

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

Title: **Monday, March 8, 1976 2:30 p.m.**

[The House met at 2:30 p.m.]

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 6****The Calgary General Hospital Board Act**

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 6, The Calgary General Hospital Board Act. Mr. Speaker, this bill will replace The Calgary Hospitals Board Act, Chapter 7 of the Statutes of Alberta, 1954. In effect, this bill will provide a new act to govern the affairs of Calgary General Hospital.

[Leave granted; Bill 6 introduced and read a first time]

**Bill 5****The Alberta School Trustees' Association Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 5, The Alberta School Trustees' Association Amendment Act, 1976. The purpose of this bill is to permit the association to acquire and to own real and personal property, and to substitute the designation of "zone" for "divisional associations".

[Leave granted; Bill 5 introduced and read a first time]

**Bill 200****The Cash Discount Act**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Cash Discount Act. This bill gives cash customers a 2 per cent discount and corrects the present situation where cash customers subsidize national credit card customers.

[Leave granted; Bill 200 introduced and read a first time]

**Bill 9****The Libraries Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, The Libraries Amendment Act, 1976. This bill will make it possible to increase the grants to public libraries.

[Leave granted; Bill 9 introduced and read a first time]

**Bill 10**  
**The Unfair Trade Practices**  
**Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 10, The Unfair Trade Practices Amendment Act, 1976. The purpose of the bill is to clarify the requirements relating to prominence to be given to part of the price as compared to the total price in various representations, and thereby, to increase public understanding and awareness of the protection provided to consumers by the legislation.

[Leave granted; Bill 10 introduced and read a first time]

**Bill 15**

**The Municipal and**  
**Provincial Properties Valuation**  
**Amendment Act, 1976**

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 15, The Municipal and Provincial Properties Valuation Amendment Act, 1976. This bill provides greater certainty in the evaluation and assessment of electric power distribution facilities and AGT installations, in the context of the school foundation program and provincial grants in lieu of taxes, respectively.

[Leave granted; Bill 15 introduced and read a first time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following bills and orders be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders: Bill 5, The Alberta School Trustees' Association Amendment Act, 1976; Bill 9, The Libraries Amendment Act, 1976; and Bill 10, The Unfair Trade Practices Amendment Act, 1976.

[Motion carried]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. SPEAKER. I have the honor to draw the attention of members of the Assembly to a distinguished delegation from the Legislature of our sister province of Saskatchewan, including the Hon. J. E. Brockelbank, the Speaker; Mr. J. A. Pepper, the Deputy Speaker; the Hon. R. Romanow, the Attorney General and Government House Leader; Mr. Edward Malone, the Opposition Whip; Mr. Eric Berntson, the Progressive Conservative Whip; Mr. Jack Wiebe, MLA; Mr. B. M. Dyck, MLA; Mr. Leonard Larson, MLA; Mr. Gordon Barnhart, Clerk of the Assembly; and Mrs. G. Ronyk, Clerk Assistant. I would ask our distinguished guests if they would stand to receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, some 60 Grade 12 students from Lindsay Thurber Comprehensive High School in Edmonton. They are seated in both the ... in Red Deer, rather ... I work in Edmonton, Mr. Speaker, I live in Red Deer. I sometimes get confused.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which riding are you from?

MR. FOSTER: I'm from Red Deer and I live there as well.

Mr. Speaker, they are in both galleries and they are accompanied, on this occasion, by three of their instructors, Bruce Hancock, Dale Storvik, and Phil Kennedy. May I ask that they rise and be recognized by the Assembly, please.

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, a distinguished visitor from southern Alberta, Mr. Wilf McDougall. He is the son of Chief Maurice McDougall, and a councillor of the Piegan tribe at Brocket. He is attending this Legislature for the first time, showing an increased interest of this government towards the affairs of our native people. I'd like him to stand and be recognized.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, a group of ladies who are in the public gallery. This group has taken a course on pioneer women. It is my pleasure to ask them to rise now and be recognized by members of this Assembly.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, in Mr. Fred Peacock's absence, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce 45 students from the Bishop Carroll High School in his constituency in Calgary, with their teachers, Dennis MacGuire, Mrs. Adamec, Miss Penner, and Mrs. Eshpeter who is with them. I'd ask them to stand in the members gallery, please, and be recognized.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the hon. members of the Legislature, a former page boy in this Legislature, Tom Cox. He has with him two Grade 12 students from M.E. LaZerte High School, Doug Eglinski and Garry Hayes. I would ask these three fine young men to stand and be recognized.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce to you, and to the Assembly, members of the St. Francis Xavier High School political science club. They are here studying practical political science. They are in the public gallery and I'd ask they receive the welcome of the Assembly at this time.

#### head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to file four documents with the Legislative Assembly library: first of all, a Review of Coal Exploration Policies and Programs in the Eastern Slopes of Alberta; secondly, the Proceedings of the ECA Hearings on The Environmental Effects of Residential Development in the Leduc/International Airport Area; thirdly, the proceedings of the Environment Conservation Authority Hearings on the Regulation of the Flow of the Red Deer River; and fourthly, two copies of the Land Use Forum report.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the Glenbow-Alberta Institute ninth annual report. I would also like to file the Manifest of Alberta Government Services Aircraft With Respect to Executive Council and Government Agencies Air Travel in '75.

#### head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

##### **Oil Pricing**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, and ask how successful he was in acquiring a \$2 per barrel increase in the price of Alberta crude oil in his meetings at Ottawa last Thursday and Friday.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, we won't be able to judge the success of that meeting until after June 30, when we have a new price for oil in Canada.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the minister or the Premier. Is it the position of the Government of Alberta that, in fact, the \$2 per barrel increase is the position of the Government of Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, in the meeting, and outside of the meeting for that matter, I made the point with my colleagues, and with others who were interested, that I didn't feel it would be reasonable to ask Alberta to accept less than a \$2 increase per barrel of oil at this stage, recognizing as we do that foreign crude oil is being supplied into Canada at \$13.30 to \$13.50, and Alberta is selling its crude oil at \$8.

##### **VS Services Ltd. Contract**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Premier, and it flows from a request that has been made to the Premier by the Alberta Civil Service Association as a result of the contracting of services at ASH/Deerhome at Red Deer. The proposal put forward by the Civil Service Association is that an independent inquiry be made into the circumstances surrounding the awarding of a contract to VS Services Ltd.

Is the government prepared to give favorable consideration to the request from the Civil Service Association, in light of the number of rather surprising circumstances?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that is no. It's our view that it is clearly the responsibility of government to make that sort of decision. It's a decision that's made in terms of the best interests of the people of Alberta, after an evaluation by the appropriate government department. For that reason, certainly it is not in our view an appropriate situation with regard to any sort of inquiry, other than any inquiry that might evolve with regard to the matter of debate here in the Legislative Assembly.

MR. CLARK: A supplementary question to the Premier. Is the government prepared to table in the Assembly all the evaluations which were done by the government, so that in fact members of the Assembly have the benefit of that information prior to the estimates of the minister's department?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm not certain about the position with regard to the tabling of documents, or the degree to which documents would be tabled, but certainly I'm sure that the hon. minister involved would be prepared to respond to any questions that have to do with the decision. And if the hon. minister wants to expand upon my answer, she's free to do so.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would not give an undertaking to table all the documents the hon. member might require. Many of them are interdepartmental working documents. Certainly, they could be considered if the hon. member would put them on the Order Paper.

In relation to the estimates, I would be very pleased to discuss that during the course of my estimates, although I would draw to the attention of the hon. member that the contract which we are entering reflects the coming years and was arrived at after the preparation of my estimates.

While I'm on my feet also, Mr. Speaker, there were a couple of areas which came up during the question period on Friday. One was a question relating to VS Services Ltd. I would reply to the Assembly as follows: VS Services Ltd. is a public company whose stocks trade on the Toronto Stock Exchange. Their head office is in Toronto. They have been active in Alberta for the past 23 years. They have an office in this province located in Edmonton, and at the present time they have 23 contracts throughout the province of Alberta.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I may have laid stress on another question inadvertently, when I referred to The Financial Administration Act. The true merit in a private enterprise approach to a contract is the flexibility that a private company has in purchasing, particularly when they purchase in such massive quantities across the nation. That's where true economies can be realized. I think a good measure of that has been indicated in the province in the past and, of course, I'm very enthusiastic that we can realize it in the future.

MR. CLARK: A further supplementary question to the minister. Is it still the position of the Government of Alberta that the bulk of the alleged \$1 million savings will result from the bulk purchasing?

MISS HUNLEY: There are several areas in which an economy can be realized. I just can't stress too highly, Mr. Speaker, how important this really is. We can save approximately \$1 million on the delivery of services which are not related to treatment and nursing care, and make use of additional funds in order to improve that. I just think that's extremely important and can't be stressed too much.

There are economies to be realized in staffing. It's important also that this be on the table and that they clearly understand it. There's an opportunity to save 80 staff positions in those three areas. The staff

positions are protected because they will be achieved, in the long run, through attrition. The greatest economy would have been realized unilaterally — just accept the contract starting in 60 days' time and give people their notice. That didn't seem to me to be in the best interest of the province or of the ASH/Deerhome people who have served this province extremely well. I admire their dedication.

So we opted for a second one and this is: eventually 80 fewer positions will be required, particularly in those three service areas. And I think that is what we need to keep in mind. On top of that are economies in purchasing, which can only be achieved by flexibility, availability, and specialty.

This is a specialized company which has great expertise in its field. They have proven that they can do the job, and I am anxious to have them do it and show the province that we can indeed provide service, take care of our people, and still practise an economy. I make no apologies for that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, with the comments about no apologies ringing in my ears, would the minister be prepared, then, with the same kind of enthusiasm, to give a commitment to the Assembly that the quality of care will not decline at Deerhome and Alberta School Hospital?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, never in the past when we have entered into a contract has the quality of service to our people declined. I am confident that this will be the case again at ASH/Deerhome. I know that it will be possible for people to skulk about with their dark glasses on and inquire of various people whether they are satisfied, and how satisfactory it is, and does it work; and you will be able to get a variety of opinion. But I am quite confident that we can deliver the service as well, if not better, and practise an economy for the people of this province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister assure the House that there will be no change in either the salary or benefits of those employees who are transferred from the public sector to VS Services?

MISS HUNLEY: I don't have all the details of that before me, Mr. Speaker, but that's one of the instructions that I gave to the officials of my department: that the staff benefits should be protected.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary also. Will the hon. minister give the assurance that the laundry will be just as clean?

MR. NOTLEY: It's not really a follow-up question, Mr. Speaker, but I'd like to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member asking a supplementary?

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, on a slightly different part of this problem. Can the minister confirm that the labor-management review committee scored the CSA proposal 31 per cent higher, with respect to patient welfare, than VS Services? Can the hon. minister confirm whether or not that happened?

MISS HUNLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not able to confirm that at this time. I've reviewed some of the reports from the officials in my department. Their basic evaluation was received by me with their recommendations, and the overall benefit to the province and to the ASH/Deerhome management situation was the one on which I issued my instructions.

MR. NOTLEY: A further supplementary question to the hon. minister with respect to the ownership of VS Services. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether it is true that VS Services, while it does allow trading on the Toronto Stock Exchange, is nevertheless controlled by Automatic Retailers of Philadelphia?

MISS HUNLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't have any of that information. I merely sought to obtain information as to who VS Services were in the province of Alberta. My main concern was: were they a firm which was reliable, which had proven capabilities, and whom we could count on to deliver the kind of service we wanted and still practise an economy? That's the main concern that I had. I have satisfied myself that that is so.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister tell the House how long the period of attrition will be to reduce the employee load by 80 staff positions, which I believe was the figure she mentioned?

MISS HUNLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't. There will be some people who will retire, some who will decide to move on. There is a fair amount of turnover in that particular component of the service area in ASH/Deerhome. If everybody resigned tomorrow, the attrition would be pretty fast, but if they don't resign for another 10 or 15 years, it will take some time.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, just for clarification. Can the minister indicate that no tendering went on, whatsoever? This contract was just given to this company after studies by your department?

MISS HUNLEY: If the hon. member wants to refer to tendering — did we advertise in the paper and ask for tenders — it's not that simple. That was not done. We felt there were a number of firms which had capability along that line and could do the job. There's quite a difference between catering in an institution, where we have great responsibility for those in our care, and tendering to cater in a bush camp, for example. We knew we had only a few firms we could approach for a request for a proposal. That was the method we followed.

DR. BUCK: So Mr. Speaker, no public tender was asked for.

MISS HUNLEY: We didn't advertise in the paper. I've already told the hon. member that. We approached companies which we felt had skill and expertise, in that manner. The civil service — and I give them great credit for this — also approached us to see if they could make a presentation, feeling that they, too,

would like to attempt to see if they could meet private enterprise criteria. I give them great credit for that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct one final supplementary question, if I may. This concerns employee benefits and salaries. Mr. Speaker, if I could clarify the minister's answer, my understanding is that she has instructed VS Services to maintain the same level of salaries and benefits.

My question is: in looking at benefits, will this include all the normal benefits, such as pension, vacation, and what have you, that have been built up by the employees of the public service who will be transferred to VS Services Ltd?

MISS HUNLEY: The hon. member is saying a couple of things that are not exactly so. The employees will only transfer to VS Services if they wish. Some may decide they don't wish to. My instruction — it was not to VS Services, it was to the officials in my department — was that staff benefits should be protected. I understand that those negotiations are going on now. I don't have the specific details in order to compare the minute details of the contract.

#### **Waste Oil**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of the Environment. A very short explanation is necessary first. It is estimated that some 15 million gallons of waste oil are dumped in Alberta every year. Some 200 million gallons of waste oil are spilled in Canada. Environment Canada states that some 79 million gallons could be re-refined.

My question to the hon. minister: is anything being done in Alberta to re-refine our waste oils?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes it is, Mr. Speaker, in two ways: one, by government, by way of research which is being funded through the Department of the Environment, and through the Environmental Research Trust. There's also a private enterprise company in Alberta which has some very good plans under way with respect to a new re-refining facility to be built in the Edmonton region.

#### **PWA Move**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Deputy Premier and Minister of Transportation. Can the hon. minister advise the House, in light of the current controversy which has developed and a meeting this afternoon which is of rather more than passing interest, what the government's intention is with respect to moving the headquarters of PWA from Vancouver to Alberta? By the question I would like to know the extent of the move, how many employees, and the timetable.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated previously, the position the government takes is to deal with the board of directors in the matter of broad and long-range policy on behalf of the owners. That policy has been conveyed to the board of directors. In due course, we'll hear about their meeting today.

It is envisaged, certainly, that the initial moves of the executive offices to Calgary will be of a minor nature and that the expansion of service and maintenance in the Edmonton area will be on a growth basis. I might take this opportunity to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there's been a major amount of distortion in the position, or policy outline, we gave to the board, and perhaps there are a lot of non-politicians practising politics.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of that rather gentle answer, which I'm sure is not unnoticed across the way, can the minister advise the House whether the figure we have heard — \$5 million moving expenses — is in fact an accurate estimate of the cost of moving the headquarters of PWA from Vancouver to Edmonton or, if not, whether other figures have been obtained by the board?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated, we put before the board of directors the desires of the owners in the broad and longer range policy directives. It is then for the board of directors to advise us as to the nature and the planning, the staging, and, indeed, the cost that such a move might entail.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the uncertainty over the legal position of Alberta — that will be resolved no doubt in time — has the government asked the board of directors that the move should be delayed until the legal question of Alberta's ownership of PWA is finally settled?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I think there are two points there. First of all, the legal problem the hon. member speaks about does not relate to the question of ownership at all, but relates, rather, to whether the province is a person and has to follow certain directives of the Ministry of Transport or the CTC. So I don't consider that a legal question as to the ownership of the air line. I consider it a constitutional question quite apart from that. Therefore, I wouldn't feel considered to allow that to interfere with the broader and longer range operation of the air line.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification. Do I take it from the hon. minister's answer that the board will not be asked to delay the staging of the move until after the question of whether Alberta is a person is settled legally?

DR. HORNER: Again, Mr. Speaker, I don't think they're related. The question of whether the province is a person is certainly a problem for the province and, with respect, not a problem for the board of directors.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Is the hon. minister aware that long before PWA was taken over by the Government of Alberta, attempts were made by the then government to have PWA move some of its forces into Alberta, based on the fact that they were doing much of their business in Alberta?

DR. HORNER: Yes, I'm aware of that, Mr. Speaker, and indeed this is an attempt to bring back the executive offices to Alberta.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Supplementary to the minister. It's my understanding that the chairman of the board doesn't quite agree with the minister's point of view.

AN HON. MEMBER: President.

MR. R. SPEAKER: I was wondering, has the minister had discussions with Mr. Watson with regard to his position and attitude in the board discussions?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, the only occasion on which I had any conversations with the president was, as a matter of courtesy, to inform him, ahead of the board of directors' meeting, of the general policy directives of the owners. I might assure the hon. member that there is no disagreement between the chairman of the board and the government and myself.

MR. CLARK: He asked about the president, Hugh, not the chairman of the board. Nice try.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, we seem to be waffling around a little. I just want to know, Mr. Speaker, from the hon. minister, did the minister in his usual gentle fashion, or the government, indicate do they or do they not want that move to take place? Has the government given a directive that the executive offices move to Alberta: yes or no?

MR. NOTLEY: Even if the president is fired.

DR. HORNER: I don't know whether the hon. Member for Clover Bar can read or not, Mr. Speaker, but in case his hearing is still all right I might say to him we have given general policy directives to the board of directors that, over a long-range program, we wanted to see the executive offices moved to Calgary and that the increase or growth in maintenance and service be located in the Edmonton area.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, it's quite obvious the contempt the government has for this Legislature in that you have to read it in the newspaper . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Is the hon. member asking a question?

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise the Assembly, when he held discussions with the chairman of the board, whether any discussion took place as to timetable for transferring the offices, the headquarters staff, the support staff, and the additional staff, from Vancouver to Edmonton or Calgary?

DR. HORNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, again I'd have to repeat what I've said. I've said we gave the policy directives to the board of directors and asked them to prepare a plan which would include a timetable. Indeed, I stressed we wanted to do this in the least disruptive manner possible, because we have the affairs of Pacific Western at heart as well.

DR. BUCK: Five million dollars.

#### **Propane Supplies**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question will follow up the one last Friday to the Minister of Energy. It's with regard to propane. It has been indicated to me that we have an unusual supply of propane in the province at the present time.

I was wondering if the minister could comment on that supply, and if we are going to be short of storage facilities.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Minister of Utilities and Telephones, drew to my attention that the hon. member had raised the question in the House on Friday. It was relatively short notice to get the information he was requesting.

As a preliminary amount of information, I would like to advise him that there is a surplus of propane in Canada. It's been brought on essentially by two factors. One is the lack of demand in traditional markets in the United States and some parts of Canada, due to an exceptionally warm fall and winter. Also there have been minimum export prices, which have been put on at the border by the National Energy Board. To some extent, these prices have priced Canadian propane out of some of the traditional markets.

Therefore we do have a surplus. Last year, as of December 1, 1975, propane inventories in Canada totalled about 9.6 million barrels. In 1974, that was 6.8 million barrels. So, as you can see, there are almost 3 million barrels more in inventory.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. Will it be the step of the minister or government to make representation to the National Energy Board to have the minimum price changed?

MR. GETTY: We have been working with the National Energy Board over the winter months, Mr. Speaker. One way that we have been successful is to have some reduction in that price. The price should, of course, reflect market conditions. From December 1975, when it was at 23 cents a gallon, it came to January, 21 cents a gallon; February, 20 cents a gallon; and March, 18 cents a gallon.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Is there any indication — or just an estimate — at this point in time of the amount of royalties lost because of the market position at the present time?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't know whether you could say royalties were lost, because this is produced and therefore the government takes a royalty on the selling price. However, if the hon. member would like to be specific in some way as to propane royalties, I would be able to get him information. Probably the best thing for him to do would be to put the specifics on the Order Paper.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Perhaps I wasn't clear on his comment on the reduction of price.

I would like to ask the minister whether he has noted any reduction in price to the consumer because of this surplus situation.

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's my information that price has been reduced because of the surplus, as it is in the United States.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification. Is that price reduction uniform throughout the province, and have there been discussions with the Public Utilities Board in view of the fact that propane is a regulated commodity in Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it's uniform throughout the province. It would seem to me it would be far better if it operated within the specific market areas.

Having to do with the Public Utilities Board, that would be the responsibility of my colleague, the Minister of Utilities and Telephones, and I would refer the question to him. Perhaps he will want to get additional information.

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, at this point I could add that the regulation of propane under the Public Utilities Board has to do with a maximum price, so that it is possible for there to be less than that maximum price and still be within the terms of the Public Utilities Board.

#### **Suffield Block**

MR. MANDEVILLE: My question is also to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Could the minister indicate to the Assembly when drilling operations for the Alberta Energy Company will commence in the Suffield block?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker, I can't tell him when the Alberta Energy Company will commence drilling operations. That's a matter of administrative detail that I'm sure the management of the Alberta Energy Company is on top of. I do know though, just on a broad policy basis, that they are proceeding to develop the Suffield block as quickly as possible, and during the coming drilling season will be attempting to drill some 200 wells.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Alberta Energy Company be contracting the drilling operations to private drilling companies, or will they be doing the drilling themselves?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, it would be my judgment that it will be done through private drilling companies. However, Mr. Speaker, again that's a matter that I'm merely raising as a point of judgment. I would suggest to the hon. member, and hopefully — he hasn't ever mentioned this to me, he's a shareholder of the Alberta Energy Company — that he communicate with his management.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will the Energy Company be

involved in the deep oil exploration in the Suffield block?

MR. GETTY: Again, Mr. Speaker, from a government's point of view, the Alberta Energy Company does control all rights in the Suffield block and therefore, presumably, as lessor from the government of those rights — or is it lessee — in any event, they have the responsibility to develop those rights as well.

#### **Government Office Space**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Housing. Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the government bureaucracy is growing very rapidly, can the minister indicate if the province of Alberta has rented approximately one-third of the vacant commercial space in the city of Edmonton to use for its public service?

MR. NOTLEY: Paring down the cost of government.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, it's now public knowledge that I spoke to a news reporter of the *Edmonton Journal* in the last several days and indicated that, in fact, the Government of Alberta does have under lease 33 per cent of the office space within the core of the city of Edmonton.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, that just confirms it. We have to read a newspaper to find out what's going on over there. You don't hear it here. Mr. Speaker . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Do a little work.

DR. BUCK: Do a little work! Why don't you tell us in the House? That's what it's for, in case you've forgotten.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know from the hon. minister if he can confirm that a large amount of this commercial space has been rented and is going to be unused for about three months. Can the minister indicate to the Legislature if this is a fact or not?

MR. YURKO: Well, Mr. Speaker, one must recognize that when one is in the business in terms of engaging large blocks of office space, there is oftentimes this engagement of phasing between the actual need and the availability of the people who are going to in fact fill that space. In the light of good business, it's often necessary for the government to engage some of this space several months before it's actually used, and in connection with the Park Square and Capitol Square buildings this, in fact, is the case.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary. Can the minister indicate to the Legislature, so we don't have to read it in the paper, if the proposed new government centre is going to proceed, or has the government decided to go ahead with rental space and not build the proposed government centre?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, the question of whether the government builds new office space, or leases, or engages in lease-purchase agreements, has been of considerable concern to the government in the last several months, because of the highly escalating cost

of space.

As a result, both the Minister of Government Services and myself have had this question under consideration for some 10 months to a year now. One of the reasons the realty division was relocated with the public works side of the Department of Housing and Public Works was because planning in a forward direction can't be done between two departments without some degree of duplication. In fact, it was the Minister of Government Services who suggested the realty division be brought back to public works so that in fact planning could be done from one place; that all the decisions would be made from one department.

Now, in relation to government centre, I would indicate that this was a long-range project which, in fact, is still being studied in a very active way. We anticipate that the preliminary study phase of the amount of space and the nature of the plan being put forward will probably be completed by the end of this year, and will be presented to government for review.

#### **Calgary Convention Centre**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney General. When might we expect the public release of the inquiry into the Calgary Convention Centre?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I've had several calls to my office in the course of the last two or three weeks asking the same question. I have not talked to the commissioner or any of the participants, and have no personal knowledge as to when that report might be received.

#### **Criminal Charges — Government Employee**

MR. FOSTER: While I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could reply to a question the hon. leader made to me last day, concerning the disposition of a possible appeal in the case of an employee of government who was charged with 12 charges of defrauding the Crown in the sum of \$10,000. I have looked into that matter, and it is the recommendation of the Crown counsel who was handling the case that the matter be appealed. I am prepared to accept his recommendation.

#### **Land Banking**

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. This is regarding provincial land banking in Mill Woods, and the provincial-Edmonton agreement in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, the question is: in view of the fact that the city of Edmonton is selling land, that is, land land-banked in Mill Woods, at half market price to developers — that is, at \$70,000 an acre, rather than \$140,000 an acre — and the end price of that land and home is equal to or higher than the market price of the home and the land, is the minister prepared to review the provincial-Edmonton agreement, with a view to assuring that if that land is again sold at that low price, this is indeed passed on to the consumer in the future?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I should indicate to the House that I've generated some interest in the nature of the agreement signed between the government and the city of Edmonton with respect to land banking in Mill Woods, and have asked this agreement to be brought forward so I can have an opportunity to look at it. I haven't had an opportunity to look at it, but I should indicate that my reasons and concerns with respect to that agreement related more to the making of lots available for low- and middle-income housing at more reasonable rates than they are, in fact, rather than the reasons suggested by the hon. member.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I don't think we are at variance, but I appreciate that comment.

A supplementary question. Would the minister assure the House during his review of that agreement, if the land is, in fact, sold to developers, that the end price of the land and the home be assured by the price set down in a tender agreement and that during the consideration, the city of Edmonton take into consideration as a main concern the lowest price and quality of the home and the land, rather than the main consideration being that of planning alone, which is the case now?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the agreement, I would point out to the House that agreements bind two parties. In fact, if the agreement relates or assigns to the city of Edmonton the right to market lots at the price they wish to fix, then that agreement will certainly be respected. However, in that particular case, my only leverage would be that of using persuasive language, if you wish, in an attempt to accomplish some of the policies and objectives of the Alberta Housing Corporation in providing housing for low- and middle-income Albertans.

DR. PAPROSKI: A final supplementary, then. I wonder if the minister would also review all land-banked land sold to municipalities in the province of Alberta to assure that, in fact, the lowest economic price is passed on to the consumer. I believe the minister does subscribe to that concept.

MR. YURKO: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not necessarily for me to review the present agreements, or the agreements during the last year. In fact, I'm a party to those agreements. It is our intent to transfer serviced lots to the eventual home-owner at cost to the Alberta Housing Corporation.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Would the minister consider the \$15,000 and \$20,000 lots at Fort McMurray — which started as Crown land — a reasonable price?

MR. YURKO: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member had had the ability or desire to question some of the developers in Fort McMurray when I think he was there, he would have found that the majority of the costs were not related to the actual cost of land. In fact, the cost of land is transferred at the cost, plus the additional holding and monetary costs with respect to the cost of money. But the actual cost of land is transferred at cost. The cost of servicing, both on sites and off sites, is horrendous in Fort

McMurray. The cost of the lots reflects, to a large degree, the very high cost of on sites and off sites.

#### **Housing for Handicapped**

MR. TAYLOR: My question is to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. A very short explanation is necessary first. A wheelchair person requires special features in a home, such as lower light switches, special features in bathtubs, et cetera.

My question is: has Alberta Housing provided, in its plans to contractors, items required in a house by wheelchair persons?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the hon. member for giving me notice of this question. I would like to answer it in four parts, if I may, as fast as I possibly can. It won't take too long.

In regard to all new senior citizens' projects, self-contained and lodges are designed so that about 5 per cent of the units are for wheelchair people.

With respect to general housing for handicapped persons, we have been studying for some time a project in Edmonton, in the Garneau district, which I'm sure will be discussed more appropriately in the budget debate. It's intended to mix handicapped with non-handicapped people in a housing unit in Edmonton.

In addition to that, with respect to family public housing, at present there is not any attempt being made to incorporate a design for wheelchair people. However, we will be designating about 10 per cent of the family public housing toward senior citizens' housing in accordance with the legislation that now exists.

In regard to general housing under the various programs administered by Alberta Housing Corporation: if a person who applies for a home under any one of our programs is a handicapped person, then the necessary provisions will be made in that house to accommodate him, in the normal manner that a loan is supplied to any other person.

#### **Hockey Violence**

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. minister responsible for Calgary affairs. The question is related to an unfortunate weekend incident involving some fans and hockey players at the Shouldice Arena in Calgary.

I am wondering if the minister could tell us whether or not any charges are being contemplated with regard to this incident?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the incident, having been advised of it this morning. I think we can all deplore the violence we are seeing in organized sports these days. I think much of the correction lies at our own fingertips. I think if the parents, the minor hockey officials, the coaches, and the management would get together and try to discourage this kind of conduct, we wouldn't see half the violence that we do see.

In response to the specific question, whether or not a charge was laid, I understand that one was laid against either a player or a parent. Of course, I wouldn't make any further comment on that inasmuch as it will probably be coming before a court.

However, I would like to comment — and this isn't necessarily government policy, but strictly my own view — that we should, as parents and individuals, be discouraging that type of conduct, as it does result in violence in these types of sports, rather than expecting the police to be out there laying charges every time something untowards happens.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister from Calgary, so seldom I agree with him. Would he give the House an undertaking to urge the government to make that last position he outlined government policy? It seems to me an eminently wise position.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how the government could be expected to implement such a general statement as government policy. I think it should rather be a policy of all of us, as individuals, to encourage that type of conduct, rather than expecting the government to do everything for us.

#### CFB Calgary

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, my question, also, is for the Minister Without Portfolio responsible for Calgary affairs.

[interjections]  
It's getting longer.

I'm wondering what representations are being made to Ottawa concerning the rumored closure of the armed forces base at Currie in Calgary?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, all of us from Calgary are extremely concerned about the possibility of a closure of the Canadian armed forces base there. I think we are all aware of the fact that Calgary is very much reliant on the oil and gas exploration industry for its well-being, and any downs in the exploration industry do have a very detrimental effect upon the community. As such, we'd all be concerned about the possibility of a closure of that base.

Mr. Speaker, along with the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs, I have arranged through his office to make representations to Ottawa to the Minister of Defence, Mr. Richardson, requesting that that base not be closed. Mr. Speaker, I believe also the mayor and representatives of the city, as well as MPs, have made representations in this area.

#### Oil Pricing (continued)

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, and ask him whether or not the government instructed the Petroleum Marketing Commission or the Department of Energy and Natural Resources to obtain accurate statistics on the so-called blended price of oil in the United States, prior to the minister attending the energy ministers' conference last weekend?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as part of our preparation in going to the conference on Friday a great deal of back-up material was provided by Department of Energy and Natural Resources, the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, and the

Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission. I am sure that in that material, as I recall my briefing of it and from it, there was information regarding the blended average price of oil in the United States.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary to the hon. minister. In view of the importance of obtaining accurate statistics on the average price, and the minister's indication that he received this information, is he in the position today to advise the House what the blended price of oil in the United States actually is at the moment?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I agree with the hon. member about the weight of importance that should be placed on the figure, because, Mr. Speaker, it's only one factor for us to consider in deciding what a reasonable price should be for Alberta crude and Canadian crude. Nevertheless, I'd point out also to the hon. member that people have views as to what an average price is made up of. For instance, the federal government has filed documents giving what they think to be an average price; we, through our Petroleum Marketing Commission. It's a variety of inputs which makes it difficult to come up with the same average price.

The one that would be of the most value to me would be a true average price of all inputs for products in the United States, and equate that on an equivalent basis to the wellhead price in Alberta. We have carried out some investigations in that regard. I might say that my general assessment is that it's now roughly about \$9.80 to \$10.20, and it fluctuates. As of July 1, it may well be \$10.25 to \$10.50. At the end of that pricing period, if you like, of July 1, 1976 to June 30, 1977, a lot of variables start to come into play and people have a great deal of difficulty estimating what that would be. The price range for that period runs as low as \$10 and as high as perhaps \$11, \$11.25.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the government conducted, either through the department or the Petroleum Marketing Commission, any studies on the best competitive price, vis-a-vis the United States, for industry in western Canada? I'm not talking about industry in central Canada, but industry in western Canada, particularly the world scale petrochemical industry.

MR. SPEAKER: We're running out of time. If the hon. minister feels this question may be answered briefly, perhaps it could be answered in that way. I've already recognized the hon. Leader of the Opposition and would like to fit that question in as well before we close down the question period.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, from our assessment the competitive nature of the petrochemical industry in Alberta is adequately protected through the pricing arrangements we have worked out in Canada with the manner in which natural gas is priced in parity to crude oil. I think the hon. member is familiar with our pricing arrangements and how that parity is struck.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, I'd only point out that in Canada we have had, and probably will have,

the best prices for crude oil of anywhere in the world. Therefore I think that, while this is only one feature of competitiveness of industry in Canada, it's certainly one that has given us a substantial edge. As I pointed out to the people from eastern Canada last Friday, when people in industry and entrepreneurs in western Canada wish to be competitive in world markets, quite often they are required to purchase manufactured goods from eastern Canada as part of their product, and when they do that they not only pay world price but they pay the world price plus. Over the years that's been a matter of history for Albertans and western Canadians to live with.

#### **Coal Policy**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question also to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It flows from the impending coal policy announcement.

I'd like to ask the minister: have draft copies of the policy gone out to industry; and secondly, have the same draft copies of the policy gone out to the Alberta Fish & Game Association?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker, not draft policies. Draft policy documents have not gone out to the industry. We have had discussions with industry. Much of our discussion over the past year is part of our policy considerations now, and we have been talking to industry about various potential components of the policy statement, but we have not passed a document as such to them.

With regard to the Alberta Fish and Game Association, I have not been aware of any discussions with them on the policy matter, through the Department of Energy and Natural Resources.

#### **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Macleod revert to Introduction of Visitors?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### **head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS** (*reversion*)

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to introduce to you today, and through you to the members of the Legislature, the reeve of the municipality of Willow Creek, Mr. George Whitehead, who is seated in the members gallery.

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

Mr. Shaben 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.

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Clark]

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to lead off the debate, from this side of the House, on the Speech from the Throne that was delivered to this Assembly last week by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

I have had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to attend the Assembly on something like 15 Speeches from the Throne at this particular time. I don't really plan to get involved in a rating as to where this one would stand. But I think to be fair to the members of the Assembly I would have to say that it would be somewhere towards the bottom — in the vicinity of 13, 14, or 15 in that particular category.

I say that, Mr. Speaker, not because there are no desirable aspects in this particular speech. There are, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that, regardless of who the government is, there would be some desirable aspects in the Speech from the Throne. We wouldn't wish that on any particular government or any particular political party. So I say there are some desirable aspects in the speech — no question about that.

I think many of us wait for the new coal policy with considerable enthusiasm, I hope. We look forward to the minister making that statement in the House, as my colleague from Clover Bar would say, so there could be an opportunity here during this session to look at that new coal policy in considerable detail. No question The Dependent Adults Act is a step in the right direction. No question the workers' health and safety moves are certainly steps in the right direction.

But I get the overriding feeling, Mr. Speaker, when I look at this Speech from the Throne and read it through several times, that really what we have here is a government which has lost much of its initiative, a government which finds itself involved in a program of restraint across Canada right now, and is really failing to come to grips with the number of problems that Albertans have, really saying we can't come to grips with those problems because we're living within a time of restraint.

So it's only appropriate, I think, Mr. Speaker, that one of the areas I would touch on in the course of my remarks this afternoon is: what about this restraint? What kind of a job is this government doing in 1976 as far as restraint is concerned?

Then I think there's no question perhaps the second most important issue at this session is going to be the heritage fund legislation. I say it's second most important only because the budget has to be the most important issue of any particular session. We have the heritage fund legislation; and I want certainly to raise some concerns there, and for a few minutes look at Alberta heritage as it is today. All too often we sit in this chamber, on both sides of the House, and tend to think how good things are in many areas of Alberta. We're fortunate that's the case in many regards. But for a few moments I want to have us look at some of the other aspects of the quality of life in this particular province.

Thirdly, I'd like to deal with some of the concerns that have been brought to our attention in the course

of the last three months.

Then I'd like to deal with what I consider to be one of the biggest omissions of the speech itself: the question of this government's apparent unwillingness to tackle the problems of bureaucracy.

The first issue I'd like to deal with is the question of restraint itself. I was interested in reading the editorial comment with regard to the Speech from the Throne. It seems that many people — at least some people who don't look perhaps as deeply as they might — are convinced that this government is really involved in a program of restraint at the provincial level. Even before I use this example, I know some people are going to say this is a small example. And it is a small example. But it's indicative of the kind of style this government is caught up in. The first page of the Speech from the Throne says, and I'd like to quote:

by every means possible, to exercise restraint in government and public sector spending so as to reduce the inflationary pressures on our society, but without losing the momentum of our essential economic diversification.

I'm sure most members are aware that this morning the Minister of Government Services hosted a champagne breakfast at the Chateau Lacombe in Edmonton for new Alberta novelists. Now, it's important that we have new Alberta novelists. There's no question about that. But I think it's very important also that we recognize the kind of influence this has upon people who are living with guidelines of 8, 10, and 12 per cent.

You know, I hardly think it's essential to the economic diversification of Alberta that we had a champagne breakfast at public expense this morning at the Chateau Lacombe for 20 novelists. We read in the Speech from the Throne: "by every means possible, to exercise restraint in government and public sector ...". Now, I know people are going to say, this is a small example. And it is. But it's an example of the kind of lack of commitment by this government in the field of restraint. I think it's slightly fair to say that, with regard to restraint, this government would really fiddle while Edmonton burnt.

When we look at the restraint situation, I would want to compliment the Member for Lesser Slave Lake and the Member for Calgary Bow for their comments made on Friday morning. I'm rather pleased to be able to remind both members who took a great deal of credit for the government being the first jurisdiction in Canada to move on spending guidelines that that's right. They were. But they were moving on very fine advice. My colleague, the member from Fort Saskatchewan, the Clover Bar constituency, urged the government to move on a rather massive restraint program on June 2 last year when he led off the debate on behalf of the opposition as far as the budget itself was concerned.

When we looked at the budget and ballpark figures of 30 per cent increase in the provincial budget for one year, it wasn't hard to see that we had to have some restraint. So it wasn't surprising, really, that on February 17, 1975, the Provincial Treasurer — just before he left for Europe — announced that there would be spending restraints as far as local governments were concerned; that there would be spending restraints as far as school boards were concerned;

that there would be spending restraints as far as colleges, universities, and hospitals were concerned.

Perhaps it should be pointed out that there was no prior discussion between these levels of local government and the government. There were rather token discussions later on. At the time the government made its announcement as far as restraint was concerned to local governments and school boards and so on, there was no commitment as far as the province was concerned to keep its own spending within 11 per cent. It's important we remember that this was in September, 1975, because we caught local governments right in the middle of their budget year. You see, local governments have no special warrant mechanism. They have no means of going back to the taxpayer later in the course of the year the way the Legislature or the way the federal government does.

So we said 11 per cent to municipalities, school boards, hospital boards, colleges, and universities after they had set their budgets for the year. We locked them into that. The Social Credit members of the Legislature indicated we would support the government's move in the direction of 11 per cent spending guidelines if the government lived within those guidelines. Then it was on Thanksgiving evening that the Prime Minister announced the federal anti-inflation program. Following on, not very long after that, we had the rate increases by Alberta Government Telephones, or the application for over 20 per cent rate increases. It's interesting to note that when we pursued the matter in the fall session last year, there had been no directive to the Public Utilities Board from the government, urging it to live with the spirit of restraint, be it federal or provincial restraint.

Then the fall session came along, starting in November. I think it's fair to say that the government became involved in rather grudging acceptance of this restraint program nationally. I recall it was one Friday morning during that session the Attorney General spoke for something like an hour and a half, telling us about the Kirby report and how the government was going to implement the Kirby report. He indicated to us that the administration of justice in this province was one area that was going to be exempt from 11 per cent, and I think he got support for that from this side of the House. But much to the surprise of my three colleagues and me, it wasn't more than a week after the House adjourned when we found out what the Attorney General hadn't told us in the House, that there would be tremendous increases in the Crown prosecutors' salaries. We didn't have the discussion here in the House. How did we find out about this? Well, it came through a memo that the Deputy Attorney General sent to a number of people.

Then, on December 18 last year, when we were looking at the track record of this government, we had the Auditor's report with regard to the operation of the Office of Special Programmes and the Department of Agriculture. More fairly, the report really looked at grant programs throughout the whole government. But one of the comments made by the Provincial Auditor was that part of the problem the minister had got himself into was being overexuberant in spending the money before the end of the fiscal year. So the first question we ask the

Premier in this session is, have steps been taken by policy to indicate to senior civil servants that this practice shouldn't continue? Really, it was of no concern to the government. It didn't think it was a big enough problem.

Shortly after the first of the year, the school boards got their message from the Minister of Education, especially with regard to special grants, busing, small school systems across the province. It was just their time to get it right between the eyes. And that's where they got it, believe me.

Then we have the federal government not many weeks ago coming out with the federal spending estimates for next year: an 18 per cent increase in the federal government spending estimates. One of the worst things about the federal spending estimates in Ottawa is that, in addition to an 18 per cent increase, they are now trying to slide under various Crown corporations other expenditures which haven't been included there in the past. Whether we've got to this stage here in Alberta, we'll only know when the budget comes down.

Then it was last week that the Minister of Housing and Public Works announced that we'd spent something like \$1.7 million in the course of the last year renovating Government House. Two or three rather interesting comments concerning the Government House situation: I raised the question of the rug in the caucus room on the third floor of Government House at a press conference that I held to point out that here is an example of misguided priorities; that we were saying to wage earners in this province, to civil servants, to the average Albertan, to teachers, doctors, nurses, other people, you've got to live with 8, 10, and 12 per cent. Yet during this same period we've got all sorts of things going on in the government which indicate there's no commitment at all to restraint. The \$6,000 rug, or \$270 per square yard, is just another example of this kind of lack of commitment.

It was interesting to note that the Minister of Public Works, in his press conference, said that Government House was the most important building in Alberta. I think that tells us a great deal. From where we sit, this is the most important building in the province of Alberta, if we've got to get involved in that kind of discussion. This is where the decisions are supposed to be made, not over at Government House or any other house in this province. The last time I checked, it was here that the decisions on spending for this province were to be made; not on anyone's patio, not in any back room anyplace, but here on the floor of the Legislative Assembly. Perhaps the minister didn't really intend to give us that much insight into the real government attitude when he talked to his rather hastily drawn together press conference.

So we look at the government's estimates from last spring. Then we check the special warrants that have come in this year: \$321 million in special warrants since the Legislature adjourned last June. There were a few before then, between April and May 15, but the bulk of \$321 million of estimates in a budget which was prepared in April and the early part of May, really 10 months of the budgeting year, and we've got \$321 million of supplementary estimates.

AN. HON. MEMBER: That's restraint, baby.

MR. CLARK: That's restraint. If you go to the budget that this Assembly approved last year, if you add the special warrants which have been approved by the cabinet to date, you'll find we're already over the 11 per cent spending guidelines that you're trying to hoist down the throats of local governments in this province. If we're going to use, in this Assembly, the same guidelines we've asked the county of Red Deer to use, the M.D. of Willow Creek, the county of Mountain View, the city of Edmonton, school boards, hospital boards in this province, we've already spent more, already have more committed for this year, than we should if we're going to be living with an 11 per cent increase over the estimates last year. And that's restraint. Go look at the special warrants that have come in since September 17, when the Provincial Treasurer made his announcement of restraint. No indication of restraint there at all. Even more important than no indication of restraint is just bloody awful, if I might use that term, budgeting procedures. Some of the special warrants centre around a bridge at Fort McMurray. Surely last spring, when the budget was being prepared, we knew we had to have a bridge at Fort McMurray. There are all sorts of other examples. Another one of the choice morsels that just came up last week is a \$50,000 special warrant for the minister of hospital services, and so on, to become involved in a detailed financial study, and so on. We used to just have a Health Care Commission. Now we've got a minister, now we're going to have a study on top of all that. And that couldn't wait until the Legislature had a chance to discuss it? No.

I've come to the conclusion that we have restraint in this province only in areas of provincial spending where someone else has to face the public. That's where we've got restraint from this government: where some other government or some appointed board has to face the public and say, sorry, we've got to increase your tuition fees 25 per cent; sorry, we might have to close down one portion of a hospital in Red Deer; sorry, we're going to have to impose limits on students. That's where we've got restraint: when somebody other than the government is prepared to face the public. The attitude of the cabinet seems to be, we'll cut down some other programs but don't cut down mine. So we're not going to cut any down around the cabinet table, then we'll pass the buck to local governments and let them do it. It's fair to say that this government's commitment to restraint is zero and sinking fast.

MR. NOTLEY: Like the *Titanic*.

MR. CLARK: Worse than the *Titanic*.

I just leave the question of restraint from this standpoint. Wage earners, people in this province, people in the professions look to this Legislature to give some example. In the budget that will come up in two weeks' time, or a week and a half's time, I'm almost sure the Treasurer will use the very nice sleight of hand approach of taking the forecasts which it looks like the government is going to spend by the end of this year and then say, my gosh, Albertans, we've lived within 11 per cent. Why, we've done very well. He's almost smiling when I say that. That's the approach the government's used the last couple of years. We don't compare apples and

oranges, we compare — we do, in fact, compare apples and oranges. We don't compare the estimates of '74 with the estimates of '75. The procedure this government uses is to take the forecast spending, which this year will include the budget we approved in this Assembly, plus \$321 million, and then say that we'll only increase 11 or 12 or 9 or 10 or 15 per cent from there. That's misleading. That's the only way you can look at it.

So as far as restraint is concerned, yes, we've got restraint where somebody else has to face the music. But since September 17 I've seen no indication of restraint as far as this government is concerned.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move on to the second area, the area of the heritage fund legislation. The Speech from the Throne refers to the heritage fund legislation as unique in parliamentary democracy, and that is so true. I question whether many democracies would try to bring in legislation that really, in fact, would set up a fund over which the Legislature has no prior approval, the fund [to] become larger than the whole budget of the province before very long. That's the unique part of it. If there aren't some major changes in the heritage fund legislation, it will be very unique, very unique indeed.

What's really at stake, as far as the heritage fund legislation is concerned, is the right of the Legislature to approve public expenditures. That's what's at stake. This airy-fairy idea of coming around in '77 to give us an accounting of what's happened during the last year. When we look at some of the investment footwork of this government, when we look at Canadian Cane as a good example, we look at Compak Foods in Lethbridge, we look at a livestock organization out of Winterburn, just to name two or three, those examples themselves can indicate why we'd be just more than a little touchy to rest upon the laurels of the investment practices of this government, even if it were within the keeping of accepted legislative practice.

There are going to be other times in this Assembly to debate the heritage fund legislation, and I genuinely hope there are major changes from the legislation we saw last fall. If there aren't, if there are no major changes in that legislation, the unique portion of this legislation will be that it will be the most unique and the largest parliamentary rubber stamp that this country has ever seen.

I indicated earlier in my remarks that there are many things in this province we have to be thankful for. That's certainly the case. But during this session, when we're looking at the heritage fund legislation, let's also look at some of the problems we have. I don't stand here and say that the Alberta government, be it Conservative, Social Credit, Liberal, NDP, or any other stripe, can solve all these problems single-handedly. That isn't the case. But if there's ever a time we should look at some of the problems we face today, now is the time, before we make some poor decisions as far as the heritage fund legislation is concerned. I don't lay all the blame for all these problems at the steps of the government, much as I might enjoy doing that.

If we look at the population growth in Alberta from 1925 to 1966, we'll find that there's been a 150 per cent increase in the population. If we look at the increases from the sales of the Alberta Liquor Control Board, we'll see there's been something like a 2,200

per cent increase in profits there. Alcoholism is the major cause of 50 per cent of the fatal highway accidents in this province. Over the last 18 months, I'm sure all members would agree that the use of booze in schools has increased dramatically. In 1974-75, over \$89.3 million from the ALCB profits went into general revenue. That's \$89.3 million. Yet during the same year, we spent \$5.9 million on the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission. There's one of the areas we might well look at and should look at seriously.

Let's look at how we rank as far as libraries are concerned. Some members will say, that's a very small area. Yes it is, very small in the kind of support we give them as a Legislature, as a government. From a cross-Canada survey of 27 cities, Calgary and Edmonton rank twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh for the amount of support libraries receive from the provincial government. That's one we can't lay anywhere else but right here.

We look at the crime rate in the province of Alberta when we're looking at our heritage, when we're looking at where we stand in 1976 as we debate the possibilities of setting up this heritage fund. We look at the increases between '73 and '74: a 28 per cent increase in murders, a 21 per cent increase in rape, and 14 per cent increase in motor vehicle theft. What's the government's response basically been? Well, unconditional grants for law enforcement and then a continuing fight between the Solicitor General and some of the larger jurisdictions in the province as to whether they are using the money properly or not.

Then we look at Fort Saskatchewan: 123 breakouts in the last four years. Now the minister tells us all those things are going to be fixed up as soon as we've got the renovations. As my colleague from Clover Bar will tell you, what we need out there are guards, reasonable pay for those guards, and some rehabilitation programs. Those things haven't taken four years in coming.

Being very candid to the Solicitor General, I should say that our office has had representation from officials within the Solicitor General's Department which indicate that from the Deputy Minister on down there is a lack of direction and certainly poor administration. This applies specifically to Fort Saskatchewan, in our judgment.

Then, when we look at our heritage, let's move along a bit further and think in terms of postsecondary education in this province. Perhaps I can rather best set the tone for my remarks here if I were to take some comments made by the Member for Calgary West prior to the 1971 provincial election. The quotation is this: "a target of 50 per cent of our young citizens involved in some form of postsecondary education, without sacrifice to the quality of education, is desirable." That's the Premier, before he became the Premier, saying we should be aiming at 50 per cent of our young people in this province being involved in some form of postsecondary education. What does the Speech from the Throne say? Well, it says we're going to try to kind of keep close to the national average as far as postsecondary education spending is concerned. That comes from a province that's got the richest spending habit of any province in Canada. For us to simply keep close to the national average — we're falling behind all the time.

While we're looking at the heritage fund legislation, let's for a moment or two think in terms of direct and indirect debt in this province. If you total together the direct and indirect debt, it comes to something like \$4,121 million. We might well want to look at some commitments in that area.

Or, if we look at the area of home ownership, affordability — the Minister of Housing, Friday last I believe in the House, indicated that the problem today in housing isn't getting new houses built; it's a matter of affordability. Indeed, I believe he's right.

But the situation as it is today is that in the city of Edmonton and the city of Calgary, 50 per cent of our residents live in rented accommodation. From where we sit, the four of us in the official opposition, no greater priority can be placed on the use of that heritage fund legislation than in the area of housing. Despite what the Land Use Forum says, despite what experts from Toronto, what experts in Europe say, the greatest heritage or the greatest legacy we could leave to generations to follow might well be in the area of keeping it possible for Albertans who want to, to be able to own their own homes. It isn't just a matter of home ownership, it's a matter of the kinds of opportunities they have in the communities they live in, the kind of responsibilities they assume.

When we're looking at the kind of heritage we're talking about today, where do we stand? Agricultural land is increasingly falling into the hands of those people who are not agriculturally involved. Agricultural land in this province today is an extremely good investment. To give you an example — at least a very expensive investment too — in my riding west of Highway 2, west of Crossfield, land sold for agricultural purposes last week in excess of \$625 an acre. The likelihood of young farmers making it agriculturally on that land is zilch.

It isn't good enough for us to sit here and say, but we're just going to let that go past. In fairness, not all the pressure is coming from foreign ownership either, as much as as I would like to have seen in this speech a commitment to legislation on foreign ownership. Some of it is coming from people who see agricultural land as indeed a good investment.

Now I would like to move on to four specific aspects of this new heritage we're developing in Alberta, that too rest squarely on the shoulders of this government. That isn't to say these other responsibilities don't, but these next four lie even more squarely on their shoulders.

First of all, there's the PWA heritage. It's very charitable to say that PWA is really acting as an air line without a rudder today. The morale of the staff is low. I recall sitting in this Assembly about a year and a half ago and having no less a personage than the Deputy Premier tell us that one of the great reasons they acquired PWA was to use the freighting services of PWA to break into the agricultural markets of the world. Despite the fact that it had never been mentioned before in any government publication anybody could see — because I'm sure he would table it if he could find one — it wasn't done.

We were going to break into the agricultural markets of the world with the PWA freighters. We haven't heard any announcement inside or outside the Legislature from the Alberta Bureau of Public Affairs or anyplace else. Not long ago, PWA sold those freighters we were going to break into the

world market with. If you talk to people who are involved in the world trading business now, they will tell you they've either got to get planes from Air Canada or go outside the country, and that in fact PWA was providing a good service there.

Then there's the question of PWA and the decision handed down by the federal Court of Appeals, the question of can the people of Alberta acquire PWA or can't we. Now, we're very short of lawyers on this side of the House, and perhaps that tends to have us oversimplify the situation. But I'd like to remind the members of this Assembly that prior to the Alberta government acquiring PWA, when the White Pass & Yukon group were in the process of making an application to acquire PWA, the government of the province of Alberta, with all its legal beagles in full plume, filed an intervention with the Canadian Transport Commission, using the argument that Alberta was a person. From that standpoint, they could file the injunction.

Now, to a person who isn't a lawyer but who has talked to some members of the legal profession, when you point that out to them, then point out that Alberta is now using the argument — in fact used the argument last week, or within the last short while anyway, when Alberta's counsel was making it's case to the federal Court of Appeals — that we're no longer a person, that the CTC legislation doesn't apply to us, how stupid do we look?

I don't want to be overly critical, much, of the way in which this is being handled. But the other argument is that we, in our submission, really said that ownership of the air line wasn't important. Yet the whole proposition for us acquiring the air line initially was so we'd have the control here in Alberta, so we could look after the north, so we could break our way into the world markets. That's reminiscent of another Conservative, Bennett, when he talked in terms of breaking his way into the world markets. I wouldn't want to wish that upon the people of Alberta.

I'd like to draw the attention of the members of the Assembly to one other situation as far as this PWA thing is concerned. We have appointed a board of directors who are supposedly responsible for PWA. I think it became pretty clear in the House today that the Deputy Premier has given the word to the board of directors that the head offices of PWA should move to Alberta. I, for one, think that's a reasoned approach. But then I find out that the government really hasn't done any work on what costs are going to be involved, the implication as far as service is concerned. What's this going to do to the air line? I think we all should recognize that . . .

MR. NOTLEY: What's \$5 million, Peter?

MR. CLARK: What's \$5 million to move it? That appears to be the attitude. During restraint. During any time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Take that up at a school board meeting.

MR. CLARK: We've got the situation now where the president of PWA has dared to question the wisdom of this move. It will be very interesting to see how long the president of PWA continues in his place. It

wasn't very many months ago when this government was commenting how fortunate we were to have a businessman like Mr. Watson [as] the head of PWA, when Air Canada was after his services. It seemed at that time that we wanted his advice very much. But the shoe has changed tremendously in the last short period of time.

To move on quickly to two or three other portions of this heritage in Alberta that we've recently developed, we have the Syncrude venture. I'm not going to get involved in the pros and cons of that again. There will be lots of time during this session to do that. Simply let me say to the members of this Assembly — and not many of you will agree with me, but the day will come when you will — that we are in a situation as far as Syncrude is concerned where we have the greatest potential conflict of public interest situation this province has ever seen. When this government has to start making decisions as to what's best for Syncrude and its corporate side, and what's best for Albertans from the standpoint of the non-corporate side of Syncrude, I think we know where the chips will come down.

We now have the Alberta Energy Company, and I was interested in the comments today when my colleague, the Member for Bow Valley, asked the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources if the Alberta Energy Company would be involved in drilling and production. I recall that when this legislation went through the House the point was made that, oh no, the Alberta Energy Company isn't going to get involved in drilling; it isn't going to be involved in production, and so on. A rather small news release came out about two weeks ago. The second page of the news release indicated that the Alberta Energy Company is going to do its own drilling and its own production down in the Suffield Block area. That's a new part of the heritage we just picked up in the last couple of weeks.

One other aspect, as to this new heritage in Alberta, deals with this question of ministerial accountability. I plan to become much more deeply involved in this discussion later during the session. But I would refer the hon. members of the government, if you have not had a chance to read the special investigation by the Provincial Auditor, do so. If you can honestly come to me after you've read that and say you have no qualms, you're quite satisfied with this kind of administration, I'd be extremely, extremely disappointed.

I could pick out several comments by the Provincial Auditor in the course of his report. But for the sake of this occasion, I'd like to quote from the top of page 17, the last of his findings, when he said:

The expenditure to be shown in the Public Accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1975 is incorrect in that the expenditure for the Department of Manpower and Labour and the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation are both misstated in an [undetermined] amount.

I frankly can think of no more damning commentary on the administration of government than that statement, let alone numerous other statements one finds in the Auditor's report. Interestingly enough, no one has challenged the validity of what the Auditor has said since that time.

I've come to the conclusion that the Tory concept of ministerial non-accountability is another part of our

heritage of this province. This government fails to apply the same standards to cabinet ministers that it applies to its public service. The Premier's record on ministerial accountability falls very pale beside that of former Premier Ernest Manning on this account.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move on from the question of the heritage situation to a number of concerns that have been brought to our attention, which really are not included in the Speech from the Throne itself. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal with the question of the reorganization of government departments. I indicated earlier in my remarks that perhaps one of the biggest disappointments I had was that the government had failed to come to grips with the problems of bureaucracy itself. Here's a government with a huge majority. Here's a government early in a term. If there were some difficult things that had to be done in the area of coming to grips with the bureaucracy, we never had a better time to do it. Yet I see little, if anything, to indicate a commitment in that direction, as far as this speech is concerned.

Let me give you two or three examples, rather quickly. One is the regulations report that a special committee of the Legislature dealt with about three years ago. That report basically called for a major change in the whole approach as far as regulations are concerned. Virtually nothing has been done with that. Since the reorganization of government departments, we still have no firm location for the lands branch. The 4-H and junior forest wardens programs are still being shunted from pillar to post.

Then there's the marketing wing of this government — or wings, I should more properly say, three of them at least. We have the Alberta Export Agency; we have the marketing people in agriculture; we have the marketing people in business, industry and tourism. On more than one occasion, I for one have been critical of the Alberta Export Agency. Perhaps, in retrospect, some of those criticisms have been overstated, at least overstated from the standpoint that there is a need for some sort of government apparatus to be an umbrella for encouraging exports and imports as far as Alberta is concerned. I think this approach was initially tried as far as the Export Agency is concerned. It may well have been a contemporary approach to a need. But the real problem is that once the Export Agency got its feet, it lost its sense of direction. It's been banded around from pillar to post. Now it really is the responsibility of one minister, yet other departments have tremendous influence as far as the Export Agency is concerned. The Export Agency itself has no legal advice. It has gotten itself involved in some bad situations in that area. You have a situation where the Export Agency and its people, who are responsible for various parts of the world, are told by other departments — primarily Agriculture, but other departments — what they can or can't do. If you don't get approval from some senior people in Agriculture, the Export Agency can't get involved in this area or other areas.

It seems to me that what we have now, as far as the Export Agency is concerned, is two of the senior people of the Export Agency holding the hand, one of the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. They're each kind of holding their hand during this period when we can't make up our mind what we're going to do with

the Export Agency.

Here's something the minister told me he was going to be looking at right after the session last June. We're still waiting for a decision on it. As a result of this kind of foolishness, we have power plays within the agency itself, or within the three marketing wings themselves.

Members will recall the people from the NFU and the cow-calf situation marching on the front steps of the Legislature Building last year. Alberta has been receiving several requests recently with regard to calves. Just last week, a wire went from the Alberta Export Agency to federal government people in Bonn and other countries in Europe, telling them Alberta has no calves, calves from 100 to 600 pounds. We've got no calves! I checked, as recently as noon today, with a forwarding firm in Montreal. They indicate there are no firm deals at this time.

But here we are in Alberta, telling Europe — not just Bonn, but also Italy and other parts of Europe — that we've got no calves in this province. If the NFU people were upset last year at not being able to meet the government, how do you think an awful lot of Alberta farmers are feeling today? We may not have the calves today, on March 8, but we're going to have calves which will be able to meet those markets before long. As one of the people we spoke to from outside the country said to us, it's inconceivable that Alberta would be telling us we've got no calves, because in the last several years we've been told about the cattle we've got, all the particular potential there is. Now we're telling the European Common Market people that we've got no calves. For those people who are interested, the wire went out last week over the name of a Mr. A.A. Presber of the Export Agency.

This is a clear example of one arm of the government not knowing what the other arm is doing, the end result being that Alberta farmers, in this case, are paying the price for it, and paying very dearly. Between the ministers involved, someone should be held accountable for it. Make some decisions as far as the Export Agency is concerned, and decide once and for all what its role is going to be, if it's going to have a role. If it's not going to have a role, then wipe it out. If it's going to have a role — and I say I think it has some potential — then put the people in some of those other departments where they belong, so we know what in the world is going on. This idea of airy-fairy trips at \$2,000 per day all across the world by people in three different departments is just ludicrous. That's the kind of thing this government could have dealt with at this session, if it had had the guts, as far as dealing with a lot of problems within the bureaucracy itself is concerned.

We talk about the problems of the bureaucracy. I remind the members once again, as I've done on several occasions, that the most often-heard comment from the ombudsman, in two of the last three years of his annual report, has been the inability of Albertans to get answers from their government. I don't see one thing, one thing in the speech that touches on that at all.

Some of the other concerns: the utility costs, be they utility costs in northwestern Alberta, be they utility costs as far as the rural farm co-ops are concerned. I've had directors of the rural gas co-ops say, I got involved in this program because I thought it

was good for my neighbors. I told them what the price was going to be. I told them we had a commitment that there'd not be more than a 4 per cent increase per year in the price of gas.

AN HON. MEMBER: There you are, Doctor.

MR. CLARK: We have some of the most respected people in rural Alberta on these rural gas boards.

AN HON. MEMBER: Misled.

MR. CLARK: Misled! They're being made to look like fools in the eyes of their neighbors and friends . . .

DR. BUCK: Many of them have resigned.

MR. CLARK: . . . Some of them, as my colleague says, aren't simply carrying on. Some of them will tell me they can't possibly get in to see the minister, he's too busy. Well, he's got lots to be straightened out. I hope he's doing something in straightening out. But I really see little in that area.

Then we look at the Speech from the Throne and the cow-calf situation — no mention. Really, I think even the Minister of Agriculture himself was amazed at how easy he got away at the fall session with this idea that he tried on Unifarm, that he was going to Ottawa, and in the course of two or three days we were going to get Ottawa and the rest of the provinces to agree to a national stabilization program. I think that even the minister knew that wasn't going to happen. It hasn't happened yet. We're the only province west of the maritimes which hasn't moved and done something. Now it isn't only the cow-calf operator, but the people who are going to be batting on the minister's door next are those people in the dairy business who are involved in the shipping of commercial milk. The ADC has got some pretty major obligations in that area, in excess of \$7 million.

Then we look at the speech as far as the native people are concerned. I propose to say two things here quickly. One is the question of centralization of the staff in Edmonton. The other comment in the Speech from the Throne centres around this matter of, we are going to help as far as social assistance and social programs are concerned. It's that rather patronizing attitude that we don't need. That's not what our native people are asking today, for more handouts. From the discussions I've had with them, they want a chance to stand on their own feet. They don't want more gimme things. I look at that money we've got in that heritage fund and I can think of a tremendous amount of good that could come of some of that money being committed to native people in this province, even if they had nothing more than a chance to use the interest to help them to come to grips with some of their problems.

One of the rather interesting special warrants that went through was a special warrant from Municipal Affairs for the land secretariat, looking at this question of native land claims. That has been going on for five years at least. Maybe longer than that, but at least five years. That's the kind of thing the native people are looking for.

Some of the other concerns just quickly: this question of inaccessibility. I don't really want to name the minister involved, although I'd be prepared

to. A minister sits down with a school board from his area and the school board has got a rather serious problem. The school board spends the first twenty minutes being told by the minister how busy he is, and then not being able to get any answers and saying, well really what you do is go through the Department of Education anyway.

Or we look at the situation at the town of Lacombe, the downtown development co-op.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ask Cookson about that.

MR. CLARK: Well, he doesn't know. That is what the people of Lacombe tell me. But I wrote the minister. I got a very defensive letter back that we will get involved with later on. But in the course of the minister's response — this is how much the minister was on top of what was going on in Lacombe — he said, well the LDDC, that's the Lacombe development group, they only obtained verbal commitments as to the financial participation of local businessmen. That's all they had. So I stopped in at Lacombe and talked to the people involved and was able to see the signed documents that the businessmen of Lacombe had put their name on and their money into, if the government would just go ahead. And then you know how the people of Lacombe finally got an answer — and I don't blame the Member for Lacombe, he couldn't get an answer either, I guess. Do you know how the people of Lacombe finally got an answer? They wrote the ombudsman and the ombudsman had to write back and tell them well, I can't do anything about a ministerial decision, but the answer is no. People in Lacombe tell me — and I've seen the letter — that they went to the Premier's office in the middle of September asking for an appointment with the Premier. They're still waiting. Yes he's busy, but he wasn't so busy during the election campaign. We used to hear something about open government.

Then another of the concerns. We talk about Alberta Government Telephones. I was very interested in the comment made by the new Member for Calgary Bow — well, he's not new, he's been here a year now — when he talked about his job on Alberta Government Telephones. I really hoped he would be telling me, telling the House about some of things AGT is doing in trying to cut the corners, so we don't have to see we've got a 20 per cent increase and another one coming. But what did we hear? We heard about the phone centres in the very well-to-do parts of Calgary.

I noticed that there was a real lack of any concern in the Speech from the Throne for the Human Rights Commission report of not so many months ago. Not one mention of it. Yet the Human Rights Commission was about as strong as it could be in saying, either we've got to make the legislation workable or we had better forget about it completely.

Then there was nothing in the Speech from the Throne with regard to home care. I think it suffices to say that we could have found \$60,000 to keep the home care program in Edmonton going for three months.

With regard to education: suffice it for me to say that when you look at the grants for special education, the teaching of the severely handicapped, they are going to get a 5 per cent increase this year; the learning disability fund, a 7 per cent increase;

grants for resource rooms for the mildly handicapped, no increase; early childhood services grants, 10 per cent; small school assistance grants, no increase; declining enrolment grant, no increase; grants for extension programs, no increase; grants for 1-12 students, 11 per cent increase. They are the ones who can best look after themselves. Then on unemployment insurance, local school boards will pick up the employers' portion of the unemployment insurance share. That amounts to \$4.5 million. It will be interesting to figure out how many teachers that keeps out of the classrooms of Alberta. The one decision by the minister — \$4.5 million as far as unemployment insurance benefits are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other areas that I would like to touch upon, but in light of the time, I'd like to simply say this. It isn't really responsible on our part for me to spend all my time complaining about things that should be in the speech. We'd like to make some suggestions that we think should have been included in the speech or should be in the government's program. In the course of this session my colleagues will be introducing a number of pieces of legislation and making a number of suggestions which will further set out our views in these areas.

Let me start by making some comments as to restraint, and say that the government has lost the confidence of the people as far as their commitment to restraint is concerned. Perhaps the government can, by some means, set up some sort of mechanism to try to regain the confidence of Albertans once again. Perhaps by having some people involved who are on wages, small businessmen, some people from local government, some people involved in education, some people involved in the professions, all these are saddled with living with the restraints. Perhaps what we should say to these people is, look, you go over what we're doing as a province and tell us in the fall session how you think we're matching up, because we're the ones who put the restraint on you. What should be sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander.

Secondly, I can see no reason at all that there can't be a rollback to 11 per cent in the AGT rate increases. That's the least we could do to help people live with the increased cost of utilities. Clearly the province's priorities should be re-established. Phase in the home care program so it becomes a reality in Alberta. It should be phased in within the 11 per cent spending guidelines that we, as a province, are committed to.

Perhaps this can be done by members of the Assembly during the time this House isn't sitting. The Public Accounts Committee of the Legislature, during the time the Legislature isn't sitting and we have time to get to the meat of the matter, should be looking at some of these Crown boards and agencies, and systematically going at the public accounts to see how they are doing as far as living with these kinds of guidelines is concerned.

With regard to our negotiations with the federal government, I was pleased today to hear the comment made by the Minister of Energy that in fact \$2 a barrel is what Alberta's target is. I say to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and to the Premier when he goes to that energy conference in April or May, we will be satisfied with nothing less than \$2 per barrel. Don't come back with \$1.75,

\$1.50, \$1.85, or \$1.90 and tell us that that's what you wanted all along. We've been down that road once before. Let's win this one and win it well. We will support the government completely in their objective of getting a \$2 a barrel increase in the price of Alberta crude oil.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Treasurer will include in his budget the removal of the 10 cent gasoline tax in Alberta. That's one thing we can do constructively right now, to protect the Albertans from such an increase down the road.

I'd hoped also, when the Premier was in Ottawa, that he would talk to the Prime Minister and explain to the Prime Minister, thanks, but no thanks, we don't need Mr. Marchand trying to tell us how we're going to set the standards to operate the tar sands in this province. The federal government are now involved enough — more than I'd like to have them involved. But when Mr. Marchand stands up in the House of Commons in Ottawa and says that in fact they're going to determine what the standards are, I think it's time Mr. Marchand was told to go back to Quebec.

With regard to the PWA situation, it looks to me that we've now reached a stage that the Premier and the Prime Minister might eyeball to eyeball try to resolve this as soon as possible in the best interests of PWA, of Alberta, and of western Canadians. This was, and I think can be in the future, still one of the best regional air line carriers there is. But if we have a continuation of what we've seen in the past several months, that will not be the case. So I'd urge the Premier to eyeball it with the Prime Minister on that.

We also, Mr. Speaker, would very much like to see, in the foreign land ownership legislation at the spring portion of this session, the government have the guts to take steps to make the bureaucracy more responsive to Albertans. Let's not equate the expenditures of dollars with the quality of performance. Let's, for goodness' sake, make some decisions in the areas of what's going to happen to the whole land branch, what's going to happen to this whole marketing agency mess that we've got now. What about the 18 different government agencies that are handing out loans to people across the province? Certainly there has to be some consolidation there.

I would say lastly, as far as advice to the government is concerned, that really we could do well to stop any further development of this business-government partnership. For, down the road, I certainly see potential for great public conflict between what's good for the corporations and individuals we've got our money invested in and what's in the best interest of the people of Alberta.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, then, as far as restraint is concerned, from our standpoint, this government has a performance gap between its preachings and its practice. The gap is wide and getting wider.

As far as the heritage fund is concerned, what is at stake here is the Legislature's right to approve expenditures in advance. As far as the number of social concerns of the day are concerned, we see complacency and smugness. As far as the bureaucracy is concerned, dollars are rolling in. There's no longer any real control over what a really greatly enlarged government does with them.

In pondering the Speech from the Throne over the weekend, I tried to compare the style of government

to the style of government in some other part of the world. I know the government isn't going to be flattered by the comparison I'm going to use. Nevertheless, I think it's apt.

I suppose we could say that we're developing in Alberta kind of a Nixonian type of administration or Nixonian type of attitude. I say that for four reasons. One is the inaccessibility of this government — a very direct comparison to the Nixon administration. Secondly, the fact that, when we in this Legislature or people outside the Legislature stand up and say something that doesn't agree with this government, the favorite ploy of this government is to say, you're being non-Albertan. You're against the farmers; you're against this group; you're against that group. That tactic comes directly from the Nixon administration.

Then there's the question of consultation. This government's involved in consultation when it thinks that groups are going to agree with what they're doing. There's no consultation at all when something the government is going to do is unpopular; they have a sit-down after. That's once again indicative of the Nixonian style as far as administration is concerned. What really concerns me is that we have this kind of approach developing here in Alberta with the possible heritage fund legislation being left so wide open.

I suppose if I were to summarize my own feelings in the matter, it would be this: I'm for a government that demonstrates it can control itself, before it tries to control others. To date, I've seen no such demonstration from this government.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity of taking part in this Speech from the Throne debate. May I first of all say what a pleasure it was for me as a relatively new member to hear from the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake in his [motion on the] Speech from the Throne. I think that, Mr. Speaker, as a new member, it's an opportunity during the throne speech debate to hear from other parts of Alberta, so that I might educate myself as a member of this House.

Also, may I compliment the Member for Calgary Bow on his speech. I learned to work with him in the House. I'm sure we'll be seeing a good example of many years in the House from the Member for Calgary Bow.

I also enjoyed today the speech from the Leader of the Opposition. Ever since I was a young lad, I've enjoyed watching people try to walk tightropes. It seems to me that the Leader of the Opposition was trying very hard indeed to be on both sides of the question of economic restraint. On the one hand, I think he said that it was a good thing. I'm sure that, in his heart of hearts, he is a restrainer, because we can all recollect, I'm sure, that when he was Minister of Education in this province, he was the minister who introduced 6 per cent ceilings on public school spending.

MR. CLARK: [Inaudible] 6 per cent, too.

MR. HORSMAN: That's right. As I say, in his heart of hearts, he is a restrainer. What he would really like to be doing today, Mr. Speaker, is castigating the government for having increased the amount of government expenditure to 11 per cent from 6 per

cent. So he really is having difficulty, I'm sure, in walking that tightrope.

On the other hand, he is saying, spend, spend. I even heard him say today, cut taxes, cut taxes — in one limited area, of course. But how can you have it both ways, Mr. Speaker?

Oh, I enjoyed the speech indeed. And I look forward, indeed, Mr. Speaker, to hearing the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, because he's even more adept at magicianship than is the Leader of the Opposition, when it comes to saying save money on one hand and spend on the other.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't really come here today to speak entirely about what I heard earlier in this House. I came to tell you what a wonderful place we have to live in Medicine Hat and Redcliff. So I hope I can educate you the way I have been educated to a degree by other members in this House in listening to debates on the Speeches from the Throne. [interjections] They used to have Social Credit members. They won't have any more.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. HORSMAN: I welcome this opportunity, as I say, to come into the House, to look at this Speech from the Throne, and to realize that the term "economic restraint" is very important. Economic restraint is really the keynote of this Speech from the Throne. But we must not let that blind us to the fact that there are many new programs proposed in this Speech from the Throne which we must take a good, hard look at in the coming months.

Now, when we're talking about this question of restraint, as every member must, I think how this will affect my constituency. How will this affect the people who live in Medicine Hat, Redcliff, and southeastern Alberta? We have been, in the past five years at least, growing rapidly. Our communities of Medicine Hat and the town of Redcliff have experienced rapid growth. For an example, I'd like to point out to the House that just in the past year the equalized assessment of the city of Medicine Hat has escalated by \$7,121,000 and some hundred dollars — an increase of approximately 10.5 per cent in one year. I think that's a remarkable growth rate, and I know that type of growth is being experienced by other, smaller centres in this province. I would also like to point out, to the envy of some, that the mill rate at the residential level is 39 mills, and 59 mills for the commercial and industrial.

I think, if I may digress a moment here, a while ago a leader of another political party in the province came to Medicine Hat to make a speech and said that Medicine Hat is the most socialistic city in western Canada. I was quite astounded, Mr. Speaker, to have that information provided to me, because in every election I've been associated with them, the people espousing that particular philosophy, have either run last or next to last and I intend to keep it that way. I do think, however, that part of what he may have been trying to say was that in Medicine Hat we are fortunate enough to own our own utilities, and we are also fortunate enough to own a good deal of the land which is being developed now for residential and commercial development. That came about, of course, as a result of historical accident and had nothing whatsoever to do with a socialist philosophy

either on the part of municipal government or — and I give credit to the previous administration — on the part of any government of the province of Alberta since it has come into existence.

In that regard it is important to note that the good city fathers of Medicine Hat and Redcliff have taken an active role in promoting the diversification of economic development and, in co-operation with the Government of Alberta, they have engaged in some interesting experiments in bringing new industry to our community. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the type of development we have seen relates to the proposals contained in the Speech from the Throne and in previous government policy, and I'd just like to review a couple of those for a moment.

The diversification of economic development which began, really, in 1971 has brought about a great increase in the petrochemical industry in Medicine Hat and Redcliff. Several large industrial plants using natural gas as a feedstock have been developed, and they're now either in operation or shortly will go on stream. Of course, I am very interested in that development.

If I may just point out, too, the Alberta Energy Company is closely associated with the people of southeastern Alberta in that the Suffield block is located very close to our area. In that regard, I'd just like to point out to the House and to the members, Mr. Speaker, that in Medicine Hat the demand for shares of the Alberta Energy Company when they were introduced to the market was quite outstanding, in fact one of the most outstanding of any places in this province. I think it is because the people in Medicine Hat and district are aware of this unique method of introducing Albertans to investment in the future of this province. I support that type of concept, not only now but in the future, and I certainly cannot agree with the suggestion made today by the Leader of the Opposition that we should depart from that new venture.

Agriculture, of course, has been one of the priorities of this government. But one of the most important things we must look at in agriculture — and this affects communities such as cities and towns — is the establishment of agricultural processing industries within the towns, cities, and villages of this province, not just locating them in the two large metropolitan areas of Edmonton and Calgary. I am very pleased indeed to see in Medicine Hat the establishment of two such industries within the past few years. One which I wish to point out in particular is Hy-Point Feeds. Mr. Speaker, that is an industry which came into being as a result of local initiative, local personnel, which came into existence in a large plant through the assistance of the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation. Without that type of financing being made available to Albertans by this government we would still be looking for assistance from other areas of financing. So I applaud the record of the government in the past in having the wisdom to make such loaning enterprises available to the people of Alberta.

Certainly it is true, as has been pointed out, there will be losses to such lending institutions. These are, after all, lending institutions of last resort where conventional lenders are not willing to put their money in the hands of Albertans for future growth and development. It was mentioned earlier today that

perhaps we shouldn't be doing this because we're going to have losses. A couple of names were mentioned, and the Leader of the Opposition said today that we should be very careful about this. It is very true. But as a government we have a responsibility to make sure that people in this province who have industry, who have ideas, have ample financing. And I, for one, am prepared to take the flak and to take some of the losses that will inevitably come to lenders of last resort.

But, Mr. Speaker, another area that I think is most important as well is in secondary manufacturing. The industrial strategy outlined by this party before the 1971 election was accepted by the people, and it is working. I want to make special mention of the type of industry which has located in Medicine Hat in recent years, and that is a printing company which is named R.L. Crain Ltd. Now, printing has absolutely nothing to do with the petrochemical industry. The products they use do not relate to petrochemicals. Therefore, I was exceedingly happy to see this particular type of industry come into my community as an example of the diversification of our industrial base. I was pleased, indeed, to read in the weekend newspaper in Medicine Hat that the company, which has just been in operation for less than two years, has now turned \$1 million production shipments. I think that's an indication of the type of growth we need to see more of in this province.

The mobile home and trailer industry has also become a very important economic asset to our particular part of the province, and it's that type of thing that we have to be doing with this government to bring about a change in the industrial development and the economic diversification. The Speech from the Throne indicates that we will be consolidating this particular type of industrial development, and I applaud that.

But of course, Mr. Speaker, we do not have growth without problems. When, in a period of financial restraint, we find municipalities growing rapidly, there comes, of course, a strain on those municipal governments in regard to how they're going to be able to provide the necessary services to the communities. Those services, of course, are just the provision of the basics such as water, electricity, sanitation, and so on. Perhaps it is difficult, in a time of restraint, for rapidly growing communities such as Medicine Hat and Redcliff, and I know others in the province, to be able to provide those services in view of these economic restraints. But I do wish to point out, and I'd like to remind municipal governments all over this province, that within the lifetime of this government, since 1971, a great area of municipal taxation was opened up when this government took away from the municipalities the necessity of the 22-mill school foundation program. Therefore, that area is available to governments to assist them in providing the necessary levels of services. All one has to do is look at the mill rate I have already indicated for the city of Medicine Hat, 39 mills, as opposed to what it was a few years ago, to realize that on residential property, for the services to that residential property, at this stage, the slack may be taken up by some additional taxation.

Of course, it is important that municipal governments providing local services be responsible to their taxpayers for the services they are providing and for

the necessary taxes they are going to raise from the local property in order to provide those services. That's the name of responsibility in government. It's totally improper, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, to try to shift that onus to the government of the province of Alberta on every occasion.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I want to touch on one other area of concern to me — and I'm very pleased to see that the Solicitor General's Department is given a good position in the Speech from the Throne — and that relates to the question of law enforcement grants. I would point out that last year was the very first time in the history of this government that a special law enforcement grant was made available to the municipalities in this province in recognition of the fact that with growth, inevitably a strain is put upon the municipal government and the law enforcement bodies within those governments to provide the necessary increased law enforcement brought about by growth. There is a saying, I believe, that as the population grows, the crime rate increases at a much more rapid rate than does the population. So it was a wise move indeed to have the Solicitor General last year make those funds available, and I'm encouraged to see that the same emphasis will be placed upon law enforcement in this year's Speech from the Throne.

Now, reference has been made to quarrels between levels of government and the minister in question. But I can assure the minister and this House that in the city of Medicine Hat and the town of Redcliff, every last nickel of those special grants was made available to the policing agencies for the purposes for which they were intended. I quite agree with the minister that those are the purposes for which they should be used, and I intend to support him right down the line if he has any quarrel with any other municipality in that area.

I hope the minister will keep in mind that those municipalities that co-operated with his department last year might very well receive a little better consideration than those municipalities which did not, particularly in regard to increasing those grants in accordance with the population growth as well as the inflationary factor which is taken into consideration in the 11 per cent guidelines. I'd like the minister to keep that in mind when he's juggling his figures this coming year.

In regard to educational services, and I have a real interest in this area, Mr. Speaker, I realize that education costs are rising. I also realize that this government has given exceedingly high priority to education since assuming office in 1971. Quite frankly, I do not agree with those critics who say that we are cutting back on our educational services, or that we're putting the school boards into a strait jacket by suggesting an 11 per cent guideline on educational grants and spending. As I pointed out earlier to the Leader of the Opposition, 6 per cent was in vogue a few years ago, and we have done far better than that for education in this province.

To local school boards that are experiencing difficulties in meeting their budgets, and in meeting growth factors — and I think that's important. In my opinion, a school board which is servicing the same number of students today that it was servicing a year ago is in a lot easier position than the school board which is experiencing a larger number of students as

a result of increased growth. I think that's quite a simple statement to make, perhaps, and I know I have tried to impress that upon some people. I hope I have. But the point I am trying to get to is: I hope the members of the government and the Minister of Education will keep this in mind when there are really proven extra needs. I'm confident, from the record of this government, that those extra needs that are really proven — really relate to the question of real growth in the number of students to be served — will receive appropriate treatment. I am confident this government will do that and provide the necessary services, and that we will not see a decline in the standard of educational services provided to our citizens at any level: at the primary, secondary, or postsecondary institutions throughout this province.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to refer briefly to the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. Of course, that will be the subject of a considerable amount of debate when the bill is introduced to the House. I have been reading every editorial in practically every daily paper in the province, and I've been reading what has been said about this trust fund by members of the opposition, by members of the press, and I'm quite astonished that nobody in that area seems to understand the difference between spending and investing. You know, when I take a dollar out of my pocket and buy something in the store, and they give me something back for it, or I buy something in the cafeteria, I think then I've spent the money. It's gone. It's gone, you know. Members of the opposition, keep that in mind. But when I invest my money, I still have it. It's not spent. There is a real distinction. I don't want to belabor the point, or sound sarcastic, but I really wish the members of the opposition could see the distinction which exists between spending and investment. It has been clearly pointed out in this House by the Premier, when he introduced the concept of the bill, that any spending of the money would be brought before the Legislature for debate by special appropriation. That pledge will be carried out.

In addition, in that area, there seems to be a rather unique idea about in certain parts of this province that the cabinet has no legislative responsibility, that the cabinet of this province is not responsible to this Legislature. Well, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be more absurd. If it were not for the support provided to the cabinet by this Legislature, and all the members — well, not all the members, but a sufficient number of the members — the government would fall; the cabinet would fall. In my opinion, nothing would bring a government to its knees and put it out of office faster than a vote by this Legislature indicating non-confidence in the investment committee for the misuse of the investment fund . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: They've got rubber stamps.

MR. HORSMAN: Rubber stamps? Well, perhaps if you were more persuasive to my right you might convince some of us on this side of the House to join you. We're not rubber stamps. That may have been the way the other government treated their members, it's not the way this government does.

I recall sitting in the gallery some years ago when there were only six or seven seats on this side of the House and there was a large gallery of supporters of

the other government. I must admit at that time I wondered if they were not rubber stamps, but I don't think I ever said that, although my suspicion still exists. I know this, that we're not rubber stamps. Perhaps sitting over here now, as I do for the second session, I'm getting somewhat of an opposition mentality. I hope I'm not slipping that badly.

So I would like the members of the opposition to be a little more objective in their treatment of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, and tell the people that there is a difference between saving, spending, and investment, because saving we have the money, investing we have the money, and spending we don't. Even though we may be spending the money on such wonderful things as irrigation, the money will be gone but it won't be lost, because it will still be put into one of the most valuable things in the province of Alberta. I'm sure that the two members of the Social Credit opposition in the House today will agree with me on that, because irrigation is important to their constituencies.

AN HON. MEMBER: I knew we'd get Horsman.

MR. HORSMAN: I knew I was going to convince somebody there, Mr. Speaker, today.

So in conclusion, may I say that I look forward particularly to this session and to a debate on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I hope that this unique experiment in government in this country will be supported by all members in this House and that we will get through the distinction that exists between spending the money and saving it and investing it, and furthermore, that we will be able to convince not only the members of the opposition in this House, but the public at large in the province of Alberta, of the fact that the cabinet is directly accountable to the members of this Legislature and without the support of this Legislature they would not exist as a government. In addition, from what I've seen and heard and the people I've talked to, I am confident that, despite what the Leader of the Opposition may have had to say today, this government has not lost the confidence of the people of Alberta. Far from it.

DR. BACKUS: Mr. Speaker, this being a year of restraints, and I stress this coming year — our Leader of the Opposition appears to misunderstand the statements of the Treasurer when he talked about restraints in the coming year and then wondered why he didn't immediately apply restraints on what had already been agreed by this legislation should be the spending of the year that we are now in. However, this coming year being a year of restraints and very responsible restraints, and also it being a year of much-needed consolidation, I think it is a little bit ridiculous that some members have indicated that they think the government must be running out of ideas, or running out of steam, and this is why they are talking about a period of consolidation. I don't think anything is farther from the situation. In fact, if they read the first page of the Speech from the Throne — maybe they are a little like so many of us who pick up a book and look at the last page before we actually start to read it and then think we know all about the book — but it is apparent that there are a great many areas where new programs and increased

improvement in existing programs are going to be taking place in this coming year. But that we do need a period of consolidation I think is very important, simply because this government has been so active, so aggressive, and so concerned with the needs of this province that they have gone ahead at a speed that really can only lead to a very great need for a period of consolidation. Here I agree with the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, that it is more responsible to slow down.

I hope you will forgive me, because we are in fact in a phase of considering the situation, if I'm a little philosophical today. Although I've not been an MLA as long as many of the members in this House, I think I can say that I've been an Albertan longer than most, not because I came here before anybody did, but because I'm a little older than most of the members in the House and I've been here all my life.

I was living in Red Deer when the grading and gravelling of the road from Edmonton to Calgary finally was completed, and it was with great rejoicing that we knew we could now get from one of the metropolitan areas to the other without having to plough too much mud. I think our family also held the record from Red Deer to Sylvan Lake, the 14 miles which we managed to get done in 15 minutes. We may still hold that record, because it now takes you that long just to get out of the city of Red Deer.

But I think the tremendous strides that have taken place in this province, in what I reckon is a short lifetime, are something that we, as Albertans, can be very proud of. I think that, as Albertans, we must recognize these strides from the hungry '30s, when I remember one day my father arrived with two chickens and he says, you better enjoy these chickens because they're worth \$50 each; I've just taken them in payment for a \$100 bill. From those lean times to the present day, we must acknowledge the fact that it is the oil industry that has provided the tremendous strides forward, the tremendous advances in the way of life here in this province. Therefore, I think if we are to be at all considerate of those who come after us here in the province, the Albertans who come after us, we must realize that funds from this depleting resource must be shared by us with those who come.

I'm amazed, or I was amazed until today, at the lack of understanding of the heritage trust fund on the part of Albertans. I'm not so amazed today, because I see even the Leader of the Opposition doesn't seem to understand it, when he says that the way the heritage trust fund was put forward does not allow the Legislature to decide how the money is spent before it is spent; as my hon. member opposite was just emphasizing, the difference between spending and investing. As I read the act, or the bill as put forward at the last session, the Legislature does have the ability to decide how the money from the heritage trust fund is spent. Well, I maybe can understand the ignorance on the part of the leader with regard to what this heritage trust fund is all about.

But what I like to ask my constituents who I've spoken to about it . . . When they've been telling me all the wonderful things they think this heritage trust fund should be spent on, as opposed to invested in, they've talked about education being, after all, one of the greatest investments in the province, our youth as being a great investment. I've asked those very youths what they would say if, when they got to be

my age, they were standing up before the high school students and saying to them, we reckoned that my education was very important back in 1976, so we spent the money on my education and giving me the most expensive education in Canada; I'm sorry, we don't have any of that money left for you today. Then I've asked them what they felt about pushing for spending this heritage trust fund on that investment of education.

I think there is a real need for restraint. I think one of the reasons there is this need for restraint is to in fact encourage some return to individual independence and enterprise and the voluntary effort that was so characteristic of Albertans back in my younger days, when we didn't have as much money to spend on all the things we thought we would like to spend it on.

I can remember when, as a child in Red Deer and in Eckville, we didn't even seem to — maybe I was a little young to know about government then, but the people didn't seem to know there was much government around. It was something that was up in Edmonton and lived in this big, beautiful building. In fact, if we wanted something, we went out and got on with it ourselves. We didn't stand up and say, oh, the government ought to do this for us. They ought to give us this. The government isn't doing its job properly. The government is . . .

Really, you know, we talk today about the need for law enforcement and the fact that the government ought to be doing something about a better form of law enforcement. In those days, we had a very good system of law enforcement. If you misbehaved — as a kid, anyway — and were caught at it, if it wasn't too serious an offence, the chief of police usually took a belt to you and sent you home to your dad, who repeated the process. The same applied at school. They didn't say the government ought to do something about improving the discipline in schools. It was the parents who got together and saw that the teachers were backed up by backing them up. I know very well if I got whacked at school for something, punished for misbehaving, kept behind or something like that, my parents didn't sympathize with me. They sympathized with the teacher who had to stay behind with me, and therefore probably saw that I was given some extra chores at home to compensate and teach me a little lesson.

I think in those days, when things were a bit tough, we were probably a little more independent than we are in these days of relative opulence. I hope one thing that restraining will do today will [be to] encourage people to get back to some of that individual responsibility and voluntary effort in handling the problems before us.

Over the winter — maybe I get more of it than most of you, coming from just south of Spirit River — I've listened with amazement to the criticism levelled at the multinational corporations. The name rolls off the tongue with great ease. They have been criticized for the way in which they've operated here in Alberta.

I happen to have a son who works on an Alberta-owned service rig. Most of the work his rig does is for these multinational corporations. In fact, the multinational corporations pay him pretty well, a lot better than I was ever paid when I was his age. Therefore, not only is he able to get very good pay for his work, he is able to save enough out of that after a

year on the rigs that he is going to be able to go to Europe to get some education in gourmet cooking, which is his special interest. It's not the government taking taxes and royalties from the oil companies that's going to be paying for my son's further education in Europe. It's the multinational oil companies that are going to be paying for him to have the opportunity to go there.

I also have another son who is an engineer. He works at that multinational corporation called Procter and Gamble. Ten years ago, he probably would have had to go to the States to find work. Today, he can work in his own home town and contribute to Grande Prairie and the community life there. What I say is thank you to the multinational corporations.

However, this does bring out a point which I would like to draw to the attention of government. In Grande Prairie, there is also a large Canadian company working in the forest industry. This company has been contributing to the financial security of Grande Prairie for a great many years. Without too much in the way of government subsidy, they have provided jobs for Albertans and profits for Canadians for a lot longer than some of the newer companies that have come in the last few years. I would certainly like to see, when it is diversifying our economy and developing new opportunities for work within the province, that the government does not entirely overlook some of these other companies that have done so much by their own initiative and enterprise to develop just these very diversities of economy and opportunities for jobs. I think we sometimes get overanxious in trying to encourage new companies to come into the province; sometimes we forget about the ones that have been here and working for many years in the past and have done so much to establish this province in the way it is today.

I'm glad to see the hon. Member for Little Bow has returned, because I do want to thank him for his concern about our hospital in Grande Prairie. I also want to thank the minister for his reply. The functional plan has finally been completed by the board, after considerable consultation and pressure on my part, and was delivered to the commission only last week. With this stage now completed, further stages are possible and will be followed by me with real concern. I think we might say the conception took a little while and it's going to be a fairly long gestation period. But I can assure the hon. member that the patient is doing well.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is realized that a price and wage control, a rent control, and other controls on the economy of this province are not enjoyed by this government. But, in fact, some good may come out of it, if Albertans can use this time to reassess their own priorities, to examine their demands on government, and reassert their efforts in individual enterprise and voluntary service. These things have been a characteristic of Albertans in the past.

Thank you.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. minister adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until 8 o'clock this evening.

[The House rose at 5:27 p.m.]

[The House met at 8 p.m.]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the indulgence of the House to introduce visitors?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS** (*reversion*)

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, members of the Assembly, thank you for the privilege.

I would like to introduce 13 members of the 153rd Ardrossan Boy Scouts. They are accompanied by three of their leaders: Mr. John Morgan, Mr. Ren Gusek, and Mr. Bill Newton. They are in the public gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the greeting of the Legislature.

#### head: **CONSIDERATION OF HIS HONOUR THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR'S SPEECH** (*continued*)

MR. CRAWFORD: At the outset, I want to add to the congratulations that have already been made to the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne, the hon. members for Lesser Slave Lake and Calgary Bow. I think both of them exhibited an excellent choice of subject matter and selection, and conveyed to the Assembly a deep understanding of the issues that are current in the province.

Mr. Speaker, I think Albertans have noted significant progress in the province during 1975 and, of course, carrying over to the anticipated, as I think we well may, opportunities of 1976 and beyond. Significant progress has been achieved in both economic and social areas. In fact, if hon. members have had occasion to remark from time to time that Alberta stands in a unique position in Canada in the good fortune it enjoys, I think those remarks can be made with strong evidence in support of them and needn't be put down to the simple feeling one always has on a sort of local basis that home is a great place and our province has to be the best because it's ours.

I think both the mover and seconder effectively drew attention to what is there for all Albertans to see: the many, many good things Albertans and, I think to some extent, the government — if I may be so modest as to place that before the members — have played a part in. I think it's fair to say that for a number of years Alberta has been uniquely blessed.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time, though, it's important to note the absolute necessity of judging more carefully than ever before the appropriate level of involvement of government in the

lives of our citizens, both from the point of view of government spending and from the degree of involvement the government may of necessity have with other agencies which also serve the people of Alberta and also, in the normal course of events, commit funds that are primarily public dollars. I could review just briefly for hon. members the expression of concern our government gave voice to last fall, [which] predated the other steps that have since been taken on a national basis, and can certainly be claimed to be the pace-setter of responsible fiscal control and, I think, a useful initiative in regard to the inflationary economy of Canada. It stands as the pace-setter for the country.

Mr. Speaker, in passing I refer only to inflation because there are more appropriate occasions to go more deeply into the economy of our province, perhaps when financial matters are discussed. One of the things that we wanted to be sure did not escape the attention of hon. members, and of course the leadership shown by the Provincial Treasurer and the government in that respect, was that governments play and have played for a period of time — a lot of government leaders weren't prepared to admit it — a very significant role in the escalation of inflation, including double-digit inflation in Canada. We moved to combat that, and that is history, Mr. Speaker. The efforts were made collectively in the best way, according to our judgment, and our caucus knew at the time they were about to go forward to the people to say there would be expenditure guidelines that that wouldn't be an entirely trouble-free road to tread.

Mr. Speaker, because I will have an opportunity to deal with matters relating to the Department of Labour in more detail at the time two or three of the bills are before the House, I don't propose to forecast the legislation that will relate to the Workers' Compensation Board or the occupational health and safety division of the Department of Labour, other than to note that it has to be with some degree of pride that these items are shown in the Speech from the Throne. And the occupational health and safety program of the government is to be one of the five priorities of this session of the Alberta Legislature.

I think it is appropriate, Mr. Speaker, at this time to add a word of congratulations to the Alberta Federation of Labour — not immediately leaving the subject of occupational health and safety — because of the outstanding two-day workshop they sponsored and convened last week in the city of Calgary with regard to industrial health and safety. I think everyone there sensed the fact that it was a conference unique in the history of labor, management, and government relations in the province of Alberta. I might say the results of it are about to be fed into the government's consultative process with regard to final drafts of the legislation referred to in the Speech from the Throne. Prior to that, we informed the organizers of the workshops that that would be the case, and have since heard from them that the input will be ready very soon. I hope and trust though that it will be possible to have that particular piece of legislation before hon. members not too late in the session because of the clear importance and magnitude of the issues involved.

One of the things that was commented upon at the workshop — and I might add that this follows in the

trail of the Gale Commission report and the debate throughout Alberta for the better part of a year in regard to those recommendations. It acknowledges that the recommendations are extremely useful in arriving at the course that should be followed in Alberta at the present time in regard to occupational health and safety.

The workshop stressed the need for clarity of language if standard interpretations of what the rules would be were going to be provided and were to have the effect they must have. They stressed that existing safety programs, where they are effective, should be continued undisturbed. In my opinion, this was a useful observation on the part of the workshops, because very often there is the urge to accept — which by and large, in the case of the Gale Commission report, is to be done — the entire recipe as presented. But the workshops didn't overlook the fact that much good work is being done in safety councils and in similar agencies throughout the province. They felt that although mandatory safety committees probably have a significant place in the future in regard to health and safety in the province, good work already achieved must not be undermined.

They dealt with the joint committee structure at construction sites and with the issue that, as it may be proposed in the legislation, will relate to the right — I should say the right or otherwise at this point — of the workman to cease to perform his work on a particular job site because he would face a significant danger if he worked under the conditions at that place and time. That will be one of the very, very important issues when the Legislature reaches that point. The workshops didn't fail to underline the importance of employee education in safety, and had some suggestions about whether that could be attempted at an earlier stage, in particular, perhaps, at the technical school stage.

Mr. Speaker, the government is pleased that many changes are taking place in the labor force of Alberta at the present time. Many changes are taking place in work opportunities in a growing variety of employments. I think my honorable colleague, the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower, would not be too angry if I used one of his favorite figures and noted that with approximately 8 per cent of the work force of Canada here in the province of Alberta, we have some 14 per cent of the apprentices. That shows a major thrust to train our young people in this province.

The achievements we see in our province are, in significant measure, the achievements of the work force. I believe the people of Alberta would want me to acknowledge this. Mr. Speaker, my hope is that by working together and making some extra effort, organized labor, management, and the people of Alberta as represented by the government will examine new ideas which may help us to achieve still greater things for our province and to share its future.

Mr. Speaker, it's often mentioned how much time is lost on account of strikes. It can be expressed in terms of millions of man-days. But across Canada, the percentage of actual work time lost on account of strikes is less than .5 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, this is only a very brief introduction to many of the issues I would like to deal with. But I'm going to conclude my remarks now, and I look

forward to other opportunities during the sittings yet to come when I may deal further with these matters.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in the debate on the throne speech made on March 4, 1976, the opening day of the second session of the 18th Legislature, I too would like to congratulate the mover, the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake, and the seconder, the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, for their concise, precise and well-stated remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to congratulate the Lieutenant-Governor, the Honourable Ralph Steinhauer, for the fine presentation of the throne speech; but even more, for the important, continued, top-rate service he is providing in his capacity as representative of the Queen to the people of Alberta. The Lieutenant-Governor being the first North American Indian to hold this post must be underlined, Mr. Speaker, with humble pride.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to express my sincere thanks to my constituents of Edmonton Kingsway for giving me the sincere privilege to represent them in the Alberta Legislature for the second term. As a member of the Progressive Conservative Party, I hope I have done well in the past, Mr. Speaker. I hope I can do better. I hope the constituents will assist by communicating their concerns and suggesting directions. My central purpose, Mr. Speaker, a purpose I'm sure all members of the Legislature have, is to indeed represent them well.

Mr. Speaker, Alberta is becoming known as the Progressive Conservative province of Canada. For it can now claim to be the home of the Leader of the Opposition of the federal Progressive Conservative Party, namely not Joe Who, but the well-known hon. Joe Clark, MP for Rocky Mountain House. Mr. Speaker, having been involved in the campaign for his leadership from the beginning when few believed, I'm now confident he will no doubt soon become not only the prime minister of Canada but a first-rate prime minister. Mr. Speaker, I suggest this. Those of you in the House who participated in that hard-fought campaign of February 22, 1976, in Ottawa — the hon. members for Edmonton Highlands, Red Deer, Pincher Creek-Crowsnest, Camrose, Jasper Place, and, of course, yours truly for Edmonton Kingsway — in fact know him and therefore know there's a high probability he will indeed become prime minister in short order.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest this. Those who chose otherwise or did not participate — and God knows why anyone would have missed that event — will in short order be enlightened and will be assured of his firm, calculated, well thought out, top-rate leadership. Mr. Speaker, a leader of his calibre is rare, but Alberta makes them that way.

Mr. Speaker, of course we have Premier Lougheed, and to serve under his very able, proven stewardship gives me [along] with Albertans satisfaction, comfort, and security that is difficult to measure. Mr. Speaker, it's understandable that members of the opposition can't feel that way, and that is exactly why they're there.

And to you, Mr. Speaker: your guidance and mediation of the House proceedings has given you and the Alberta Legislature a stature second to none in Canada and, I suggest with humbleness, probably in the Commonwealth. For this, Mr. Speaker, I and I

am sure members of the House again thank you in the most sincere way.

Mr. Speaker, on a very important item. Although International Women's Year has ended, I think it's very important that we in Alberta continue to recognize that important gender as equal and for their extra-special contribution to the life of Alberta and Canada. We as the male gender in Alberta too often forget their strong support, their equal and/or superior contribution to the well-being of our society and to the fabric of families of Alberta. Difficult as it may be to acknowledge from time to time by the male gender, I'd suggest that maybe it would be wise to just take two lines from Maurice Chevalier. If I may say this, Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence and with the tolerance of the House. It's only two lines:

Thank heaven for little girls,

For little girls grow bigger every day.

Thank heaven for little girls.

They grow up in the most delightful way.

Mr. Speaker, I won't sing anymore. But if I may just quote the other two lines. Those lines go like this:

Those little eyes so helpless and appealing

One day will flash and make us crash right through the ceiling.

Thank heaven for little girls.

Mr. Speaker, again I thank them all.

As I turn to the more specific issues of the throne speech I would like to make — if I may have the tolerance of the House please, Mr. Speaker — some observations and finally a few suggested general directions to the government on behalf of the citizens. Mr. Speaker, there are many specifics that cannot be articulated during this throne speech debate because of time limitations, but I'm sure they will come up during other debates, questions, debates on the budget, and so on. I underline this last comment, Mr. Speaker, because many citizens ask me from time to time — as I'm sure they ask other members in the House — why I haven't brought up this or that. But time restraints do not allow it.

In reference to the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with a number of items, especially in the social areas, that indicate the government's concern for the individual and family. In spite of the historical events of wage and price restraints, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it should be necessary, but I suppose it is, to remind the House and especially the opposition that this Progressive Conservative government brought in the 11 per cent guidelines even before the federal Liberal government saw the light of necessity. In spite of these restraints, it is clear that the social thrusts for our citizens will be emphasized and maintained — as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, increased by 11 per cent. I hope specific areas such as housing, health and safety, as the hon. Minister of Labour has just indicated, workers' compensation, and home care will in fact increase. Having served on the select committee for Workers' Compensation and the advisory committee for Workers' Compensation since 1971, and again in 1974, I'm particularly interested in that area.

Before I go on, I believe it's very relevant that during this time of restraints it's important to emphasize the dollar benefits of living in this province. Mr. Speaker, apart from the quality of life in sunny Alberta — and I think this winter certainly

substantiates that phrase — some of the benefits of living in Alberta are: the lowest property tax in all of Canada, the lowest natural gas price, the lowest gasoline price, the lowest provincial income tax, the highest support for education and health, no sales tax, and the highest senior citizens' benefits in Canada. Mr. Speaker, in summary, it's by far the highest per person support in Canada. I suggest that if any citizen in Alberta calculates in rough figures — if he earns about \$16,000 per year being a blue collar worker, and has two children, he will probably find that he saves somewhere in the vicinity of \$2,000 to \$3,000. That may be modest. If you're earning more, I'd suggest you probably save more. That is truly performance, and something to be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other interesting issues in the speech about which I'd like to comment. The Alberta economy — what has been the economic strategy of the government? Balanced growth with diversification of economic activity, with resultant diversification of jobs and opportunity for these jobs, and job security not only for the people now but for the future, for our children and our children's children. Those who oppose this concept, Mr. Speaker, are obviously concerned about over-industrialization.

Well I say this. As long as this government is cognizant, as it is, of the hazards of too much too quickly and uncontrolled growth, as it has indicated, there is no fear for quality of life in Alberta. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the expansion of tourist promotion, cheese factories, food processing plants, or service industries is not, as the hon. Member for Clover Bar is mumbling there, a threat to our quality of life. Rather, Mr. Speaker, it enhances our quality of life, because it provides jobs for people to live in comfort.

I hope such areas, and other areas of development, will continue to expand. Mr. Speaker, always keeping in mind the quality of life and the environment at the apex of concern, yet assuring our children, as I have indicated, that there will be jobs when in fact oil, gas, and natural resources become less abundant. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the dollars that flow into the provincial coffers via the heritage trust fund will emphasize by way of investment for our future in many directions.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest maybe the government should consider developing our educational methodology, what we should actually teach to have a true social equilibrium for the future. For I suggest, Mr. Speaker, our life styles will have to alter radically in the not too distant future.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the heritage trust fund will be used, for example, for things like research for other forms of energy. I hope it will be used to assist in those areas that will be lasting indeed for the future, such as homes. It is obvious the heritage trust fund will be used for economic diversification, either directly or indirectly. What I say here, Mr. Speaker, is the example of irrigation and tertiary businesses, irrigation certainly being an indirect way of benefiting Albertans for the future.

Critics would have this government blow all the money now. When our oil, gas, and resources are depleted, we are left with no growth, no security, and no jobs. Mr. Speaker, it must be said again, we are now spending more per person than any other province. Yet some in Alberta want us to spend

more. Rather than merely spending more, Mr. Speaker, I say what we need is more defined priorities, more efficiency, more traditional emphasis, as the premier has stated, on values of saving, of investing for the future.

Mr. Speaker, being very specific now regarding housing, a vital item in the general standard of living, rating at the top of the criteria used for the standard of living: mainly food, clothing, shelter, jobs, recreation, security, freedom, education, and health. This area is also being emphasized, as indicated in the throne speech debate, via a variety of programs. With the minister we have at the helm, I am confident there is increased assurance of more housing for more people who can least afford it.

Mr. Speaker, if I may just quote from a yearly review of the Alberta Housing Corporation, just to re-emphasize this point, because housing is such a vital and most important standard of living. It indicates here, Mr. Speaker, that "Alberta had the largest actual increase of housing starts of any Province in Canada in 1975." I suggest this will be repeated in 1976." This is a 30 per cent increase. Mr. Speaker, Edmonton — and Edmontonians, especially in Edmonton Kingsway, take note — showed the greatest increase at 61 per cent, which meant that 8,647 units were started in 1975, compared to 5,362 units in 1974. The total funds committed by the Alberta Housing Corporation in 1975 were over \$105 million.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many programs by this department, and they're just starting. Let me suggest the starter home ownership program — \$12 million during 1975. A further \$17.5 million [has] already been allocated. Mr. Speaker, the core housing incentive program — \$24 million, plus a further \$25 million in loan applications are being processed now. The farm house lending program is just being started, but it's on its way. The mobile home parks — there's a total of over \$1 million for 292 mobile home lots, and loans for a further 350 lots are in progress. The social housing program, Mr. Speaker, an area that is emphasized in this throne speech debate, as it has been since 1971 — 2,303 housing units in the area of senior citizens' public housing, rural and native, Metis and staff housing, and public housing. Mr. Speaker, I think this is something to be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, during the summer in 1975 I had the privilege to visit Stockholm and London under the sponsorship of the Co-operative Housing Foundation of Canada. My comments regarding this tour, Mr. Speaker — in simple words, it was a real eye-opener. Although we had much to learn of what not to do, may I just give the House some basic ideas.

First, homes can in fact be built for a lot less than they are now. Second, in socialist countries, mainly Stockholm in Sweden and London in England, free enterprise can and is doing a good job as indicated in these countries by the officials themselves. In fact, they are going in that direction by tendering to free enterprise, because they recognize that the bureaucrats themselves have increased their costs beyond their expectations and they now have to go to tender to compete. The other point, Mr. Speaker, is that ground level detached dwellings are preferable by far. These are some key points, Mr. Speaker, I think the House should view.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Minister of Housing for his thrust in this vital area of our standard of living. The proposed Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation, in addition to the other housing programs that I mentioned, will, I am confident, alleviate the housing accommodation crisis, a central item in the standard of living.

Regarding health care, Mr. Speaker, it is common knowledge that we in Alberta benefit far more from the dollars spent on health than all other provinces. However, that should not be taken to mean that our citizens receive their dollars' worth. In fact, when we speak of total health, meaning physical, mental and social health, the problem is that many of our citizens and health professionals are too orientated towards acute episodic care—that means acute illness—rather than prevention, early diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation, teaching of health. Mr. Speaker, I suggest this is the area that must be emphasized if we are to in fact raise the level of health in Alberta and decrease and/or maintain dollar expenditure in this area.

Mr. Speaker, to simply say we spend more dollars, which is commendable, is not enough. It is well known that Albertans and Canadians spend three times more on health care than many other countries which have, in fact, a standard of health care equal to ours.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is not a criticism. It is an indictment of our affluence which indicates that money equals good, and that is not necessarily the case at all. I admit that dollars are needed, and I am the last one to say I would not want the dollar. But, Mr. Speaker, I suggest when we drive a Cadillac and we burn up a gallon of gas just to get started, is this really good?

The same example may apply to health care. We use high-priced hospitals, when out in the community people require preventive care for the ordinary ills so they won't go to the active hospitals, to the high-priced operating rooms, and to intensive care units. Mr. Speaker, we need both, in a proper balance of quality and quantity. I have said this before. I have cried about this numerous times, Mr. Speaker, and I'll continue to make this cry as long as I hold office as a member of Edmonton Kingsway. I suggest that this can be accomplished via a co-ordinated system of delivery on an out-patient basis, through community programs be they community health and social centres, as I've indicated before, or through other community programs.

I want to compliment the ministers in the health area and acknowledge that much has been done in this area for senior citizens regarding health benefits, the best in Canada. Handicapped children and adult facilities are much improved. Home care, mental health—all are excellent examples. But they are still not co-ordinated well enough and are not in every community. To cite one example, Mr. Speaker, ambulance and emergency service in some parts of Alberta is at a distressed level. Finally, of course, there is much to do in community health.

Mr. Speaker, another area of concern that has been brought to my attention over the past few months is law and permissive law—an important issue. I'm pleased this important reference is made, in fact, in the throne speech debate, and that some action will be taken in this area. Serving on the

advisory board on corrections, Mr. Speaker, it has come to me quickly that not only in Alberta but everywhere in Canada much has to be done in this area. I am certainly pleased that gun registration is coming along. I debated that and requested it in this Legislature last year, and I can only comment by saying hooray.

Specifically regarding alcoholism, Mr. Speaker, I must reiterate my previous statement, and that is: alcoholism—here lieth Goliath. Drinking allowed to 18-year olds has resulted in 15-, 16-, and 17-year olds drinking and becoming alcoholics. I wonder who brought in the 18-year old drinking age. Mr. Speaker, alcoholism in Alberta 10 years ago represented 50,000 known alcoholics. I suggest there must be 75,000 or 100,000 known alcoholics now and probably just as many unknown alcoholics. I don't have to go into the problems inherent in that legacy.

Mr. Speaker, the question has to be asked: is this permissiveness in this area when we permit and increase alcoholic advertisement on one hand and at the same time we have Check Stop—a good program, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, and it's doing a good job. But what a paradox, that we can sit in this Legislature and on one hand advertise the good life—beer, wine, drinking—and then Check Stop. Mr. Speaker, we toy with human emotions of the individual family. There is no doubt that alcoholism has increased. I hope our government, and I make specific reference to the hon. Solicitor General, does not allow easier and more expanded outlets, pubs included, and no pun intended.

Mr. Speaker, it's sure great to see some reference to—rather than having a fine or a jail term, an individual can do community work, acknowledging that when a jail sentence is imposed it should indeed be carried out. But the concept of community work to pay off an offence is sound and should be expanded. Incidentally, they have this in Sweden and are carrying it out very effectively.

So, Mr. Speaker, much more can be said about our government's positive activities to date. Let me conclude by a few recommendations which, hopefully, will not only increase the awareness of our ministers but will increase the activity in some areas of concern which have come to my attention over the past year. Regarding specific recommendations for consideration, and many more can be added, may I offer six.

Regarding labor, Mr. Speaker, the public in Canada and Alberta are sick and tired of strikes, walkouts, and general confrontation of labor and management. Surely we have had enough of this type of petty battling which hurts all, including labor, management, and the public. I recommend, Mr. Speaker, in all humbleness, that we establish, clarify, and define essential services in the public sector and do not allow strikes forthwith in these areas.

Number two, regarding labor: strikes should be avoided by conciliation and not confrontation; by negotiation, minimally at least six months in advance of any new settlement.

Number three—and this is a very important item, Mr. Speaker, a difficult one to correct, but it needs correcting, for if you don't correct it the other two are useless—be sure that those involved in settling by conciliation are in fact orientated that way. In this

area labour and management must review their leadership. That's what I'm saying. It's obvious by recent actions that with the slightest misunderstanding there's a walkout, there's a strike, there's public debate rather than discussion, consideration, resolution, and good faith.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a true challenge to the Minister of Labour, and I know he can do it. I know he can do it well, being able as he is. And it's a challenge to this government and all governments in Canada. I hope, Mr. Speaker, the minister is sure that his staff — he's not in the House right now, but I hope he'll read this — is conciliation orientated. You can't have a bull act like a dove in conciliation.

Mr. Speaker, regarding local governments and their representation. When I, as a citizen of Edmonton, see some of the activities of our local representatives and the bureaucrats associated with them, I am amazed and very concerned, as many Edmontonians are, Mr. Speaker. As completely as I agree with the concept of local autonomy which this government has indeed developed and emphasized and promoted, I begin to wonder, Mr. Speaker, when I asked the question today, when the provincial government banks land at Mill Woods, sells it to the city of Edmonton for \$2,000 per acre. The city in turn sells it, after developing it, at half the market price. Developers produce homes at market or above market price, and nobody gets the benefit except the developer. The province loses, the municipal government loses, the consumer loses. The question I have to ask, Mr. Speaker, is: is this local autonomy? The whole concept of providing economic land for the consumer is lost if surveillance is not maintained.

Let me give you another example, Mr. Speaker. Again, this is hitting local autonomy, not only in Edmonton but in other municipalities. I'm sure there are municipalities that are functioning very well. In Edmonton, adequate funds are provided and allocated for transportation. These could be used for bus service, Mr. Speaker, which was at a deficit position then. The city of Edmonton chooses rapid transit. I like rapid transit too, but we can't afford it. The costs have escalated and the property tax has gone up. The bus service is still in a deficit position, and the question arises again: is this responsible local autonomy?

Another example, Mr. Speaker: the provincial government helps to fund the Commonwealth Games stadium. But the city decides to build another coliseum. And now they're considering the building of a trade and convention centre. I like all of these, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure all members would like all of them, but can we afford them? What happens? The coliseum and the trade and convention centre will be in a deficit position for many years and property tax goes up. The question again: is this proper, responsible local autonomy?

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayer is paying more in Edmonton than in many municipalities, in spite of the fact that the provincial government has brought in the property tax rebate plan, Alberta gas subsidy, renter rebate, senior citizens' assistance, and low interest loans and grants to municipalities. There are many more examples, Mr. Speaker, of this type of action by some municipalities and their bureaucrats or representatives. They are taxed excessively, then they ask for more money from the provincial government, like

a family with poor budgeting.

Mr. Speaker, I recommend a review of where this money is going, how and why. Alert some of the local representatives and take note, and put them on notice to rationalize, to set realistic priorities. Mr. Speaker, this is as applicable to provincial governments as it is to the federal government and to the municipal governments.

Mr. Speaker, I have another three points, and I'll take about three minutes. Regarding farmers and cattle raisers, there is no doubt that the government has given more support to the farmers through rural gas, development corporation and other loans, and so forth. But, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to cattle raising and the problem they are having — and the direction to resolve this problem is fuzzy and not good enough as far as I'm concerned — I recommend that the Alberta government take hold of the cow, the bull, the heifer, and the steer and ask why this could possibly happen. A cow, Mr. Speaker, 12 years old, selling at 10 cents a pound; a bull, 10 or 12 years old, selling at 28 cents a pound; a heifer, 1 or 2 years old, selling at 34 cents a pound; a steer, 1 or 2 years old, selling at 40 cents a pound, gets to the consumer at the same price of \$1.75 or \$2 a pound.

Mr. Speaker, three things are elementary in this. The producer gets less money, or equal to the cost of bringing that animal to the packing plant. The cost to the consumer has not even changed. The consumer doesn't know whether he's eating a 10- or 12-year old cow or a bull, or a 1- or 2-year old heifer or a steer. Well, Mr. Speaker, I find it ridiculous too. When I have a farmer coming to my office in a medical way, crying about this, and literally crying, I'm distressed.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest the recommendation here — if I may have permission — is that we re-evaluate this area to assure that the producer is in fact getting a fair price, a minimal price. Mr. Speaker, if we can't do that, at least allow the consumer to know if he's eating a 12-year old cow or bull, or a steer or a heifer that's 2 years old, or whether it's a red label or a blue label, and be assured that there's a difference in price. Mr. Speaker, I think it's time we evaluate the need and efficiency in all departments, and clarify the programs with a view to assuring that, in fact, we're getting our dollars' worth.

Mr. Speaker, if I may have permission of the House for another two minutes, because I don't want to rush through this.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, getting on to the fourth point regarding programs, let me just give you one example. The Hospitals Care Commission is to advise regarding budgetary items for health care for the hospitals in the province. Mr. Speaker, it's interesting — you begin to wonder. I heard the opposition members saying, is that right. I begin to wonder if that's right too, because despite the fact that their administrative costs have skyrocketed, they're not doing this. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care that this matter be reviewed forthwith with a view to getting proper service from this area that is costing the

provincial taxpayers so much.

Mr. Speaker, if we mean to save money in health care — this is a relative type of saving and it always will be a relative type of saving — let me ask this question: how can anyone say that having home care at \$4.05 a day versus a nursing home hospital at \$18 a day, an auxiliary hospital at \$35, and an active hospital at \$90 a day is not saving money by the simplest consideration? Using the argument that the beds are going to be used up by somebody else is ridiculous. Of course they're going to be used up by somebody else, Mr. Speaker, by somebody else who needs the beds more. But those people are kept out of hospitals. Therefore we don't have to build more nursing homes, auxiliary hospitals, and active hospitals and, in fact, we have a relative saving.

Mr. Speaker, there is and will be, as I've stated before, only one way to maintain a relative saving in health care, and that is to offer effective, efficient out-patient prevention diagnosis, early diagnosis, treatment, rehabilitation, and the teaching of health apart from institutions.

Mr. Speaker, regarding economy — and this is the last statement — I agree with the diversification of our economy. I agree with decentralization. I agree with increased opportunity offered by our government for small business, for the farmers and for the energy producers. I know that in this process of diversification and development of job security for the future that industrial development will not depend solely on oil and gas, and I hope our government will take this into consideration.

I hope the overall thrust in this area will continue in environment control, quality of life control. The last, Mr. Speaker, is most of all part of the world scheme of things, for, as I have stated before and the Minister of the Environment even stated after he attended the Stockholm conference, we are being overpopulated from 4 billion to 8 billion in the year 2000; 66 per cent of our people are in fact going hungry to bed every day. We're polluting our environment and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we as leaders in the community act with determination, not only locally but by influencing our federal and international leaders to correct the course and make a happier life for all of us.

So, Mr. Speaker, with these comments — there are many other items. I think it takes bold leadership; I know we have that bold leadership in this Legislature. I suggest we use it well, Mr. Speaker, and in humbleness and sincerity I thank you for your indulgence.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin by thanking His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor for his generous address, and congratulating the hon. members for Lesser Slave Lake and Calgary Bow on their splendid speeches in response.

I rise to take part in this debate, Mr. Speaker, with a special purpose. While I applaud the government's overall policy of restraint and consolidation, it's my purpose to address myself to the reasons why law enforcement and justice, in addition to housing, should be in a preferred priority position. This has been a responsible decision by a responsible government, a government that has had the courage to act with firm resolution. Too often in the past, governments, well knowing their problems, have sought to

give the impression of action by setting up royal commissions or inquiries which avoid decision and action. In my area, Mr. Speaker, there are some problems, not of my making. They've been a long time cooking, 15, 20 years. But I don't run away from them.

Mr. Speaker, democracy sinks or swims according to the regard it pays to the rule of law. If society allows the framework of law, on which it has been built, to become eroded by disrespect, ignored by a significant number of its citizens, or corrupted by abuse, the very foundations of civilization begin to crumble. In the words of Adlai Stevenson, a famous American orator:

As citizens of this democracy, you are the rulers and the ruled, the law givers and the law abiding, the beginning and the end. Government in a democracy cannot be stronger or more tough minded than its people.

There are many examples in history. Ancient Greece sank in a plethora of words when debate for debate's sake questioned every truth. Rome sank under a dead weight of corruption when its citizens no longer respected the law and when those in authority abused their power. Tyrants through the centuries have ridden roughshod over the law to the detriment of their subjects and to the inevitable destruction of their civilizations. In fact it is respect for laws, honestly arrived at in the interests of all, that is the hallmark of civilized man.

We of the commonwealth of nations are justifiably proud of the system we've inherited: a symbolic head of state in the Crown which continues on forever and is not subject to the whims of parties in power, elected parliaments, appointed judges who then become unassailable by the politicians, courts of appeal, civic rights, and a vast body of law.

This law is subject to constant reform and improvement, and yet it has its roots in the precedents set through the ages. Constantly law-making assemblies such as ours are trying to make justice and the law synonymous. They're still not identical. Without order there can be no law, and without law there can be no order. It's the laws that society makes in its own interests that distinguish civilization from chaos. If we believe in the rule of laws, the laws we make in assemblies such as this, if we believe that we reject the law of the jungle, we must recognize certain basic principles for all citizens.

The famous British poet, Wordsworth, said this:

And through the heat of conflict, keeps the law.  
In calmness made, and sees what he foresaw.

For every privilege there's a corresponding responsibility. Freedom is not licence if there's to be order everywhere. The strong cannot be allowed to prey unfairly on the weak. A man who strives is entitled to a just reward for his accomplishments, but there is a difference between just reward and rip-off. Our citizens have a right to enjoy their property without fear of predators or of anyone else. Our citizens have a right to expect peace and security for themselves and for their children.

Mankind may be destined to struggle, but his struggle should be fair and within the rules, rules that are the same for all. If he errs through human weakness, the sanctions imposed by society must be evenhanded. It must be clear to all that the true path is plain to see and possible to regain. Civilized man

must always exercise compassion. That distinguishes him from the beasts. But it's not compassionate to be so flexible as to make it difficult for bewildered man to distinguish between right and wrong.

"Thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not bear false witness": these were written in stone at the very beginning of our Judaic culture. No kindness is done to the lost soul by pretending that these rules can be adjusted according to circumstance. Nor can the later Christian admonition to love thy neighbor properly be distorted, as it is by some, to mean that one should condone wrongdoing. That's the main reason for punishment under the law. It's not to exact retribution or revenge. It's to underline, over and over again, what is right and what is wrong. That's why our judges are saddled with the awesome responsibility of attempting to fit the punishment to the crime.

First we must have efficient law enforcement agencies, who will apprehend suspected wrongdoers and bring them, together with whatever evidence they feel they have, before the courts. These policemen are the frontline guards of our society. Their job is unenviable, often misunderstood. They are exposed to risk from violent mavericks. They must try to pursue their duty with tact and diplomacy. Yet it's too much to expect every one of them to be both a brave soldier and a smooth diplomat. They can't all be Henry Kissingers. As upholders of the law, they must be beyond reproach themselves. Clearly, they can only function as efficiently as they should, in the best interests of society, if the people recognize they are the champions of society itself.

Naturally, those who don't appreciate the importance of, or who actually oppose, the rule of law will first seek to divide the police from the society they are charged to protect. That's the danger to which we should be constantly alert. Any gulf between the police and the people is a fault which can be widened into a significant breach in society's defence through which all the floods of chaos can pour. Apart from the obvious validity of the proverb that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, this is the main reason for promoting the involvement of police in crime prevention. Of course police must react after the fact, but how much better it is if they can also involve themselves so closely with the people that they can influence potential offenders toward a worthwhile role in society or, at the very least, deter offenders from criminal acts.

Secondly, we must have corrections agencies that apply horse sense to the treatment of the convicted criminal. Sentences must take place, of course, in accordance with the decision of the court, but corrections staff must remember that the very purpose of punishment is to define the difference between right and wrong. Above all, they must never become so flexible as to blur the definition of right and wrong. They must also recognize that their duty is to salvage as well as to deter. Certainly, the most usual sanction of the courts is to fine or to imprison, and imprisonment means depriving a man of his liberty, his most precious possession. But most sentences, almost all sentences, come to an end and the inmate is returned to the society from which he came. It would be tragic if the time of incarceration had been totally wasted and no attempt had been made to

wean the offender away from his pattern of antisocial behavior. What sort of sense would it be to do that? Every effort must be made to retrieve the failure and to remold the errant into useful, productive citizens. Otherwise little has been accomplished other than perhaps the protection of society for a short period, and emphasis on the laws of right and wrong.

It's true the statistics seem to point to an almost constant recidivism rate of 60 per cent, and to a police solution rate incidentally of around 30 per cent, but that's no excuse for not trying. A reduction of a mere 4 per cent in the rate of repeat offences would have enormous benefits to society. An increase in the solution rate of a mere 5 per cent would also be equally beneficial. That's why probation must be meaningful, and why the discipline of action on breaches is most important. It must be strict. That is why we must try to change the attitudes in the prison, must encourage activity, despite the increased threats that increased activity means to security. Every time you move people around, try to get them more active, you are moving them into a less secure position, because the most secure place is locked in their cells. But it's a justifiable risk.

We must classify and segregate offenders. We must occasionally take a calculated risk in releasing inmates back into the community to find worthwhile employment or training. When they have been carefully evaluated — one day they're going to go back anyway; if they were worthwhile citizens they wouldn't be there in the first place.

We must challenge youth to build up self-esteem. A lot of them identify themselves as losers at an early age, and it's because they lack self-pride that they fall into this losing pattern. We must recognize that discipline of itself has some therapeutic value to a person who's been accustomed to run wild.

The other day I heard a German engineer give what I thought was a very good illustration of the permissive society on one hand, and the people who believe in structured discipline on the other. He was talking to a young mother who was about to send her child for early childhood education and he said: Do you know what the word kindergarten means? It means child garden in German. Do you really want your child to go to a child garden, or do you want it to go to a kinder jungle, a child jungle? Do you want the child to be tended, pruned, watered, looked after in an orderly fashion, or do you want it to do what comes naturally, and pull out the weeds at a later date? This young lady was not at all sure, but my inclination is on the side of the kindergarten as opposed to the kinder jungle.

The same philosophies must be applied to the court system. It is the duty of any corrections system worth its salt to provide as broad a range of options as possible to the judge at the time of sentence. Human character has many sides, varied as a diamond. Every case is different. Correction systems, as well as assisting the courts with pre-sentence reports, should offer alternatives in structures and facilities so that the judge has a better opportunity to fit the punishment to the crime, always with human salvage in mind. The simplest sentences, traditionally, have been fines or imprisonment or both, but there should be many alternatives as conditions on a probation order or conditions on a suspended sentence. Even the type of imprisonment itself can vary, but the

judges will naturally only use alternatives in which they have faith, and they will only use them if they trust them. Many of the government's new initiatives in this regard will be outlined later in the session.

I have said that the rule of law is vital to society, and I'll explain why the government thinks that law enforcement and justice should have particular importance in its new program. Before I give you a few statistics, perhaps I should say that our civilization has come through much worse times. There were times in the early days of the west when every man had to have an ivory-handled pistol slung low to protect himself on the main street at high noon. There were times, not too long ago, when every gentleman carried a sword or a pistol, when highwaymen and thugs frequented the thoroughfares. There were times when a large proportion of the population was drunk on gin all the time, in the sordid, disgusting gin palaces one sees portrayed in a Hogarth print. So there have been worse times. There have been better times, too.

Today there are some warning signals which any responsible government must heed in the interest of its people. They are not peculiar to this province. They are there right across the country if not across the continent. Alberta is not alone in this regard, because rising antisocial behavior is a phenomenon of the entire western world today. But this is where our jurisdiction is, this is where our responsibility is, and this is where we can do something. In fact, in some respects, our position is better than most. Our figures for crimes against the person are not as alarming as in most jurisdictions, but our figures for crimes against property are.

Let's look at the background. Once upon a time people thought that antisocial behavior arose out of economic deprivation. If you were in the slums, you were bound to have a much better chance of becoming a crook than if you were living in affluence in a middle-class suburban neighborhood. Well, that's obviously not true today. That excuse just won't hold water any more. We have no starving, and few real poor in the world context, yet we are seeing rising crime rates at a time of exceptional affluence. In the Canadian context, Alberta only runs second to B.C. in the general crime rate. Saskatchewan is a close third. This has been the position for some time, under the former government and this government. The monthly average for juvenile delinquents was up 26 per cent in 1974, as opposed to 1973. There's been a small reduction in 1975.

I mention these two facts together because you'll readily appreciate that criminals are not born, or seldom born. Maybe there's the odd fellow who has some sort of character defect, but the majority are not born; they're made, or they're spoiled during their childhood. They're almost always made by experience which starts at an early age. Some 40 per cent of our prison inmates are under 21. Sixty per cent are under 25. There are 6,000 adults over the age of 16 on probation, and the figure for juveniles varies from about 2,000 to 3,000. Those are the ones under 16. There will also be, of course, a number of juveniles who have not been adjudged delinquents and haven't been to the courts but are being handled by the child welfare authorities, or by the police squad.

For years, in every province in Canada, law en-

forcement and justice have been at the bottom of the priority list. Alberta was no exception. In this province it's not unfair to say that we're reaping the harvest of years of neglect. Budgets were around 1 to 3 per cent of total provincial expenditures, compared with up to 70 per cent for health, education, and welfare. In Alberta for many years the functions of the Attorney General and the Solicitor General were handled on a part-time basis as a sideline by the Premier.

What are the reasons for the increase in crime rate, which I have linked directly to juveniles because that's obviously where it starts? Well, they can only be in the area of conjecture. But I'll give you a few opinions. First of all, the population of the west is very young. The postwar baby boom is still passing through our society like a big wave of population. The first of those babies born after the war are now around the age of 25, so we're just moving out of the peak of the wave. That's one reason. Another, that despite all the huge sums spent on education, results seem to show that the system did not achieve success in character building for a significant minority of students. This may have been a direct result of the permissive philosophies of John Dewey, which were particularly pervasive in the west, in the whole of western North America: California, B.C., and the midwest. The most popular philosopher today, he's getting on in years, is Viktor Frankl, whose experience came out of the concentration camps in Germany in the last war. Following in the steps of Freud and Jung, he has come up with a pretty significant point: that the ones who survived, the ones who do the best, are the ones who have something to believe in, the ones who really understand what the rules are. The ones who haven't got any firm beliefs are the ones who become lost souls, like the American soldiers who were taken prisoner in Korea.

A third reason: B.C. is a Pacific port in which the illicit drug trade has become firmly established, and Alberta is the first port of call going east. Affluence has been reflected in enormous increases in the consumption of alcohol, as the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway mentioned in his speech. Beer consumption is up about 68 per cent in four years. Hard liquor consumption is increasing at a rate of about 20 per cent a year. Fifty per cent of the prison inmates are serving time for offences related to the abuse of alcohol or the abuse of drugs.

Another possible reason, almost coincidental with the arrival of television and its preponderance of sex and violence scenes: there has been a deterioration from the ethical standards of our homesteader forebears. There's been a breakdown of more family units, reflected in the divorce rates, a decline in the influence of religion, an increase in the number of neglected children, and so on.

Well, the government will continue to address itself to this very important question of social order. Last year, as a first for any province in Canada, Alberta made direct grants to municipal law enforcement agencies of more than \$12 million. In addition to that basic grant, which will be increased, extra moneys will be made available to municipalities for approved programs of crime prevention and enhanced policing.

In accordance with the recommendations of Mr. Justice Kirby, we will be proceeding with a three-

pronged fine option program. The three prongs will be these: first, a follow-through on the pilot restitution program we have going now in Calgary; secondly, community work-for-fine, and that will be developed in Edmonton; and thirdly, the collection of fines by civil process. Remember that some 40 per cent of provincial prison inmates are incarcerated for non-payment of fines.

Extensive capital improvements will continue to all the correctional institutions, particularly to Fort Saskatchewan, and a start will be made on the new remand centre in Edmonton. We'll be beginning an outward bound program to build self esteem and pride through challenge among young offenders at Nordegg. We'll be extending treatment in the areas of alcoholism and forensic psychiatry through the department of my colleague, the hon. Miss Helen Hunley. Further amendments and directives will be introduced to step up the enforcement of our traffic laws.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the kernel of an exciting program in which the Department of the Solicitor General is proud to play its part. I'd just like to finish with a quotation from Pitt the Younger, who said, "Where the law ends, tyranny begins."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [applause]

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, with such an applause, I should actually get wound up for about a 40-minute debate. But I look around the Assembly, and I see that the opposition members are perhaps a little less than enthusiastic in participating in this throne speech debate. I wonder why. Is it because the throne speech has so much to offer Albertans that they have no criticism or no . . .

MR. R. SPEAKER: On a point of order, I'd like to point out to the hon. member that 25 per cent of us have spoken already.

MRS. CHICHAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps the fact that when one member speaks and that represents 25 per cent, that represents the impression with which Albertans were faced, or made their decision on, in having such a significant number in the loyal opposition.

I think, Mr. Speaker, at the start of each new session there is usually an aura of excitement, anticipation, challenge — a new beginning. It is a privilege to be part of it all, and I am pleased to participate.

First, I wish to congratulate those who have participated thus far in the debate. May I say they have expressed many of the thoughts I had intended or would have wished to convey in my message. Perhaps not wanting to be repetitive and have the members sit in agony by hearing words time and time again, although perhaps they may be extremely eloquent, I will, I think, shorten my message this evening and hopefully continue on another day.

I'd just like to say that the challenge before us is to chart a course, one that can continue to be full of achievements and success, or perhaps one of our demise in the tomorrow. When I speak of our demise I speak of the demise of Alberta as a great province. This, therefore, is the theme of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker. The key factors to examine and to consider are perhaps some of the following: people services; a

total Alberta growth; a future Alberta.

With respect to people services, expectations for provision of support by the government are rising. Since 1971, this government has set a pace second to none in providing assistance, growth, diversity, and individual opportunity for realization of personal aspirations. Having whetted our tastebuds, it has become difficult to contain our appetites. So having set a momentum, we simply ask for more.

There is no doubt in my mind that Albertans today are experiencing a kind of financial support from this government in the areas of health, education, housing, recreation, cultural development, and social assistance never known before in history. It may be said that this is the trend of the times; that the government is richer financially and therefore Albertans are entitled to a piece of the action. But are we setting a life style today which tomorrow we will not be able to satisfy or meet?

Reviewing advances made in some areas of people services through the period from 1971 to 1975, just touching on a few areas, the picture is somewhat like this: financing of local government during this time, some \$180 million has been provided in unconditional assistance grants, in excess of \$300 million in health, social services, transportation, recreation, and other programs at the local level. Education — the provincial share of the school foundation program increased from 66 per cent to 88 per cent. Grants to schools increased by 92 per cent, to universities by 51 per cent, and they're increasing. Some \$260 million has been provided in direct or indirect property tax reduction. Senior citizen programs exceeded \$200 million as compared to \$25 million in 1971. Expenditures in agriculture increased in excess of 258 per cent. Funding for manpower training opportunities between 1971 and 1975 was increased more than 100 per cent. Personal income tax reduction in the provincial income tax has been decreased and today remains at 26 per cent, this in light of the substantial increases in the personal income levels of all Albertans.

Our housing program, designed in 1975 and projected, is in millions of dollars, but I think we're beginning to lose count. Why do I think we need to review the kinds of programs that we in a short four years really have made available for Albertans? Today, I think we are experiencing a constant criticism, a constant demand for more and more assistance, for more funds at every level. We are turning our dialogue from need, I think perhaps to some extent, to greed. It seems the more we have, the more we are wanting, and the less we are satisfied with what has already been granted.

I think we need to recognize that by providing this massive assistance financially [it] has been shifting our attitudes as individuals from individual incentive to individual disincentive. I think we have become, or allowed ourselves to become, people of less satisfaction with what we are able to do personally to contribute from our own personal resources to develop a greater province in which to live. I think that we have stopped having the attitude that we really are the ones who make a nation great through our own initiative, rather than having the matter turned the other way about.

I think it has been proper for this government to have set priorities in the area of people services for

those who are less fortunate, who are less able to assist themselves through whatever their misfortune is, but I think we have seen a development whereby even those who are healthy, who are capable, who have the resource, have a lesser degree of desirability to play their share in this great province of ours. I think we need to re-examine [whether] simply adding dollars to the way of life we become accustomed to, is not really the answer: because dollars alone do not give quality. There must be the other half of the coin: people and their contribution.

When we consider tomorrow, a total Alberta growth, there are several things we must take into consideration. This government has embarked on a diversification on many fronts. First and foremost [is] the area of agriculture, because that has been and perhaps always will be our base, our mainstay for the people of Alberta if and when all else fails.

We are a landlocked province. This has many inherent disadvantages. Added to those inherent disadvantages, we have also the disadvantages of what other parts of Canada and other governments have imposed on a province such as ours. Here I am thinking of the tariffs, of the price Albertans have to pay for the goods they must buy from other parts of this country, or from other countries, the tariffs we have had to learn to live with since the time of confederation, part of which has caused this government to embark on a program of diversification in many areas, on a very broad front.

We have attempted to develop an industrial base in order that, when our natural resources are no longer in abundance, this province will not revert to a have-not province, but will be self-sufficient in many areas to maintain a healthy economy, a healthy Alberta, and a way of life that should forever be the envy of others.

We have embarked on developing and providing incentives that are relevant to agriculture, the production or the processing of agricultural products. In order to assure our industrial expansion, our diversification in processing agricultural products, to assure these industries and businesses, these people, that they will be able to convey or have a means of moving their products to the markets, we as a government found it necessary to move into an area of investment which has been criticized by those narrower in their thinking, or by those in opposition to our programs and our policies.

We have embarked on the purchase of a mode of transportation that this province cannot afford to be without. I'm speaking, of course, of none other than our Pacific Western Airlines. We must be able to assure that we have an up-to-date, modern mechanism or method of moving people from one area to another, of moving products from one area to another, not only in the province but in this country and internationally. We must find a way of breaking down the tariff barriers of transportation.

Currently there is a great deal of controversy over this very area that the government of Alberta, for the people of Alberta, made a move to assure that Alberta would not continue to be at a disadvantage. There has been controversy as to where the decisions must be made in how this province is served in this area of need. Albertans themselves have been critical of the fact that we ask that the decisions which must be made in the area of transportation be made here in

this province, amidst the activities of this province. How can any one Albertan truly feel or say that such decisions ought to be made in Toronto, in New York, in Philadelphia, in Vancouver, and yet have a true appreciation of the needs on a day-to-day changing basis of the people of Alberta, when it appears at times that the allegiance of the people who make the decisions is not truly with this province and with these people.

What about a future Alberta? When we talk about a future Alberta, we must of necessity talk about our natural resources and their revenues, and what happens to these. I think it is very important and necessary to bring home to Albertans a true understanding of what it means to Alberta today, and tomorrow, when we talk about our natural resource prices, who pays for them, and what we as Albertans get back from them.

I think it is necessary, time and time again, because it seems to be a point that is constantly overlooked, constantly misinterpreted and missed, that although Albertans initially, perhaps, pay basically a price close to what other Canadians pay for our oil and gas — which I do not agree is so, but the point is argued — we must recognize that Alberta uses approximately 15.9 per cent of the oil produced in this province. I think it's essential that Albertans recognize the very small percentage we use of that oil and gas, and that the balance of it, 38.4 per cent, goes to the rest of Canada, and 45.7 per cent to the United States. Now surely it is not unfair for Alberta to ask a fair price for a depleting resource that is by and large used by people outside of this province, who, if we should ever fall into a position of a have-not province, are not going to help look after us.

I think it is essential to think about the natural gas, and to set again before the people of Alberta the realization of what percentage we truly use. The information on the statistics I have is simply this: Alberta uses approximately 16.2 per cent of the natural gas produced in this province; the rest of Canada uses 44.7 per cent approximately; and 39.1 per cent is exported to the United States. How, in heaven's name, can any true Albertan and true Canadian say that we are not true Canadians when we ask for a fair price?

If we look back, and are asked, if we are Albertans then why do we pay the same price for our own natural resource as other Canadians, or other people in other countries do? We really do not pay the same price. Because, indirectly, I cited just a little bit earlier all the many programs that we as a provincial government are giving right back to Albertans in education, in social services, in housing, and social assistance. We are getting every bit of it back; 26 per cent on our personal income taxes is the lowest in Canada that has ever been known. Surely we must have Albertans realize that they are not paying the same price as other Canadians.

Why must we receive a fair price? Because tomorrow our children — and I hope many of us will be here — will still need to continue a life style that should be fair and comparable to other people, and surely we must have the revenues from our limited resources to plan for that tomorrow.

When we talk about a future Alberta, we have to talk about the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. We have to talk about how we're going to implement

that and plan it for tomorrow. We have heard, inside and outside this Legislature, criticisms that we are so rich in our natural resource revenues, why are we not providing more for education, more for all kinds of programs, and let tomorrow take care of itself. That simply is not a fair assessment, because spending more dollars today is not necessarily improving quality. It is raising expectations for us to become accustomed to that tomorrow [that] will not be there. We must look at those. For those who say that we have, we must spend, spend, spend, and not recognize what investment truly means, do not really have the best interests at heart for all Albertans for the future. I would have to say that I feel very strongly that perhaps such individuals are little less than Albertans.

I am sorry, I have received a message that as usual I have been taking too long in my speaking. However, perhaps at another time you will bear with me again.

I truly hope that we will think very deeply about not only today but tomorrow, and that we must plan it wisely. I think that is the challenge before us. We are the architects of a future Alberta, and what we will have tomorrow will be how we have designed

it today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. member adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion for adjournment by the hon. Government House Leader, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30.

[The House rose at 9:45 p.m.]