

## LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Friday, January 31, 1975

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

## PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

## Bill 19 The Co-operative Associations Amendment Act, 1975

MR. COOKSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Co-operative Associations Amendment Act, 1975.

The bill basically makes provision for co-operatives across Canada to combine, and it also makes provision for REAs to remove materials which are no longer in operation.

[Leave being granted, Bill 19 was introduced and read a first time.]

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill 19, The Co-operative Associations Amendment Act, be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[The motion was carried.]

## Bill 202 The Lie Detector Act

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being Bill 202, The Lie Detector Act.

This bill provides that only members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, a municipal police force or a person authorized by the Attorney General may operate a lie detector.

[Leave being granted, Bill 202 was introduced and read a first time.]

## TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. YURKO:

Mr. Speaker, during 1974 the Environment Conservation Authority, in conjunction with the Department of Advanced Education and the Department of Education, held the first Alberta conference on environmental education. As a matter of fact, I think it was the first in Canada. I am pleased to table today the report of the public advisory committee to that educational conference, as well as the proceedings of that conference.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the annual report of the Department of Highways and Transport, 1973-74. Mr. Speaker, I have only two copies today, but the rest should be here on Monday.

I am also tabling with them certain other documents required by law.

#### MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

##### Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, today it is the government's great pleasure to announce further details of a program revealed in the Throne Speech, a program which is in fact an investment in Alberta's bright future, a program which will enrich the quality of our lives and the lives of all future Albertans.

This \$200 million program is, Mr. Speaker, undoubtedly the most significant step ever taken in Canada towards the development of recreation.

Two objectives of the provincial government are to encourage the orderly and coordinated development of recreational activities and facilities to improve the quality of life in Alberta and to encourage further contributions by volunteer organizations to the province's recreational life.

To meet a multitude of public demands for major multipurpose recreation/cultural facilities throughout the province, the government has formulated the new financial assistance program effective April 1, 1975.

The program will encourage and support shared-cost contribution and cooperative planning between municipal authorities and service organizations, ethno-cultural groups, exhibition associations, universities, colleges, schools and other agencies towards the development of major public facilities.

Assistance totalling \$200 million will be contributed to projects undertaken over the next 10-year period. Funds, averaging \$20 million per year, will be available on the basis of the following guidelines:

Regional and municipal multipurpose projects will receive a higher level of funding, enabling the cooperative development of facilities on a regional basis which might not be possible if communities attempted such development on their own. Projects in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary will qualify as regional developments.

At least one third of the amount available to municipalities is to be for projects funded cooperatively with local organizations, service clubs, ethno-cultural groups or other incorporated groups and agencies.

A minimum of 25 per cent of the total funds available is for the purpose of providing recreation-cultural facilities. These may be developed in conjunction with, or separate from, recreation-sport facilities.

Not more than half of the total funds available under this program per year may be used for retirement of debt of previously built recreational facilities. Construction of new facilities, renovations or additions, however, will receive a higher priority.

Mr. Speaker, this program will allow the people of Alberta to provide for themselves multipurpose facilities such as a combination theatre, art gallery and library; a combination arts and crafts centre, arena or curling rink; an arena to serve a variety of activities such as hockey, skating, figure skating, tennis and rodeo. As well, this program will allow single-purpose facilities such as winter ski areas, a craft centre, bowling alleys or residential outdoor camps.

Funds for projects in large population centres should be distributed to more than one facility and to more than one area in a community. And, since it is important that all projects be compatible with the overall recreational development of the community, the endorsement of the municipal or regional recreation board and municipal council or representative municipality is therefore required before the application is approved.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Alberta have worked diligently to build the society we now enjoy. Hard work is the backbone of any thriving society. But it is critical to remember that healthy human beings need the release that recreation and cultural activities provide.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that this program will provide a most solid foundation for that release and, in doing so, will enable Albertans to work even harder to build our province and our future.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, we welcome the announcement made by the minister today. We've waited with bated breath for some time for this announcement to be made, and I would have to say that we are somewhat disappointed when we hear the announcement today. To talk in terms of \$200 million over 10 years. If you go back over the last 10 years and take the wide variety of possible projects that the minister includes in his announcement today, I am sure that the amount would not be a great deal less than \$150 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. CLARK:

We might go on, Mr. Speaker ... we can go on, Mr. Speaker.

[Interjections]

We recognize when we hit the pups across the way, they howl.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's right.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How about the wind?

MR. CLARK:

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we recognize that to a very great degree this program is necessary because of the very uncoordinated way during the last three years we have had, through agricultural societies, spring up in the province a large number of facilities which are needed but which are not integrated with the recreational boards and recreational operations across the province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. CLARK:

Members on both sides of the House well know of a number of agricultural societies now, and recreation boards, which are in trouble because of a lack of coordinated planning, not just over the past three years but over the past five to seven years in this particular area.

The third point, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make is this: one of the very heartening aspects of the announcement made by the minister today deals with shared facilities for libraries, theatres and cultural groups. Hopefully this will go hand in hand with a final decision by the government as to assistance to libraries across the province, and a more active role will be taken in the area of coordination between educational facilities, recreational facilities and recreation boards.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

#### Syncrude Discussions

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I got such a great response from my friends across the way I almost forgot that it was question period.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Premier if he is in a position to indicate to the Assembly at this time the state of negotiations between Syncrude and the Province of Alberta and if he can also shed any further light on the announcement which came from Ottawa yesterday.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, no I cannot. The discussions are ongoing and in this particular case, as distinguished from the previous negotiations, are even more complicated and more delicate because we have not only the Syncrude partners, but we have the federal government, the Ontario government, Shell Canada and perhaps others. So the discussions are ongoing. I certainly will attempt to report to the Legislature as soon as there is something concrete that I can advise.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Will the officials of Syncrude be meeting with representatives of the Province of Ontario in the course of negotiations at this stage?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that they have already met with the Government of Ontario and no doubt will be again as the discussions proceed.

MR. CLARK:

Further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Who is the ranking or senior Alberta official available in Ottawa at this particular time, should there be need for consultation with Alberta during these discussions in Ottawa?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader perhaps doesn't understand the way in which we approach the matter. We reached a decision some time ago that when we are dealing with cabinet ministers or deputy ministers of the federal government, it's much more effective to be dealing on a direct basis by telephone on a constant basis between the cabinet ministers involved in both the federal and Alberta government, rather than interjecting some intermediary in the position. That was an evaluation we took some time ago.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. Premier advise if the government has now received any or all of the assessment studies which they commissioned?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, we have not. We have, I think, received some draft or preliminary information, but not the studies. It probably will be during the course of next week or the week after before they are finalized.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Can the Premier advise the Assembly what the status is of the so-called deadline. Is there in fact a de facto extension of the deadline?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I think, as I said yesterday, we've never accepted a position of any sort of deadline. Certainly the Syncrude participants as business corporations can make a decision, but we haven't accepted any deadline. All we are trying to do is work with other parties involved in the public interest to see if it is possible to pull this situation together and at the same time do it in a way that is both in the Canadian and the public interest.

MR. NOTLEY:

Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did the participants in the discussions yesterday indicate they would be prepared to carry on the project?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure hon. members do not want to prejudice the discussions at this stage by any sort of comment on my part with regard to the nature of the discussions.

Certainly we took the position that we reiterated to them, as we did in the House yesterday, that if there was any deadline or ultimatum being put to the Alberta government, there was just simply no way in which we could respond in the time period of - I guess it's midnight tonight, January 31, in terms of a request for some \$1 billion. So it's really a matter now in the hands of the companies to decide. I believe our position is the same as the federal government's.

MR. NOTLEY:

Just one final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Was there any discussion yesterday of interim financing, or any possibility of assistance in the form of loans or what have you from the province?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that's exactly on the point of dealing with the nature of the discussions and I don't want to prejudice the discussions. When I have something concrete to report to the House, I will.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Premier. Has the apparent offer of Ottawa to participate in the Syncrude project been made contingent upon help being offered by Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I'm at liberty in terms of discussions to advise hon. members generally as to what is occurring relative to the time of discussions, but I can't respond at this time to that question.

MR. LUDWIG:

Has the position of Alberta's investment in Syncrude been made? Is it an open-door policy or has the Premier made an adamant refusal to participate in the project?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, again I would have to respond the same way.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question if I may to the Premier. Because of the fact that the federal government has offered help, did the companies indicate that there will be an extension of time for making final arrangements?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I can't speak for the companies on that basis. They have made their public statements with regard to a time period expiring tonight. Whether or not they follow through with it, we will just have to see.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the provincial government made any plans or has it any policy to deal with the imminent shut-down of Syncrude at Fort McMurray?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that's a hypothetical question.

MR. LUDWIG:

It is not a hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a further supplementary question to the Premier. Has the Premier been in contact, or does he plan conversations by telephone or any other mechanism, with the Prime Minister at this time?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, the discussions that are ensuing are between the hon. minister, Mr. Macdonald, and Mr. Getty our Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, and our Minister of Mines and Minerals, Mr. Dickie. If necessary, such conversations will occur. In any event I will be meeting the Prime Minister on February 11.

#### Canada-Cities Service

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier. It's to do with one of the remaining partners in the consortium, Canada-Cities Service Ltd.

Is one of the problems - which hasn't had too much publicity - the fact that they would also like to sell a portion of their part of it? What I'm trying to say is do they wish to sell part of their interest in Syncrude? Is that causing extra financial burden on the money that is going to be needed to fill up where ARCO has abandoned?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I can speak for Cities Service on that basis, and I've noticed no public comment to that effect by them.

I believe a week ago I did answer the Member for Drumheller that with respect to Atlantic Richfield that was a factor in their decision, but they made it quite clear that on its own it was not a critical factor.

#### National Parks - Land Transfers

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I would have liked to have directed this question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, but will in his absence either to the hon. Premier or the minister in charge of northern development.

Can the Premier advise the Assembly what the position of the Alberta government is with respect to the transfer of land out of Wood Buffalo Park?

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to indicate at this time that the only information I have is that there's some correspondence between the federal minister and our Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the hon. minister in charge of northern development advise whether there is a meeting planned on this particular subject with Mr. Buchanan when he's in Alberta next week?

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, at the moment I'm not aware of one on that subject.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Has the government developed any overall policy with respect to the transfer of land out of national parks?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I don't know that you could respond on the basis of overall policy, because we have a number of very different situations involving the national parks in the

province. The hon. member is aware of course of the townsite situations with regard to Banff, Jasper; aware too of the situation with regard to Wood Buffalo Park. We really think that each one of these decisions, in terms of public policy, should be dealt with on its own merits.

#### Senior Citizens Complex - Calgary

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Public Works. Can he advise what price the government paid for that property on 16th Avenue and 6th Street [NE] on which they are going to be building a senior citizens complex?

DR. BACKUS:

Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that under advisement. I don't have the actual figure before me right at the moment.

MR. LUDWIG:

While the minister is going to find the answer to that question, could he also advise at the same time whether the property was tendered for, whether it was expropriated or whether it was a negotiated agreement price?

#### Coal Sales to Ontario

MR. TAYLOR:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals. Is the minister able to report any progress in getting Alberta coal into the Ontario market?

MR. DICKIE:

We've had a number of discussions, Mr. Speaker, on that question, and I think the only progress I can report is particularly in respect to the underground mines that exist now in the Drumheller area. The thought has been put forth, and we have advanced it to Ontario, that they could perhaps look at part of the coal from the underground mines in existence in Drumheller.

Although that production isn't enough to satisfy the Ontario needs, it might be worked with other, say, surface mines from other parts of Alberta to give the production they need. That proposal is now under consideration.

MR. TAYLOR:

A supplementary. Did the hon. minister get any information from the Premier of Ontario as to the results of the testing done on Drumheller coals in the factories of Ontario?

MR. DICKIE:

Mr. Speaker, I think the mention of the Premier - there is no information. But during the course of the conversations we've had, my recollection was that there were certain problems with the coal, but they could design and with the proper blending be able to utilize it.

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. What is the current royalty rate for coal?

MR. DICKIE:

The current royalty rate is set by statute, and that's 10 cents a ton.

#### School Act - Student Dropouts

MR. ANDERSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Education. Is the Department of Education considering any modifications to The School Act which would permit students under the minimum school-leaving age to be dropped out on the recommendations of the teachers and parents?

MR. HYNDMAN:

Mr. Speaker, I think the department wouldn't be amending the act, but the subject is one on which we have had a number of submissions. It relates particularly, I think, to the last two grades of senior high school and [is] an area where certainly we are now

receiving recommendations and submissions from parents. I have also spoken to a number of high school students.

There are a number of optional ways in which one might proceed. Whether legislative amendment would be required I am not sure. I think it could be done under regulation but it's something I would like to discuss further with people, including those in the education field and also MLAs. So if the hon. gentleman has some suggestions or comments on the area, I would be happy to hear from him at this time.

#### Compulsory Vehicle Inspection

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Highways. Would the hon. minister consider bringing back compulsory vehicle inspection to a limited degree by ensuring that all used vehicles meet certain safety standards and undergo inspection before being sold by Alberta dealers?

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, we are evaluating continually the various methods of making the automobiles on the highway safe.

#### Snowmobiles - Provincial Parks

MR. WYSE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests. I understand the federal government is allowing limited snowmobiling in federal parks. Is the provincial government considering the same policy for provincial parks?

DR. WARRACK:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware whether the national parks have now provided that snowmobiles can be used in them or not; they may very well have.

We have considered that matter very carefully, including the subject as brought forward by people in the area the member represents. In keeping with the representations we have had over the last three and a half years and as stated in our parks position paper, we have felt, on balance, that provincial parks should not permit the use of snowmobiles.

MR. DRAIN:

On the same subject, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister: is any consideration being given by his department to zoning the winter feeding areas of big game where they are infringed upon by the intrusion of snowmobiles?

I'm aware of a couple of areas traditionally used by moose, where people, not unknowingly, frighten and scare these animals on a continuing basis and it's quite unnecessary, Mr. Speaker - I'm getting to the question, Mr. Speaker, very rapidly. These particular areas can be identified.

DR. WARRACK:

I am having some difficulty perceiving the import of the member's question. But in any case certainly, as I said, we are not permitting the use of snowmobiles in provincial parks. So I would not think there would be an impact of snowmobile use on ungulates in provincial parks - if that is the question.

MR. WYSE:

A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Did I understand the minister to say that he has received considerable representation from people in southeastern Alberta asking that skidoos be allowed on a limited basis in Cypress Hills Provincial Park?

DR. WARRACK:

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that is correct and I'm shocked if the hon. member doesn't know about it.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, we will start out on a new theme and direct our endeavors in this particular question directly to the question. I'm proceeding now as expeditiously as I can, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the question is: is there any thought given by the hon. minister to, in fact, banning snowmobiles in the areas that are used as feeding grounds by big game? This would not apply to a vast area.

DR. WARRACK:

Yes, I think the hon. member is referring to the critical winter-range areas for the big game.

This is one of the representations, and I think an important one, that was put before the Environment Conservation Authority report - they have made some observations on that point. I think that's one of the considerations that needs to be regarded very seriously as we look towards the land-use planning and any possible zoning such as the hon. member is suggesting. I think it's worth very serious consideration.

#### Grasshopper Outbreak Forecast

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Agriculture. I was wondering whether the department or the government is planning any additional programs as a result of the forecast of a serious outbreak of grasshoppers this coming year in eastern Alberta and southern parts?

DR. HORNER:

Mr. Speaker, the department in its usual way is attempting to keep up and to be able to forecast the manner and the amount of grasshopper infestation that might occur in any given year, at the same time maintaining some supplies of chemical on hand so they can be dealt with. That will be an ongoing situation.

#### AECB - Feasibility Study

MR. MANDEVILLE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the Alberta Energy Conservation Board completed its feasibility study on the proposed Pan-Canadian hydrous ammonia plant at Bow City near Brooks?

MR. PFACOCK:

Mr. Speaker, no, they haven't. As I understand though, they are well advanced along their findings and the report should be forthcoming in the near future.

#### Recreation Program

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation with regard to his announcement today. I'd like to ask: do swimming pools qualify for funds under the announced program?

MR. SCHMID:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, all recreational facilities qualify under the program depending, of course, on the type of facility. It is either multipurpose or semipurpose. That item decides what the percentage of social assistance will be.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. minister has answered part of my supplementary question. What are the amounts and are there going to be some maximums established for projects such as this or any other projects?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, the maximum of course would be the population figure at the time of application. In other words, if I may take a place like Fort McMurray right now, if the population let's say is 15,000, they would be eligible for \$1,500,000 at the time of application. Now if three years down the road the population increases to 40,000, they would then of course be eligible for an additional \$2,500,000.

MR. R. SPEAKER:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the program outlined by the minister provide funding into integrated programs with present-day school complexes? For example, can you integrate a swimming pool complex with the gymnasium with a community-type function with a set of rooms?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, there again I think the outstanding example is that if our MLA from Grande Prairie worked together with Grande Prairians, the combination of the school, community and service clubs is a typical example where this can be done - an arena, a swimming pool and school facilities provided in one area for one project.

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Would the capital assistance be available for renovation projects?



MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, yes. Since the last government under the previous assistance program provided only 20 cents per capita for cities and only \$1.60 per capita for other areas ...

[Interjections]

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. Order please.

MR. SCHMID:

Under this ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. minister's lead in the direction of debate may be only too readily followed by the opposition.

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, under this program, since it is now \$10 per capita, certainly renovations and additions are provided for.

MR. CLARK:

A supplementary question. Can certain portions of this money be allocated to private developments, i.e. ski developments let's say in the Edson or west of Calgary areas?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, it can, of course, only be provided for if the facility is municipally-owned or owned eventually by the people of Alberta. The reason I say that is actually, let's say there is a Lions centre, or the Kinsmen centre here in Edmonton - they are going to provide a swimming pool for the citizens of Edmonton. Something along that line, of course, would be eligible because it's a registered society.

MR. CLARK:

A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. In light of the minister's answer, Mr. Speaker, is he saying that the ownership of the facility will then have to be in the hands either of the municipality or the provincial government?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, the ownership could rest with a service organization also, providing that the municipality agrees that the service organization is eligible under this program because the facilities are going to be used by the community.

MR. TAYLOR:

Supplementary to the hon. minister. Is the government by any chance one of the anonymous donors to the swimming pool at the Prime Minister's residence?

[Laughter]

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, through the oil royalties of Canada - from which I am quite sure some of the donors have royalties or dividends - indirectly, we definitely are.

[Laughter]

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I assume that it's going to be on a first come, first served basis. But is there going to be any formula at all developed to allocate this \$200 million over the 10 years each year in the different communities, or will it be on the basis of projects as they arise on a first come, first served basis?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, the caucus of this government very thoroughly discussed this matter and felt that, in all fairness to the people of Alberta, the projects should be considered as they come in and as they are being built; that's the way the money would be allocated.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. minister makes frequent reference to the amount of grants he is making, is he taking into account the fact that the Conservative dollar is a much cheaper dollar, Mr. ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

## Human Rights Commission

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the hon. Premier and he can pass it along to whichever minister would be responsible.

It's regarding the meeting of the Human Rights Commission in Calgary on December 3, which ran through to December 15, where they were going to review, Mr. Speaker, a number of things including the reclassification of positions, Schmidt v. the Calgary School Board, and legal opinions concerning massage parlors. I just wondered if we'd had any report back from the commission on some of these. There are four or five others.

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, I had a brief informal discussion with the chairman of the commission, Dr. Wyman, not too long ago. He didn't raise those matters with me so I'll have to take the hon. member's question as notice and discuss it with the various ministers involved.

## Alberta Racing Commission

MR. WILSON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the hon. Solicitor General. Would the hon. Solicitor General advise if the government has made a decision regarding appointments to the Alberta Racing Commission for 1975?

MISS HUNLEY:

That matter has been under considerable review, Mr. Speaker, and I expect to be making an announcement shortly.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the government decided to enlarge the membership on the Alberta Racing Commission?

MISS HUNLEY:

That's not a closed issue, Mr. Speaker. We have not expanded the membership on the racing commission, although I am open for suggestions if we deem it in the best interests of the racing fraternity and the public of Alberta.

MR. WILSON:

Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Solicitor General. In making the appointment, has the government taken into consideration the interests of the various racing enterprises in Alberta? I am thinking in terms of the various breed associations.

MISS HUNLEY:

Yes we have, Mr. Speaker. We try to make all our decisions on the basis of what is best for the public of Alberta and this one will be done the same way.

## Recreation Program (continued)

DR. PAPROSKI:

Another question to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. In view of his comments that the support for recreational facilities is 10 times higher under this government than the previous government ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

DR. PAPROSKI:

I'll go on with my question then, Mr. Speaker, and limit it. Is it true that the support relative to the other provinces is the highest in Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

---

Agricultural Societies Aid

MR. KING:

In light of comments made earlier by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture could advise whether or not his department has received any requests from agricultural societies in the province for emergent aid?

DR. HORNER:

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we haven't. I was interested in the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition because my information is that they work very well and do work in close coordination with the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation.

## Recreation Program (continued)

MR. CLARK:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation regarding his announcement today. Is it a fair assessment that only moneys of the \$200 million will be paid out from his department at the request and approval of municipalities?

MR. SCHMID:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the municipality, the elected official, the mayor and/or, of course, council would have to approve the applications for these funds, even if they are paid through a service organization.

Maybe I should explain that 30 per cent of this fund, in other words \$30 out of \$100, would have to be spent in cooperation with a service organization, whether an ethno-cultural group or something like the Kinsmen, Rotarians or whoever they are, if they prepare, plan or build a project for a community.

## National Parks - Land Transfers (continued)

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister Without Portfolio in charge of northern affairs. It's a follow-up question to one I asked a few moments ago.

In view of the fact that there are Indian land claims in Wood Buffalo Park, my question to the minister is: has your department reviewed those land claims?

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, to this particular point in time we have not received any official description of the land claim per se, so I really haven't anything to review at this point.

MR. NOTLEY:

A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is it the government's intention to contact Ottawa to find out what the land claims in fact represent, as it would have some provincial implications as well?

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, at the moment I would assume that the federal government in Ottawa would be contacting us after they have completed their negotiations with the Native people involved.

MR. NOTLEY:

One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, either to the Minister Without Portfolio in charge of northern development or the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Can either minister advise the Assembly whether it is true that there are very substantial gypsum deposits in the area of the land claims at this point in time?

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to pass that to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I am aware of rumors that in fact there are some deposits but I can't substantiate that.

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Has the federal government made any suggestions to the province that they may be requesting land outside Wood Buffalo Park for the Indian reserves which are outstanding at the time?

MR. ADAIR:

Mr. Speaker, would you repeat the question please?

MR. STROM:

Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is: has the federal government made any request to the province for land outside Wood Buffalo Park to satisfy the outstanding claims for a reserve in the Fort Chip area?

MR. ADAIR:

Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY:

Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question to the hon. minister. In the event that the federal government moves on the land claim, would the Government of Alberta be prepared to give an undertaking to ask Ottawa to hold public hearings before any land is taken out of the national park?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

Possibly the hon. member could ask that question in the event that the hypothesis on which it's based comes to pass.

#### Kirby Commission

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Attorney General. Can he give us some indication as to when we might expect a further report from the Kirby Commission?

MR. LEITCH:

No, Mr. Speaker, I can't give any positive dates as to when we might expect the report. I know that the members of the commission are working very hard at it and I know that they had hoped to have another interim report, that is one dealing with the provincial courts, very soon.

MR. LUDWIG:

Supplementary to the hon. Attorney General. Has he met with officials in Calgary, and has he taken any steps in the critical court reporter situation that exists in both the provincial court and the Supreme Court in Calgary at the present time?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the honorable gentleman has raised that question because it does give me the opportunity to outline what this government has done during the past three and a half years to cure a situation with the court reporters which has existed for a long time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. Attorney General appears to be predicting a ministerial announcement.

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, as I understood it, the question was whether we have met with the officials in Calgary regarding that problem and what steps we have taken to cure it.

The steps, Mr. Speaker, are these: in the past three and a half years we've increased the full-time court reporter positions from 56 to 98, which is an increase of some 70 per cent. We have also, Mr. Speaker, begun a course in NAIT which is graduating court reporters at somewhere between 8 and 10 students per year. I have, Mr. Speaker, also had a committee working on it for some time, and have been talking with the people in Calgary. We think this serious problem is finally on the way to being resolved.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, can the hon. Attorney General, in light of his information on the increase in court reporters, advise how many new court reporters Calgary got and how many have quit and left the service?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member is undoubtedly aware that that question is eminently fitted for the Order Paper.

MR. LUDWIG:

A further supplementary then. Is the Attorney General satisfied that the court reporter situation in Calgary is under control at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member will undoubtedly also be aware that a question which as directly as that elicits an opinion is not in order in the question period.

MR. LUDWIG:

Further supplementary. When was the last time that the hon. Attorney General has been in touch with the officials at Calgary and has discussed this issue - the latest time?

MR. LEITCH:

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last I was in Calgary and had a ...

[Interjections]

... and had a discussion regarding the court reporter situation.

MR. LUDWIG:

And was the hon. Attorney General advised that the court reporter situation in Calgary had become very critical at that time?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, order.

#### Billy's Guide

MR. SORENSON:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Premier. Could the hon. Premier advise the Assembly how he had the good fortune to be featured on Billy's Guide to Where It's At in Edmonton ...

[Laughter]

... along with such a company of talented artists who I hope are in a much different line?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, having been asked a similar question in the fall, and having been burned on it, I'm very cautious about responding. I'll check.

[Laughter]

#### Recreation Program (continued)

MR. FRENCH:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation. It's with reference to the ministerial statement earlier this morning. Will there be formal applications prepared to process these grants and, if so, when will they be available?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, of course the program will be effective after the budget of next year is approved and applications will be sent out then which will be made as simple as possible so any service organization if necessary can apply for it also.

MR. DRAIN:

Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation should add to the popularity that he has this morning here in the Legislature.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is this: is this new program announced today flexible enough to include a situation where a library is built in conjunction with a town hall or office?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned in the announcement, certainly libraries are included and if the municipality, town or even hamlet feel they would like to include that in their building plans, they are certainly eligible to apply.

#### Syncrude - Oil Sands Investment

MR. WYSE:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. the Premier. I'm not sure if the figures have been made public at this time, but what is the approximate investment in the oil sands project in terms of dollars by Syncrude at the present time? I've heard various figures from \$100 million up to a half a ...

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, rather than respond to that question off the top of my head I think I would prefer to wait for the report from Price Waterhouse, which I mentioned a week ago,

because it will be dealing specifically with that question and will give us better information.

#### Crude Oil Price

MR. WYSE:

One other supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the provincial government committed to the \$6.50 price of crude oil until June, or can the province raise it earlier?

MR. LOUGHEED:

Mr. Speaker, that's a subject I would like to deal with further on debate in the Legislature as the session proceeds.

#### Olympic Games

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the very popular minister this morning, the Minister of Youth, Culture and "Donations".

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Minister, in light of the fact that we have so many facilities here in Alberta, I'm wondering if you have ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Would the hon. member please avoid a certain pronoun.

MR. DIXON:

Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. minister is: has his department or this government been in touch with the Olympic officials in Montreal regarding the possibility of moving some of it to Alberta, as apparently they aren't going to be able to complete all the facilities there?

MR. SCHMID:

Mr. Speaker, having attended one Olympic Games and having had the experience of other world amateur sport competitions, I think the logistics of moving athletes that distance, which would be something like from Paris to Moscow, would be rather horrendous and I don't think the Olympic committee would be able to go along with it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

... the whole Olympics.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please.

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might have leave of the Assembly to revert to introduction of visitors?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

#### INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (reversion)

MR. APPLEBY:

Mr. Speaker, it's my very great pleasure this morning to introduce to you and to members of the Assembly, a group of air cadets from Squadron 230 in Athabasca. This group, who are about 70 in number, are seated in the members' gallery and they belong to a squadron which has a long record of outstanding achievements in this province.

They are accompanied this morning, Mr. Speaker, by five officers: their commanding officer, Captain Walters; two lady officers seated in the middle of the group up there, Lieutenant Richards and Lieutenant Haub, and two other lieutenants on the far end, Lieutenant Chrusch and Lieutenant Verbisky. I would ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

## CONSIDERATION OF HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

Mr. Koziak proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an humble address be presented to His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of Alberta as follows:

To His Honour the Honourable Ralph G. Steinhauer, Lieutenant Governor of the Province of Alberta:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly, now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present session.

To which the following amendment was moved by Mr. Clark:

But this Assembly regrets that the Speech from the Throne contained no indication of proposed actions or legislation in the following five areas:

1. The control and limitation of the amount of expenditure that may be authorized by special warrant;
2. The reorganization of municipal financing;
3. Steps to restore confidence of investors in Albertan industry and commerce;
4. The reduction of or restraint on the growth of the Province's bureaucracy;
5. The reduction of personal income taxes.

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Ruste]

MR. RUSTE:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the debate on the amendment, I realize there are many things I would have liked to have said that I could have said in the ordinary Throne Speech debate; however, I'll be somewhat restricted.

I must commend the Minister of Highways who waxed eloquent last night on the floor in the discussion of this amendment. I couldn't help but have the feeling, when he was discussing the large special warrants that he had the privilege to spend on our behalf, that easy come, easy go.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Didn't want it.

MR. RUSTE:

Now, Mr. Speaker, in reading reports as we rural members follow the news media and so on, it is rather interesting to see the forecasts of what this session is going to do. I refer to one by the house leader who, about the middle of January, forecast what was going to take place.

He mentioned that the Throne Speech wasn't going to be the item of the government program; the budget was going to be the main one. But he also went on to say, discussing the format of the estimates, "rather than reviewing every expenditure item of every department, the subcommittees will confine themselves to specific areas of interest to the MLAs."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in looking at that I was a bit disturbed. Surely as Members of the Legislative Assembly in this province of Alberta we should be interested in everything that goes on in this Assembly. I have to report back to my constituents on the business of government, not just those things that I choose to find more interesting than others. I think that when the house leader suggests this to me, it's rather, shall we say, a dereliction of duty if I were to follow that attitude as a member of this Assembly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was most interested in some of the comments on the amendment. I think several of the members raised the portion in Section 3 where the word originally typed in was "increase" and it had been changed to "restore". Well, Mr. Speaker, today we had an official government document handed to us, and on page 2 there are two words added, "renovations" and "additions". Now I wonder what caucus approved those two- or three-word additions?

That reminds me of another one where the Premier was out on one of these cabinet tours this past summer, and there's a news release, datelined Lloydminster, talking about the Premier's visit to the community of Viking. It said that the early morning visit also produced an instant change in policy, and here it referred to the grant of \$2000 for community halls which was widely appreciated, but it also goes on to say that the Premier pencilled in a few words in his news release that will allow community halls built in the last five years to use the \$2000 for furnishing equipment. Now I just mention this, Mr. Speaker, because here's an instant change in policy out in the field. We have evidently had a change of policy since the time the Minister of Culture, Youth, and Recreation had this document drafted, so I'm just wondering how much planning and how much foresight goes into some of these things.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking before this group, I can't help but think of the cartoon I saw the other day captioned "The Wizard of Oz", or rather "Id". This guy comes down and says, hey Wizard, I've got a problem. He goes on to say, we've got all these politicians making laws for the kingdom to live by, but we've got so danged many laws I can't remember them all, so I get lawyers to keep me straight. But now I find out that most of the politicians are lawyers, so the more rules they make, the more lawyers I need. I'm not casting any reflections on lawyers, but I think in this Assembly we have probably a dozen of them or so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to me it's rather interesting too to notice the debate this year on the Speech from the Throne. I can recall last year when the Speech from the Throne ended about as abruptly as the fall session did last year. In looking back at Hansard on March 11, and this follows the Speech from the Throne read by His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor. The mover and the seconder on the previous Friday - and then the following Monday we find this: there were 12 pages devoted to the Leader of the Opposition and one other opposition member and three and one-half pages to the members of the opposition side. Not one minister chose to get up and explain the program outlined in the Speech from the Throne. I'm just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if it's any wonder that the house leader this year chose to say, well there's not really going to be anything in the Speech from the Throne, it's all going to be in the budget. I think that as members of this Assembly we can probably look forward to an awful lot of goodies in the budget this year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the amendment, I think it deals with five different areas: one is the number of special warrants by this government, another one is reorganization of municipal financing, another one to restore confidence to investors in Alberta, another one dealing with the provincial bureaucracy and the growth of it, and then the reduction of personal income taxes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Highways last night in his mention of the many special warrants that he'd passed, and I don't argue with the work that he had done - certainly not - but I argue, Mr. Speaker, with the principle that here we as legislators meet twice a year and surely, Mr. Speaker, at the sitting last fall, the 'now' government could well have informed us that there was need for more money in all these programs.

When we are faced with the \$310 million in special warrants for the year that is just now passing, I can't help but wonder what would have happened if the government hadn't been on the receiving end of the windfall income from circumstances that this government had nothing to do with really, from incidents that happened in the Middle East and other countries in the world, both in agriculture and the energy situation. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we wouldn't have seen that type of special warrant if it hadn't been because of the tremendous sums of money that have accrued to the people of Alberta based on policies that were formulated long before this government came in.

MR. FOSTER:  
What nonsense.

MR. RUSTE:  
The member says, "what nonsense". Doesn't the member realize that in 19 ...

[Interjections]

Mr. Speaker, if he wishes to talk should I sit down and let him have the floor?

MR. FOSTER:  
I'd be delighted.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
You are getting to him.

MR. RUSTE:  
I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the member who was interrupting should realize that if it hadn't been for the energy situation in the Middle East, coupled with the review of the royalty rates that were under way when that government took over, coupled with the agricultural situation - I'm a farmer and I know what has happened in that field - if it hadn't been for those things, the government today would be standing with a debt that would be almost insurmountable. They wouldn't be standing there saying, we are "it" in Canada.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this government had better consider carefully the way it spends money. I think we could go into many areas where there might have been \$10 spent



where \$9 or \$8 might have done it. It's all well to smile and be smug and complacent but I submit, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of special warrants, that when we meet two sessions a year, to me it's folly that this government saw fit to have \$310 million of special warrants in this year.

When we met in session in the fall there was no mention that I recall of the need for the tremendous amounts of special warrants between that time and this time. Certainly that doesn't follow what the members on the front bench, who were on this side of the House when we were in government, were talking about: open government; decisions should be made on the floor of the Legislature; the supremacy of the Legislature. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it's a far cry from what they talked about and indicated what they were going to do when they were on this side.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier, we debated the words "increase" confidence or "restore" confidence. I say "restore" confidence. We saw not long ago, as recently as January 8, 1974. "Economic Boom Predicted for the West" was one of the headlines in The Albertan. It says, "... the West's two aces in the hole, oil and grain". I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the reason for those two aces goes back a lot further than the present government. They go back to international situations.

It's rather interesting to talk about the boom and investor confidence when you pick up such papers as The Reporter, serving the communities of Parkland and Lac St. Anne. Here's a headline: "Industry Abandoned. A \$10 million industrial development planned for Stony Plain has been abandoned". It goes on to say, "and the letter added feasibility studies information might be outdated by rising costs in the past two years. It is probably useless."

I think we have heard a lot of discussion in this Assembly about various increases in costs and so on. But I think we had better realize that there is a current thing under way, that there are a lot of people sitting there wondering, should I move now? They can say they are talking about pessimism but I think only time will tell whether or not.

Certainly when you get into the matter of expenditures of money and the confidence of interest, I was rather interested - and this follows up a question I asked the Ministers of Lands and Forests, and Industry and Commerce the other day, dealing with the government getting involved in business. I asked the Minister of Lands and Forests whether they had any discussions in the forest industry [on] profit sharing. I asked that as well of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Now is this the way this government is going to go? If there is something that is going to be profitable, is the government going to say, well here, we want a slice of it; we want to know everything that is going on in there?

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that industry is going to look pretty seriously at those things. I think when you look at the 'new' government when they said, oh those agreements on royalties are null and void, to me, Mr. Speaker, that was the first step of the questioning of industry, whether it be in the agricultural industry, whether it be in the tar sands, no matter where it is. When they start to question government motives, can they depend on government, I think it's a pretty serious thing.

Another one I'd just like to mention is, the Premier certainly in this province is the outspoken saying of open government, we're going to get out to the people. I was interested in the debate a little earlier in this session when one of the members suggested open government was the cabinet getting out to the people. I was at a meeting the Premier attended, and I know of two people at that meeting who haven't got replies to their submissions to the Premier. Now is this the way it's going to be done? Are the ministers going to flit in, smile, and flit out again? Or are they going to sit down and discuss problems and so on?

That leads to another matter, of course, of the regulations and all the things - when you have your committee that dealt with a number of regulations passed by this government. Certainly the 'now' government, when they were on the opposition side, were pretty critical of the 'then' government for doing this. Yet we have a report today saying that this is continuing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in continuing - I think we'll go on. I've dealt certainly with the matter of the special warrants. I'd like to go on a bit to municipal financing. I'd like to take a bit of a different line than many of the members have. I'd like to refer to municipal financing as affecting myself, as an individual taxpayer, as it relates to educational financing. I don't think you can separate them really.

I, as a representative of an area in eastern Alberta, had representations from the Alberta School Trustees Association, Zone 4, asking me to attend one of their meetings. I was unable to attend, but they were courteous enough to send me a copy of a letter that had been sent to the Minister of Education. This is December 17, 1974, Mr. Speaker. It isn't back in '71. Here is the text of it, written to the hon. Minister, Mr. Hyndman. It says as follows:

The following motion was passed unanimously at the A.S.T.A. Executive meeting held in Lacombe on 4 December 1974.

Motion: The inadequacy of the Government's announced increase in education funding is threatening the School Foundation program and the philosophy the government espouses. It is recommended the government immediately increase to a realistic level the support funding.  
Carried.

And then it goes on to say:

I have been instructed by the Executive of Zone 4 to advise you of the above motion, as well as to ask for your kind consideration in releasing additional funds for all areas of education.

Signed by Mr. Monaghan, Secretary-Treasurer, Zone 4.

Is that municipal financing? Is that adequate? I've raised this point in this Assembly before, of the growing disparity between the facilities, the educational opportunities, of the people in our smaller rural areas and our large urban centres.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have some band-aid programs. I know the Minister of Education sent to all of us a few thousand dollars here, a few thousand dollars there, to update some of these facilities.

Mr. Speaker, with the announcement by the Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation this morning, I think we had better have some substantial programs in the educational field as it relates to rural education which, after all, is the basis for what our young men and young women will be and be able to do in the years ahead.

I also look into the farm trends, and I'm a member of a farm organization. They express some of their concerns in their publication of August '74. I'm just going to quote part of this again. It says:

How can the government justify the offering of incentives to keep the rural areas settled and to grow on the one hand, while removing one of the primary needs of a community with a present and developing potential, by removing the source of high school education?

It goes on to say: "With no high school available, new families will reconsider settlement and others will re-locate, reversing the very trend the government is trying to encourage." And it goes on:

Urban areas with their highly-dense student population, under the present funding system are able to range more widely in their budgeting in setting priorities, while rural areas on the same funding system, have to struggle with the extra costs incurred in serving communities too far flung to draw all the students into one high school unit.

And a final one: "Young people are being penalized because they live on farms too far from a larger center to daily travel the distance to and from school."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that covers some of the things that are involved in education. I refer to this as municipal financing because certainly I, as a taxpayer, a ratepayer, am interested, am concerned about what's going on.

I think there is another one that is more interesting than this. This goes back - from the school trustees at their convention where the school trustees ... "The demand by trustees for the right to decide not only how they spend their money, but how large the budget should be, is a sharp reaction to new government controls on education spending."

I find another one that was most interesting from a trustee who had served as a school trustee. This is noted in June '74 of the Alberta School Trustee. I'm not going to read the whole letter. He points out some of the things they have to do as trustees in dealing with education and educational cost, teachers' salaries and so on. I think the key word that I would just like to refer to this Assembly at this time is - and it goes on to say: "... don't give me any of this nonsense about local autonomy. All we effectively do as a School Board is to choose the colour of the walls on the School and whether or not the School Janitor is going to be permitted to use a snow blower or a snow shovel."

Now, Mr. Speaker, is this the kind of municipal finance we want? Is this the kind of local autonomy we are looking towards? I think not, Mr. Speaker.

Then we get into the matter of reduction restraint of the government's bureaucracy. I think the figures will show that certainly it's a far cry from what was proposed by members on the other side of the House at this time when they were talking about, we're going to cut back, we're going to cut back on the civil service, on the expensive government. Figures show otherwise.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal on another matter just briefly, and that is the matter of the credibility of government. As an agricultural producer, I'm concerned, along with a lot of other people, [about] the apparent aim of this government to do away with the wheat board. I think there are movements [afoot] that this government would just like to phase this wheat board out. They would like to turn it over to a multinational group, including Cargill and another company that I understand do over half the grain trade in the world.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, when you get into that thing, I want to remind the members that I can recall the days before we had such a thing as the Canadian Wheat Board. I can recall the fall when the individual who had his own threshing machine or who did custom work would start threshing when the price was up, and then every day it started to drop. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, when you see a movement by this government - and it isn't being denied - to take away or get rid of the Canadian Wheat Board, it concerns me. It concerns a lot of producers in this province.

I know the Minister of Agriculture in debate in an earlier session referred to the Member for Wainwright for quibbling about figures. Now if he considers quibbling about figures, when the Premier of this province in one of the statements here was out 860 per cent - and I proved that in debate - I think that's going a long way, Mr. Speaker. I

feel when you get those statements that certainly it doesn't speak much for - there has been nothing said to correct it or set it straight and it gives me a lot of concern when you get into those types of representations.

Now as an individual member, of course, through the year, and I might mention here, Mr. Speaker, that during the session we are pretty busy. We have volumes of reports and so on tabled in this Legislature. It's kind of interesting that after the fall sitting I went back to one that was tabled by the Minister of Lands and Forests. He made quite a display of it on March 11 when he tabled a copy of the manifests for Lands and Forests aircraft, King Air, Queen Air and the helicopter. I was rather interested, Mr. Speaker, this spring that he didn't include the helicopter until he was requested to. But in looking through this information, Mr. Speaker, I was rather interested in a certain flight that was taken by the Minister of Agriculture to an agriculture meeting in ...

MR. MOORE:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, your ruling yesterday evening with respect to this debate was that it must be relevant to the amendments. I hardly see how the manifest of the aircrafts or the Canadian Wheat Board pertain to the amendments that are before us.

MR. SPEAKER:

It has been suggested that perhaps the area of investor confidence is sufficiently broad to include about anything that is going on in the province. In view of the latitude which the House and the Chair accorded the hon. minister last night, I think it would be difficult to restrict the hon. member to any substantial extent.

MR. RUSTE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was mentioning, I was going back through the manifest and I find one here on January 10, 1973, "Primary passenger in department, Dr. H. Horner, Minister and Deputy Premier, purpose of the meeting, agriculture meeting in Provost ...". Well this is fine "... and accompanying passenger, Mr. Finity."

I did a little research, Mr. Speaker, and I looked back into the local newspaper in the Provost area and I find two ads prior to that meeting. There is one on the date December 27, another one dated December 20, 1972 and they read as follows, Mr. Speaker:

Wainwright constituency Progressive Conservative annual meeting. Wednesday, January 10, 8:00 p.m. Legion Hall, Provost. Speaker: Dr. Hugh Horner, Minister of Agriculture and Deputy Premier. Everyone welcome.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh.

MR. RUSTE:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I look back again, and I follow it up following the meeting that was held in Provost. It said, "... the Hon. Hugh Horner, Minister of Agriculture, Province of Alberta, spoke to approximately" ... so many people ... "at the Wainwright constituency Progressive Conservative Association annual meeting held in Legion Hall, Provost." I'm not going to do any more than to say the PC candidate who ran against me at the last election was the one who introduced the minister at that time. And I would also like to say that there was a remark made at the meeting reported in the press that, "... it's too bad your visit had to be in the dark and at this time of the year because we have a very nice town."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we get back to the matter of the manifest: purpose, agriculture meeting. Mr. Speaker, I followed that up with a question to the Minister of Lands and Forests on May 22, 1974 which reads as follows. This was, I believe, in consideration of the Estimates, and I'm quoting: "The other question I would want to ask at this time is, were any of these flights ..." I'm referring now, Mr. Speaker, to the manifest that was tabled by the hon. minister, "... were any of these flights used to attend political conventions?" To which the minister, Dr. Warrack answered: "Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the answer to that question is no."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can talk about investor confidence, we can talk about industry confidence, and I know the Minister of Agriculture, Deputy Premier has accused me of quibbling with figures. But, Mr. Speaker, to me, and I've been on audit committees and that, and one cent is just as valuable as one dollar, one million dollars or two billion or whatever you want to call it. I submit that when we find such things as this happening in government, it casts a reflection, certainly, on the credibility of government. I'm concerned - they may laugh all they want. But here we have a statement tabled in this Legislature, I questioned it and I can't help but say, Mr. Speaker, that this statement is false. What other way can you put it?

Then we go on. We've had a lot of debate with the Syncrude project, but certainly, Mr. Speaker, when you get into the financial papers, and I find one here in the Financial Post, "Syncrude put-on, but the real reason ..." and it goes on to say, "... right now it is hard to tell whether the Premier wants to show that he is doing his job as protector of the provincial financial interest in the project, or whether he wants to create a political issue that could be of value later on." And it goes on to say, "... on the whole, the Premier's announcement is a decidedly unfriendly document ordering a sort of mix between a public inquiry and a show trial. It could just as well have been undertaken

with much less drama." And there is another thing, Mr. Speaker, that concerns me here and goes on, and I mean I'm not sticking up for the oil industry as such; I'm sticking up for the principle. It goes on to say, "... Mannix Co., Loram International Calgary has undertaken a considerable amount of work in connection with the Great Canadian Oil Sands plant" says a leading industry man after checks with legal advisers." It is simply unheard of that a competitor be asked to check the books of a firm.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you see items such as this, is there any wonder that industry - and I'm talking of industry back down to my individual self as in the farming industry, whether it be small business - big business, is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that there is an era of doubt, of wondering what is going on next. I think there are people who - I know that figures were used earlier in this discussion at the session, Mr. Speaker, where somebody referred to figures last June. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this government had better get its head out of the cloud of last June and see what is going on in January of 1975.

I was in to see a farm implement dealer not too long ago and he had a new tractor sitting out there. I said, has that been sold? Well, he said, there is an order for it but I don't think the man can handle it. I think, Mr. Speaker, we're standing here at the end of January, 1975 and in these last few weeks we have seen the price of rapeseed go down by \$3 a bushel at one point. We've seen the price of wheat in the last few days drop in selling price of \$1 per bushel.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we had better have a lot more than a lot of super ballyhoo as outlined in one of the columns in the local paper where propaganda has taken precedence over performance. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Alberta had better assess pretty carefully what is really going on in government. I submit that if they were aware of what goes on under the dome of this Legislature Building, there would be quite a difference in attitudes to what was prevalent even just six months or a year ago.

I'm sorry to see this happen, Mr. Speaker, because I've sat in this Legislative Assembly for on to 20 years now.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Too long.

MR. RUSTE:

I've seen Mr. Speaker, when the minister's word was supposed to be fact and I say, Mr. Speaker ... We hear the arrogant reply over here that - and I mentioned his name when I was looking at these manifests and I have no reason - he mentioned, he hasn't reneged on it or anything else. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that when we have these things occurring in government - and it's not just once, there are different times - the people of Alberta had better assess pretty carefully who is going to do the governing.

Thank you.

MR. TRYNCHY:

At the outside, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say I will not be voting in favor of the amendment. I would like to outline the reasons for my decision.

MR. LUDWIG:

I'm amazed at that decision.

MR. TRYNCHY:

I know it's pretty easy to amaze the hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View. I'm sure of that, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to speak on the items as they're outlined in the amendment, and the first one: the control and limitation of the amount of expenditure that may be authorized by special warrant.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. TRYNCHY:

I'd like to go back to March 17, 1972, when the headline, and I would quote:

\$94.7 million being sought

The legislature will be asked to ratify \$94.7 million in special warrants that had to be passed by the cabinet to meet unforeseen spending demands during fiscal 1971-72.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer at that time said that the Legislature would put a curb "on use of special warrants except ..." - and I wish to underline the word 'except' - "where they are needed to finance a program established to meet a new ..." - again underline 'new' - "public need."

Departments have been told they will have to live within the estimates contained in [Friday's] budget and can't expect special warrants to be passed automatically to give them more money if they overspend.

Now we are all aware, Mr. Speaker, what special warrants are for, and I am sure the members on the other side are aware because they've been here a lot longer than some of us. And speaking on that, I'd like to go back to how overspending by the previous government was done.

In 1971, \$64.7 million was primarily all sheer overspending or underbudgeting, and that was by August 31 which was only for 12 months.

MR. LUDWIG:

... [Inaudible] ... some clarification for the hon. ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please. The hon. member's clarifications will have to be fitted into the rules of debate.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I'm permitted to request a question from the party speaking and I would ask whether he would permit a question. The rules provide for it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, I'll answer all questions as soon as I'm done, if the hon. member will just write them down. I'm sure he will have quite a few more and I'll answer them all when I'm finished.

MR. LUDWIG:

Don't forget.

MR. TRYNCHY:

I won't.

Mr. Speaker, at the rate of overspending and underbudgeting by the previous government, if they had run the full term, it would have amounted to \$170 or \$180 million. With a budget of that day of \$1.2 billion, that would have been approximately 11 per cent of special warrants used primarily or totally for underbudget and overspending in their departments.

Since then, compare this to the special warrants issued in 1974-75. Under the present government, special warrants were used for new projects, unforeseen circumstances which are not contained in the budget.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. TRYNCHY:

The total special warrants used this year, Mr. Speaker, in contrast to the two different budgets, was a mere 1 per cent as compared to the direction of 11 per cent in the year 1971.

Mr. Speaker, last spring, in a climate where no government anticipated the degree of inflation, the cost of living increases, [the] need for interim financing was unforeseen. We had an accelerated highway program which I'd like to expand on in a few moments. It was outlined last night by the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport and again, Mr. Speaker, that's what special warrants were for.

We look at the amount of special warrants - and it's been brought up a number of times \$310 million. Let's really look and see what they're for. \$60.5 million were for emergency assistance to farmers and municipalities. Cost of living and inflation (this was brought in by unforeseen circumstances of course) a raise of living allowance to the civil servants amounted to \$58,915,633. Another special warrant was an investment, not expenditure. It was for land purchases, park development investments: \$85,725,000. Fire suppression - here again, Mr. Speaker, who knows how much fire you'll have in any year - \$3,300,000. Accelerated highway work due to excellent fall weather over and above was \$5,143,000.

I'd just like to go over these and relate them to how they affect me in rural Alberta and my constituency. I'm sure the people of my constituency would like to know where these special warrants went and how they were spent and I'd like to make this information to them because I think it is as open government that we do this. And we're not afraid to publish our special warrants. Therefore I think we should bring them out.

Highway transport, secondary highway: - some of this was done in my constituency ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Let's get ... [inaudible] ...

MR. TRYNCHY:

... \$4 million. Alberta Hospitals Services Commission, nursing home staff increases: \$2,898,000. I have a nursing home in my constituency. Alberta Hospitals Services Commission: \$4,800,000 - and that goes to all hospitals. Anticipated cost of living for government workers, civil service: - and we are all aware of what happened last year - \$18 million.

Municipal affairs - I think I have spoken on this before but I think I should remind the hon. members on the other side, this was new town capital debt reduction - write-off of debts: \$4,614,386. All because of an incompetent government and actions on the other side even though they approved them in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Shame, shame.

MR. TRYNCHY:

... a reduction of debt that amounted to \$3,420 per capita to one town. Now you call that real good government? I don't.

[Interjections]

Let's talk about agriculture and irrigation programs. Some of the programs we used special warrants for were repaid by federal funds and if we hadn't gone ahead we would have lost that money. It was brought out so clearly by the hon. Member for Smoky River, and I think the members in the south who sit on that side of the House can well recall that the program was \$4.2 million. Temporary production program for agriculture: \$8.5 million. Agricultural livestock facility program, to keep the farmers at home and build their facilities: \$6 million. Water supply program, livestock improvement: \$2.5 million. Hail and crop insurance losses - unforeseen again, which must be paid unless we're going to wait and say no, we can't pay you this year, we'll pay you next year - \$3,937,500.

Again, gravel crushing, clearing right of way, getting ready for construction in improvement districts for highways: \$1,143,000. PEP program for unforeseen areas where there was unemployment, a total of \$9 million.

Mr. Speaker, we spent some money on grazing reserves and one of them was in my constituency - \$417,000 - to make sure we had the necessary grazing lands for cattle that have to remain on our hands until the prices increase or get better.

Airport clearing and construction - one of them is in my constituency too, in Whitecourt - \$892,000. And the reason for that, Mr. Speaker, is very obvious. We must have airstrips that can handle the planes so that we can help suppress fires when we see them.

Mr. Speaker, I outline that there was \$85 million in investments, and, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add that we did put \$75 million into the Alberta Energy Company, which is an investment, not an expenditure.

Urban transportation: \$5.9 million. Land purchases: \$5.2 million. Capital City Park: \$5.5 million. Municipal debt reduction, which went to all residents of Alberta: \$10 million. This amounted to over \$100 million.

But they say, and maybe rightfully so, that it should be discussed in the House. Let's go back over the years before we were in office, and the way they ran the House and they got approval for this. They did it right.

Alberta Resources railroad: ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Wow.

MR. TRYNCHY:

... let's go over that. Estimated cost by the Legislature: \$33 million. Hooray for Alberta. We're moving ahead. Final cost: \$133 million. Real good budgeting. That's what I call real good government. Expenditure, loss to the people of Alberta, Mr. Speaker, \$8 million every year ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Shame, shame.

MR. TRYNCHY:

... because of their actions. Do you realize that since the day of the ARR we could have bought PWA four times over with the interest alone and not spent any Alberta money? And they say we made a bad deal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Bow your heads, bow your heads.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move on to steps to increase confidence of investors in Alberta. Well, Mr. Speaker, that's a good one.

MR. LUDWIG:

Talk about the quicksands then ... [inaudible] ...

MR. TRYNCHY:

We've removed the borrowing limits on growing towns, which has helped many municipalities. I can speak of Whitecourt and Fox Creek, where the borrowing is not restricted any more and they can advance in the way that they should. Houses are going up, not by ones and twos - by fifties and hundreds in my two towns. So that's what I call reorganization and letting the towns advance the way they should.

We've increased the municipal grants by over 33 per cent. The Social Credit, and this was a real big gift by them, froze it at \$36 million.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Froze it?

MR. TRYNCHY:

We alone have allowed \$81 million in tax reduction - just in tax reduction alone - to municipalities.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's performance.

MR. TRYNCHY:

A freeze of \$36 million in total moneys from the province to municipalities as against \$81 million alone in tax reduction, let's compare that.

Sure, Mr. Speaker, we all agree that municipalities need more money. Now I'd be foolish to say that they don't. But no matter what they have got, they could spend more. And I'm sure there isn't one member in this House who doesn't agree with that.

Let's have a look at the Arabs and their oil money. God, they've got more money now than they can spend, and they're saying so freely. But they haven't reduced the price of oil - they want more. Now what the devil for? But that's the way human nature is. The more we've got the more we want and the more we'll spend.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's for sure.

MR. TRYNCHY:

So, Mr. Speaker, my county - the one I represent - had its grant increased by over double. I speak about municipal councillors, they're happy. As a matter of fact, they got a grant of \$127,830.75 for flood damage on roads, which is a first in Alberta.

We've had flooding in the Paddle flats for years and years and years. The hon. Member for Cypress, as minister then, was down in our area and spoke. He said: well, I'm sorry I can't do anything for you. Why didn't they use a special warrant and provide the funds to municipalities so they could fix these roads? They didn't think it was necessary.

We talk about steps to restore or increase confidence in investors of Alberta. Mr. Speaker, as I travel through the villages and towns in my constituency, they're all developing at a rapid pace. There are homes going up in every village, in every town. There are developments of all kinds. There are new business buildings going up. There are more homes. Senior citizen lodges are going up. There's that new street expansion. They're paving curb and gutter, sidewalks, and so on. There's a number of people expanding the present businesses. We have market road expansion; we're upgrading, oiling, paving roads leading to major market centres. And even in Drumheller they're talking about re-opening the coal mines. Is this not confidence, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, when you have more gas plant construction in my area. Every company is expanding their gas plants because they're confident of what's going to happen in Alberta.

We're having airstrips built in rural Alberta and this is a need by the oil people, by forestry, and by the private sector. Recreation buildings are going up in every town. The community hall program has just got to be fabulous. The announcement again this morning is one that every member of this House will applaud. I'm sure that if they didn't have sore arms they [would] have been applauding a little harder than they were.

And yes, we even have more drilling in Alberta as announced by the minister yesterday. So when people talk about confidence in industry I'd like to see where it's not. We're building vet clinics, processing plants and a number of other things in the constituency.

Mr. Speaker, I move down to item No. 4: the reduction, it says, in the growth of the province's bureaucracy. I'd like to know what they want to do. Who are they going to fire first, and how many? That's what I'd like to see them answer, and I imagine when we start the campaign in August for the next election that will be a major issue right across the province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You'll be gone before then.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, I spoke of some expansions in my area and I'd like to just go on and outline to you why we need more people in the civil service. Now if you're standing still as the past government has done, you don't need more people - you can get rid of some.

I'd like to outline just what has happened in my constituency. We have two new treasury branches, we have a treasury branch agency, two liquor stores, a Highways Department scale on the highway, highway enforcement officers, expansion to agricultural offices. We have expansion in the Lands and Forests Department; the Highways Department

has great expansion in my area. We've moved an environment officer into Whitecourt. We've moved more people into Health and Social Development. We have a regional director for the [Alberta] Opportunity Company; more people into Fish and Wildlife. We have a nursing station which employs people at Fox Creek, where before you couldn't get any service. We have vet services where we never had them before.

I totalled it up, Mr. Speaker, and just in my own constituency it's over 40 new people - 40 new jobs. So if we multiply that by 75, that comes to quite a figure. If you're standing still you don't need these people. But we're not standing still. So, Mr. Speaker, let's look at that.

Mr. Speaker, this takes me back to a request by the hon. members on the other side about the growth of civil service back in 1973. I was fortunate to keep the copy of the figures that were presented by the Provincial Treasurer.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You don't believe it.

MR. TRYNCHY:

It's interesting to note - I believe it because it's fact - in 1967 ...

AN HON. MEMBER:

Nobody else believes it.

MR. TRYNCHY:

... the growth of the provincial civil service was 11.9 per cent. In '68 it was 12.5 per cent. They had a total increase of 9.8 per cent eight years previous to this government taking over.

To 1973, with all the expansion that we've done in this government, our average increase was 4.5 per cent. I have to say this is quite an achievement by the ministers that they can control their expansion and do the kind of work they're doing with that type and amount of manpower.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's performance.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Mr. Speaker, going back to PWA, and by not using special warrants, I'd just like to read from Hansard something that the previous government did. Now they did this in the House so it's legal and it's rightfully so, that they gave the ARR or the CNR a blank cheque for the Alberta Resources railroad - just write anything you want.

I'd like to read what it says here: "The government shall arrange" - imagine this, Mr. Speaker - "irrevocable credit for the Treasury Branch against which the CNR may draw cheques for expenditures in the construction of this railroad ..."

AN HON. MEMBER:

Unbelievable. Just unbelievable.

MR. TRYNCHY:

Just a blank cheque. So when the railroad was announced at \$33 million, it's no wonder it went to \$133 million. Why not? Give me a blank cheque and I'll make damn sure I'll use it. And that's what you people did.

[Interjections]

So we talk about special warrants, Mr. Speaker. It's just got to be a joke that they can come up and try to rebuff any of the special warrants that I've announced, and I'd like to see which one they would cut out. Just name one. Which one would they cut out? That's what I'd like to hear.

[Interjections]

Mr. Speaker, in closing, it's amazing the kind of requests we now get from people [and what] they expect from government. I go to a letter where a dancing school in Edmonton was putting on dancing instructions throughout the province and this included a number of constituencies and a number of towns. Since that agreement with the teacher, the teacher went back to the United States and the contracts had to be cancelled. Of course some of the mothers had paid some money. They didn't recover all their lessons so they had some money coming back. The company couldn't function - I guess it folded up.

But they're asking now for this type of service, and this type of service they should have. I think all the young people in Alberta should have a chance to take dancing lessons if they so desire. But they're asking now for the provincial government to do it because they can't get it done by private enterprise. So what do we do? Do we tell them no, we don't think you should have dancing lessons?

MR. LUDWIG:

... dancing ...



MR. TRYNCHY:

So we have to look at this. We haven't done it yet but I hope we consider it because the young people of Alberta today are going to govern this province tomorrow and the day after and so on.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I'd like just to touch on the fifth item, the reduction of personal income tax. I agree we should have one. As a matter of fact the investment committee, the Foreign Investment Committee I served on, made this recommendation. I'm sure if the hon. members on the other side will just hang on - I know it is hard for them to do - until February 7, we might even have a tax reduction. I don't know.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I just for the life of me can't comprehend ...

MR. LUDWIG:

That's your ...

MR. TRYNCHY:

... the amendment made by the hon. member, the hon. House leader - he's not in his seat - to come up with a thing here that he had to cross out and recross and didn't know what he wanted to do - to come up with something like this which is truly, in my mind, just so much nonsense.

Thank you.

MR. LUDWIG:

Mr. Speaker, I was going to pose a question to the hon. member but after listening I thought I would want a more credible source for my replies. Thank you.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a great pleasure to be able to take part in the debate on this amendment. As far as I'm concerned it probably will be also the only speech I will be making on the Speech from the Throne.

I was rather amused at our last speaker because this is the time of year - in fact in sitting in the House now for eight years, if there is any time of incredibility to the members in the House, it's on the Speech from the Throne. This is because the government goes overboard on one side and probably the opposition goes overboard on the other and people wonder just what type of government or just what type of representatives they have in the House.

I was quite interested in the Speech from the Throne. Why did we have to have an amendment? I read in the Lethbridge Herald: "Conservatives warned speech from the throne would be non-event." I would just like to quote:

But it came well-disguised, cloaked by the rhetoric of the government's house leader, urbane Lou Hyndman.

There are two pillars to any session of a legislature, Mr. Hyndman said, for all the world like a Roman senator taking his constituents on a tour of the Forum.

Of the two - throne speech and budget - he sensed the budget would be the key pillar of this session.

Of course, the reporter then says: "What he meant, after a peek in the oven like a worried housewife, was that, 'We've ruined the first course, folks, but just wait for dessert.' "

We on this side, when you find a fly in the soup, begin to wonder about the raisin pie.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I lose track of the hon. member who just spoke before me, he ended up saying what a wonderful job the government has done. I'm awfully pleased in his remarks that his constituency has come into the 20th century and I'm awfully pleased that they have put so much money in. They must have been slightly worried they were going to lose it in the next election.

But what really caught me, Mr. Speaker, was when he said that we are going to pay for dance lessons for all young Albertans because they were going to be the future citizens of this province. I was just thinking ...

MR. TRYNCHY:

Point of order. I did not state we will pay for dance lessons but I suggested the program should be looked into. I don't think I should be misquoted.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, you said it.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, I understood from the hon. member that because free enterprise couldn't do it because there was no money in it - you had to have our citizens dance, therefore the government was going to pay for it. I thought this was rather wonderful. When the old age pensioner with his added supplement shuffles down to get his mail to find that his rent has gone up \$10 more than his supplement, it's nice to know that his grandchildren can dance down the street to the new facilities provided by the Minister of Culture.

When I'm speaking I'd like to talk first about special warrants. The government, in some ways, is quite sensitive to this. We on our side are just as sensitive in our way. We realized what special warrants were for. We have no quarrel with special warrants, how they were issued and for what purpose they were issued. We realized the needs and the

purpose of the special warrant, probably more so than the government does. But what the backbenchers on the government side don't realize [is] that in the proliferation of special warrants, the cabinet is by-passing even the backbenchers on the government side.

AN HON. MEMBER:

That's not new.

MR. BUCKWELL:

I have three or four examples I would like to give you. I'm not arguing with the need of these special warrants, but I would like to show you why there is some concern.

Let us take the calf loan special warrant of \$50 million. This calf loan program, or grant, was announced at the fall session last year. There was absolutely no reason why a special supplementary budget could not have been passed for the \$50 million. It was announced right here in the House while the Legislature was in session. We have no fight with the calf loan program. But when you start letting cabinet spend \$50 million on special warrants and all we've got to do as the Legislature is ratify it in the spring at the end of the session when it's passed, [that] to me is wrong.

Let us take the spring flood and all those things which were entailed for relief. We have no quarrel with that. But we sat here until June 6. We spent the early part of May with the country under flood. All the various members, particularly in the northeast part of Alberta and east of Edmonton, listened to the plight these people were in. We are sorry for these people. We would like to help. We commend the government. But that \$40 million, why could that not have been passed with a supplementary requisition to the budget? Why did it have to come to a special board?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Sock it to them.

MR. BUCKWELL:

We now come down to the PWA - \$35 million. Where did you get the money for PWA?

AN HON. MEMBER:

ARR.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Under the rug.

MR. BUCKWELL:

You screwed around until you got it through The Financial Administration Act. What is more important, on the PWA only an inner circle of the cabinet knew that PWA was bought before even the rest of the cabinet knew. You backbenchers didn't know any more about it than we did over on this side.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They still don't.

MR. BUCKWELL:

And yet here we've got it.

Now we've got the idea that we are now going to spend \$30 million on four new planes, or three new planes, whatever it is. We asked the other day, who represents the 90 per cent interest the Alberta government has in PWA. Who is the minister? It's the Minister of Industry. He says, well I represent it. Well who gives the guidelines to PWA? Have we got a \$35 million elephant, white elephant, that we've bought? Is this company going to run it exactly the way they want to?

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, he's pink.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Or who is going to give the direction on how PWA, how the 90 per cent interest or whatever per cent interest the government has - who is going to give the direction to that? If the government is going to give the direction to it, let it become a Crown corporation. Let it come here on the floor of the House. Let the financial returns come into the public accounts and not sit right out there.

The other day the question was asked, can we see a financial statement of PWA. Well now I don't know if they would make it public or not. If they do, well we will probably see it in the papers. We are 90 per cent stockholders, or a percentage of 90 per cent. Every member of this Legislature has a right to have a financial statement of PWA up to date, including last year. It's our air line. I don't care who runs it. But this is part again of a special warrant.

Then we come to the [Alberta] Energy Company. We knew that we had an energy company and that they were going to need money. We were here last November. Why didn't they put through a supplementary requisition then for \$75 or \$100 million? If you didn't take the full amount, you didn't have to take it. The government wasn't out anything. But what do we find out? We know the energy company has to have money, we've granted it through legislation, we've agreed to it, in fact we even supported the concept of the energy

company provided that it would get down to the individual voter, the individual constituent could turn around and buy his share. But what happens? We find out then we have a board of directors.

We find out now from the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs that the energy company is now negotiating the price they will pay for the Suffield Block: in other words, taking it out of one hand and putting into the other. It doesn't matter how but they're going to try to acquire the rights. Who represents the government then? We are told that they will decide what is going to happen to the Suffield Block. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that whether [or not] it's through a special warrant, the Legislature should decide what's going to happen to the Suffield Block.

Then last night we had another special warrant. This is to the Minister of Highways and Transport. He was very proud of this. It was the grants to the cities. Now, he announced this program about June 5 or 6 because it was just before we closed, and from the length of the document he didn't dream it up overnight. This program - and it's a good one; we have no quarrel with it - possibly took at least six months to bring to fruition so he could give a grant program, but it was during the session. Why couldn't he have said, look, I have prepared the grants, here is the grant system, we need so much money, we're going to give so much money, we'll have a special warrant right now, pass it here in the Legislature. But we didn't do it that way.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct the hon. gentleman from Macleod because in the Estimates and during the Estimates in this House ...

MR. SPEAKER:

Order please. The hon. ... order please. The hon. minister is not entitled to make that correction unless it's with respect to a part of his speech that has been misunderstood.

MR. COPITHORNE:

Mr. Speaker, it is in respect to a part of the speech that the hon. member is making. It was ...

MR. SPEAKER:

The correction would have to be with respect to the speech which the hon. minister made.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Mr. Speaker, other special warrants mentioned by the Minister of Highways and Transport we would agree with, because this last year was one in which much work was done, extra work probably not envisioned by the Highways Department. That work had to be done partly through weather conditions and partly through adverse flood conditions. We don't quarrel, but what we do quarrel [with] is when you use special warrants and by-pass the Legislature completely. We think this system is wrong. In turn, as far as the back bench is concerned, you are losing control to the administration and the policy of your cabinet.

Turning to municipal financing, Mr. Speaker, regarding this amendment, the government - and we congratulate them for it - over the years has assumed the full cost of the school foundation program. They have assumed the full cost of health units and hospitals. As the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs says, this year they're spending \$153 million. This is fine.

But you get with one and take with the other. I'll have to agree, Mr. Speaker, that we did the same thing. It's far nicer to be able to give a grant directly to the constituent than it is to hand it over to a town council or a city council who say nothing about it and assume they have done a wonderful job on the government's money. It is far nicer to hand it over. We did the same thing ourselves with the home-owners grant.

But in assuming the full cost of education and taking the ceiling off the municipal costs or the municipal requisition, what we found in Calgary was, where you turned around and gave them 26 or 28 mills on education, municipal-wise the city raised it 19 mills. The people are no better off than they were before. There has to be something different done.

In assuming the total costs of hospitals, schools, and health units, we are doing in one sense, we are reaching the point today - and it has already been mentioned by my honorable friend from Wainwright. The danger and the limitation in providing all the funds and all the guidelines is that, [with] school boards particularly and hospital boards where we've had a tremendous number of people, interested people, who have spent years and years of service, we are now getting to the point that when we come to replace these nobody wants to take on the job.

If we have to turn around - and the hon. minister did it last year, and there were places in the province where we had a difficulty in getting school board members. Why? Because there's no responsibility anymore.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right.

MR. BUCKWELL:

They have to live within the parameters set down by either the Department of Education or the Department of Health. There's no challenge anymore. Why should a member spend his evenings sitting down trying to figure out just where the money goes within the parameters that have already been set down? Yet one of the most interesting things that we come down, that when it comes to negotiating with the teachers for wages, when it comes to negotiating with nurses for wages when the government might take a few lumps, they say then to the board, well you fellows negotiate; we don't want to have anything to do with it, but you're paying the bill. As I said to one councillor and one group of school trustees, what's the point of sticking your neck on the line?

MR. WYSE:

Public service.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Public service and public abuse that should be taken by the government.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. BUCKWELL:

It's all very nice to let them take the lumps. We take the credit of giving them all the money. We're big fellows.

AN HON. MEMBER:

We're occupied.

MR. BUCKWELL:

Now we come down to investor confidence. I don't want to go on, Mr. Speaker, and spend too much time on Syncrude or any of those. We realize what has happened. We realize that in a short eight months, costs have doubled, almost tripled, within our country. This is primarily caused by inflation. When we talk about investor confidence, we wonder where all the money's coming from, we wonder what is going on.

When we come down to it, partly some of the investor confidence, some of the reasons we feel that you're losing are that you're continually changing the ground rules and the guidelines. When you become so deeply involved, as you have in so many areas, and when something goes wrong, nobody today can say with assurance this is what it's going to be for even six months before you change the guidelines or try to update things again.

Some of the reasons for investor confidence on a smaller scale rather than, say, into the oil industry itself, particularly on smaller businesses - and we're not complaining - has been through the Alberta Opportunity Company, through the Agricultural Development Corporation, through agribusinesses, in which money has been lent for smaller businesses that are in competition with ones that are already there that have been put up by private capital and private initiative. This is not fair.

We had a motion for a return that was tabled the other day, in the period from January 1 to September 30, 1974 the Agricultural Development Corporation has loaned out over \$73 million. This is not counting the \$115 million for the emergency crop loan program. Now we're not including that. If you add that all together, it comes to \$115 million, give or take a few bucks. One I'm concerned about is this, we talk about investor confidence; from January 1 to September 30 in livestock purchases alone, there were over 2,000 loans for the total of \$14,837,000. I would like to know, of those 2000 people today, how many would wish they'd never even heard of the livestock loan? These people bought in the spring when cows were \$400 to \$500 apiece. Today they couldn't even get \$200 for them. You have to loan the money to keep the calves over the winter. These are some of the things that we talk about in investor confidence.

We talk about agricultural implements and farm machinery - 4,800 loans, to the tune of \$25 million and yet you turn around on the other hand and say the agricultural economy of this province was never so buoyant. We are over a billion dollars, hurrah for us. You had nothing to do with it because the cattle market and grain market is something over which you had absolutely no control.

I have here the total livestock - and I'm not knocking agriculture - but we have here the total acreage of wheat, oats and barley for the years 1971 to 1974 and of the livestock on farms, and if it hadn't been for the higher value of these animals, we are producing about 8 per cent more in 1974 than we were in 1971.

I am concerned about the investor confidence in this province. I am not concerned about the farmers as such, that they are going to pull out, because if we were going to pull out we would have pulled out 40 years ago. The farmer is the kind of fellow who has confidence because he is going to be here next year, and it's a next-year country. But I am concerned - and I have to give credit to the minister, the Minister of Agriculture particularly, when I talk about agricultural credit, but I'm afraid that through his compassion, his kindness, he has given out more than we can afford.

I would like to talk on about the reduction or restraint on bureaucracy, Mr. Speaker, but for a few minutes before I close I would like to talk as the Member for Macleod - and I hope as a responsible member - on the note of caution I feel should be given at this particular time.

On July 8, 1974 we had a federal election. It's rather paradoxical that Mr. Stanfield, who preached that inflation was going to be something we are going to have to

reckon with, lost the election. But it's rather surprising too that he won all 19 seats in Alberta. But whether we like it or not, Mr. Stanfield was probably one of the most honest politicians in the whole of Canada because he faced up to the facts that there was inflation, that the government of the day was doing nothing about it and put his neck on the line. Whether it had been inflation or anything else, maybe he was not destined to be the Prime Minister of Canada. But I admire the man because he stood up and told the facts the way they were, even though some of his own party supporters suggested that he was not going to win.

In the United States, up until six months ago they would only slightly admit that there was going to be a recession, we are not quite as well off as we were before. Yet in the middle of January when the President of the United States makes his annual report on the state of the nation, he came out honestly and said, folks we are in trouble, deep trouble. Not since the 1930s have we been in such a terrible position.

As Mr. Stanfield has done in Eastern Canada or on the federal scene, we in Alberta go blithely around ignoring inflation, because it might hurt our record, pouring out the money and trying to get people up to their eyes in debt rather than saying, listen folks, we have been good to you. We are not going to cut the money off but for God's sake let's slow down a little bit. Let's take a look at where we are going.

I find there is nothing more comforting to a farmer or a businessman [than] to lie in bed at night knowing that his bills are paid. But there is nothing worse than hell lying in bed or dodging his creditors, and he doesn't know where it's come from and it's not his fault. Yet you press on him and continually press on him grants and credits. Here we've gone into another \$200 million program to bail you out, to give all the things - maybe you can't afford them but let's wait and see if we can afford them.

You spent four years - and I say this kindly to you - just giving people everything they could [want], but the bills are starting to come due. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House, that unless we honestly face what is happening and realize what is happening, with all the money we have, we can go down the drain.

Syncrude is one of the best examples we can get. Do you mean to tell me the [Alberta] Energy Company today could turn around and say, let's build a plant for \$200 million and it's going to come in at \$600 million? Do you think these things are going to go on forever and the money is going to keep rolling out of the ground?

Let's face the facts. Japan realized they were in desperate trouble and cut off all foreign imports to live within their income. But we in Canada today, and particularly in Alberta, we've got the Conservatives, God help us, where money's coming out of the ground, we're in the banana belt.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to be honest and fair to the people of Alberta and the future generation, for heavens sake let's have a look at where we are going. We don't have to go that fast. You could get elected on your own record - we are not going to help you, but you could get elected on your own record without spending any more money. Surely to heavens you have enough common sense - some of it on the front bench - but surely you've got enough common sense on the back bench that you can turn around, fellows like myself, and know that you can't make it fellows.

We are not helping anybody by putting them up to their ears in debt. But if the government, through grants and loans, is going to help people out and they fall short it is not right for the government to say, well folks we'll wipe it out and keep it all clean. Because there are many people you turned down. And in the hope and aspirations of your great chamber of commerce addresses there are many people who have had to go to the banks and the banks are not going to say, we'll forgive you, we'll cut off the interest.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, and I say this kindly, honestly and sincerely that when we start to knock government, and it's not those who are responsible, it's not really fair because these men and women have given the best they could to the people of the Province of Alberta. Whether we agree with them entirely or whether we agree with the administration entirely, we have to give credit where credit is due.

But I am concerned that there are many within the government on the front bench - all of you collectively have a right to govern, but there are some of you who would like to rule.

I think the sooner we get back a little more humility into some of the ministers, and [get] some who could come up with a decision without having to wait six months and continually put it off because they are afraid to make a mistake, to stand out and do a little soul-searching on behalf of the rest of you because you are leaving yourself a bad name.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's up to the government to help as much as possible, to stay out of businesses as much as they possibly can and to leave a climate for confidence and expansion.

MR. HINMAN:

Mr. Speaker, this isn't going to be a swan song because while I can write lyrics, I have no skill at music.

After all the noise we have heard, I propose to sort of ask us to sit down and look at ourselves and see what this is all about. I think I can relate everything I am going to say to the amendment but I have to go back a little bit to the tradition.

Most of you know that I am a lover of history and out of it I think I learned some things. But what I'm going to say is, the Speech from the Throne was a technique developed in the old days to let everybody who wanted to make a speech make it. It was the one kind of debate where nobody was tied to anything because the Speech from the

Throne itself only gave some indications of the government's direction and philosophy. It was principally an excuse to let people talk about their constituencies, air their philosophies and it worked that way.

Now the amendment is traditional too and its purpose, of course, was to indicate the attitudes of the opposition. It was to remind the government itself that they had to retain the confidence of their own members and the confidence of the opposition. Sometimes it was used to reflect genuine concerns and enhance the political charisma of the members of the opposition.

One of the facets which has been treated in the debate on the amendment has been responsibility. Anybody who has read the Speeches from the Throne as long as I have realizes that while they may have served the purposes I indicate, in many instances they are just halo polish. In the same vein, the movement for an amendment is just mud-throwing. Maybe we've outgrown that traditional use.

But I referred to responsibility and I think we believe in responsibility. Every government believes in being responsible. By definition of course responsible has several meanings. It means that you will act in accordance with direction, rule and principle. On the other hand, responsible can mean that you have to take the blame for something or that perhaps you deserve some credit for it. But responsible to whom?

Too often I think events of the last few years have indicated that governments want to be responsible to the people who kick some money into the election funds. They want to be responsible more or less to collective groups, and that goes all the way from church bodies to big unions. They want to be responsible to the Legislature as far as politics will permit. They want to be responsible to the voter groups no matter who they are. They have to consider also the nonvoter because he becomes a voter and is often very influential too. But in the main, we hope that governments will be responsible to principles and policies and that's what it's all about.

If a government is dedicated to performance in accordance with direction, prescription and promise, that is responsible government. Nobody has to check it up or point out where it's missing. I say that even responsibility is a matter of degree and we make it often a matter of priority.

I can illustrate by what has been said in this debate. We're responsible for the poor farmers and the price of cattle. We're responsible to the point where we give it a priority and we pass a special warrant which we try to justify. So I repeat that even responsibility often becomes a matter of priority and degree. Will you be responsible to this person or that? To this body or that? To this principle or that? One of the troubles with trying to stand on principles is that it's no good unless you have enough principles to support you. Sometimes we're led to believe that we're lacking.

So the Speech from the Throne is really a traditional thing and so is the amendment. The debate on the Speech from the Throne always seems to make government members defensive.

This was a pretty innocuous amendment because it simply said "this Assembly regrets". And the government might easily have said, well, we don't regret it; it's fine the way it is. Or they might have said, well, we regret it too but we can't have everything in the budget. And so the debate would have ended. But we don't do that. We get on the defensive immediately. Of course, that invites the opposition to become aggressive and perhaps even abusive. The only no-no in the business is that the people on the government side must in no way indicate that there is any sense on this side. And the no-no for us is to admit that maybe you fellows do have some sense and maybe you did consider the facts. That's not to be done.

Well, let's look at this amendment. It says: "... this Assembly regrets that the Speech from the Throne contained no indication of proposed actions or legislation in the following five areas:" This is one case where the fact is right. There is no indication. So what do we do?

First, "The control and limitation of the amount of expenditure that may be authorized by special warrant." What's the defence? We didn't hear anybody say, we're concerned about that. But I know you're concerned about it. I met with your members in the regulations committee and you were concerned about regulations. It's the trend that's worrisome. So I say again, maybe our responsibility is a matter of priority and degree.

Well, all that happened was members on the government side began to defend each special warrant. I submit that isn't justified. If the banker whose board of directors tell him to make loans in these fields and he says, yeah but, these fellows come in and boy, did they need money; I just couldn't resist; surely you fellows wouldn't mind making that kind of loan. Well, because banking is a fiduciary responsibility, the directors probably fired him. You fellows might be fired if the directorate of the provincial voters happens to get concerned about it.

But that isn't the point. The fact that many of these warrants are justifiable doesn't change the fact that it's something to worry about because it's a trend to be irresponsible, to place your priority on responsibility to little voter groups, to the charisma that can be created, and that is important. I'm not going to say much more about that.

The second one is: "The reorganization of municipal financing." Now reorganization just doesn't mean, give them some more money so they won't have to tax the people. And it doesn't mean just take off a tax. It means you overhaul this system. That's exactly what the mayors of Calgary and Edmonton and I think also the reeves of municipalities were talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. HINMAN:

They want to reorganize this thing. They want to sit down with the government and decide how can we raise the money we need if we're going to do what the people want, and how can we share it. That's reorganization. Could we not have accepted the regret that that wasn't mentioned simply by saying, well, it was an oversight but we won't let it go on.

No. 3 says: "Steps to restore confidence of investors in Albertan industry and commerce." We've heard the greatest dissertations to prove that there isn't any lack of confidence. Now, Mr. Speaker, you can deny pregnancy but it's pretty hard to conceal, and it isn't often mistaken for goiter. On the other hand, just the fact that one big industrial project may quit doesn't indicate, for instance, that there isn't any confidence. By the same token, a great demand for coffins is not very much proof of confidence in the future. All this says is "to restore confidence".

I think the members on the Speaker's right - your right, Mr. Speaker - may say that there is no lack of confidence. Everybody is just a little bit jittery. Everybody is just a little concerned. I say that government spending, government largesse and government loans are not going to be proof of confidence. In fact it may be the very proof of the concern of the government and of this Legislature that we have to do something to restore, to maintain, to increase confidence.

By the same token I submit, Mr. Speaker, that sometimes we need our confidence jolted a little bit. Sometimes our confidence is conceit and we have to have it jolted to bring a little reality back into the thinking of our people.

Let us go to No. 4: "The reduction of restraint on the growth of the province's bureaucracy." Well, of course that depends on where you sit. Some of the members on the front bench used to berate the Social Credit Government on the great increase of civil service. My own opponent in the election promised that there would be a great reduction in civil service.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear. Get the fat out.

MR. HINMAN:

Well, as I told him in a meeting, don't make promises you may not even want to keep.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. HINMAN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, the resolution only said, we regret that there is nothing to indicate a concern in this field. I hope the government is concerned about bureaucracy and I hope it's concerned about an untoward growth in civil service. On the other hand, I think it behooves the members on this side to realize that if you're going to initiate new programs, they take management. I think we have to realize that with the change in working hours and the change in the social implications of labor, men who worked ten hours a day and then move up to five, can't be replaced by just one man; that growth there has to be expected. But let it be responsible growth and let's not fail to regret that sometimes we forget to look at it.

Sometimes we let the civil service grow and nobody says, could somebody already here have given the service? Is it possible that we can transfer some people? Above all, let's not increase the civil service just to make jobs. If we're going to do that we might just as well dole out the money and say to the people, don't work. We'll let the people who want to work as long as we get the work done. Those aren't what we want.

Now where do we go in this business of restraint. Somebody asks, who would you fire? Well I walk up and down these halls and I walk up and down the halls in the Administration Building and the others, and sometimes I stop for a few minutes and watch people. They aren't doing a darned thing, and there is a lot of duplication in that department. I don't know which one of them I would fire, or whether I would fire anybody, but at least I would say, we don't need all of you. Those of you who want to stay had better demonstrate that you want to be busy. Of course I don't want them to be busy just doing nothing. There never was much merit in that either.

What are we going to do about it? Are we going to try to kid ourselves that there is no danger in a perpetual growth of civil service, that there is no danger in a perpetual building up of new bureaucracies. Or are we going to try to kid ourselves that the government themselves and the members of the Legislature are just too busy, we have to turn some of these decisions over to these people.

Of course we have to turn some decisions over to them. We are going to receive a report pretty soon on regulations. Regulations will be very much related to bureaucracy because almost invariably there is a great bureaucracy to enforce regulations.

I submit the amendment was very wise; that we do regret there is nothing to indicate we are concerned about it. The government might have said, the fact that we didn't mention it doesn't mean we aren't concerned. They don't do that. They feel they are on the defensive to say, well, there isn't any real increase in civil service. It isn't any

greater than when you were there. In other words, if we don't sin any worse than you do, Saint Peter has no right to call us to account. Well that isn't really the kind of responsibility I have always hoped we would have in government.

Now [on] the reduction of income tax. Really neither side can justify a thing like that if we need the money. So the debate centres around the fact that we have so darn much money, what's the best thing to do with it. Shall we dig up new and new and new ways to do things for people that they should do for themselves. Somebody says, no, no, no, let's give them a reduction in income tax.

There are some reasons for it. Of course it's always political. I can remember when I used to boast of all the taxes we had abolished in Alberta. I used to even go away thinking maybe I'd done that - I was Treasurer. Then I got thinking it over and I said, well God put the oil here and some fellow who wanted to risk his money found it and about all the credit we can take is that we turned it to the advantage of the government so we could take off some of these taxes.

Now I think we were wrong. I think the better thing to have done if you really believe in the individual, if you really are private enterprisers, would have been to say to the people, we believe that if you want a service you should pay for it. We believe that even if you're on relief you ought to pay some taxes to remind yourselves that these services don't come for nothing. But in the alternative, we'll take a good share of this money which has come to us by grace and we'll give it to you as citizens.

It has some advantages over what is suggested here. For one, I'm not too sorry we didn't see anything in the budget about income tax. On the other hand, I could turn it around and say that we regret you didn't mention it. We think you should have told us why you don't want to do it, if you don't. Maybe before the session is over we will find you do. But nobody mentioned that.

I want to repeat that perhaps if we were really responsible we would say to the people, we're going to ask you to pay for the services you want. We think income tax is pretty fair because it does satisfy one of the essentials. It does call on individuals to contribute to the general welfare somewhat in relation to their ability to pay.

If you take it off, who gets the advantage? If you truly believe that those who have the most should pay the most, then to take off income tax is a false move because it gives the benefit chiefly to those who could pay. Somebody said, well we want to take it off but we want to take it off at the bottom. I submit that really that's what's wrong with democracy. That's where the danger lies. We're going to cultivate an attitude on the part of the people that up to this and this and this level you shouldn't pay anything. Society owes you this. Most of you have seen the figures. If you took all the money away from all the people in Canada who make over \$100,000, it wouldn't make a dent in the cost of welfare and other things. We're just kidding the people. We're kidding ourselves if we want to take the income tax from what we call the low bracket.

What's the alternative? The alternative of course is something that this government is attempting to do in some ways: to give some guaranteed income to the people, to say to them, in fact, if our taxation is a burden and you can show it's a burden, we'll help you with it.

It's nice to do things for the old people but there are statistics galore to show you that people on pensions have more per person income than the low strata of the workers. Maybe it's low, but suppose it is \$235 a piece for each of two people. Do you think the bottom 40 per cent of income earners with families in this province have \$235 per person? By the same token, as you get older you don't need the same. You don't wear out shoes like a 16 year old boy.

I regret nothing was mentioned in the budget to give us the government's attitude on it but there were intimations in the debate that maybe the government's thinking isn't quite straight on this particular issue.

I submit that, in regretting there was no reorganization of municipal finance, we missed another boat. The hon. member Mr. Trynchy said, of course they'll spend all you'll give them. I remember being chastised in this House for saying just that, when the Liberals were on this side. But it's so true. It's just human, when you're in a municipal government and you're under pressure and you're close to the people and they can get at you, to say well, of course this is going to cost money and we don't want to tax you but believe me, we're going after the senior governments. Is there any excuse for the senior government to be attacked in this ... [inaudible] ...

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the nearer to the people the collection agency is, the more responsible government you get. So I submit that it is time for reorganization of the municipal financing in the province. It's high time we sat down with these people and said, all right, which services will you give.

Maybe I can relate it a little to decentralization. Decentralization doesn't mean taking a centre and putting it here or there. It means letting decisions be made at lower levels by those people who are closest to the problems. Some of you who have been reading the papers realize that they think maybe they should have some of the gasoline tax, and maybe they should. They think they should have some of the income tax and maybe they should. But we can argue, on the other hand, you're getting it. We're giving you grants for roads. We heard about these special warrants and all these beautiful grants for roads. Well that comes out of the income tax and gasoline tax and they're getting it.



Maybe what we should say to the cities is, once the highway gets to your border it's all yours. You can have the share of the gasoline tax, but that's yours. You look after it.

That's what we talk about when we want reorganization and that's all the amendment says. We regret the government didn't indicate that they're thinking about this. Maybe they are thinking about it. I hope so. I have confidence that once they put their attention to it they'll come up with some plans that are just as good as ours.

Inflation was used in the debate as to why we have to have special warrants. Well, Mr. Speaker, the statistics the government gives out show that they know the rate of inflation from X years back. They can predict it. When we talked about the budget in the last spring session, we talked about inflation a lot of times. We knew we had to provide for it. I submit it's no reason for special warrants. Again I say I'm not so concerned with special warrants or with what you did with the money. But I am concerned with this trend to spend more and more by special warrants. That's all the amendment asked for. Well what are we going to do about these things? I submit again that if it weren't for politics - I heard statistics quoted galore over there and they don't prove very much many times.

I often think when we say, I agree with you in principle, and then come those words that always bother me: "but in this case ...". It couldn't have been a sin. Well, maybe we'd better get around to taking some politics out of it.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that maybe it's time that we abandoned some of the tradition. We don't have fiddlers on the roof any more and it doesn't mean that culture has gone down the drain. Maybe that's what we've got to do in politics. It may be time that we have to say to the opposition, what would you like in the Speech from the Throne as a basis for discussion. I don't know whether we'd come up with any ideas or not. Maybe we should say to all the people in the province, what would you like in the Speech from the Throne as a basis for discussion, if that's what the purpose is.

The hon. member Mr. Hyndman, tells us it's sort of window dressing, just watch for the budget and then you'll see what the meat's going to be. Well, I just hope the meat isn't half baked and we have to swallow it.

So I say there are some things we can do to improve our system. I submit that this resolution is a basis for a lot of change. The government might indicate they regret that certain things cannot be in their policies this year, it doesn't mean that they've abandoned the principle. I submit that it's quite possible we need a new approach. And I have indicated what it might be: we invite people to say what they would like in the Speech from the Throne and admit, frankly, that this is just a basis for some discussion; a kind of forum to start with.

But most of all, I submit that maybe it's high time we got over so much politics. After quite a few years on both sides of the House I began keeping records last year of how much time was spent with no other purpose than politics. The hon. Minister of Agriculture, doing a good job on which he could be silent and be admired, but if we goad him a little bit he gets up and takes 25 minutes defending his position for politics. And then the hon. member from Calgary gets up and says his piece. Well, that's expensive. We'd have had a lot more to help the farmers if we hadn't spent so much time in politics.

So I suggest, seriously, that there is time, there is a chance for us to examine the tradition on which we have been debating. If we could take politics out of it, if when the Speech from the Throne comes to us, the government didn't feel obliged to defend what it had done but could exert its thinking on the policy, and if the opposition wasn't so concerned with berating the government but simply wanted to put forth its arguments for something better, for which we all hope, I suggest that our true responsibility would be to reason [and use] logic in meeting the exigencies which exist in our province.

We have heard a lot about Syncrude. I was almost to write an article about Syncrude or "crude sin". What's going on here? I have confidence that our Premier is negotiating in the best interests of the province. If I had to pick a negotiator; he's pretty skilful, I'd probably pick him. But we seem to feel obliged on this side to criticize all that's happened and to blame him, and on your side you feel to tell us that we don't know a thing about it, that nobody could have done better even in hindsight, or rearsight, or whatever you call it. I know that sometimes we boast of hindsight as if that's where our eyes were, and it's easy to do.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in concluding, I say that there's nothing wrong with the amendment. It served its purpose. It's only in the way you interpret it. Both in Throne Speeches and in amendments in the future, much could be done if we take politics out, forget some dollars and put our emphasis on sense.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question.

[The amendment was lost.]

MR. CRAWFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in joining the debate on the main motion which now seems like it began some time ago. I want to begin, as some other hon. members did in speaking to the main motion, by making just a few remarks about the fact that the Speech from the Throne on this occasion was read by the Hon. Ralph Steinhauer, the first Canadian of Native descent to read a Speech from the Throne in Canada.

I think the entire House, time and time again, has reflected on how entirely appropriate we feel it is that a person of his racial descent should be reading the Speech from the Throne in a Canadian Legislature. That it has happened in Alberta for the first time is something I would like to express my personal pride and feeling about.

As well, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to comment on the excellent presentations made by the mover and the seconder of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona and the hon. Member for Athabasca have also made very notable contributions to the debate. The uniqueness of the pronunciation of a number of words in the Cree language by the hon. Member for Edmonton Strathcona has been remarked upon; something that we hope will be inscribed in Hansard in the original Cree characters in the final printing of Hansard.

As well I wanted to say about the speech made by the mover that I was very taken with the suggestion he made that the crime compensation type of legislation might be slightly expanded to include compensation for people who have suffered injury, suffered damages, perhaps personal injury, but in the case he quoted, damages in the sense of loss of income as a result of undertaking to try to save the life of another person. It seems to me that my colleagues in the government caucus will want to take a look at a suggestion like that.

I also have the understanding, Mr. Speaker, that there is a number of members who are in the Assembly now who, due to their own decisions, will not be returning. They won't be placing their names before the electorate in their various constituencies. Among honorable gentlemen opposite - if I make a mistake in mentioning someone who is not retiring and I say he is, I ask him to forgive me; I don't think I'll do that. If I make a mistake the other way I consider it much less important because I know there are some that have not perhaps come to my attention. The only word I ever have on these things is occasional conversations with hon. members. But I believe the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc, the hon. Member for Cardston, the hon. Member for Taber-Warner, the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen and the hon. Member for Cypress are among those who have said that they would not seek re-election.

I wanted to wish all of them very well in other pursuits and express on behalf of all members in the Assembly sincere appreciation for the services they have performed and the manners in which they have represented their constituents here.

[Applause]

I don't think it should happen, Mr. Speaker, that a former premier of this province should be retiring by not seeking re-election, and have us fail to note that we understand and appreciate the contribution he has made, not only to this Legislature, but to several preceding Legislatures, if I'm not mistaken, in the case of the hon. Member for Cypress, going back some twenty years. It's an outstanding contribution.

[Applause]

Mr. Speaker, on our side of the House the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight and two members of the Executive Council - the hon. Minister of Mines and Minerals and the hon. Minister of Highways and Transport - have signified a similar intention that they will not seek re-election. I want to say to all of them that the sense of achievement and the enjoyment of working with people, the understanding that we have of the goals and the attempts that each of us make to achieve things on behalf of the province of Alberta, are marked and outstanding characteristics of all three gentlemen. Speaking for the government caucus, we will certainly miss them and of course it will only be in the sense of their not being in the caucus that we will miss them, because they are good friends and we will be seeing them anyway outside the Chamber.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having heard the brave call of the Leader of the Opposition for less taxes and higher pensions, I thought I would try to place in perspective at the outset of my remarks a few of the programs in regard to senior citizens that the government has brought forward in the Speech from the Throne. This is done, as hon. members are aware, not in the context of a late gasp in the life of this government to try to do a lot of catching up in this field. This is one of those which is entirely different from that.

This is a field of concern; a field of policies being proposed, a field of legislative intentions being disclosed in the Speech from the Throne which is part of a continuous record of careful attention and much concern for the position of the senior citizens of our province. I can reflect, and hon. members know the facts, back to the fall of 1971 when the government acted - prior even to the first sitting of the 17th Legislature which began in March of 1972 - months prior to that to resolve one of the difficulties that remained to senior citizens at that time in regard to the payment of premiums for medicare and Alberta Blue Cross coverage. That alone was a contribution to the sense of well-being and a relief to those who previously had to find the funds to make those payments in so many cases. That I think is a very very notable contribution to the enjoyment of life by our citizens of 65 and over.

We are looking, by 1981, at a population of about 158,000 people 65 years and over in the province of Alberta. The interesting thing is that the percentage of people who are 65 and over is increasing and we know the reasons. They increase not only in numbers as the population grows, they increase in the percentage of population. The reasons are the balance in age groups in the population that shifts upwards as a result of smaller families today and of course the longer life expectancy that has been a feature of the

last few generations, the slow but continual progress that is being made in increasing the life expectancy of people.

I look forward to programs getting better and better, Mr. Speaker. In 1996 I want to join the ranks of Alberta's senior citizens, and I don't shrink from that at all. I think anyone contemplating the process of growing a little older can only hope for one thing; you know you don't really feel regret at growing older when you consider the alternative.

Part of the message I think that we would all like to express to senior citizens of our province at this time, Mr. Speaker, is that we know we understand them when they tell us that we are not to generalize about them. We are not to look at 127,000 people, which is the approximate number in Alberta as of 1975, and presume that because they have attained that age or a greater age they are likely to be so similar that we should treat them in all respects always the same, and have programs that will stereotype and regiment them. That is not the objective of any enlightened program in regard to senior citizens. We know that they have many many different and varying interests in exactly the same way, I could say, as we have here, but also in the same way that they have always had themselves. And there is nothing that should surprise us at all that those inclinations should carry themselves into the later years of life as well.

The message, therefore, Mr. Speaker, is that the greatest thing we can offer by way of a benefit is independence for the senior citizens: the right to make decisions on their own about the way in which they will live and the various options open to them so far as possible as much as any other person would.

As a result of that we've treated the question of minimum income as being of principal importance. There is no better claim to independence than a minimum income adequate for a person to make his own decisions about the various day to day things in life. So that is why that is really right at the top of our list of important programs in the senior citizen section of this year's Speech from the Throne.

But there are ways other than income of adding to the independence of any person. In the sense of senior citizens in particular, one of the other ones that we want to work with more and more, as a new program, is the support of the individual or the senior citizen couple in their own home for as long as possible before age or illness perhaps make it necessary for them to seek other accommodations, such as in a senior citizens lodge. But the sense of independence that remains to a person who is still able to look after himself or herself in his or her own home is a very very important item. That's why the home support programs are being encouraged through the senior citizen community service programs that we are going to be asking volunteer associations and municipal governments to work with us on. I believe the funding was referred to in the Speech from the Throne. It would be similar to the funding through the municipalities of the preventive social service programs by which the province would pay 80 per cent of deficits of those undertakings. And I stress it, in leaving the reference to that subject for the moment, Mr. Speaker, in the sense that the message again is independence. That's the score upon which we've tried to fashion these proposals.

In the nursing homes and lodges of this province, going from memory, we have in the neighborhood of 6,000 people in lodges and 6,000 people - give or take a few hundred in each case - in nursing homes. I've already mentioned that we have 127,000 senior citizens. So the statistic is clear that the vast majority still do look after themselves, despite the importance of those other facilities. We will continue to extend those programs too. The vast majority, some 90 per cent, are still largely self-sufficient, and that's why the programs of home support are so vital.

Mr. Speaker, I had begun by mentioning the \$235 a month assured income plan. The payments will vary of course from person to person because once they get above the old age pension payment from the federal government and the guaranteed income supplement if they're entitled to it, people may or may not have differing amounts of income of their own. That means that recipients of the assured income plan will receive amounts which are unlike the \$10 a month payment brought in last session, in that people will be getting varying amounts to bring them up to \$235.

The people who receive the maximum federal supplement under the guaranteed income supplement program will also, therefore, receive the maximum payment provided under the Alberta program. For the single person at the present time under the federal program alone, that figure is \$204.27, and for couples it would be \$194.85 for each of two people. Our program of course brings for a couple, each of two people, \$235; therefore \$470 as an assured income for two people, both of whom are 65 or over.

I'd have to mention I think at this time, Mr. Speaker, that as the federal program changes and is indexed annually, which is their intention - presumably if inflation continues their adjustments will be upwards - those benefits are all passed on to the senior citizen in the province. In other words, our limit of \$235 will change at that time. If the federal government increases its allowance by an additional \$5 a month, our program would be a minimum income program not of \$235, but of \$240. I think that's very very important to point out because it wasn't always the case in this province that those benefits were passed on.

I remember - and it must be a source of embarrassment to some honorable gentlemen opposite who probably were opposed to what was done at the time - the government in this province in 1970 found that when OAS and GIS, the combined federal program, increased, and this was the combined program at the time, by the sum of \$2.21 to \$111.41, for those senior citizens who were on public assistance - and they are in the vast minority - but for those who were, the government of the day found it necessary to charge them back the \$2.21.

I say, Mr. Speaker, when I hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition crying out for an increase over the \$235 a month provided under the new plan and know that he was a member of the Executive Council of this province in January 1970 when the decision was taken that \$2.21 was too much to pass on to the senior citizens of this province who were receiving it as part of their income and happened to be on social allowance, then I can understand the great silence on the other side of this Assembly at this particular moment.

Mr. Speaker, I know it's one minute to one and I just want to say prior to adjourning the debate that the figures will show that the figure of \$235 a month per person will give Alberta senior citizens - admittedly the variations are not large among three of the provinces in cash income - the highest nevertheless of those three pacesetters in the country which are Alberta, British Columbia and Ontario.

Without going into specifics, Mr. Speaker, the additional benefits which are provided almost uniquely in Alberta in the sense of extended health benefits and the like put Alberta way out in front in regard to income support. By averaging them - if I can just give these two figures at the present time - if you want to average in the benefits over and above the assured income plan that the individual in Alberta receives: [for a] single [person] it would come to \$270 a month in value because of the other programs provided. For couples the figure would be \$534 per month. I wanted to put those very very significant figures on the record today.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until Monday afternoon at 2:30 p.m.

[The House rose at 1 o'clock.]