the Americans, but I certainly don't want them

to own our land. Let them come and enjoy it. But I don't like to see their stamp of ownership on our recreational lands.

The fact that there is a German corporation, and possibly other European corporations, in the province now buying up land at exorbitant prices makes me very very suspicious of the motives of those corporations. Because when a corporation is paying \$300 and more per acre, the thought immediately comes to me that the land will not produce that kind of produce. You can't get that back from farming the land, unless, of course, we get into a monopoly situation where they have complete control of the price of food. Then of course, they charge whatever the market will bear. I hope that we will not let the sale of our lands in this province ever reach even close to the extent where corporations that are not Canadian-controlled have the control of the production of food in the province of Alberta or anywhere in Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Hear, hear.

MR. TAYLOR:

As a matter of fact, I wouldn't like to see any corporation get the monopoly of food production. I believe the family farm is the safest possible way for the people in our urban areas to be assured of fair prices for food. As long as the farms are out there by the hundreds, we can be sure we will get food at a reasonable price. But when a corporation gets it and starts on their merry way, it may well be that they will then get control of the price, become a monopoly and charge all the market will bear.

So I really think the bill should have gone further, and I hope the government will consider a further step after they have been able to monitor some of the sales that are taking place.

It may be that our fears are ill-founded; that there is not as much land being purchased now in this province as we hear through the grapevine. But it seems to me that wherever I go, whatever part of my constituency I go to, farmers are saying, somebody was here from some corporation wanting to buy my land at \$200 and \$300 an acre. That's worrying. You can't fault the farmer, particularly if he is getting up in years, for selling his land at exorbitant prices like that. But the fact that some have refused to do so because they think it isn't good for Alberta and for Canada shows the high calibre of people on our farms in this province. I think we can be proud of people who put their country ahead of the dollar bill.

I'm simply expressing the hope that this bill will be extended so that we can look into the motives and the objectives particularly of foreign corporations which come in to buy up our farm lands and our recreational lands. I'm not so sure we shouldn't even do the same thing for Canadian-controlled corporations.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on third reading of this bill, I'm utterly amazed at the reaction of the Attorney General and the members on the other side of the House. I am reminded of a TV show I saw not too long ago where they had a lion tamer. He had about six big lions and he was cracking the whip. He had them at his control. I can't help but think that over on the other side there is one who is in control and the others meekly follow.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They're all toothless tigers.

MR. RUSTE:

One hon. member mentions toothless tigers. Well, maybe that's it.

But I can recall, Mr. Speaker, attending the Canadian Parliamentary Conference in the city of Toronto just this year. One of the topics for discussion at that conference was a matter of orders in council, cabinet decrees and so on.

I'd like to quote, Mr. Speaker, just for a minute from the Alberta government and this goes back to the 1972 Speech from the Throne under the subject of open government. It says, Mr. Speaker: "My government is committed to the principle of open government; providing citizens with easier access to their Legislature and its deliberations." Then it refers to the matter of Hansard. We have that. It refers to the matter of "television and radio media will be put forward." We have that.

The third one is really the gem in light of the debate we have had here tonight:

The "open government" concept will also be fostered by the decision of my government to call the Legislative Assembly into Session twice a year, beginning in this year, 1972. The addition of Fall Sittings will make my government more frequently accountable to the people for its decisions and policies. In addition, this reform will enable the expanding public business of the province to be handled more efficiently and expeditiously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. RUSTE:

Emerging problems and contemporary issues that call for debate [should] then receive greater public scrutiny, with less delay than has been the case in the past. Laws needing amendment will be changed more quickly, to serve faster and more effectively the needs of Alberta.

MR. FOSTER:

You're a great reader.

MR. RUSTE:

Now, Mr. Speaker, in looking at what is happening here - a regulation that the minister may omit certain things. You know, a regulation has the force of law, Mr. Speaker. A regulation is not made as openly as laws. It's not made directly by representatives of the people. It's made behind closed doors. And it seems to me that some of the decisions have been made at patio parties not too long ago. And these regulations impose legally enforceable obligations on the rights of the residents of this province.

So, Mr. Speaker, when we see the Attorney General of this province just sitting back as smug as he can be - and by the silence of the other members, they are agreeing with him on this thing - I believe it is a pretty serious thing.

It is rather interesting that in one of the editorials dealing with monitoring government regulations it says that regrettably but understandably, most citizens don't realize the extent to which their lives are governed by regulations imposed by governments without debate in any legislative assembly.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I support the principles involved in the bill, I certainly can't support the section that gives power to the minister to exempt certain classes. And for that I certainly can't appreciate what the 'now' government is doing. I might have to say that certainly when I follow the federal Hansard, which incidentally costs about a fifth of what the provincial Hansard costs, I can't help but think there are two faces in the Progressive Conservative party.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister conclude the debate.

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I'll begin by saying that I took, and I am sure many others did too, with a very large grain of salt the statement by the hon. Leader of the Opposition about how much it pained him to watch a personal attack. I think that statement was about on the same level as much of the rest of the debate he has been involved in, in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Carry on.

MR. LEITCH:

I am also, Mr. Speaker, very much amused by some of the comments of the hon. members on the other side on the principle of this type of regulation.

MR. LUDWIG:

If you were amused why weren't you smiling.

MR. LEITCH:

One of course needs only to look at the legislation most of them were involved in passing within the past few years to find this kind of thing in gross abundance. Their views on the principle, of course, underwent a dramatic change when they passed from this side of the House to the side they are now on.

Mr. Speaker, for those who seriously raised the question of this section, and there were a number who did and contributed good and worth-while comment to the issue, I would like to simply go through again why it seems to us this kind of a provision is essential in this legislation, at least at this time.

One starts with these things, Mr. Speaker. First of all, we are imposing on all people who acquire an ownership interest in land, an obligation to disclose their citizenship if they are individuals, and the citizenship of the majority of their shareholders if they are companies. We also provide a penalty for them for failing to do that or doing it improperly.

Perhaps more important is the provision in the bill that they can't register a transfer or even a caveat in respect of that transfer, unless they have complied with the

citizenship information requirement. Clearly there is going to be this kind of situation develop and it is the kind of situation for which the clause that has been the subject of discussion, is designed to provide. There are going to be many companies, or many people - and I want to draw the members' attention to the provision of the bill that requires someone who is buying as trustee for the company to make a declaration as to the citizenship of the shareholders of the corporation for whom he is acting as trustee.

Without the slightest doubt, Mr. Speaker, in all the multitude of land transactions that occur within this province in the course of a year, we're going to find companies, or people who are taking as trustees for companies, simply unable to comply with that. The difficulty is - if one could give them time, if they had the opportunity to take a month or two months or a couple of weeks even to gather the information and comply with it, there perhaps might not be the need for this kind of provision. But that time isn't going to be available to them because there are going to be many land transactions where the deal has been made, the money is to change hands, the documents are to be handed over. At that time the purchaser cannot protect his interest by registering a document in the Land Titles Office which is the way that these land transactions are handled today. He's going to arrive at the Land Titles Office and find he can't get his interest registered; he can't get it protected because he's unable to complete that information statement with respect to citizenship.

Now in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, and in my submission, it is grossly unfair for governments to put their people in that kind of position unless it's absolutely necessary for them to do so. It's not something you can wait for the next sitting of the Legislature to get cured or things of that nature. It's something that you're going to have to cure at that time.

The simple way to cure it is to give someone discretion to excuse them from filing that information at that time. It's not necessary that they're excused for all time. It may well be that the discretion will be exercised in a way that says, you can file it now in order to protect the interest you've just bought, in order to complete the transaction you've just entered into, but at some later date you must file a statement with us indicating the citizenship of the shareholders of the corporation which is acquiring the beneficial interest.

In some cases, as I had indicated earlier, it may well be that for administrative purposes, at the request of the Land Use Forum, for example, we may want to excuse a company from filing a statement for every transfer it takes. There may be companies, particularly that are buying things like rights of way, if they acquire them by transfer, where there are literally hundreds of them coming in. Neither the Land Use Forum nor the Land Titles Office want to have to process each one of these pieces of paper. We're going to be fighting a large enough paper battle as it is. It may be that under those circumstances one declaration file, covering the whole period, will be precisely what the Land Use Forum wants. And it's going to reduce the paper flow by a very substantial amount.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the fears the honorable gentlemen on the other side expressed are just ill-founded, and [I would] draw to their attention that it was the motion of this government that brought the Land Use Forum into existence. It is the Land Use Forum that wants this information and it's our intent to see they get the maximum possible that would assist them in completing their report and making recommendations to the Legislature.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 63 was read a third time.]

#### Bill No. 64 The Department of Public Works Amendment Act, 1974 (No. 2)

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I move third reading of Bill No. 64, The Department of Public Works Admendment Act, 1974 (No. 2).

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I posed some questions to the hon. minister during second reading and in committee, and he answered me that the government was going to stockpile cement, steel and electrical equipment. In debate during committee, the minister very cleverly tried to pull sort of an about-face on me, and I believe he almost succeeded in stating that I'm the one who is creating some concern about stockpiling by the government. But this was his own answer.

I wish he would stand up in this House on third reading and tell the people, tell the contractors who are worried about this material. There is a shortage, a shortage of cement. And for the government to announce, especially the minister in charge, that we want more money, we want \$5 million now to stockpile some of this cement because we don't think there will be enough to go around, especially when we need it. Let the devil take the hindmost, let the little contractor take his chances on getting some because he can't stockpile anything. He just has to rely on short-term delivery. But the government is big and has a lot of taxpayers' money. So it can stockpile.

Now this might be placing too much emphasis on the meaning of the word "stockpiling" as the minister had stated. But nobody knows what he really meant. For him to state that he will be stockpiling this material in the event that the government should build a major



project and they will have it handy because these things are slow in coming ... I object to this government belief that it should have some priority in competition with the very people who pay taxes to make it possible for this government to state that we have ample money and we will stockpile. Perhaps the minister could say we are just going to do a very modest amount of stockpiling for urgent business. Because there is no way the government can decide, we will stockpile enough cement to take care of one year's government public works projects. They could be anything up to \$100 million for all we know. I am sure they will be quite extensive in the next budget because that's the way things appear to be going. Their was rather light this year, but they will turn the pressure on construction next year. So they are going to say, well, we don't want to be caught without cement.

But building a house for an individual for a residence, or building some public works by the city, or building something for another government jurisdiction may be just as important as if not more than the government plans for construction of some government administration buidings that they say they need.

So I think the minister could probably stand up and acquit himself a little better than he did in committee and in second reading and state that it is going to be a very limited type of stockpiling. Because the words are his. When you talk about stockpiling steel, its a very high priority item for most of the construction in this province. So to say that the government is now going to try to get a strangle hold on supplies because they have the money is wrong in principle. It's unfair competition for those who have to make a living and those who have to stay in business by construction. I think the minister ought to explain that this is going to be very modest, very limited; [that] he doesn't think it will hurt anybody and we'll take it from there, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister conclude the debate?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the hon. Member for Mountain View for his great expectations of me, in salvaging my position.

First, I would like to point out that the stock advance program concerned in this bill has taken into consideration the small construction industry companies and, in fact, will enable them to do work where perhaps they wouldn't have been able to otherwise. It was certainly my understanding that there was not necessarily a shortage of steel but a slow delivery of steel. This situation has improved. In fact steel is in much better supply now and the price is going down.

I would like to add that because of a certain amount of stock advance work on the Courthouse in Calgary, we have been able to continue that program and keep it up to schedule. I think this has been extremely valuable not only to the smaller firms that are involved in the work there, but also to the taxpayer in that it has saved him considerable money that would have been expended if that operation had been delayed by shortage of certain items. It is therefore my position that we are not going to build a lot of unnecessary capital works as a result of this stock advance [and] that, in fact, we are probably going to pare the capital works to meet the apparent shortages of manpower which may occur next year. The hon. member's expectations of a huge capital works program next year, I'm afraid, will be rather disappointed.

With these assurances, I would like to ask all people to support the third reading of this bill.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 64 was read a third time.]

#### Bill No. 66 The Alberta Opportunity Fund Amendment Act, 1974

MR. PEACOCK:

Mr. Speaker I move third reading of Bill No. 66, The Alberta Opportunity Fund Amendment Act, 1974.

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 66 was read a third time.]

#### Bill No. 68 The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1974 (No. 2)

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move third reading of Bill 68, The Highway Traffic Amendment Act, 1974 (No. 2).

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, in Bill 68, there's a section dealing with accidents and penalties. I would like to take this opportunity to point out to the House that this government has a program to deal with impaired driving.

Check Stop has failed to provide some form of program that would carry their efforts to reduce the mayhem on the roads and the slaughter in cities due to drinking and driving. The program has fallen short of expectations. The RCMP are reporting from many corners that in their own everyday patrol - not the Check Stop program but just a general routine patrol of highways in the province - are stopping more impaired drivers than the Check Stop program is. Perhaps the minister doesn't know this. The minister doesn't always find these things out. Perhaps they wouldn't tell her. But I have it from some fairly experienced and senior RCMP that they are, in many instances, doing a better job on their own patrolling highways and stopping drinking drivers than the Check Stop program.

Notwithstanding the fact that this may be the case, I believe the Check Stop program has a tremendous merit, but it falls short of achieving what we need in this field in this province. Certainly alerting the people to the dangers of drinking and driving, stopping them and telling them that they may be obliged to take a breathalyzer test if their driving indicates they may have been drinking, has gone a long way towards making the people take this matter more seriously. But it has not solved the problem.

I don't think we ought to stop here, feeling content that we have done something, and sit back and gloat over the fact that we are ahead of other jurisdictions; we're moving ahead and we're doing something. That isn't good enough.

In Calgary to date they have had, I believe, 49 traffic deaths. A number of these were the result of impaired driving. That's the worst record Calgary has had to date. It's more than one a week and the year isn't finished yet. I believe quite a number of fatal accidents in the vicinity of Calgary may well be attributed to drinking. So when we say 49 to date, that is indeed a terrible record. The government has to move in some way to reduce this. Perhaps the hon. Solicitor General will say this is within the city's jurisdiction. It is also a provincial problem.

I suggested once a move that may not be popular, that may lose votes for people, especially those who wish to implement this program. That is to experiment with a program that will prevent the driver from getting to his car after he has been drinking. This sounds far-fetched. It can be done. For instance, if some beer parlor has 200 or 300 patrons drinking beer or other liquor a good part of the night, there's no reason the police could not alert or give advance notice to the people inhabiting or patronizing this particular beer parlor, that we will check everyone coming out. If he's going to drive the car, we will request that he does not. If we think that he's not fit to drive, we will simply ask him for his keys. This might be pushing things a bit too far, but when you look at the deaths on the highway, nothing should be left untried in order to reduce [the number of] drinking drivers on our highways.

I'm sure most parents who have teenage children would be very appreciative if they knew that the son or daughter who may be drinking would be apprehended or stopped by the RCMP, or some other police or highway patrol, and requested not to drive. It's a lot better to go and even have to pick up the son or daughter or friend, as it may be, than to call an ambulance.

As far as I'm concerned, the concern in Ottawa by the hon. minister, Mr. Lang about the problem is an indication that it is not an easy one, that we have to do something. The Solicitor General ought to come up with some more innovations. Try it. At least you can't lose. It might not be popular. I'm sure some country beer parlors particularly will object to this, but that is beside the point. I think we know there are thousands of people on Saturday night going out to have a few drinks. They get into their cars and drive and then the RCMP or city police try to catch them if they're lucky before they kill somebody or before they hit someone.

Certainly we could carry this whole program one step further, because once you get thousands of drivers who have been drinking on the roads, it's like trying to herd rabbits with a horse. You're lucky if you stop the odd one. Most of them are lucky and get home. Some of them get on the road and get killed. Some innocent drivers get killed by someone who has had one too many.

This is just a suggestion. It might not be practical but it has not been tried. The RCMP often will see a young fellow leave a beer parlor in the country and get into his car. They can see he is not fit to drive. He'll get into his car and the RCMP will catch up to him and apprehend him. Why could they not have moved a little sooner and said, you're not able to drive. You have impaired your own judgment to make that decision. Give us the keys and get home as best you can.

MR. GHITTER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Judging from your ruling this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, relative to being in the context of the bill I would ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Third reading, boy.

MR. GHITTER:

... suggest our hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View is reaching far abreast and far awide. The only section clause by clause in the bill as I understand it relates to the authority of a police constable to ask for a licence if someone appears to be impaired. Now we're going into all these other fantasies. I would think on the basis of your ruling this afternoon the basis of, Mr. Speaker, we should stick to the bill while in clause by clause.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Another nomination...

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo was perhaps a little prompter than the Chair in this regard. It would seem that on third reading, having gone into the provisions of the bill in committee and the principles of the bill on second reading, the debate should be restricted to the actual content of the bill. The hon. member is using the occasion for debating a program which is a topic in itself, although undoubtedly related to some extent to the bill. I would respectfully suggest to the hon. member that he might confine the remainder of his remarks to the actual bill itself.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your ruling but I believe in the past the widest latitude had been given to all members speaking on third reading of the bill. But I have completed my remarks.

I just wish to point out that the efforts to prevent accidents on highways, particularly the suggestion I made was not one of fantasy but an effort to see whether anything more can be done than we're doing, because we're not doing enough. At least all the families who have to pick up the bodies of their drivers, of their husbands or wives or children, along the road do not think that any effort to reduce impaired driving on our highways is termed a fantasy.

We've had desperate measures in the highway traffic legislation before in an effort to curb accidents. We'll have to continue to attempt to find more solutions. Mine was just a suggestion that could be tried. It's an experiment that is worth while. This is not something that I imagine. I have talked to RCMP from many different areas of the province and many agree that this idea may have merit.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the hon. Solicitor General and the hon. Minister of Highways to give this matter favorable consideration to see if they can come up with a new idea in enforcing traffic laws with a view to saving lives rather than just giving us more of what has been done in the past.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. COOKSON:

In closing and responding to the Member for Mountain View, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but draw the attention of the Assembly to the fact that the former government was responsible for lowering the drinking age to 18 just prior to the last election. I think we should give some address to that change in legislation sometime in the future.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Are you going to change it?

[The motion was carried. Bill No. 68 was read a third time.]

[It was moved by the members indicated that the following bills be read a third time, and the motions were carried.]

No.	Name	Moved by
69	The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1974	Miniely
70	The Trust Companies Amendment Act, 1974	Leitch
72	The Health and Social Development Statutes Amendment Act, 1974	Crawford
75	The Attorney General Statutes Amendment Act, 1974 (No. 2)	Leitch
71	The Alberta Heritage Amendment Act, 1974	Schmid (for Hansen)
73	The District Courts Amendment Act, 1974	Leitch
74	The Surrogate Courts Amendment Act, 1974	Leitch
76	The Cancer Treatment and Prevention Amendment Act, 1974	Crawford
77	The Ophthalmic Dispensers Amendment Act, 1974	Crawford

## GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

## 3. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:

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: Mr. R. Speaker.]

## MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, Conservatives are flying rather high in this province. So high, Mr. Speaker, that they can't even hear or see what Albertans are saying. Mr. Speaker, Albertans from every walk of life want me to report to this Legislature that the credibility gap between the verbal commitments of this government, philosophically and policy-wise, and their actual actions is becoming glaringly evident.

## SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

## MR. R. SPEAKER:

I would like to pursue this particular allegation in three separate areas: first, the erosion of competitive individual enterprise; secondly, the disrespect for involvement of local individuals and local governments in determining government policies and programs; and thirdly, the continuous expansion of laws and regulation to reduce individual initiative in this province of Alberta.

I would like to quote the Premier and the Leader of the Conservative party, to clarify his verbal position on each of these three areas. First, on individual enterprise and government interference. In Hansard of October 23 and 24, the Premier states on page 3133 that he wants "to strengthen in this province what is truly free enterprise." On page 3173 he says that "funds must be invested with a minimum of interference with the competitive private sector activity." On page 3174 he says, in referring to surplus funds:

... they should be invested in such a way that the essential feature of Alberta society and strength which is an investment that will not thwart the individual enterprise and individual initiative of our citizens will have to be a fundamental parameter of our investment.

In the Conservative handbook of 1971, one called New Directions, the party repeats often its support for competitive free enterprise.

Secondly, let's have a look at the other areas of individual and local involvement in determining policy. In the handbook of 1971 it says in section P and I quote: "To involve the individual citizen in the formation of our laws and programs." In section IV H: "We believe that the proper role of Provincial Government is guidance, advice and assistance to local government - not direction, control and restriction of their affairs."

Mr. Speaker, these are the verbal commitments of this Conservative government.

## AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

## MR. R. SPEAKER:

To really determine whether the commitments are meaningful or not, Mr. Speaker, we must examine the actions of this government. The actions are the true reflection of the direction this government is taking in the province of Alberta.

Let's look at some examples. PWA: the Premier said to this Assembly, the people of this province understand and support our decision. When did they have the opportunity to understand the decision? The people were told about the decision. They were told what it was and now as residents and citizens of Alberta we must live with that decision. What type of citizen involvement is that, what type of commitment to the principles that were enunciated so clearly in the early stages of this government? Those are the things that should be reported to the Legislature, and the people of Alberta certainly want me to report that to this government.

## AN HON. MEMBER:

Agreed.

## MR. R. SPEAKER:

I feel with regard to PWA and the early stages of this session that the attempt by this government to prove to us the reason for its purchase was certainly a snow job and did not show clearly any reason or purpose for the purchase of Pacific Western Airlines in this province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Premier's awareness of the frustration the government and his decision have created in the minds of individual Albertans. The people of Alberta

fear the next move of this government. The people of Alberta recognize the seriousness of the purchase of PWA but I think, far more serious than that purchase is the violation that has occurred in the principles this government says it stands for. It has come into office on those particular principles. Many people believed that that was the type of government they were going to have. In only three years, the people of Alberta have been deceived on the basic stance of this government.

I think those actions are very serious and the leader, the Premier - I am sorry he is not here this evening - should assess that, in the direction he is taking with the people of Alberta. Certainly the people at the grass roots are assessing it. They are assessing and fearing much, as to the next steps this government will take. The Conservatives in this province have broken an election and continued promise about free enterprise. They have violated the principle that residents of Alberta could influence the democratic process through the Legislature.

Thirdly, we have had a loss of rights of the elected representatives to decide the total expenditures of this province. I think PWA only highlights that particular instance. We all recognize that the funds for the purchase of PWA came by a cabinet order from the Consolidated Cash Investment Fund through the use of The Financial Administration Act. Only \$35 million was spent on PWA. However, if we understand that there is from \$300 to \$500 million in the fund, add to that over \$100 million in special warrants, what discretion is left in that fund for spending?

We have a Legislature losing the right to decide on over 25 per cent of its actual expenditure, 25 percent of the current provincial budget. How does the government justify this as citizen involvement in the affairs of this Conservative government. To me, that is actual nonsense and deception, and nothing to do with the real fact of what its intentions were.

Mr. Speaker, I can only conclude, first, that any private company in Alberta is a potential target for government to become a majority or a minority shareholder; and secondly, that the individual competitive enterprise, people involvement, legislative tradition and the decrease in regulatory laws by the Conservatives, are nothing but words and words and more words, and nothing else.

Mr. Speaker, Albertans are gun-shy, scared to death as to what the next move of this government will be. The Premier said in his closing remarks about PWA, despite the relative ease of taking over Pacific Western Airlines ... The first one was easy.

What next can be taken over with relative ease with the Alberta taxpayers' money? I think that is the question the people of Alberta want answered. Certainly they would like a report on that question from the Premier and this Conservative government.

Mr. Speaker, Albertans for 35 years under a Social Credit government knew their government stood for competitive enterprise.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

A trust was there beyond question. People knew that the principle was not violated. Our Mr. Manning, Mr. Strom and our present leader, Mr. Schmidt, stand today for that principle.

[Interjections]

AN HON. MEMBER:

Certainly, just keep listening.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's great.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, the name as spelled does not stop at "d", but stops at "t", down the alphabet a little further.

[Interjections]

MR. R. SPEAKER:

... Where there is certainly a little more strength than emphasis in this ... [Inaudible]  
...

AN HON. MEMBER:

The first name isn't Horst either.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

The first name isn't Horst either, that's right.  
I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that the audience on the other side understands there is a leader in this province with that kind of principle, and certainly come to the occasion and raise their voices. Because I don't hear anything, Mr. Speaker, from those

backbenchers over there about the way this government violates its basic principles or about the way it doesn't set up any guidelines or priorities established along the lines of those principles. Mr. Speaker, that is what I ask from the backbenchers. That is the direction they should give to these cabinet ministers. They should keep the reins on them.

We can talk about individuals and leaders, but the backbenchers of the Conservative party have in no way taken any leadership in showing some guidance and control in bringing about grass-roots representation in this province. Those are the things that are important, Mr. Speaker.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that we in this Legislature should stand up and talk about the principles we stand for. All we talk about are issues. We talk about little things. I think that's the point we're at. We're at a crossroads in our philosophic direction, each and every one of us who sits in this Legislature. I think it's time we stand up and be counted about where we stand in regard to free enterprise, government takeovers, government interference.

That is the type of debate we should be having, so we know that Alberta's direction is clear and meaningful. I'm saying at this point in time that under the Conservative government it is not that way.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, Social Crediters believe that principles should stand the test of expediency. I feel that with the actions I have observed in three years, or in this past summer particularly, Conservatives place expediency over principle.

On the PWA issue, however, Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives have lost on two counts. One, in violating their principle. Two, the expediency of the action is another loss because the people of Alberta do not support that move. So they have lost on both counts. I can't explain why they ever made the decision.

Mr. Speaker, PWA would be a private company in Alberta today if the Conservative government had not interfered. No information has been given to me to show me anything different. All the information placed in this House certainly gave no evidence of that situation.

The second example I would like to look at with regard to this government is the surplus funds which are supposedly available and their relationship to inflation. In the Premier's remarks to this Assembly, the government outlined certain terms for handling the surplus funds. In short, the Premier said, we'll support the competitive private sector, we'll protect financial institutions both provincially and nationally, we'll protect capital markets, it will be invested in Alberta as much as possible, it will not be spent but invested, and we're going to take our time in determining where the investment is. Those sound like very fine tenets, very fine positions with regard to the surplus funds.

I was very interested in an article, written by a reporter well known to all of us, in The Calgary Herald of Tuesday, October 29, where he had a look at some of the surplus funds. I'd like to quote one or two paragraphs as I found them very interesting. He said this:

The premier, who originally came up with the \$900 million figure, is now talking about \$600 to \$900 million. The rest will have to be fed back to the oil industry, which created the surplus in the first place to keep it operating in Alberta.

Then he said:

The government has to come up with \$75 million for the first Alberta energy company share offering \$100 million over five years for oil sands research and more funds if it is going to pick up all its stock options in new Alberta industries. The \$35 million spent on Pacific Western Airlines also comes under this category. The premier has also said more money will be invested in expanding the airline.

While MLAs were absent from Edmonton over the summer, the cabinet also passed \$141 million in special warrants - money for expenditures not contained in the budget passed last spring. ...

Almost \$100 million of the extra spending money went to emergency agriculture programs.

And then just lately we can add another \$100 million that will go towards municipalities. I'm not saying that is wrong or not, but the other paragraph sums it up by saying that this figure approaches "400 million which does not leave that much kicking around for early use."

The point I'd like to make, Mr. Speaker, is: here we have a beautiful set of tenets and principles upon which those funds are going to be invested but, first of all, we note that a lot of them are already committed. Doesn't that mean spent? We also note that some of them are involved in enterprises which are not private enterprise. We note that not all, I don't know whether they're all invested in Alberta. We note also that a lot of time hasn't been taken to invest them. It's already done. So what are we talking about

time for - another case of just words relative to actions which don't support that particular situation.

What do those four or five guidelines really mean when the money is already committed. A bunch of nonsense. To me that can only lend support to my earlier allegation and situation, that the credibility gap of this government is showing. And it's obvious because there's a terrific gap between the words of ministers - the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs hasn't said much this session so I can't really criticize him - and the action. I think that's the way we have to assess this government at this particular time.

Mr. Speaker, I think there should be some grass-roots input into how those surplus funds are handled and I would like to make just one or two suggestions which came as I toured my constituency three or four weeks ago. I had a number of suggestions for ground rules which I certainly respect.

My constituents said the bulk of the money should be used for capital projects; secondly, the projects should be of long-term nature; thirdly, the projects should be those which support the individual in his life's endeavors but not government owned or controlled projects, operations or investments. The fourth principle they expressed to me, which I felt was very significant, was that we should take advantage of the growth capability of that \$900 million. We should exploit it to the fullest so that Alberta expands its economic capability and leadership. We should have businesslike investment.

They felt, and I certainly support this position, that we could make Alberta the financial oasis of the world, never mind just Canada. That's the kind of leadership we are asking from the Premier and the Conservative government at this time, to really invest that money and use it. That's what investment is, not spending it the way I've already indicated.

As I toured the constituency, certainly my constituents indicated areas where they felt the money should be spent on a priority basis. But they also said we should look at techniques to invest it to ensure that we can use the growth of the money to pay for some of these things, not spend the base of the money on these things and have nothing left in a year or two.

These are some of the things they suggested: interest-free long-term loans to irrigation districts; research funds to explore new avenues and efficient uses of energy, for example, in the area of solar energy and nuclear power; paved county, municipal, village and town roads.

They wanted us to look at provincial parks on a broader basis. They felt there should be a classification of provincial parks. For example, we should have maybe a class 1 park where there is just a caretaker with a truck and a few small tools so that he can keep the place clean and indicate to the general public that that's the kind of park it is. Maybe there are classes 2, 3, 4, 5 and so on, up to the more sophisticated type of park we have at the present time so that we can look at different needs across the province. Another suggestion was with regard to housing for private citizens.

They had other suggestions too: reduction in gas tax, ten cents; in propane, five cents; more dollars for elementary education; more dollars for the wild oat program and for credit union deposits. But I'd like to stress, Mr. Speaker, that they were concerned about the growth capability of that money so that we would have money available on a long-term basis.

The third [area] that I'd like to cover with regard to my first allegation is programs in the Department of Health and Social Development. I have felt that in this department we have had a lot of silence with a few noises now and then. With this government, I feel the priorities of human resource development have only been reactionary. I certainly expected the goal of citizen participation and involvement to be enhanced, but I don't find, Mr. Speaker, that this is evident. For example, in 1971 the Conservative handbook and an announcement by this Premier, the Conservatives were going to, and I quote: "...shift the emphasis from merely welfare to programs and incentives to get those able to work ... off the welfare rolls and onto the payrolls." That sounds great.

The Premier reinforced this position in early 1974 in a television interview, at which time he stated the Minister of Health and Social Development has a plan ready to present to cabinet but the oil discussions have not allowed time to make a decision on the plan.

Mr. Speaker, I questioned the Minister of Health and Social Development about a month and a half later in the subcommittee study of estimates, as to whether a plan was ready or not to present to cabinet. The minister said, no, there are only a few working papers. Mr. Speaker, the public assistance program has not changed one iota in this province to further help or to stimulate the self-responsibility of those on welfare who could look after themselves - another situation where there's a terrific gap between words or intent and actions. Three years have gone by, Mr. Speaker, a lot of sincere sounding statements, but no credibility in action. Only another example of neglect of individual needs in this province.

The fourth example I would like to look at, Mr. Speaker, to support my case - this will be the last one - deals with the responsibility and the attitude of the Minister of Lands and Forests. This Conservative minister in his administrative responsibilities is the best example of how government disregards grass-roots individual input and participation.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Agreed.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

I would like to use three examples from the minister's actions to support my position. First, the 1974 pheasant season - and I'm not going to review it all. He totally ignored local fish and game organizations. He totally ignored individual farmers, the people who really are informed about pheasant populations. We all know the rest of the story.

The second area I would like to cover is with regard to the eastern slopes. We have talked about this, about the secret rules for the exploration of these particular slopes. We find, as citizens after the fact, that 58 plus exploration permits were given out last year when the public was led to believe that a moratorium was in effect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame, shame.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

The Alberta Wilderness Association had this to say about that concern in their magazine:

Secrecy by government in the area of environmental protection has no place in a democratic nation. This type of "confidentiality" doesn't protect one coal company from another from unfair practices by another but it does set the stage for environmental abuse. The Minister of Lands and Forests, the Hon. Dr. Allan A. Warrack, should realize that decisions such as this which can be interpreted as a "coverup for industry" do not enhance the credibility of either his department or the responsible companies which have been issued coal exploration permits by his department.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

We had a decision made, we had the permits given. People didn't know until after the permits were given. How in the world can the average citizen participate in the process of decision-making? Grass roots have no opportunity to have any kind of input, participation or influence. It's just a good example.

DR. BUCK:

Back to murdering bears.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

On Friday we questioned the minister about this particular item. He said he would consult with environmental groups but I only say again, why consult with them after you've taken the action and made the decision on your own.

The third example I would look at has been a favorite of mine for a long time and is with regard to Alberta provincial parks. I'm very concerned with the way they're being handled at the present time.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yeh, go on. Give 'em hell.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

If we can believe it or not, the development and administration of our provincial parks are totally - practically to the cutting of a blade of grass - run from central office. The participation of local residents around the parks, patrons of the parks and even the local staff have practically nothing to say about the administration or progressive development of a provincial park. The responsibility for this is totally that of the Minister of Lands and Forests.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, I respect very much the parks director and his staff as they have been most helpful in meeting with local citizens. I also appreciate the budget allocated for the parks across the province. However, I cannot support the central control and planning enforced by the minister.

I would like to use, as an example, Little Bow Park that is in my constituency. When I toured that park during my pre-session meetings, I found a number of complaints and I would like to enumerate them very very quickly if I may, Mr. Speaker. I could have relayed these to the Minister of Lands and Forests but my honorable colleague for Bow Valley and I did that very thing prior to the decision on the pheasant hunting season. We got no results, so I felt my only alternative was to air them in this Assembly so that other MLAs and people of this province are aware of the problems created by the decision-making process of this minister.

Here are some of the complaints I picked up about planning. If there's going to be a park and you're going to irrigate the park, irrigate it, not just little plots scattered around the park. Why put a summer water line and a sewer line in a year-round office? Why not get information from people and workers in the area before starting a project? The people using and working in the parks should have some say. A person should work in the park for a year before trying to plan or design anything. Why put 12 toilets in the



camping area where nobody will be in the daytime because there is no shade, and put only 6 toilets in the day-use area where everybody will be in the daytime because there is shade.

The boat launch and boat dock should have top priority in being completed because it is a fishing and boating park. It makes no sense to spend thousands of dollars on something and then spend more money tearing it down because it wasn't planned right or put in the right place in the first instance. We find the boat dock has sat up on the dry ground for about two years and has never been placed in the right place, simply because - and it is an expensive floating dock - all the planning is done in the building just across the way and nobody is doing any planning down there about the planners.

There are more criticisms I could mention. Nobody learns anything with the people in charge of the project being in Edmonton. They only come down once a month, for approximately one hour, and forget to bring things down from Edmonton, so they go back with hopes of coming down next month.

And I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, of delay after delay because of the centralized control of this particular department and the poor planning that comes out of it. I can only lay that responsibility at the door of the Conservative minister. He is responsible for setting the precedent as to how the project should be run.

My suggestions are: one, an on-site project director; two, the capability of that man or woman making decisions right there on the spot; and three, the use of volunteer help from the local community to give some good advice. Those are three suggestions which I have for that particular item, Mr. Speaker.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that I only have two or three minutes left. I would like to summarize. The Conservative government, as far as I'm concerned, Mr. Speaker, have no real priorities or guidelines to enhance individual competitive enterprise in this province, just words.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Secondly, they have no real priority or guidelines to give local people a meaningful involvement in government planning and decision-making. That's my second allegation. Thirdly, this Conservative government has no priorities or guidelines to remove government control in the individual's daily activities.

Mr. Speaker, we have a government, by reaction and with actions of expedience, disregarding a principled position about which I have spoken. Mr. Speaker, in light of that, I certainly feel I cannot support the report that was brought in by the Premier. I want to move an amendment to Motion No. 3 at this particular time.

I would like to move, Mr. Speaker, that government Motion No. 3 be amended as follows. One, that that portion of the motion, after the words, "23rd day of October, 1974" be struck out and the following added immediately thereafter:

... and that the said report be rejected as this Assembly deplores the Conservative government's inaction in establishing guidelines and priorities to meet the needs of the individual Albertan.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I'll get rid of this because I might not like what I'm going to hear. It's a little contrary to my nature to speak on such a motion as this, but most of you realize that these motions are really to give us a chance to say a lot of things we think we ought to say.

I'm going to treat the whole matter, basing it on the Premier's statements here in the House. He told us first that the premiers were confident. He sort of intimated to us that they had agreed to come back and tell us they were confident. And yet the newspaper report says: "The exception was a tight-lipped Premier Peter Lougheed of Alberta, who had no comment on the meeting."

He went on to review for us the economics of Alberta. We all recognize that they are pretty good in a sense. We have had considerable prosperity in this province. I don't think they were particularly due to the efforts of the government. I am not sure that they were against the efforts of the government either. But there are some things we ought to think about.

In spite of what we say, the papers report that the balance of payments for Canada is declining, which simply means that we are buying more abroad than we are exporting. Maybe that's good. Maybe it isn't. When we convert the growth rate of Canada to real terms, taking in inflation, we find it is the lowest ever. It's down to about 2 per cent. We had hoped for 4.

When we look at the automotive industry we discover, for instance, that in October the sales were the lowest on record for many many years. There isn't a lot of confidence and Ford Canada and other companies ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. I regret to interrupt the hon. member. I have just had an opportunity to review the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Little Bow. I find the amendment is not in order, is not acceptable, since it proposes a direct negative to the motion which is before the House. Consequently the same object can be achieved by simply voting against the motion. I think the hon. member will find in the Precedents on Parliamentary

Usage that a direct negative is not in order, since, as I mentioned, that can be achieved by simply voting against the main motion.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, then I take it I am speaking to the motion and not the amendment. I can say the same things, fortunately.

I was speaking about the economy of Alberta and merely pointing out that to express confidence doesn't mean we need to be confident. There are some sour notes in our economy, and I'm going to treat just a few of these.

There is the reality. Is the money we're getting buying as much as it used to buy and if not, why? We have the highest interest rates in Alberta and Canada that we've had for many years. When we look at the newspapers - this was Thursday last week - one economist predicts lower interest rates while another - and these are two bankers - predicts the high interest rates will continue.

We have the lowest amount of capital available for housing that there has ever been, and we've had a lot of discussion about that today. We have the lumber industry in trouble, largely because of troubles in the United States and housing starts aren't going. We have labor refusing to accept recommendations and wanting still more money.

I'm interested sometimes when I look at little cartoons. One you may all have noticed in The Albertan simply shows a discussion in which a politician says, "Let's keep away from politics, we're plum out of band-aids." I think perhaps it indicates we have to do some thinking.

In the midst of all this, Mr. Speaker, inflation is going on. I want to practise just a little arrogance tonight - it might be one of my last chances. By that I mean that I want to recall to you what you already know about inflation. Somebody said to me once, what do you know about this anyway, and after he had gone I sat down to see what I knew. I didn't know very much until I began reviewing. Now maybe we're all that way. I don't pretend to know all about inflation. But I do want to get you to just think a little because it may materially affect what we do in Alberta.

There are several kinds of inflation. The first, of course, is that proverbial kind where there is a real shortage of something. Consequently, those who can bid for the shortage. We used to hope under the old laissez faire system that it would work out all right; that it would be used for the purpose for which it should be used. That didn't prove to be the case because money doesn't recognize legitimate needs very much.

Then there are those kinds of inflation which I'm going to call the arbitrary kinds, the kinds that are either manageable or are actually managed as part of policy. These are the arbitrary increases in costs which people force on us. The Arab nations put a great deal of inflation on the world by their arbitrary increase in prices. They had the power and they did it. But labor unions do that too, and I'm going to associate it a little with other types of inflation.

There is the affluence inflation, and that's the one hitting Alberta. People have so much money that when they want something they don't resist the price. They buy it. It's all around us, and many of the things this government is doing are adding to that kind of inflation. I know that isn't their objective. I'm not sure that any other government might do differently, but I point out again governments can contribute to that.

Then there is the psychological inflation of which we are all guilty. It's the idea that prices are going to rise. If you don't buy now, it will cost you 25 per cent more next year. Why resist it? And so we even borrow money at exorbitant rates to buy this stuff which we may or may not need and store it up. That lack of resistance to price is an encouragement to inflation. At the same time, the storing of goods which we may never use adds to the shortages that are sometimes around us.

Then there is the worst kind of inflation of all, and that is government-sponsored inflation. All governments seem to have fallen for it, particularly federal governments. First is the increase in the money supply. You suggest to the government, go easy and they go easy. So there is no money to build houses. Then we change our minds and say the government's wrong, you've got to get some money out here, we've got to get going. So they put out some more money. I'm not going to talk about how they do it but that is inflationary.

Then governments pay high interest rates themselves. Never in my lifetime could you buy government bonds at the interest rates which they are assuring us today. They didn't have to do it, I submit. And in doing it, they added to inflation.

Then there is the high spending by the governments, of which this government is very guilty. We on this side are guilty of advising them of the things they don't spend so maybe we have to share the responsibility. Nevertheless governments do not seem to dare to, or want to, cut back their own spending as an anti-inflationary measure.

And then these tax exemptions: both sides of the House think about tax exemptions. It is a great political gimmick. You're going to take this money off and the poor people have more to spend. But when you leave them more to spend, you have contributed to that affluence which, I submit, is one of the causes of inflation. There are subsidies and loans and these again increase buying pressure.

I realize the Minister of Agriculture knows something about what he is doing. I am not being critical but I'll just point out that this loan to us poor ranchers to keep our calves is one of that type. It isn't going to solve anything, it's going to give us some interest-free money which most of us will not have sense enough to spend wisely. But it is going to do something else. It is going to increase the ultimate amount of beef on the

market simply by keeping these until they are higher. Yet it is an attempt to help a sector of our economy which is in difficulty.

Then there are the welfare plans. They add immensely to the affluence of people, not just to those who receive welfare but to that great army of bureaucrats which manages it. I refer to minimum wage laws. I know the pressure the government is under, that poor people are not being paid enough. There might be some good things about it but there is also inflationary pressure. In a time of more than ample employment when you can't get people, the minimum wage increases simply add to the costs which result in still higher costs for poorer production. In that sense, they are inflationary.

Now I am only trying to get you to remember that if you want to fight inflation you have to say, what are we doing that is inflationary and stop doing it. You have to say what can we do that is anti-inflationary and do it. Well let's get around to this \$400 or \$600 or \$900 million which is coming to us simply by inflation. What could we do with it that would be anti-inflationary?

Well there is something you could do about it. I don't think anybody will, but it would be simply this. Suppose we were to take these cheques as they come to the government, go down to the chartered banks, demand cash, carry it up here, put it in one of these vaults and just leave it there. Every dollar in cash that you withdrew from the economy would do one of two things; it would either check this oversupply of money and check inflation or it would put the federal government right on the spot to issue some more money and we could blame them for inflation rather than ourselves.

Now we aren't going to do that for several reasons, the first of them being that the people would cry, my gosh, when you could get 9 per cent are you going to put this money in a vault. So I point out again, we aren't going to do it.

The other thing we could do, of course, with the money would be to spend it in such a way that it could not multiply in its effect.

All right, let's go on from there. If governments go into business - this government seems intent on doing just that, and there may be some justifications - what usually happens is that you go out into the industry, you find those industrial magnates who have made the private businesses go, and you hire them for government. But there's a difference. When they were out in the world, they had to face shareholders. You put them in charge of a government business and the knowledgeable manipulator in the private market is now in that happy state where he doesn't answer to anybody. The government doesn't presume to know how he ought to run the business. And he doesn't have to make it pay because there are so many advantages that accrue to either a Crown corporation or a business owned by a government. So I point out again, we are not guiltless when it comes to those things which make for inflation.

Then there is this paternalism, this idea that the government has got to bail us out. I thought the address given by Bert Hargrave was one of the better ones when it comes to this, when he advised the industry to keep the government out of our cattle business. But I don't think he impressed everybody because when we're hurt we like paternalism. We don't say to ourselves that when calves were 70 cents a pound, it was crazy. It was. We didn't save any of that money. But now they're down to less than half that. Some way it has to be the government's fault. We all fall for a little paternalism and I know that, politically, paternalism is a wonderful weapon.

To turn to a few other aspects of the economy in Alberta, we are very concerned that we develop the tar sands rapidly enough to meet what we anticipate to be a crying need at the end of this decade. And by the same token we listen to quite an extent to the environmentalists who try to persuade us that coal can stay there forever. Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the development of coal, concurrently with oil, is one of the things we ought to be looking at seriously. The estimates are that we have a thousand-year supply of coal. Not of every kind, but of coal. This coal can and will someday be converted. Maybe we had just as well face the consequence now.

I'm always amused when I hear people complain about the rises in costs and then see what they do. It was only about a year ago that we were buying gasoline at the Circle Mohawk service station in Lethbridge for 47.9. Now it's up to 52.9 but on my way up here I find I can't buy any gasoline under 61.9. So I checked the wholesale price and find it's just the same at both places and I wonder how come.

But the point I'm making is that it doesn't stop us from buying. I don't know how high gasoline prices can go before each of you, including me, would really cut down on driving, buy ourselves a bicycle or do any of the obvious things we have to do.

What I'm getting at is that perhaps we're wrong if we're thinking about the economy of Alberta in being too cautious in the development of coal. We can develop coal without any great rape of the environment. All you need do is fly over this country, including the strip mines, to conclude that they don't cover very many acres and they're only a fly in the ointment compared to the things we do, the acres we convert to roads. Somebody mentioned, Friday I believe it was, the necessity for miles of service roads which take a lot of land out of production.

So I submit that maybe we need to get with industry, but we need to do some thinking about whether or not we should develop our coal to the extent that we can convert it, too, to the gasoline and oil which are going to be in such great demand.

That brings me around to our attitude about the federal government and what they're doing. I submit that if it's all right in Alberta for the government to embark on programs which take from those who are called rich or affluent, to give to those who are less fortunate, it's not out of order for the federal government - as long as it works

under its constitutional powers - to take from us in Alberta, if you like, to ease the load on those who are not here.

Let's go a step further. If it's all right for both of those things to happen, if governments truly have a right to take from the citizen, to do things with the money that he would never want to do, how long will it be before a combination of world powers will find it's just as justifiable to take from Canada and the 'have' nations, by force if necessary, to distribute to those who are less fortunate.

I think we have to keep these things in mind when we begin to congratulate ourselves on the very fine situation in Alberta economically. Maybe we have some responsibilities outside.

The business of confrontation bothers me a little. If we had adopted the proper moral attitudes in all these things, perhaps we could have got along a little better with the rest of Canada and with the United States. Confrontations don't usually arrive very far, particularly when the antagonist has the balance of power.

Now I want to carry it a little further. It has to do with the relationships with our neighboring country. We are all aware it is our best market. Yet sometimes we buy more from them than they buy from us. I want to refer to this cattle business and the meetings that were held in the States, particularly those held in Washington, when the cattle industry came in. What did they want? They said Canada is wagging America; it has been wagging us for years. It made me kind of proud to think we could wag America. If it were really true I'd want to get in on some of the wagging myself.

But what they were saying was, if Canada is going to block our exports of cattle - and remember that our relationship is 10:1, even in cattle they have about 90 for every 10 that we have and it isn't very important. But what do they want to do? They want to put embargoes on all the things we sell to the States. The politicians almost fall for it until they discover we have a few things they've got to have. They say, doggone it, if we do that what will Canada do? And so the confrontation goes on and we really haven't solved anything. The price of beef is one of those phenomena and it will show up in other things as well.

Then we have this business of what the world is going to do about currency. The Bretton Woods Agreement failed. That agreement said, we'll go back, in essence, to the gold standard for the world. We like the American dollar, it has been sound for so long. So we'll say to America, you agree that you'll give us gold at \$33.30 an ounce if you get in a deficit position. That sounded all right; we had Fort Knox plum full of gold and didn't know what to do with it. It wasn't drawing any interest; until by giveaways and spending we began to change the balance of payments and we didn't have the gold.

Now the big shots - that's a good Social Credit term I understand - of the world are meeting and they say, we've got to have an international credit system. The 'have not' nations can draw on this credit. What's behind the credit? Not a darned thing, and I hope Canada has the sense to keep out of it. We are one of the few nations in a productive position to make our currency stand up in the world market and I hope we do just that.

That leads me to touch on another aspect of the economy of Alberta which maybe we ought to be thinking about. The Deputy Premier carried me away in a few speeches until I was about to agree completely with him. Then I backed off a little. It has to do with this business that we will process in Alberta every product we can as near to the ultimate end as we can. Then I got to analyzing the nations of the world. The population of the world in a different position is some 1000:1 for Canada. These nations cannot make a living except by buying raw materials, processing them, and converting their technical know-how and work into cash on the world market.

If we insist that we are going to manufacture everything to the end, where is the market going to be? These people can't buy it. We are going to be competing with them for what little market there is. We're going to be inviting those who can produce beef and butter and cheese and honey as well as us to fight us for that world market on a price basis or to go into what we call a world consortium of price setting. And that has never worked very well either.

While I, too, would like to see Alberta's economy move over somewhat into secondary industry, which in turn sparks tertiary industry, I want us to remember that in so doing we are violating one of those principles of the world that he who can do the job best must be allowed to do it. If we take that privilege from those nations which must manufacture, which must process to live and become their opponents in the world market, we are stirring up just those conditions which in the end inevitably lead to war.

I'm not saying we shouldn't do some of these things. But I am pointing out that if Alberta is fortunate enough to bring a lot of that manufacturing here, and we may be, there will follow a great influx of people. We can't do anything about it. And in the end I'm not so sure we'll be better off.

While I'm here I want to touch on another aspect of life in Alberta which is partially economic. A number of people who have spoken on the idea of what to do with the windfall have said, let's spend it to increase the quality of life in our province. Well, I get to wondering just what they mean by quality of life. I sat down and said, now if this is what they mean, I'm for it; if this is what they mean, well perhaps I'll question it. If the Speaker will permit me to use some notes maybe I can do it more quickly than if I try to remember.

It's something like this: if by quality of life we mean that freedom from worry, frustration, fears and tensions, from social pressures, from the slights and hurts which we inflict upon each other, from despotism in its many forms, from those influences which

debase our actions and our natures; if we mean the freedom coupled with the opportunity to seek self-fulfilment, to enjoy beauties and sounds and smells and the physical joys which are attendant on it; if we mean to excite our nobler natures and to discover those joys which are attendant on service, charity, integrity, obedience, to those immutable laws upon which physical, mental and spiritual comfort depend; if we mean that harmony with our environment, with nature and with our fellows which is conducive to happiness, then I agree. If we can spend money to get that, let's get at it.

If, on the other hand, by quality of life we mean some other things: an automobile for every person qualified to drive, a TV in every room, club membership for every adult, restaurant eating as a family habit, unlimited spending and money for children, foreign travel for everybody, the relinquishing of parental responsibilities to hired tutors and governesses, swimming pools in every backyard and holiday trailers and boats and skidoos and so on for everybody - if we mean to spend the windfall, and in the end it doesn't prove a blessing but only an accessory of man's determination to subjugate spiritual, moral and mental uplift to the satisfaction of those materially-motivated appetites which throughout history have debased and helped to destroy one dominant culture after another, perhaps this windfall is not a blessing.

Now that didn't necessarily cover the whole field. But I do want to draw attention to the fact that money has almost invariably had as many bad results as good results. If we want the quality of life in Alberta to be what I mean it should be, we've got a lot of thinking to do and perhaps the non-use of money becomes one of our problems rather than the use.

Mr. Speaker, I see my time is almost up. I want to just review a few things. In the same paper that I mentioned we have two things: "Wage board grants hike, union says it wants more." We have "Government promises help for the lumber industry." But what can it do? It lowers the royalty. The royalty in itself is very little and helps only a few people. "Turner shows impatience with slow monetary change." He says:

... reducing reliance on U.S. dollars, gold and other stronger currencies such as marks with a new international credit unit, now called a special drawing right.

I mentioned that these were in the paper. Another one says the price of bread could rise if rate structures change.

You analyse it a little and what does it mean? It means that you add 6 cents a bushel to the cost of transporting grain and somebody wants to add 5 cents a loaf to the price of bread which only takes about 7.73 pounds of flour. If we're going to swallow all of that, we're not going to solve the problems of Alberta.

I'm proud to be an Albertan. I think we have the finest province - I have to say that all of our motives are the same. We want to keep Alberta there. Can we have an influence on the rest of Canada? Do we have a responsibility that the economic windfall which has come to us shall in some way be reflected in something better for the rest of Canada? I don't think we can escape the fact that in a sense we are our brother's keeper.

This little cartoon tells the story. There is a fellow sitting in the chair as a guest. The host comes in and says: "I told Frances to hold off on dinner for a few more minutes. The children want to get a tape recording of your stomach growling". Well, if we want to hold off what we might have as a responsibility to the rest of Canada until it's stomach growls louder, we can do it. But I submit that in our good fortune, and with the capabilities we have, we should not forget that perhaps all this affluence is not necessarily good and particularly that we do have a responsibility, that we do contribute to inflation. When we say we can't do anything about it, we're fooling ourselves. Perhaps it's time for Alberta to begin thinking what we can do to influence [the situation].

I have been discussing with your finance minister some ways and means of doing just that. But I point out to you that there is just no way of spending \$900 million that isn't inflationary. Perhaps we can only offset it by recognizing some Canadian responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, the state of Alberta is good. I want the government to have full credit for whatever it has done to increase the well-being of Alberta. I hope they will be modest enough to recognize that some of it just happened and that they were fortunate enough to be in power.

Just to show you I'm not a spendthrift, I'm not going to use the whole three minutes. I'm going to say that in the opposition, our responsibility is to remind us, as well as you, of those things which are wrong in our attitudes, to remind us of our responsibilities, to encourage us to dig deeply into the ways and means we can use, not only to make Alberta better, but to contribute to that well-being of Canada which is vital, and to go on from there, contributing and not being part of those influences which make the Third World a danger to us all.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WYSE:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm very happy to participate in the debate on Motion No. 3.

I certainly supported the amendment which was put forth by the Member for Little Bow, even though the Speaker ruled it out of order. I supported it, Mr. Speaker, because publicity-wise this government has done a wonderful job. But they have failed to really come to grips with the problems of the little guy in this province. The majority of the

PC problems, Mr. Speaker, are not geared for the small businessman - when you realize that last year in the province of Alberta, over 839 businesses went bankrupt. So, Mr. Speaker, in the next few minutes I hope to elaborate on a few of the concerns I have regarding this government.

First, I'm very disappointed with the government regarding their attitude to the Legislature and the role of the opposition MLAs. Now just reminiscing a bit, Mr. Speaker, it's over three years since the majority of the MLAs in this Legislature were first elected.

I might say at this point that I've really enjoyed it here. It's been a wonderful experience. I expect to be back.

[Interjections]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure we can all elaborate on the reasons we sought this particular role in the Legislature. Probably some of us had some personal ambitions. But I think, Mr. Speaker, the majority of the MLAs wanted to run because they thought they could contribute something to the betterment of Alberta.

Frankly speaking, Mr. Speaker, I don't take my role in this Legislature very lightly. Whether we sit on the government side or the opposition side, I think we all have a very important role to play in this Legislature. And sometimes, Mr. Speaker, I think the role of the opposition is even more important than the government's because if it hadn't been for the role of the opposition in the last three years or so, when we think of all the issues that would have been put under the rug ... So, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make it absolutely clear at this time that I intend to express myself on this side of the House, whether the government wants us to or not.

No doubt, Mr. Speaker, we're living in one of the most exciting times in the history of this province. I know things are changing so fast it's really hard to keep up. Who would ever have thought three years ago or even two years ago that in 1974 we would have an extra \$5 million, \$6 million, \$7 million or \$9 million from the resources of this province.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Nine hundred ...

MR. WYSE:  
... million.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to stop right here and praise the former administration for the policies they initiated, for the policies they maintained while they were the government of this province. And that [policy] was, Mr. Speaker, that Albertans would not lose control of the resources in this province. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the success of those policies is being borne out today in this province. The fact is, the small success of the 'now' government has to be reflected to those sound and shrewd policies of the Social Credit government. I think we must give credit where credit is due. Credit, Mr. Speaker, to those men who no doubt gave more to Alberta than we younger men could ever think to give. I know Albertans will never lose sight of those facts, Mr. Speaker.

Now to get back to accountability and credibility, Mr. Speaker, which would be one of the most important principles of any government. The question stands now and I'm sure is in the minds of most Albertans: will this government be able to stand the test of time? Sure it's easy, Mr. Speaker, to run a government when you've got more money than you know what to do with.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Where did it come from?

MR. WYSE:  
But listening to this government one gets the impression that they saved Alberta from disaster; they found the oil and the gas.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Agreed.

MR. WYSE:  
Mr. Speaker, how different from the days when the Socreds came into power.

MR. TRYNCHY:  
Agreed.

MR. WYSE:  
Millions of dollars in debt. In the years of [its] administration, [it] brought this province from near bankruptcy to one of the three 'have' provinces in Canada today which I think is pretty significant and pretty great. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Alberta have not forgotten. Oh sure, Mr. Speaker, we hear the old story that the Socreds are dead.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Agreed.

MR. WYSE:

Well, I'm not dead and I don't think the other four members over here are dead. If the government thinks we're dead, why not call an election, why not call an election now? We're ready. I think the people of Alberta are concerned about this government because they're starting to see through the bandwagon approach. I think it would be one of the biggest catastrophes of all time to have a PC government in Alberta with no opposition. Soon all the oil and gas would be gone, the money spent, and back to a bankrupt economy.

I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, I had to laugh on Friday as the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests hollered across the floor, we're going to wipe you all out. We're going to wipe you all out so we won't have any more opposition. We don't have to worry about our backbenchers, they never say anything anyway, so we can do exactly what we want to and no one will be the wiser. Get rid of the opposition.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Look, Ernie.

MR. WYSE:

As the hon. Member for Little Bow mentioned a few minutes ago regarding the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, broken promises by the minister. I'm not going to go into it because the hon. Member for Little Bow did; but frankly speaking, Mr. Speaker, I'm disappointed with this government and I'm disappointed with their policies, as I'm sure many Albertans are. Where has the principle of free enterprise gone. People are no longer saying what's the difference between the Socreds and the PCs. They know the difference now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right.

MR. WYSE:

They have seen the policies of the government.

Mr. Speaker, one of the first promises of the Premier was cut the fat out of government.

[Interjections]

Well, Mr. Speaker, in looking at the records here - we've got it documented - in the last three years there was a 40.9 per cent increase in the civil servants, and I'd like to ask the Premier if he were here, what did he mean when he said cut the fat out of government. What about the promise, Mr. Speaker, to put more decision back into the Legislature. We're going to make it hum.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hum?

MR. WYSE:

What did he mean when he said that, Mr. Speaker. Never in the history of Canadian parliamentary records has the power of the Legislature been eroded like the one in Alberta. Someone mentioned \$135 million order in council. Unbelievable.

Frankly speaking, Mr. Speaker, I don't blame the civil service in Alberta for being upset. I would be upset too. This government, before coming into power, promised the civil service full bargaining under The Alberta Labour Act. We have it documented. Three years ago, Mr. Speaker, the civil service in this province was one of the highest paid, and today the civil service in the province of Alberta is not the last but it is far from the top.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Shame.

MR. WYSE:

Shame. I think, Mr. Speaker, they have a right to complain when this party ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

This is a party?

MR. WYSE:

... appointed so many political civil servants, political appointees that got the job they should have had.

I'd just like to say at this point, Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciated the cabinet tour in southern Alberta. They called it nonpolitical. That's fine, it's debatable. I happen to be the elected MLA for Medicine Hat-Redcliff. I asked the hon. Premier twice in the House if he would let me know when he was coming down to my area. I thought he signified that he would at least write me a letter. We never heard a word. ...

[Interjections] ... But we did appreciate the tour. I hope the cabinet doesn't think they know all of our concerns, and there are just a few I would like to go over very quickly, Mr. Speaker.

First, regarding the Suffield Block, we are expecting the provincial government to commit a large percentage of the gas in the block for uses in Medicine Hat and the Redcliff area. We have heard of industry [being] interested in locating in our area, but they need some kind of long-term commitment or contract for gas in that area. We think it is very important that the provincial government make some kind of a commitment to Medicine Hat and Redcliff. I am totally against piping the gas out of the area. I don't know what plans the provincial government has in that area, but there has been some talk that they are anticipating piping some of the gas out.

Regarding our library in Medicine Hat, I would like to direct this to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. Earlier in the spring, he had a report on libraries in the province. The report was completed sometime in June I believe. The report suggested that libraries in the province be funded, and be funded immediately. But the hon. Minister continues to do nothing, to sit on his pants. The library in Medicine Hat is in desperate need of money now. We can't wait. Requests have been made to the minister and he has turned a deaf ear.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, no.

MR. WYSE:

The Minister of Youth, Recreation and Culture ...

MR. SCHMID:

Culture, Youth and Recreation.

MR. WYSE:

... is vigorously giving out grants over the province. Nearly everywhere you go in southern Alberta there is some kind of grant the hon. minister is handing out, while the Medicine Hat Symphony Orchestra has been trying to get a grant for two years and we haven't succeeded. For two years applications ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please.

MR. WYSE:

We are looking for a ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. A disagreement as to facts does not constitute a point of privilege.

MR. WYSE:

We're looking for a \$1,000 grant this year, a thousand dollars.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Keep looking.

MR. WYSE:

I'd like to also mention to the ...

[Interjections]

MR. WYSE:

... I'm finished with you ... .. Minister of Municipal Affairs regarding Redcliff, a town in my constituency - I understand there are five towns in the province that have been paying on an old debt for a number of years and they contacted the hon. minister on it. They are: Redcliff, Tofield, Fort Macleod, Bassano and Athabasca, and they certainly would like some relief. Redcliff for instance only has a year or two left to pay on it, one year left. So with the extra money we have from our resources we would appreciate it if the minister would wipe out the last account. I hope he will take that under consideration anyway.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He just nodded.

MR. WYSE:

Good. Now I certainly agree with the hon. Member for Lethbridge West regarding more assistance to the young prospective home-owners in the province. These young families are having a difficult time trying to raise enough capital to buy a home. They can't secure the down payment and if they can, the interest rate is too high for them to afford it. When we can afford \$36 million dollars for an airline, it seems to me we can gear some of this money into this particular area which I think is pretty important. The housing shortage in Medicine Hat is really acute at this particular time.



Also, to the Minister of Lands and Forests, I understand that \$35 million has been guaranteed to Edmonton for a park or for upgrading the river through Edmonton. Some \$25 million dollars has been directed to Calgary for a park. We have a river that runs through Medicine Hat too, and all we are asking is our share. Our share, that's all we want. If the minister has money to dish out to Edmonton and Calgary, I think Medicine Hat should be entitled to some of the dollars. Certainly Elkwater is overcrowded and we need some upgrading there.

I'd like to make a couple of points to the hon. Minister of Health and Social Development. We require additional facilities in our hospital. I am sure the minister is aware of it. We've got to have some upgrading in our service areas at the hospital, in the laundry, in the kitchen. They are a real disgrace at this time. The working conditions are very very bad there and I am sure this has been brought to the minister's attention.

Another point is the data processing in Edmonton. There's a real bottleneck there. Last summer we had considerable problems getting some of the documents, pay cheques and the like processed through Edmonton. It took up to three months for one lady to get her cheque.

The local social workers are doing an excellent job, a great job. But the bottleneck is up here in Edmonton. I hope the minister will look into that particular problem.

Regarding the social aid, there's always going to be some abuse whenever a government agency or a government is giving out money. But I think more dollars should be given to the people who really need it. I know some widows with children, some handicapped people who are really finding it hard to get by. The most one crippled lady I know can get is \$150 a month. Seventy or eighty dollars of that has to go for housing and it leaves her not too many dollars to live on. These people are finding it very very difficult.

Now I have a number of other areas that I could speak on, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Premier suggested that Albertans all agree with the acquisition of PWA. Well we still haven't found out why the government bought it. In the House on Friday I asked the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs how many dollars PWA has outstanding, how many planes are leased, and how many are owned? And regarding the dollars that are outstanding, does the government have stand good for this? No answer. No reply. When the government indicated that they have the mandate from the people, well, I was just looking at the figures. We find that this government got into power with less than 33 per cent of the eligible voters in the province. Less than 33 per cent.

One last point, Mr. Speaker. I mentioned that no doubt the election will be called in the next few months. We're ready and I think it's imperative that the hon. Premier state before the election if he plans to go federal or not.

[Interjections]

MR. WYSE:

I think the people of this province have a right to know.

AN HON. MEMBER:

There you are. He's in the front bench.

MR. WYSE:

That's right. If the Premier will continue as leader of the PC party or if it will be turned over to the obvious first choice, the hon. minister, Mr. Copithorne.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I had planned to speak on the amendment but my few remarks I'm sure will have the same coverage as those when I was speaking on the main motion by the hon. the Premier.

I'm very very disappointed that the hon. Premier is not here. I think it was the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View who said the Premier does a hit and miss exercise in this House. I'm sure a man who moves a motion in this House, spends a whole hour or so telling us about all the good things or all the bad things that are going on in the province and then never appears so that anybody can question him or tell him directly to his face what we feel regarding his speech ... We may even want to, and I do congratulate him for what is going on. I do, in some cases. But I believe the hon. Premier owes it to this Legislature to be here.

I noticed the hon. members opposite became very flippant a few minutes ago when the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff mentioned that the premier should declare his intentions.

I believe this is one thing that is holding back the federal-provincial relations and is having a dire effect on our energy policy in this province. Now hon. members opposite can laugh if they want, but I am sure no prime minister, whether it be Prime Minister Trudeau or any other prime minister, is going to be too anxious to negotiate with someone from some other party who has political ambitions to run against him. I think that even the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, who I am sure will be the first to admit that his department might as well go out of existence - because as I listened to the hon. Premier the other day coming back with all the bad news from Ottawa that we aren't going to get anything here in Alberta by way of concessions which are so vital to our oil industry ...

I am glad the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals is here tonight. I am sure he will agree with me that in our city of Calgary we are in a very very serious situation as far as the oil industry is concerned. At the present time all major oil companies, and all small oil companies for that matter, are right in the critical budget state.

And what are they saying today? When are these two governments going to settle their differences so that we'll know where we fit into the program, so that we can go ahead and tell investors, whether they be in Canada or elsewhere, that this is going to be the policy, this is the program. Then the companies can decide whether they want to go ahead or not.

I am going to tell you that if this thing isn't settled fairly soon, the busiest people in Alberta are going to be the moving people, moving people out. The thing that concerns me is not that some of the engineers and some of that type will have problems. It's the administrators who are working for these oil companies, many of them for many years. It will be very very difficult for them to move away and find new jobs.

And so I say it's not that I would like to see the hon. Premier move away. As an Albertan, I would like to have him stay here. But if he has any political ambitions federally, I think he should announce them. Then I think we will be able to have someone in the front bench who will probably be in a better position to negotiate with the federal government. The Prime Minister of Canada then will be looking across at a man who he realizes is going to be a Premier, with no political ambitions to try to take him out of office.

I'm saying that in all sincerity. Because the situation is so bad in our oil industry that if we don't settle it, and settle it quickly, and get away from politics and get down to negotiations that will mean growth in our industry rather than the stalemate we're at, at the present time - I think the sooner this government decides that, the better.

Mr. Speaker, there are one or two other important things I would like to touch on. I always get amused at the hon. Premier. He said, we have no sales tax, we have no estate tax. Well gosh, we had that here in Alberta long before we got this great Arab windfall we now have. So my gosh, if we have to have a sales tax now, I don't know ... I don't think the public will go for that at all.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, they're really looking for a reduction in taxes. I was bitterly disappointed when the members opposite who seemed to think the fellow on the street in Alberta is quite happy with this government being the biggest money changer in Canada - I don't think that impresses the fellow who is working down at the Burns packing plant or the wage earner at Ogden shops or some of the other industries in my constituency. He wants to know what this government is going to do for him.

I notice there are quite a few fellows who are trying to jump on the Conservative bandwagon. I hope the hon. members opposite don't get excited with the idea that all these fellows are trying to jump on the bandwagon at nomination meetings.

And I have a warning, too, for some of the hon. members opposite who I give full credit for. They ran in the last election and they didn't have any hopes, maybe, of getting elected. Maybe they felt, well I'm going to take a chance and if I make it, fine. If I don't ... But now I see a lot of fellows who I know are bandwagon jumpers. They couldn't care less whether they get the nomination or not because they know as long as they mention in this province that they are a Tory, they'll have some kind of contract or some kind of pay-off. Talk about defeated Liberals looking for senatorships. They're pikers compared to some of these fellows.

What I'd like to do, Mr. Speaker, is point out a thing here - and I'm going to talk on this subject of free enterprise. I'm not going to touch on it too long. When you have fellows running for a party, they usually want to run for that party because it stands for the principles they believe in. Now here's a fellow who has announced he's going to run for the party opposite and says he wants to run on the Tory side, listen to this, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members, because the Lougheed administration needs a new - gee, they haven't been in very long but they already need something new; I thought he was going to say "a 'now' new" - "a strong infusion - listen to this - of basic, clear, undiluted free enterprise philosophy."

[Interjections.]

Mind you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members, this candidate has a lot of credentials. I won't bother reading them all. So it's not some fly-by-night fellow who's hoping he can say this with no hope of getting nominated. I think he has a good chance of being nominated. So you can see how concerned your own supporters are. You can see why we should be concerned. Things are really in a tough way and we're trying to help, wherever we can, to put this government on a straight and narrow path which we feel will be a constructive path.

This government has a very very sorry record ...

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Agreed.

MR. DIXON:

... when it comes to the abuse of people's rights. Just imagine how they treated the shareholders of Pacific Western Airlines. If somebody had run a cloak-and-dagger operation like this government has done on PWA, he would now be in front of the Attorney General explaining why he did it. But this government comes along and they've got all

kinds of fellows who can write pretty good press and pretty good reports. So the first day of the opening, what do we get hit with? As the hon. Leader of the opposition mentioned, just a great big snow job on why they took over PWA. I've read the thing. I can't see any reason yet why they took it over that could satisfy spending the kind of money they spent on it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Better than a railroad.

AN HON. MEMBER:

One hundred million dollars and we'll never make a profit.

MR. DIXON:

We can touch on that too, but I wonder now. There was no way we abused any shareholders.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right.

MR. DIXON:

And if our securities legislation means anything, Mr. Speaker, this government had better sit up and take notice or there's going to be a revolution here.

I think I would pay the bail for any man who's charged under our Securities Commission. I don't know how the government can lay a charge any more against anybody abusing the Securities Commission because all the poor fellow can tell the judge is, I'm only doing what the government is doing, what's so bad about that? Well, if it happens to be a liberal judge, he may get pretty good treatment.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, getting back, let's have a look at this so-called takeover deal of Pacific Western Airlines. I'm not going to get into the free enterprise versus the socialist aspect of it. We all know that the government shook its own supporters to the roots when it jumped in on this cloak-and-dagger operation.

What I'm trying to point out, Mr. Speaker, is the abuse of minority rights, in this case, the shareholders of Pacific Western Airlines. But of course, way back in 1935 when I was a boy, I can remember my father and mother talking about, Conservatives were always the people for big business. I thought, when the hon. Premier got into office, he meant what he would say, that they were for everybody. Well when you look at this Pacific Western Airlines deal, you can see once more they are for big business.

What does this government do? They go out to some secret meeting in Vancouver, they hire somebody to go there with some kind of message from this government. Apparently, from press reports, they say only three cabinet ministers were in on this deal. If that's democracy, we're in trouble. Anyway the thing I was amused at was when these two gentlemen went to Vancouver and there was supposed to be such secrecy about this deal, if press reports are right, and I have no reason to believe they aren't. You know James Bond couldn't have written a better book than this. Here it is. One fellow says, well I can't sit with you because somebody might know something about the deal. I would imagine 90 per cent of the people on that plane were from somewhere else in Canada. Now how in heaven's name would they have any idea if these two gentlemen sat together that the deal would come to light.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, private initiative has really suffered a setback in our province. What I'm concerned with more than anything else - if governments can get away with what the Alberta government did, by circumventing things ... Sure it was legal. But I think you have to ask the question: was it morally right. You know I'm sure there are a lot of learned lawyers on the other side who got their particular client off but in some cases it wasn't because he wasn't guilty. It was because he was lucky. Or he had a good lawyer maybe. But that doesn't make it right.

If you would just look at this deal, when Pacific Western Airlines was purchased by this government, the stock market was in rapid retreat. There have been millions of dollars lost on the stock market since June and July of this year, so few of the shareholders are going to complain too loudly about the price they received from Pacific Western Airlines stock. That's not my argument.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

What is your argument?

MR. DIXON:

I'm going to get to that and I'm glad the hon. Deputy Premier asked me that because he's going right into what I'm going to say ... [Interjections] ... And yet, as I was going to say, the whole deal needs a very critical second look. On August 1, Mr. Speaker, the Alberta government, as an unidentified buyer, offered \$13.37 a share for all the 2.3 million shares of PWA. These are the kind of tactics I don't like. Mr. Speaker, if they're going to hire somebody, let them be fair and not try to mislead the public of Canada and in particular the public of Alberta.

But here is the paper: "Mystery PWA buyer is a Canadian." That's nice to know. We'll start off that he's a Canadian. But when the stock exchange begins to ask, who is this Canadian, is it a fully Canadian company? Oh yes, it's a fully Canadian company. Well heaven's name, Mr. Speaker, when did a government become a fully Canadian company? That's

the type of thing that makes you wonder. We had the hon. Attorney General the other day - I'm not a legal man, I don't pretend to be - say something that the government wasn't a company, it wasn't an individual, it was something else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

A person.

MR. DIXON:

Well I wish they had been a little more personal with the shareholders of PWA. Then we read in The Edmonton Journal of October 26 that not only Art Dixon, the hon. Member for Calgary Millican, was concerned but lo and behold who is concerned with the actions of this very government? One of its top employees, Robert Scott, Chairman of the Alberta Securities Commission. He says the PWA takeover spurs security revisions.

MR. RUSTE:

They haven't silenced him yet, eh?

MR. DIXON:

No, but I guess one of these days they may be asking for his early retirement.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Down the road.

MR. DIXON:

He may be on his way out. I hope he isn't because I like a fellow to come out and say what he thinks, whether I agree with him or whether I don't.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Down the road.

MR. DIXON:

So if they try to move this honorable gentleman out of office, I think I would be the first one to make a motion that the Legislature try to get the government to reconsider its decision.

Listen to this: "Takeover bids are being studied by all the commissions in Canada." Boy, this PWA, didn't it stir things up right across Canada, because under present conditions some shareholders can be left out in the cold when it comes to a takeover bid.

We'll go further, Mr. Speaker, in my few minutes that are left, and go into this so-called takeover. The first question I would like to ask is why the government would pay the highest price ever for PWA shares.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Come off it.

MR. DIXON:

You know, Mr. Speaker, I believe it was the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs - or maybe I might stand corrected, it may have been the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce - the other day mentioned when this deal was first talked about. Apparently from what one of the hon. ministers mentioned in his question, it was first talked about in June. Well, if you look over the shareholders list here, the actual sales of shares doubled in that month which is usually a quiet one on the stock exchange.

I have other reports here from Richardson [Securities of Canada] which keeps a running account on all companies here. I can show it to the hon. members, table it or whatever they wish to do with it. But it shows that [in] the takeover by the Federal Grain Company or the White Pass & Yukon railway company which is a subsidiary of theirs, they were going to offer anywhere from \$10 but not more than \$12 a share. Do you know what the investment brokers and analysts were saying? Well, if you made that kind of offer for PWA, you would have to proration the shares. What they mean by "proration the shares" is that they'd probably get more shares than they would need in order to get the 60 per cent control they're after. Yet this government comes along a few days later and pays us 70 per cent bonus.

I'm sure the members opposite - and many of them have been interested in stock exchanges and in stock activity - know that the usual bonus to take over any company is anywhere from 25 to 30 per cent over the quoted share price on the stock exchange. In this case, we had a lot of the taxpayers' money so it wasn't so important, just as the hon. Member for Cardston pointed out a few minutes ago. With government money it's a little different from shareholders' money so it was okay to pay that bonus.

Mr. Speaker, another thing I was quite interested in. The other day when I was listening quite intently to the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, he said we want to go to the major stockholders and tell them we have an anxious buyer. Boy, isn't that a salesman's dream. An anxious buyer. And that's exactly what happened.

So we had an open wallet approach and we paid over 70 per cent bonus. During the end of the first day of trading under the offer made through the Toronto and Vancouver stock exchanges, almost 80 per cent of the shares traded hands. Now my complaint is this, Mr. Speaker: as a party, I think a government, any government, whether it be the present

government in Alberta or any other government, is more duty-bound to be honest and fair in their dealings than even a company because in companies there's a lot more competition. But no, what did this government do? Four hundred thousand shares by Canada Trust and 400,000 shares by the directors, and they didn't tell any of the other shareholders what was going on.

Now a lot of these people had rushed to sell their shares. Fine. As it turned out, because the stock market has dropped, they get a pretty good thing out of it. But if the stock market hadn't dropped, they could have been taken. This is my complaint.

Let's walk through this deal once more, because it was not just another corporation takeover. We used tax money gleaned, of course, from the higher petroleum revenues to transfer a healthy corporation. It wasn't in trouble. Other people were willing to buy it. Other private enterprise, Canadians, were willing to buy it. It wasn't some mystery foreign company that wanted to buy it. It was a Canadian company that wanted to buy it. But here we are, we transfer a healthy corporation enterprise from private to public ownership.

I still maintain, Mr. Speaker, the further I study this takeover, more than ever I'm convinced that the shareholders' rights were abused. The particular takeover technique employed was crudely insensitive to the broader rights of the PWA shareholders - surprisingly so, when you consider that Alberta is one of the 11 governments in Canada that is responsible for enacting and upholding security legislation.

Mr. Speaker, takeover law must consider the interests of many parties, but its primary emphasis must be on the welfare of the target company's existing shareholders. But of course, there's the old Tory and Conservative angle again. What do they care about the little guy. He doesn't mean anything. We are only interested in Canada Trust, with 400,000 shares, and the directors, with the other 400,000 shares. Sacrifice the other people. It doesn't matter. We don't need to tell them a thing.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this government, when it got control of that 800,000 shares, could have told the people that instant they were going to buy those shares, in particular when they were offering \$13 a share. They still would have got the shares. Wouldn't it have been a nicer and a fairer deal to let the little fellow know what was going on. But no.

The trouble with the Conservative party over the years is they have never been for the little fellow. I like a lot of things Conservatives once stood for, but one thing they have never been known to do is to support the little fellow.

The nub of the PWA case, Mr. Speaker, is that the government chose to plunge through a very wide gap in shareholder protection. Most of the existing laws and regulations are based on the assumption that a formal takeover bid will not be through the facilities of the stock exchange. Let's emphasize that. Usually, if people want to be honest in a takeover, they go to the shareholders and try to buy from the shareholders rather than trying to rush off to the stock exchange once they have satisfied the major shareholders, which in this case happened to be two, two out of the thousands of shareholders in PWA.

I'm not going to go into usual takeover procedure, but I'm sure most hon. members know how that is done. It is not usually done the way the government did it.

Ottawa may want to ask some questions on this, Mr. Speaker. Alberta chose to take advantage of a major exemption in takeover law by making a cash offer through the exchange for all PWA shares. It did not have to disclose its identity in advance or allow shareholders the right to change their minds. Wouldn't it have been nice if we could have given the minority shareholders, the little guy, an opportunity to look at it, to see whether he wanted to buy or change his mind and not sell. No, we didn't do that.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, the deal could be well within legal terms. But legal terms sometimes aren't the right terms where morals are involved. This is well within the letter of the law, but perhaps not in keeping with the intent of the law.

Mr. Speaker, I've done some arithmetic on this case, and in my investigations - and in any investigations, when you consider that White Pass & Yukon were afraid that if they offered \$10 a share they would get more than they would need for the 60 per cent takeover - the people of Alberta paid in the neighborhood of \$10 million too much for PWA.

We have 50,000 people on very low incomes in this province. Just take out your pencils, hon. members, and you will see that will be \$300 for some fellow or lady on low income in Alberta. Three hundred dollars would have bought him an overcoat this winter and would also have given him about \$300 grocery money. I think that would have done more good with taxpayers' money than in the hands of the major shareholders in the PWA deal.

I believe I have [made] the \$10 million figure low. I think investigation will prove we paid about \$15 million too much. But I'm trying to be fair on this deal. I think it's \$10 million too much.

The hon. members can laugh all they want. I would just like to remind them as late as tonight's paper - and I just wish the hon. members would pay attention.

I hope PWA doesn't fail. But I think I should add a little warning here. Pan American World Airways last year had a profit of \$1 million, or a little over a million. This year they are \$300 million in the red. They are in the world cargo business. It scares me, when I hear the hon. Premier and the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce saying, well we have great visions of the world cargo business.

I say to the hon. members opposite and to the Premier, in particular, let's take a second look before we jump off that bridge because that could cost the taxpayers a lot of money. If the world air cargo business, if Pan American World Airways that has more landing rights than any other airline in the world covering almost every country of the

world, is in the difficulty it's in, I am sure it wouldn't be too long before our own Pacific Western Airlines is in trouble.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think we are going to see the day that Pacific Western Airlines will be moving out of British Columbia if the board of transport has anything to say about it, and I am sure it has because it has the last say. They are serving 25 centres in British Columbia. I believe we have about five centres it serves in Alberta and eleven in The Northwest Territories. I think if this government wants to be honest with the people - when the question was asked in the House, are they going to move the headquarters here, there was a lot of stalling and jumping around. I think if you look at it realistically, it is not going to come here so jobs aren't going to be brought here. I always get a kick out of and appreciate it when the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce talks about Alberta opportunity loans. He always says, well they've loaned money to a barber shop or something else and they are going to employ two people, or they have put it into a trailer factory and they are going to employ 500. I think if you look at the PWA deal, most of the employees or a great part of them on the payroll are over in British Columbia. I'm not opposed to British Columbia. They are Canadians just like we are.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, the government has already bought PWA much to the disappointment and chagrin of a lot of their own supporters. What I am mainly concerned about tonight, Mr. Speaker, is my own constituency of Calgary Millican and the thousands of people who are employed in the oil industry. We will reach within the next two weeks a very very critical point. Tonight it was announced that the federal budget will be brought down on November 18. If I read the Premier right, there is no hope for any relief from the original budget that was presented by the federal government when it had a minority last year. I can only see it being tougher. So two or three things must happen. One is, I mentioned earlier, I think the Premier should announce his intentions if he has any political ambitions to run against Mr. Trudeau as one of the leaders of the particular party he would like to run with. I believe there should be a decision made very very quickly and that the provincial government should announce its plans. If the budget turns out that the plans don't need to be implemented, fine and dandy. But I think right now is the time we should be indicating to the industry and the thousands of people working in that industry just what this government intends to do in order that our industry will go ahead rather than fall back.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister for Industry and Commerce.

MR. PEACOCK:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

May the hon. minister adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN:

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

MR. SPEAKER:

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

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

[The House rose at 11:04 p.m.]