

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Friday, March 12, 1976 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**head: PRESENTING REPORTS BY  
STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES**

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, as chairman of a committee to select the following committees, I wish to table the report of the Standing Committee on Law and Regulations; the Standing Committee on Public Affairs; the Standing Committee on Private Bills; the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections; and the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 19**  
**The Alberta Home**  
**Mortgage Corporation Act**

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 19, The Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation Act. This being a money bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this bill, recommends the same to the Assembly. Mr. Speaker, the main purpose of this bill is to set up a home mortgage corporation, which will have as its primary functions, besides a number of minor ones: first of all, the engagement in the business of providing mortgage money for home building and home ownership basically to low- and middle-income home-owners; and secondly, engage itself in the business of purchasing mortgages with the prior approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

[Leave granted; Bill 19 introduced and read a first time]

**Bill 206**  
**An Act to Amend**  
**The Highway Traffic Act, 1976**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being An Act to Amend The Highway Traffic Act, 1976. A section in The Highway Traffic Act makes it an offence to park or stop a vehicle under certain enumerated conditions. This bill adds one more instance, namely, parking or stopping at or near an explosion, fire, et cetera, and is designed to keep curious sightseers from hampering police and rescue parties from doing their job.

[Leave granted; Bill 206 introduced and read a first time]

**Bill 204**

**An Act to Amend**  
**The Alberta Health Care Insurance Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 204, being An Act to Amend The Alberta Health Care Insurance Act. Mr. Speaker, the principle and purpose of this act is to eliminate extra billing by medical practitioners in the province of Alberta. If passed, it would mean that the payments from the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission would represent payment in full.

[Leave granted; Bill 204 introduced and read a first time]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this morning to introduce a group of attractive visitors. They are 40 Girl Guides from my Calgary Foothills constituency. They are with the 47th Guide Company, the 117th Guide Company, and the 158th Guide Company. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that they came up last evening and visited overnight. This morning they will go to the museum after visiting the Legislature. They are accompanied by some very courageous leaders, Mrs. Helen Parry, Mrs. Joan Banack, Mrs. Doreen Bruce, Mrs. Joyce Ballendine, and Mrs. Ona Trudel. They are in the members gallery. I would ask that they would stand and you would join me in recognizing them.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, some 50 Grade 5 students from the Beacon Heights School in the constituency of Edmonton Beverly. They are accompanied by Mr. Gordon Orlick, Miss Godberson, and Miss Oxamitny; also two parents, Mrs. McGunigle and Mrs. Sadoway. They are seated in the public gallery. I would ask them to rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

**head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Inflation Guidelines**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question today to the minister who reports to the Assembly for the Public Utilities Board, the Attorney General. What general policy guidelines with respect to restraint have been given to the Public Utilities Board, either in writing or verbally?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, policy guidelines have been given to the Public Utilities Board for their consideration. They arise primarily out of federal Bill C-73 in the guidelines, or a part thereof. They are also aware of the agreement in detail that the province of Alberta entered into with the federal government on this subject. I can provide the hon. leader with copies of these documents if he's interested.

MR. CLARK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to direct a supplementary question then to the minister

responsible for Alberta Government Telephones. I'd like to ask the minister what steps AGT has taken since approximately September 15 this year, or since the Treasurer made his announcement with regard to restraint in Alberta? What specific steps has AGT taken to operate within the spirit of restraint as enunciated by the Provincial Treasurer?

DR. WARRACK: With respect to the announcement by the Provincial Treasurer on September 17 — I believe it was 1975 — these were not announcements specifically aimed at AGT. For that matter, Crown agencies would not be specifically included in that announcement. But in any case, certainly in AGT, it's been my endeavor, as a part of my responsibility with respect to being chairman of the AGT commission, to take into account the concerns of restraint in all areas of decision, in all manners of operation and policy relative to Alberta Government Telephones.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister, perhaps a bit more specific. What specific steps has the AGT commission taken since the middle of September as far as staffing patterns are concerned?

DR. WARRACK: The staffing patterns, as the hon. member puts it, would be to meet the excellent service provided by Alberta Government Telephones to all the people of Alberta, with the exception of the city of Edmonton, and to do so within reasonable cost parameters and as efficiently as can possibly be done. Aside from that, I don't know quite what the hon. member might be driving at.

MR. CLARK: A further supplementary question to the minister. Has a directive been given by the commission of Alberta Government Telephones with regard to a freeze on hiring by Alberta Government Telephones?

DR. WARRACK: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker. I would add that we have discussed in some considerable detail all aspects of the intent and spirit and legislation of the federal government, and the provincial government's involvement by way of agreement, at the commission level in Alberta Government Telephones. So those who have management responsibilities, wherever they may be within that Crown corporation, can take them into serious account and be contributors to the intent and spirit of inflation control within our operations in Alberta Government Telephones.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister a further supplementary question. In his capacity as chairman of the AGT commission, has the minister or the chairman been responsible for any directive going to AGT as to the advertising policy within AGT, since the middle of September of last year?

DR. WARRACK: Not to my knowledge, other than perhaps at a commission level as some relatively modest directions that are certainly within the management and operating parameters of Alberta Government Telephones. If the hon. member has a

specific concern, I'd naturally be pleased to look into the matter.

MR. CLARK: One further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Has any specific direction gone to that portion of AGT which I'd refer to as the non-telephone portion, that portion that really is in competition with the private sector? Have any specific instructions gone to that portion of AGT, with regard to living within the 11 per cent spending guidelines as brought down by the Provincial Treasurer?

DR. WARRACK: I can think of just the one specific, Mr. Speaker. That would be on the question of mobile radio telephones, where there had been a change in the charge level involved. It was drawn to our attention that it was beyond the amount of the interim across-the-board increase order granted by the Public Utilities Board, effective December 1. That particular increase was rolled back to be of the same level granted by the Public Utilities Board on an interim basis, December 1. That's the item I can think of that's specific in that regard.

I might add this, though, Mr. Speaker. There has been a recent ruling by the Public Utilities Board on the question of charges for individual line service. The charges levied are those that have been approved by the Public Utilities Board. I understand, however, that when the Public Utilities Board first undertook consideration of the rate application by Alberta Government Telephones, there was a request on the part of interveners for delay. That was granted by the Public Utilities Board. I understand that later this month there will be a hearing on the question of just which areas should and should not be regulated by the Public Utilities Board specifically.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could rephrase the question so the minister could be more specific. Dealing with that portion of AGT that is not involved in the telephone services across Alberta, has any specific direction gone from the minister, either in his capacity as minister or chairman of the commission, to tell that portion of the corporation to in fact live within the 11 per cent spending guidelines, keeping in mind that this portion of the AGT operation is in competition with the private sector?

DR. WARRACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought I was pretty specific by way of the example with the mobile radio telephone question, but not with respect to the 11 per cent. I think I see now that the Leader of the Opposition misunderstands that matter, with respect to government policy, insofar as the 11 per cent restraint guideline referring to expenditures by way of the provincial government and the particular areas advance notice was given to back in September. In no way has this been a suggestion, nor is it of the anti-inflation effort and legislation by the federal government, that cost pass-throughs that could be fully justified before regulatory bodies would not be considered.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, a supplementary question for clarification to the hon. Attorney General. Do I take it from his answer to the first question posed by the Leader of the Opposition that the

directive to the Public Utilities Board would, in fact, set out the federal guidelines as they apply to price increases; that is, the per unit cost averaged over five years, or would it be just the continuation of the traditional price control yardstick used by the Public Utilities Board?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I provided the Public Utilities Board with the documentation to which I referred earlier. I have not specifically discussed with them the interpretation of the guidelines as they may see it. That is clearly something I will be doing with them, but I have not done so at the moment.

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Utilities and Telephones. I wonder if the minister could indicate to the Assembly if advance notice was given to the construction end of AGT before the 11 per cent guidelines were laid down, in regard to individual lines for consumers [going] from normal costs up to \$400.

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm having difficulty understanding the question. Did the hon. member mean to suggest that the 11 per cent guideline on government expenditure would relate to construction crew activity? I'd appreciate some clarification.

MR. PURDY: To clarify that, Mr. Speaker, there was a recent announcement by Alberta Government Telephones that to get a private line in the rural area, the price would go up to \$400 from, at one time, a nominal fee of \$12 or \$14.

DR. WARRACK: I'm certainly aware of that, Mr. Speaker. I think it's a different matter from the original question posed. In any case, I'm happy to answer it.

The announcement came out from the Public Utilities Board at roughly the end of February, after they had received those charges to which the member is referring. The difficulty that the Public Utilities Board, along with Alberta Government Telephones, faced on that matter was that with essentially no installation charge for private line service in rural areas, and considerable loss being absorbed by AGT with those installations, we had a situation where people with the lesser multiparty service were, in fact, in a position of having to subsidize those with private line service. That hardly seems fair.

#### **Provincial Auditor's Report**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Provincial Treasurer, and ask if he's had a chance to check the nine-month statement which was released the day before yesterday. Is he in a position today to indicate to the Assembly what increase there was in the total receipts of the province in the nine months?

MR. LEITCH: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't catch the last few words of the question.

MR. CLARK: Was the Provincial Treasurer in a position to be able to indicate to the Assembly what the increase was in the total receipts of the province

during the nine-month period the Auditor's report referred to?

MR. LEITCH: I'm not sure whether the hon. Leader is asking me to calculate the percentages on figures shown in the statement. If he is, Mr. Speaker, that's something that anyone who has received the document — and I take it that the hon. leader has — can do for himself.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, may I rephrase the question like this, then? In light of the 33.8 per cent increase in total payments during the nine months, and only a 6.7 per cent increase in total receipts, does the minister concede that that spending and revenue pattern is indeed alarming?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. leader is clearly asking for an expression of opinion . . .

MR. CLARK: I can't get any other expression from him.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . or for an agreement from the minister with regard to a representation or opinion being expressed in the guise of a question.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can help the hon. Leader of the Opposition by pointing out to him that the nine-month statement compares an expenditure and revenue pattern for this year as compared to last year.

While the expenditure patterns on a percentage basis are relatively close — that is, at the end of the nine months — I think we've spent approximately 80 per cent of what we anticipate spending. At the end of nine months last year we had spent approximately 80 per cent of what we actually spent. However, on the revenue side the comparison is quite different. By the end of nine months last year we'd received something in excess of 90 per cent of the total revenues received last year, whereas at the end of nine months this year we received roughly 80 per cent of our forecast revenues. I hope that information will help the hon. member.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the most helpful information from the Provincial Treasurer, could the Treasurer indicate to the Assembly, in his usual helpful way, what the province now predicts will be the increase in revenue this fiscal year over last fiscal year?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. leader knows, we are now touching on matters which are normally the subject of the budget debate. As he would also appreciate, these are estimates and we are continually revising these estimates as information comes to us that leads to revision. I would hesitate at this moment to give the most up-to-date estimate.

#### **Liquor Consumption**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Solicitor General. It comes out of the booze report commonly known as the *Annual Report of the Alberta Liquor Control Board*.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the federal Minister of Health and Welfare said in a report that 40 per cent of the alcohol is consumed by 7 per cent of the problem drinkers in our population, has the hon. minister done any studies to determine if we have that same problem here in Alberta? Is a large percentage of the alcohol consumed by a small percentage of the problem drinkers?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, no I have no advice on that, but I will inquire about it from AADAC.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the revenue increased by about \$11 million, can the hon. minister indicate to the Legislature if members of his department or other departments are considering tying a percentage of the alcohol profits to programs such as AADAC?

MR. FARRAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think one should recognize that although the revenues of the Alberta Liquor Control Board seem high at \$90 million, of course the situation wouldn't be improved if you cut the price in half. The social problem would probably increase. That \$90 million goes only a very short way to cover the costs of many things in addition to AADAC which arise as costs of the general social problem of alcoholism: the costs of police, hospitals, welfare in many, many different portfolios.

The idea of actually earmarking sources of revenue for specific programs has been mooted many times. I think that should be part of a budget debate. I, myself, would think that this might be a very serious step to take and not, in all respects, an advisable one.

#### **Parks Facilities for Handicapped**

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. In our proposed provincial parks, will there be a reasonable number of tables suitable for wheelchair people?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, if you remember we were talking about that last spring. Yes, we do have planning in process allowing for handicapped people in the parks.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary. Will that also include facilities such as toilet and washroom to a limited degree?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I would hope it does include the wider doors, so they have proper access to those facilities, both the building itself and the facilities.

#### **Crop Stabilization Plan**

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister advise whether his officials have had an opportunity to assess the federal crop stabilization plan in relation to the Crop Insurance Corporation of Alberta?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I understand the hon. member's question about a federal crop stabilization plan. Could you expand on that?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, the intention is to provide a check-off on crops grown in Alberta and Canada in general to stabilize the incomes of crop growers. I think the program is in effect January 1, I'm not sure. This is a voluntary thing for three years. Concern was expressed that it may have an impact on the people who may want to take out crop insurance, because it's a duplication of protection.

I'm just wondering whether his officials have had a chance to assess this.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is referring to the federal grain stabilizations program which, from my information, came into effect on January 1, 1976.

Our assessment of that particular program is very simply that it's so complicated in nature, in terms of an individual grain producer trying to figure out what his income or protection from it might be, that we don't anticipate it will have any effect whatsoever on the amount of crop insurance sold in the province of Alberta.

MR. COOKSON: A further supplementary to the minister. In view of the cutback in support of the crop insurance plan recently announced by the federal government — and their input — I'm just wondering if the minister has had a chance to assess this, in particular, as to whether it may affect the rates the crop insurance corporation might charge in the future.

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have. Since the announcement by the federal government — I believe early in December — of cutbacks in a variety of areas, including crop insurance, we have received confirmation from the federal Minister of Agriculture to the effect that the province of Alberta has a signed agreement with the federal government that extends for another four years and which requires the Government of Canada to fund 50 per cent of Alberta farmers' premium costs in obtaining crop insurance.

In actual fact, Mr. Speaker, the commitment remains which was entered into some two years ago by the Government of Canada. We will be involved in some possible renegotiation of that commitment over the course of the next year. We would expect the Government of Canada to continue that commitment.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of his answer that we have an agreement with Ottawa, under what terms and conditions would there be any reason for possible renegotiation? Is Ottawa trying to renegotiate so they will not have to honor their 50 per cent commitment?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, the intention to renegotiate — at least from our point of view — would not be to leave them in a position of not honoring their 50 per cent cost of premium, but rather to renegotiate the manner in which the crop insurance program is delivered and the kind of coverage available.

I should say, however, it would be our intention in any renegotiations to renegotiate in such a way that the crop insurance program is at least as effective as it is today, if not more, in that the farmers of Alberta have a contribution equal to what they're getting today from the Government of Canada.

#### **Dodds-Round Hill Project**

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Telephones and Utilities if he will lend his weight to my recommendations to the ERCB that the public hearings on Calgary Power's application for a power plant at Dodds-Round Hill be held in Camrose as was indicated by the board last fall, and not in Edmonton as the board has now indicated to our local press.

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I well recall the representation in November on this matter. I believe it was by the hon. member. Upon checking with the Energy Resources Conservation Board, I understand that it is their normal practice to hold these hearings in the region that would be primarily involved. As I said at that time, I had a hopeful view of their thought in this matter.

It's not my understanding of the reports I have heard that any decision has been made, simply because there is no decision to make until the deficiency statements and all the analysis necessary for the hearings are on board. But I'd be pleased to check again and follow up on what the hon. member recommends.

MR. STROMBERG: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister any indication in what month the hearings might be held?

DR. WARRACK: Some indication, Mr. Speaker, yes, inasmuch as the applications have been filed. As I understand it, the deficiency statements by the Energy Resources Conservation Board have gone out to one of the applicants and either have gone or will soon go to the other. These deficiencies then need to be met by way of completing the application. Moreover, there will be a similar kind of analysis by the Department of the Environment. So anticipating the length of time that would be involved in meeting those requirements, it would seem likely that it would be at least late summer before the hearings would be possible.

#### **HSTF Investments**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. It flows out of his answers yesterday with respect to the transfer of funds to the heritage trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, is it the government's intention to transfer PWA, the Syncrude equity, and the AEC equity to the heritage trust fund?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, those matters would [not recorded] on the bill, and [not recorded] have already been expressed to reintroduce the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. But the points he raises . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I apologize for interrupting the hon. minister, but I wonder if he might perhaps give his answer, from the beginning, at a little higher volume. We're having a little trouble with the sound system.

DR. BUCK: He hasn't started, so it's okay.

MR. LEITCH: I will endeavor to do that, Mr. Speaker. I'd suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the question the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has asked would be more appropriately dealt with at greater length in either the budget debate or during the debate on the Alberta heritage savings trust fund legislation, which we've already indicated would be reintroduced this spring.

There has been consideration of putting the assets to which he has referred in the fund, but I don't know, Mr. Speaker, if I can be more helpful than to say that that matter is still open for debate and there will be ample opportunity to debate it in the House.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the minister advise whether consideration is now taking place by the government to transferring at cost the Alberta Resources Railway to the Alberta heritage trust fund, as a heritage?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, certain investments have been made in the past which I think we might be somewhat reluctant to transfer to the investment section of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. As has been indicated in the legislation already introduced during the fall, the objective of that portion of the fund is to earn a return. Looking at the history of the Alberta Resources Railway, despite the efforts now being made to reverse that history, I think one would have some reluctance about that transfer.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. What steps are being taken at the present time to research possible investments outside the province under the proposed Canada investment section of the heritage trust fund act?

MR. LEITCH: Again, Mr. Speaker, during this question period the hon. member appears to be having a debate on items that really should be dealt with when the bill is before the House. I'd just call his attention to the fact that the legislation introduced in the fall dealt with investments that were either made directly to other governments in Canada, or guaranteed by other governments. That is a very narrow range of investment.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have one final supplementary question which I'd like to direct to the hon. Premier. Can the Premier advise the Assembly whether, during his recent telephone conversation with Mr. Bourassa, the hon. Premier of Quebec tried to hit us up for an investment to cover the deficit of the Olympic games?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, to my surprise no such request was made.

**Deerfoot Trail**

MR. LITTLE: Mr. Speaker, I would address my question to the hon. Minister of Transportation. Is the hon. minister in a position to advise the Assembly what progress has been made at recent meetings between the city of Calgary and the province of Alberta regarding the extension to the Deerfoot Trail in Calgary?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I think I responded a day or two ago in regard to that matter that we were pleased with the progress of those meetings and that I intended to meet with the mayor of the city of Calgary in the near future, hopefully to continue the kind of positive results we've had so far.

**Departmental Examinations**

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Education. Could the minister advise whether it is his intention to reinstate the Grade 12 departmental examinations?

MR. KOZIAK: Very quickly, Mr. Speaker, at this time, no.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Could the minister inform if he has had a chance to make an evaluation whether the standards of those entering university have been lowered since the abolition of the Grade 12 departmental examinations?

DR. HOHOL: There have been various examinations of the circumstance by institutions and study people, but not by governments and certainly not by our department.

**Agricultural Societies Grants**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate to the Assembly what time period the ag. societies are looking at before their funding will be approved?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, perhaps within the next two weeks I expect to be able to make an announcement with regard to the various grants that will be approved this fiscal year to agricultural societies.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate whether they're accepting new applications for funding from ag. societies?

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We're always accepting applications. I would indicate, however, that the applications now in hand will very likely exceed the number of dollars available in the fiscal year 1976-77.

**Provincial Trade Missions**

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. I'm wondering if the Premier is planning

any further trade missions during the fiscal year 1976-77, similar to the one in the last fiscal year.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, nothing of a comparable nature to the mission we held in 1972 to Japan, or in 1975 to Europe. There may be some isolated trips to other areas, involving either myself or ministers, having regard to our need, as the province of Alberta, to expand our horizons in terms of marketing and opportunities and to follow up in other areas in terms of encouraging risk-taking investment in this province that will create jobs for people.

DR. BUCK: Trips to Brazil and Mexico?

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. From the other two trips mentioned by the Premier, has there been further contact with you in Alberta by trade officials of those countries and have specific industries or trade products come forth?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that's a subject that I'm sure both I and many of my colleagues would be prepared to elaborate on extensively during the course of debates in this House, rather than in the question period. I can only say that there's a very constant increase in the degree of communication and interest that has been shown by a variety of institutions, enterprises, and activities in our province. It's no longer a recognition in the rest of the world that they direct their attention automatically towards central Canada. When they think about Canada, they're now thinking about western Canada.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Is he aware if there has been any increased buying of Alberta land by foreigners as a result of the trip over there?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I think it was abundantly clear when I spoke in Frankfurt during the course of the European mission — and I think it was very well covered by the news reports — that what we were interested in, in terms of investment here in Alberta, was investment of a risk-taking nature that would create jobs and bring technology.

We were not interested in the absentee ownership of raw land, agricultural land, recreational land, or land of that nature in this province. We have no data to indicate any significant increase. As has been a matter of debate in this House, the Land Use Forum has noted that it has not been significant. During the course of discussions in the House, as has been mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, I'm sure we will be discussing further the matter of the foreign ownership of land.

DR. BUCK: When?

**Education Spending**

DR. PAPROSKI: A question to the hon. Minister of Education. Has the minister recently indicated or communicated to the Alberta trustees, or school trustees in general, what should and could be considered as fringe-type expenditures in education, meaning non-essential relative to basic education, and in

fact asked them to get back to basic educational format? Mr. Speaker, some examples are: use of regular automatic typewriters rather than high-priced IBM typewriters; use of least expensive projectors rather than most expensive projectors; and the last example, Mr. Speaker, is not to use an excessive number of administrators whose functions sometimes are ill defined.

MR. KOZIAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, what are in fact frills or fringe expenditures is quite often determined by a very subjective test. What in one individual's mind would be a frill, may be high up on the priority list of another individual. That happens throughout the province. This is why the system of delivery of education we have in Alberta is so extremely successful, in that locally elected trustees make those determinations for the residents, for the taxpayers of their particular jurisdiction; and do so keeping in mind the priorities, thoughts, and feelings of those particular students and those particular taxpayers.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I concur in those comments. Have the school trustees, in turn, made indication to the minister as to what possibly should not be included in basic education and should not be funded by the province of Alberta?

MR. KOZIAK: Not that I recall, Mr. Speaker.

DR. PAPROSKI: Another supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister raise this matter with the school trustees in order to clarify and amplify this area?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the school trustees, with many other constituent groups interested in education, are constantly reviewing the goals of education that we have set for ourselves in this province, and will review those goals in the light of financial resources available to them.

DR. PAPROSKI: One final supplementary. Would the minister concur in the comment that reading, writing, arithmetic, social studies and/or history, science, health, and religion are basic items in basic education?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is getting very, very much into the area of opinion, and perhaps that might be explored on another occasion.

#### **Alberta Energy Company**

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, my question today is to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. I would like him to comment on rumors circulating in Calgary that the Alberta Energy Company is considering purchasing its own drilling rigs for use in Suffield.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, that information has not come to me. It tends to be a matter, though, that does get into the general policy matters we have discussed with the Energy Company; therefore I'd like to look into it and advise the hon. member.

MR. GHITTER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if the hon. minister would advise the House whether, in his discussions with directors appointed to the Alberta Energy Company by the Alberta government, guidelines have been set down to ensure that the Alberta Energy Company will not interfere in a competitive way with the private sector in the oil industry.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, all members of the board have been provided with copies of the act, the memorandum of association, and policy statements by the government to guide them in their deliberations in the overall management of the company.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In the information from the government to the board of directors of the Alberta Energy Company, was direction given to the company that in fact they were not to become involved in acquiring drilling equipment or in doing their own production?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the supply of information to the directors of the company was that they live up to the policy statements and guidelines announced by the government. I don't recall making a specific statement regarding the purchase of a piece of equipment. As I said, I would expect the management and board of directors, within those broad policy guidelines, to continue to have them enforced.

MR. GHITTER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Is one of those guidelines that the Alberta Energy Company will not compete with the private sector? Is that one of the guidelines submitted to the directors?

MR. GETTY: Well, that's a little too broad, Mr. Speaker, because obviously the Alberta Energy Company is going to compete in some areas. For one thing, they will be selling natural gas. Obviously, the private sector sells natural gas too; therefore, there must be some competition.

However, we have said that we do not want the Alberta Energy Company to compete in the conventional oil and gas industry, other than to develop the unique resource which was provided to the company, that being the Suffield natural gas block.

MR. GHITTER: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister then consider advising the board of the Alberta Energy Company, through the directors appointed by the Alberta government, of the fact that it is the policy of this government as a shareholder that they should not enter into the drilling business?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I think I dealt with that at the very beginning of this question. As I mentioned to the hon. member, I am going to follow up that matter with the board of directors and the management.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Have there been any discussions to date between the minister, or senior officials in his department, and the directors of the Alberta Energy

Company, or senior officials of the Energy Company, specifically regarding the question of the Alberta Energy Company becoming actively involved in drilling anywhere in this province?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker. I haven't talked to them about drilling in this province other than, obviously, they must make some arrangements in the best interests of developing the Suffield Block. That involves drilling. One judgment would be 2,000 wells. Another would say 4,000 wells.

It's a matter of judgment as to what it takes to drain the reservoir. They're going to have to make arrangements to carry out that drilling. To that extent, they're obviously going to have to be involved. The question, more specifically, is whether they merely hire someone who owns drilling equipment, or whether they become involved in some way in the financing of drilling equipment, or whether they in fact purchase the drilling equipment and do the drilling themselves.

MR. CLARK: To make the question much more specific, Mr. Speaker, have there been discussions between the minister or his officials and the Alberta Energy Company specifically on the matter of the Alberta Energy Company acquiring drilling equipment?

MR. GETTY: That's the same question we started off with, Mr. Speaker. I mentioned we haven't had that specific discussion. I'm going to look into it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a point of clarification.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the final supplementary on this point.

MR. R. SPEAKER: As a matter of clarification, the minister hasn't made it clear to me at this point that the option is open for the Alberta Energy Company to purchase equipment to do drilling in the Suffield Block. Is that option even open in the province of Alberta? Is that correct?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, when you say the option is open, I'm not sure whether the hon. member is talking about some possibility of financing a driller in some way and providing funds so the driller can then do the drilling for the company.

As to the Alberta Energy Company becoming a drilling company, no. Within our policy guidelines we have never envisioned the Alberta Energy Company becoming a drilling company. If there are some reasons why that policy should be reviewed, I don't have a closed mind — I don't suppose anybody does. But, as of right now, no.

#### **Liquor Consumption** (continued)

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Solicitor General. The Alberta Liquor Control Board report was tabled yesterday. I was alarmed to learn that \$14 million worth of liquor was consumed in Calgary and district — on beer alone. The staggering figure is that \$27 million was guzzled

in Edmonton and district. I wonder if there's any reason for the radical difference.

At the same time, while I'm on the floor, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Solicitor General — I notice he's wired, I don't know if he's eavesdropping on the opposition on this side, or if he has a direct line to the Fort Saskatchewan jail — I wonder if he could clarify that.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad the hon. member is standing on the floor. As a Calgarian, I'm tempted to answer that it may be due to the rigors of a cold climate.

Mr. Speaker, I think probably the answer is that Edmonton and Calgary are market centres for large areas. The market area around Edmonton is more densely populated than southern Alberta. There are some 600 outlets in the Edmonton area and some 400-odd in the Calgary area. The Edmonton area probably serves more people. I should think that is the answer. I'd hate to get into these invidious comparisons or to encourage any sort of competition between the two cities in the field of drinking.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Solicitor General. Will the hon. Solicitor General confirm that alcoholism is the number one, or two, public health problem in Alberta?

MR. NOTLEY: Speculation.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is inviting the hon. minister to speculate further. Perhaps we should leave that for another occasion.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's either confirmation, or does he recognize that it is. Is that inappropriate?

MR. SPEAKER: It would certainly be a matter of opinion based on the facts. All hon. members would be entitled to form their own opinions on those facts.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, with respect, maybe the hon. Solicitor General or the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health may have those facts.

MR. SPEAKER: If hon. member is seeking specific facts, perhaps he could do so in another question period. We've run over our time a little bit.

DR. PAPROSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KUSHNER: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Solicitor General could elaborate on the earphones and who he is listening to, anyway. I am curious.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, they're available free of charge from the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly. I have difficulty sometimes hearing the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview who's across the road. So I occasionally use this excellent device.

MR. CLARK: Is that on purpose or accidentally?

DR. WARRACK: Great question.



## ORDERS OF THE DAY

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.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to take part in another throne speech debate. I've almost lost count of the number I've been involved in. However, I did want to comment initially on the very excellent speeches that have been made so far in this debate and to say to you and others that I feel the people of Alberta are in excellent hands when we can listen to the kinds of speeches that the mover, the seconder, and others have made in this Legislature relative to their constituencies and to the general needs of this province.

I did want to discuss transportation at some length, relative to the various modes. This morning, though, I believe that because of the pressures of time and because of the nature of things that have happened, I would like to spend most of my time dealing with the problems relative to the air mode, that part of transportation development relative to aircraft and the various air line companies that are involved in the province of Alberta.

I do so, Mr. Speaker, because never in 17 or 18 years in political life have I seen an issue so distorted, based on so little fact. While I expected that from certain political figures, and we're getting used to it from the Leader of the Opposition, I am rather surprised that some of the editorial writers particularly would distort and speculate, not being aware of all the facts of the matter.

I want to initiate my discussion with regard to Pacific Western Airlines by reviewing very briefly the history of its acquisition, and the reasons we acquired it initially. To do so, I think the best way would be to quote from the hon. Premier's speech in this Legislature in October 1974, and to point out the number of factors that are relative to our acquisition of Pacific Western Airlines.

I think one of the major areas has to be the reason:

... the Alberta government, in air transportation, believes in terms of a provincial input as being essential [to] the gateway province to the north.

And he went on in that area:

As far as we are concerned Pacific Western Airlines has been, is and will continue to be, an important factor in the Alberta transportation system.

... Pacific Western Airlines is one of the keys in terms of northern development and in terms of Alberta's future as a gateway province.

... Pacific Western Airlines is promising

untapped potential in air freight and tourism and other air services that haven't been taken advantage of because of a limitation of capital.

Fourthly, as I mentioned, PWA did not appear, at least recently, to be moving in that direction despite their progress ...

In fact, as the hon. Premier mentioned then, our evaluation was that they would withdraw into a B.C.-Yukon access. He concluded, Mr. Speaker, and I think all of us should recall, that:

... the Alberta government was prepared to take bold action to strengthen the position of our Alberta economy.

Mr. Speaker, those are the reasons we acquired, in a very bold move, Pacific Western Airlines: so that we could look after the people of Alberta in a very real sense, look after the transportation of goods, and strengthen our position in northern development, which is one of the exciting things that will happen in this country in the future.

It was acquired, Mr. Speaker, not just as an investment, but as a policy mechanism for the Government of Alberta to have some input into how this province developed and the direction that development would take. Let there be no misunderstanding by anybody relative to the reasons and, indeed, the subsequent acquisition.

Let me just review very briefly what we found when we did acquire this air line. We were advised by the board that the air line had become large enough that there was a need for a great deal more corporate planning than had gone on in the past. There was a need for an annual budgeting system. There was immediate need to have a senior official in the company in charge of finance and corporate planning. That hadn't taken place before.

We were very successful in Alberta in getting a senior and very dedicated Alberta businessman to serve on the board of directors, first under the chairmanship of Ron Southern of Calgary, who initiated that kind of corporate planning, that kind of hard-nosed business approach where fat was trimmed and where the entire planning of the corporation was turned around. We owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Southern for having spent his time — and believe me, the remuneration doesn't come near to looking after the time these gentlemen have spent doing their jobs on behalf of the province of Alberta.

Because of the pressure of his own business, Mr. Southern subsequently relinquished the chairmanship but remained on the board, which we appreciate. Mr. Rod McDaniel took over the chairmanship. Corporate planning continued. The vice-president in charge of planning and finance was placed in the corporate structure and began to work. The hard-nosed business approach continued. Mr. Speaker, all members of this Legislature and indeed the people of Alberta should appreciate that. It was the attitude, the hard work of that chairman and the board of directors which resulted in a profit in PWA in the past year, and that effort alone.

As that planning continued, Mr. Speaker, the board advised me with regard to their longer term objectives. We discussed them in a great variety of ways. Part of that advice to me, and my advice to the Executive Council, was that they felt the executive offices should be centred in Calgary. Their reasons

for believing that are very straightforward. Calgary is the city in this province, indeed in western Canada, which quarters the head offices of the oil and gas industry for Canada, indeed for a great deal of work being done outside Canada. The expansion and the ability to service that oil industry surely has to be one of the challenges to the board of directors, relative to the expansion of Pacific Western Airlines.

It was very logical for them to conclude that because of this centring of the head offices in the city of Calgary, because of the growth of the financial community in the city of Calgary, it would be appropriate that the executive offices of this air line should be located in that city. Mr. Speaker, I concurred with the board in that decision.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the board advised that in their longer term objectives and in their thinking, the growth of maintenance and servicing of the air line should be centred in the Edmonton area. They were already doing a great deal of the servicing, relative to the 737s, in the Edmonton area. The Hercules are serviced in the Edmonton area. It was logical in their minds that the growth in maintenance and service, as the air line expanded, should be centred in the Edmonton area. Mr. Speaker, I concurred in that decision of the board of directors.

They also outlined to me, and I would like to put it on the record, what they felt would be the ideal configuration of aircraft insofar as they were concerned, as they looked ahead, to have a trim, efficient, profit-oriented air line, expanding and doing a job for western Canada. Their conclusions were that, as to the passenger scheduling and the short-range charter, they should continue and indeed expand their fleet of 737s, which do such an efficient and good job in servicing the regional air line on a schedule basis and are ideally suited in short-range charter on weekends to make the most efficient use of their other aircraft.

Insofar as cargo is concerned, they also felt that the Hercules should be the major workhorse for them. Indeed, I want to give the House information that might correct some of the distortions by the Leader of the Opposition and others, relative to the question of air cargo. Air cargo, Mr. Speaker, is very dependent on the affluence of the world. It's very dependent on the level and nature of world trade. It's very dependent on the question of whether countries abroad can afford the higher priced goods that are obviously going to be flown by air cargo.

Many people have done studies relative to the needs of air cargo, and where we are going. It's now become apparent, Mr. Speaker, that what we said in the initial stages, and what the Premier outlined in the press release announcing our acquisition of Pacific Western Airlines, is still valid: that in the longer term, in the '80s, we'll be looking at perhaps a change from Hercules to other larger jet cargo configurations.

Let me go back to the problem of the 707. The board advised — and again I concurred in their decision — that in fact they were losing \$2 million a year on that 707 cargo freighter based in Montreal, primarily flying goods that never saw Alberta, outside of the occasional load of livestock that went out of Alberta. Well over 90 per cent of their traffic movement originated outside Alberta, in Montreal and the eastern United States and, indeed, in some

other countries, which perhaps need not be mentioned.

The fact of the matter again, Mr. Speaker, was that the board considered that in a company which they were trying to squeeze for a \$1.3 million profit they couldn't continue in good conscience to lose \$2 million on the operations of one aircraft that wasn't helping the province of Alberta at all. So that aircraft was discontinued. Again, Mr. Speaker, I concurred in the board's decision in that regard.

It does mean, Mr. Speaker, that at the moment the board advises they have two 727s, which are expensive aircraft to operate, and they are making arrangements, as I've said earlier, to go to a 737 fleet for passenger configuration and the Hercules for cargo. They still own the two 707s, and I want to come back to them in a moment when I talk about the co-operation I envisage should happen in this province with the various air lines that are around.

I think then, Mr. Speaker, just to sum up that portion of what we're about with regard to Pacific Western Airlines, it would be useful to take away the distortions that have taken place over the past two weeks, distortions that were ignited by people who didn't really care what happened to the air line, who didn't really care what happened in Alberta, who didn't really care and didn't really know the facts.

I want to read into the record the letter the new president has sent to all employees, because I think it outlines, indeed almost paraphrases, my statement to the board of directors that initiated the hornet's nest that I think has now settled down:

The mandate that the company received from the Government of Alberta at the time of the purchase, and the objectives of being profit-oriented and maintaining the highest possible standard of service, are still valid and unchanged.

I appreciate that your foremost concern is the question of relocation. One of the long-range objectives of the Board of Directors is a desire to move to more equitably distribute the employment of the company in relation to the business activities in the areas we serve. This will be a gradual adjustment, as the Board and the owners have no desire to disrupt the operations of the company. Much of this will be looked after by natural growth and expansion without any massive relocations. There is no intention to uproot major segments of the company.

The Board of Directors feel however, that the City of Calgary is the logical location for the Executive offices of the company. That city is rapidly establishing itself as the financial centre for Western Canada and currently ranks third nationally in terms of the number of head offices located there. Accordingly, it is anticipated that Pacific Western will proceed to move its Executive offices to Calgary.

While I have not had time to review the matter thoroughly, I anticipate that any initial move will involve few people. No moves will take place without an orderly, well thought out plan which will be developed by the management of this company, incorporating input from all departments with the goal of achieving long term job equity without disruption or upset in the process.

I ask for your co-operation and support and will keep you advised of details as they develop.

Mr. Speaker, that letter of the president to the employees paraphrases my direction to the board of directors. And the distortions that emanated from that, I hope everyone will be able to see are just that: complete and absolute distortions made for whatever reason those who made them wanted to have.

Let me re-emphasize: Pacific Western Airlines is an investment. Pacific Western Airlines has to be an instrument of government policy, in broad terms. Pacific Western Airlines must be profit-oriented. Pacific Western Airlines, in its own best interest, must co-operate with other air lines operating in this province. Pacific Western Airlines must give good service to the people in the areas we serve.

What about our relationship with British Columbia? Of course, I know my friends in the press like to have a little controversy going. That makes it a little more interesting for them and perhaps for their readers, I'm not sure. But we had some discussions with the province of British Columbia. Indeed, my discussions with the province of British Columbia are identical to those now being placed on the record in Mr. Eyton's letter to the employees. We talked to the province of British Columbia in relation to job equity between the two areas, relative to the business being done in the areas. At no time did we suggest there would be a holus-bolus move of people of any kind. Complete and absolute distortions! The province of British Columbia and indeed the federal government were aware of the nature of the move we are trying to make and the long-term direction we intended to take.

What about the relationship of Pacific Western Airlines with Wardair? In reviewing the Premier's speech in October 1974, he also said, it's too bad [because] it looks like we're going to lose Wardair to Toronto. Mr. Speaker, because of some good work by my predecessor in transportation, the hon. Member for Calgary Currie, and additional work since then, that particular matter has been turned around. We're assured that Wardair, one of the better charter air lines in the world, will continue to headquarter itself in Alberta, and, indeed, [that] there will be an expansion in that area.

With the co-operation of Pacific Western Airlines and my department, we have entered into an agreement for the financing of a large hangar at the International Airport here in Edmonton. The hangar will be large enough for maintenance work on 747s. If you can do it on 747s, you can go all the way down to Twin Otters, because you can tuck them in under the wings and that kind of thing.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, initially it will mean the creation of between 200 and 300 jobs, and indeed more because Wardair intends to take delivery of a third 747 within the next year to 18 months. There will be a substantial increase in the kinds of jobs we're trying to create in this province, relative to other things going on. Aircraft maintenance jobs are useful kinds of jobs. It's a real diversification in our base of economics here in the province.

My honorable friends will be aware that once the technical problems are ironed out in the agreement with Wardair, those documents, of course, will be made available to the Legislature and are all straightforward.

I did want to mention it again, though, because I believe in the longer term [and] certainly the board of directors of Pacific Western have advised, relative to what they do with the two 707s they have, that hopefully they would co-operate with Wardair, because these planes are involved in the longer range charter area. They would co-operate with Wardair not only in relation to the question of the charter business, but it would be ideally suited to have co-operation relative to the maintenance of those planes, because Wardair, of course, also has 707s. Co-operation there is going to save both of them some money in basic maintenance and will be a factor down the road.

I also want to talk for a moment with regard to the relationship with our third-level carriers. The other commitment our Premier made in the press release relative to our acquisition was that not only would we not interfere with the third-level carriers, but indeed we would help them to develop and expand. We have done that. We have provided some guarantees for Time Air in its purchase of three Shorts aircraft. Those aircraft are coming on stream in the immediate future. My latest information is that the first one will be on the run out of Lethbridge in June. Once the three of them are in place, it will mean that additional aircraft will be available for expansion of our third-level area.

In the immediate future, we would intend to put out requests for proposals for the expansion of third-level air service to the following communities as an initial basis: Brooks, Red Deer, Lloydminster, St. Paul. Down the road, we see an expansion of third-level carriers into the Whitecourt-Edson area and indeed other areas in the north. As I've said, these will be put out on a request-for-proposal basis, so all those people involved in third-level aircraft operation in this province will have an equal opportunity to put their proposals before us.

I want to say this before I leave, relative to the question of Wardair, Pacific Western, and Time. We envisage down the road, with the establishment of this hangar and the training facilities which will be in that hangar at Edmonton International, a co-operation that has not been there before among these three air lines in the matter of training crews, ancillary personnel, and maintenance people as well, so that we can, in fact, have a very strong aircraft industry in this province.

Mr. Speaker, before I leave the question of Pacific Western Airlines, perhaps it might be useful if I say a word or two with regard to what I call the legal question. Not being a lawyer, I hope I'll be excused if I make any mistake in interpretation. On the other hand, I think it should be pointed out very clearly that the federal court dealt with only one particular item. It didn't deal with whether or not the province of Alberta could buy an air line, although the media generally have given that sort of indication. It dealt with a very specific point. It dealt with the point of whether or not the Queen in the right of the province was something different from the Queen in the right of Canada. And I suggest to you, sir, that that is an entirely different situation than whether or not we can buy an air line.

Mr. Speaker, we intend to appeal that decision of the federal court, or ask leave to appeal it to the Supreme Court of Canada, because we feel very

strongly that our Queen in the right of this province is no different from the Queen in the right of Canada.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, in my view the legal question is something quite aside from how Pacific Western Airlines operates. Those other matters shouldn't be involved, because the legal question is something entirely different. I would hope those people who start frivolous actions in the courts of this province might be asked to pay for those actions in the future, unless they have more grounds for them than they have had in the past.

Mr. Speaker, we look towards the future of the air industry in this province with a great deal of optimism. It's part and parcel of the kind of expansion taking place here. It's part and parcel of the kind of province this is. Our Premier has described it very adequately as "the new west". Part of that new west surely has to be the development and expansion of the air industry in our province to keep up with what's been going on. In that regard, Mr. Speaker, we have had in the past year a very ambitious airport program. We will continue to have that kind of program in the coming months throughout the summer. We will, and have already, upgraded a number of airports throughout the province.

I would just like to mention one or two that I think are of primary importance as we go along. I think Fort Chipewyan deserves some attention. At the end of that runway there's a granite rock I'm sure every pilot who has ever flown in there would like to see blasted out. We intend to do that. As a matter of fact, tender calls have gone out in that regard. We're working very hard to try to establish a regional airport in the Jasper-Hinton area for a great variety of reasons, both insofar as industry is concerned and as the recreational facilities of the eastern slopes and Jasper National Park might come within reach of a great many more people if we had a regional airport in the Jasper-Hinton area that could handle larger aircraft.

We also believe that in the Pincher Creek area, serving the Crowsnest Pass and the southwestern portion of the province, there is need for a regional light industrial airport. We'll be moving ahead on those matters and on a great deal of other community airports throughout the province, so that we can expand our third-level carriers. We think of Drumheller and other areas that in our view need to be tied in our in the future to a third-level operation.

As I've already mentioned, in putting it out to request for proposal, we'll be doing some work with the smaller cities and towns that are involved, so that when we get the thing out there we'll know we're going to have at least some traffic we can count on. I've been very pleased with the work the MLAs have done in the towns and cities I've already mentioned, and the kind of response. They've said, yes, we'll pre-buy some of the seats. We'll do some of those things that will make it an economic matter right off the bat.

Mr. Speaker, I didn't appreciate I'd spoken this long. However, I just want to say again: we look forward to the expansion of the air industries in Alberta. We look forward to the expansion and development of Pacific Western Airlines, again, operated by a lot of very dedicated businessmen from the province of Alberta who have given of their time for a

very, very modest return, who have done an excellent job in turning that air line around and making it the trim, efficient air line that it is. I can't say too much with regard to the kind of job those businessmen have done.

We look for expansion into the north. We look for expansion into Saskatchewan, and perhaps into the cross-border routes to our neighboring states in the United States. That's the general outlook for a balanced, efficient, regional air carrier. Mr. Speaker, in my information from the chairman of the board, I hope that, in spite of the distortions, after their visiting with the employees in the Vancouver and Edmonton areas, the morale is high. The return I'm getting from the people of Alberta is summed up by the editorial in *The Advocate* recently. I wouldn't read it all, but I think the last paragraph is useful:

Anybody who expected PWA to remain in lotus-land indefinitely didn't read the mood of Albertans correctly.

I would hope that others would read the mood of Alberta correctly. They might be more successful in the future if they had.

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak at the Second Session of the Eighteenth Legislature. I would also like to add my congratulations to those already given to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. With your indulgence, I would like to cover some of the points outlined in the Speech from the Throne, and point out how they affect my constituency in particular.

With respect to inflation, the price and wage control and rental control conditions brought in by the province have been reasonably well received in my constituency by the people I have spoken to. They concur with the government that although they are not particularly palatable, they are necessary. The condition this government has brought them in under, an 18-month policy, is probably the best that could be made of an awkward situation, in light of the fact that Alberta must or should follow any program outlined by the federal government which will halt inflationary pressures in our country.

There is concern in the farming community and small business community. I think this concern is standard across the province. They find there are certain inequities, particularly in the farming community, that will become awkward. I'd like to bear on this a few moments later when I speak in specifics on my own constituency.

With respect to housing, I think the massive support programs this province has initiated already have been shown to be successful in the increase in housing starts in the past six to nine months. However, there seems to be an anomaly here as far as the federal government is concerned. They put a stop priority housing in Canada to increase employment in the housing situation across the nation. At the same time, they raise prime interest rates time after time. We probably have one of the highest, if not the highest, prime interest rates in the western hemisphere. In Canada, it's between 9.5 and 9.75 per cent. In the United States, the same prime interest rate is in the area of 6 to 6.25. It seems to me an unusual situation when they try to do one thing with one hand, yet remove with higher interest

rates the possibility of young people building a home. In fact, it seems to me that the pressures are going to come on the provincial programs which are holding their interest to a reasonable rate to allow the people of Alberta to build homes they can foresee some possibility of paying for. I feel that the fact there is a building boom in Alberta — and there actually is, probably the highest of any province in Canada — is due to two facts. Number one, Alberta building support programs are working. Number two, there is great support amongst the citizens of Alberta in the future and stability of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak for a moment or two on the overhaul and reform of our provincial courts, court system, and the Solicitor General. Our provincial court system in Alberta — there's no question about it — has become outdated, probably overlooked over a period of many years. I think it has reflected on our young people in a certain element of loss of respect for law, order, and the system of justice. The Kirby report has pointed out the salient features that have been amiss in our program. I commend the government in the vigorous approach to settling these difficulties over the coming year. It has been mentioned in the throne speech.

I must commend our Solicitor General for his policy that restitution must cover loss by those who commit crimes. If you look back over the last number of years, you find the increase in the ridiculous process of vandalism in our schools, vandalism in our public properties in the roadside camps, and across the province, vandalism in all its forms — in slashing tires, smashing windows, and all the rest of it. I think this type of thing can be reduced. It can be reduced in only one way. Make the person who does the damage pay the bill. There are those who feel this isn't the right way. I think it would make a great deal of difference to those committing this outrage if they felt they had the deterrent of, what they damage now they pay for later in some method of work or other procedure, a work camp or whatever the Solicitor General decides that may be.

Now, with respect to the Alberta heritage trust fund, I've had meetings, talked to people throughout the district and my constituency. In general, I believe the public of Alberta, and particularly the people in my area, believe in this trust fund, feel that it's a good, sound, basic idea. Most of them are farmers, small businessmen. They realize that you have years of prosperity, and in those years you must set aside for the lean years that may come. We know that our resources are depleting, and we must put aside now that which will be necessary for the future. The 11 per cent wage and price control has been accepted as necessary on a temporary basis.

However, there is one anomaly that appears here. The Alberta heritage trust fund, to nearly all people, is something that should definitely be done, but it should always apply to the other person. There always seems to be the fact that with that great sum of money lying there, there's always room for payment to each particular person's pet project. This is true of the spending of the government during the coming year on the 11 per cent wage and price guideline. They know that it's necessary, but they always feel that it should apply to the other person and preferably not to themselves.

With respect to transportation, I hesitate to speak

after listening to the discourse of our Deputy Premier. However, there are some points that I would like to bring out. Alberta has been fortunate in inheriting from the previous administration a good road system in Alberta. They have developed that over the past four and a half to five years, and I think it's a better road system now than the one we inherited. This has not happened by accident. I think there have been good road policies over the past 20 or 30 years in Alberta, and we've built up a system that is, I think, the envy of every province in Canada.

However, there have been, in the past couple of years, demands upon highways, through new development, that have been unique. I know from being up in Fort McMurray last fall — the construction of that highway was, they felt, one of the greatest boons to the area, and a necessary commitment by the government, or the area couldn't possibly develop at the rate it could and should. Every businessman I spoke to up there felt that was the greatest thing that had happened to the town in the past two years — the completion of that hardtop to Fort McMurray. A good portion of the resources over the past year or so has gone into that development. However, the secondary grid system, side-road branch highways — these have come along well, and the program looks encouraging.

This change made after the last election, to put transportation under one minister, was, I think, a realistic approach to changing times, because all forms of transportation do, one way or another, tie in together — air, road, and rail. For the last 18 months we have listened to the criticism of PWA, and the more recent criticism of the decision to move the headquarters and expansion facilities to Alberta.

I've been in the north a good many times. As a matter of fact, there is a group of us in Ponoka who, many years ago, established a tourist business on Great Bear Lake. With my limited experience of travelling in the north, trying to help operate this business, one thing has come out very clear and loud. The development of the north and the business of the north depends on two things, transportation and communications. The person, or area, or government who handles and controls these two factors, in fact, has a great say in the controlling of the north. The rewards of control are the benefits that flow from the business and the development in an area.

Alberta has the unique position of being in the central section of this development. The development of the north could flow to the east, or it could flow to the west. We believe, and I think everybody in Alberta believes, that it should flow down the Mackenzie Valley through the province of Alberta.

When you stop to think about it, the British Empire developed not because it's a great area of land. If you look at the map of the world, you'll find that the British Isles are just a small speck on the Atlantic Ocean. But what flowed from the areas and the raw materials that they developed across the world? You'll find Britain became great under that concept.

If you look at it again, Ontario in particular, and in part Quebec, have been utilizing Alberta, western Canada, the provinces in the Maritimes on the same basis for the last 50 years. This is why the centralization of industry has occurred in that region. If we want to develop industry in this province, we need not only Alberta but the expanded area to the north

that will give us this outlet for our business facilities. The pipelines, the mines, the gas, the oil, the minerals that will be and are being developed in the north must flow through Alberta. Transportation is one of the major factors.

As far as I'm concerned, speaking only from a personal point of view, I would like to see development in the north with the headquarters in Alberta for communications and telecommunications. I would like to see further road development and rail development into the north. Perhaps arrangements could be made with the United States and Alaska, because that is the overland link that should perhaps be developed. I think the senior government of this nation has some responsibility for developing this and putting some all-weather roads, year-round roads, and paved roads in this northern area. Surely this must be done over a period of time, and Alberta must lead the way.

Now, at this time I'd like to speak for a moment or two on the Department of Municipal Affairs. I've had some experience in municipal government. I've had some experience working with the hon. Mr. Farran and the Farran report with respect to municipal affairs. I've found that there was much backlog to be done. The program our new minister has laid out, The Planning Act, the other acts he is bringing forth in this session — to me he deserves a great deal of credit, because I'm sure if he's doing it, he has a great deal of courage.

Planning in Alberta must be brought up to date, because there is no question we're now in a period of remarkable growth. This growth will, I'm sure, continue. Prospects look as if it will. But roadblocks must be removed from the construction industry and the building industry, and from the development itself across the province.

Now I'd like to mention a few points with respect to my own constituency. There's some bad news, and there's some good news. With respect to the bad news first, I've had the difficulty of the Alberta Hospital in Ponoka. It appears from my delving, inquiring, and so on that the active portion, the teaching portion, and some of the other factors of the Alberta Hospital in Ponoka will be phased out in 1979-80. Due to the fact that 53 per cent of the jobs in Ponoka are tied in one way or another to the mental hospital, this is going to be, I feel, a difficult blow for the town. Although a fair number of jobs will still be in existence there, the reduction in staff is a concern to me, it's a concern to the town, it's a concern to the whole community.

I'm giving fair warning now that I am going to try to get some industry into that area, into the town, as a compensating factor for those jobs. I hope to do that, and I hope I have the co-operation and assistance of this government over the next year or two.

With respect to the cattle industry in the Ponoka area, as I've mentioned before, it has probably the highest cattle concentration of anywhere in western Canada. As a matter of point, in the area there are roughly seven to eight cattle for every constituent I have. There are well over 100,000 head. There is difficulty in this area. We have lost probably one of our major feedlots in the area. It's gone into bankruptcy in the past month or two, which means several million dollars. This is just an indication of the concern and the problems there are in this highly

concentrated cattle area.

It must be kept in mind that costs are rising. Yet the farmer who is in the cattle business — and every farmer in my area is in the cattle business — is restricted and held down by the returns from his product, which, of course, is cattle. As a matter of fact, to bring this to a point, there was a man who was in the cattle business down there, and for many, many years he bought his cars from one of the dealers in the town. Finally, the farmer sold a cow to the dealer. So to change the pattern, he sent the dealer a bill.

I'll read you this bill, which consists of: basic cow, \$200; two-tone exterior, \$45; extra stomach, \$75; product storage compartment, \$60; dispensing unit, four spigots, \$10 each; genuine cowhide upholstery, \$125; dual horns, \$15; automatic fly swatter, \$35; end price of the cow, \$595. I use this as an illustration to show that in business, particularly as to automobiles, farm machinery, and so on, it's the extras, and all the things added on, that add to the price of production. The farmer in turn is restricted to his one price when he goes to sell his products.

To turn to the good side of the picture, in Rimbey we have been fortunate, and I appreciate the fact, that the government has set up a servicing department for the provincial parks for central Alberta. It has brought 18 jobs to the town of Rimbey, and there will be construction of a service building in that town during 1976. This is appreciated, and it's been a real shot in the arm to that community.

As far as Ponoka is concerned, we are looking forward this fall to the opening of the new provincial building which will house the Alberta Opportunity Company and the offices of the provincial government. It is going to be a beautiful building, and it's going to be a real asset to the town.

There are other industries, small industries, a few coming in; not supplying the volume we require, but definitely of assistance. I appreciate the fact that we've had a 43-unit senior citizens' housing project completed. The people have moved in over the last few weeks. Construction is busy and good, homes are going up at a good sound rate. Actually, things look good in the town, if we can keep the job prospects on a reasonable basis.

Thank you for the opportunity, Mr. Speaker.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, once again it's a very sincere pleasure to be able to participate in the throne speech in this Assembly.

We've heard many sentiments expressed by the various members regarding the excellence of the speeches we have heard in this throne debate. I can very heartily add my accolades to those which have already been heard in the House.

I think the speeches of the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake and the hon. Member for Calgary Bow, the two speeches moving and seconding the Speech from the Throne, gave us a unique balance in this House and a very good picture of the environment as it exists in the province of Alberta today. I think each of them expressed very carefully and emphasized his own individual concerns and interests. But there was an area in both speeches where they showed an overlapping interest and concern, which I'm sure is shared by all of us in the Assembly. Those areas, of course, were in such things as the heritage savings

trust fund and the Land Use Forum.

I was especially pleased to hear the Member for Calgary Bow mention that he had noted in his study of the summary and the report of the Land Use Forum the question of the survival of the family farm. I think this indicated the interest all members have, not only in their own particular sphere of representation but also the sense of responsibility they have for people throughout the province.

As I look back on the last four years, Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but think of some of the issues that came before us and were paramount in the minds of all of us in the Assembly. I well remember the many discussions, and the questions which arose, regarding the Alberta Resources Railway. I felt that as a member of the Assembly and a member of the government of the province of Alberta, I should know something about that particular problem, as it existed. So that summer we took a camping trip along the forestry road from Rocky Mountain House, travelled the David Thompson Highway through to Nordegg, visited the minimum security detention centre there, then went up north to Grande Cache and to Grande Prairie. We looked at the Alberta Resources Railway before it had been restored and saw exactly the conditions as they existed.

Later, of course, in this House we heard a quite considerable discussion about the Kananaskis highway. This was another portion of the province of Alberta I was not familiar with. The summer after that discussion in the House, I thought it would be prudent to travel through that part of Alberta and look at what was developing in that area as well. I found it was a very, very majestic and beautiful part of this province, and that it certainly warranted some concern as to how development was to take place. I actually did not see anything which caused me particular concern as to how that development was taking place in the matter of developing that highway.

Throughout the years since I've been a member of this Legislature, we have travelled to the Cypress Hills region, to the irrigation areas in the Lethbridge-Taber districts. These are things I had heard about in this Assembly. I felt it my duty, as a member of this Legislature, to become familiar with all those areas of the province that were being talked about and that I really didn't know too much about before that.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, I had travelled to many parts of northern Alberta in the previous years. I was well familiar with what was going on at Fort MacMurray. I had been to the Peace River country many, many times. I thought, as I viewed my education in this Assembly, that there is no better place in this province to improve your knowledge of advanced education, as far as the province of Alberta is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly pleased to hear the speech from the hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake a week ago. I was not able to be in the Assembly last night, but I read the comments of the Member for Lac La Biche this morning. Mr. Speaker, both these members expressed a great many views about a great many things that I have been talking about in this Assembly for the past four years.

It was with a feeling of satisfaction that I heard the remarks of my honorable friend for Lesser Slave Lake and read the remarks of the hon. Member for Lac La Biche. They talked, naturally, about agriculture. I

read the speech this morning as well as heard the hon. Minister of Agriculture and the picture that he gave this House of the beef industry in Alberta and the problems that exist. This is something, of course, that we are all very familiar with and that we all have a great deal of feeling about, not only in northern Alberta but, as the hon. Member for Ponoka has just expressed, throughout the province as well. We have to realize — and I think this is something which was emphasized by the hon. Minister of Agriculture — that we in Alberta have a unique position in the beef industry because we are the largest producer in Canada. It's not quite so easy to solve the problem as it existed last fall and this winter. I think the attitude and the approach that the Minister of Agriculture has taken is very essential in trying to work and co-operate and get something established with the federal government on a national policy. I certainly hope he can continue his efforts in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had the debate in this House on the Land Use Forum. I did not participate in that debate, but I know this matter of land use is one of vital concern and interest to all people in the province of Alberta. I noted with a very deep sense of gratification that it received considerable emphasis in the throne speech. On the very first page, we saw that one of the primary objectives of this sitting and the fall sitting of the Legislature this year will be land-use planning for people in this province. Again, in the section in the throne speech dealing with agriculture, mention is made of the Land Use Forum, how it has recognized that the value and strength of the family farm is so important. A third time it is also mentioned in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker. The report of the Land Use Forum, under Environment, is a thought-provoking document which deserves close attention by legislators and the public in the coming month.

Mr. Speaker, I feel I should express the concern I have had transferred to me by many of my constituents and many of the people I have talked to here in the province of Alberta regarding the use of land. While we hear discussion on many hands regarding foreign investment in land in Alberta — and this is certainly something of vital concern, something that deserves our very careful consideration — the message I get from the people in my constituency, and in other parts of Alberta as I travel about, is concern that we should in every way safeguard the use of agricultural land here in Alberta and retain as much as possible for the use of agriculture in the future. I think that's important, Mr. Speaker, because I have to have concerns myself when here in Alberta we have five already established and recognized sites for hydro-electric development between Athabasca and Fort McMurray that are still only a matter of potential and have not been used. Along the foothills of this province we have areas and many, many sites that could be developed, that have coal which could be used for thermal development of power.

I think we have to take a very cautious approach to developing sites for power in Alberta that will make use of prime agricultural land as their base. I would like to see a very definite reclamation program exhibited to show that this land can be reclaimed. I would like to see experimentation, Mr. Speaker, where a certain section of agricultural land, if it does have a

valuable supply of coal underneath it, is utilized in a small way, and then that that land has been reclaimed. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to see that land producing maybe two or three tons of alfalfa an acre, or 40 bushels of barley, or 50 bushels of oats, or some wheat, or something like that, to prove that it actually can be done, before I would be in favor of seeing anything like that in the way of power development in this province.

The hon. Member for Lesser Slave Lake mentioned the forest resources of this province. I think that is a topic many of us here in this Assembly are not too familiar with. That is an area where a lot of work has to be done in the very near future, Mr. Speaker. Here again, as in agriculture, as in a basic industry, we have a renewable resource. It's very, very important that we should know just what that renewable resource consists of and what the prospects for its future are. We have not had an inventory of our forest resource products in this province for well over 20 years. That was the last time an official, actual inventory of forest resources was done. It's high time we had another one, so we know just what we have and can plan for the future in the forest industry as well.

Not too long ago I was pleased to see that the cabinet had passed a special warrant for research as far as forestry is concerned. This, of course, is going to deal with something that has been a matter of concern to many of the members from northern Alberta. It deals with what is known as the green zone, which has been set aside for non-agricultural purposes. Now, among other research that will be done by the forestry department, there is some bioclimatic research to determine if parts of that green area are suitable for agricultural purposes. Perhaps in the future there can be some readjustments on that green zone. From time to time throughout the years, we have had a great number of requests that some of that land be taken out for agricultural purposes. There has never been any definite assessment of its value for that. I think it's necessary. It should be done. I'm pleased to see those sorts of things going on.

We have heard my neighbors to both my west and my east and the other neighboring constituencies, Mr. Speaker, mention the commercial fishing industry. That is something else which is a renewable resource in this province. The Member for Lesser Slave Lake brought up the matter of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. He suggested this was something that was more or less an octopus around the necks of the Alberta commercial fishermen. I have to heartily agree with that. We produce maybe 5 million pounds of fish in Alberta a year. We could produce more. This is commercial fish. We consume about two-thirds of that. A number of years ago, the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation was set up by the federal government, contributed to by the provinces, and endorsed by the provinces, to market fresh-water fish in Canada. The commercial fishermen are now paying the price of that corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I've had the opportunity to see the operation of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation and to view how it operates from both sides. I think I was fortunate, I should say, to be able to attend one of their board meetings in Toronto two or

three years ago. I was not very impressed with the approach they took. There did not seem to be a great deal of care as far as the actual fisherman out on the lake was concerned, but more concern for how they were going to build their bureaucratic empire and who was going to be here and there in the pecking order. They had built a facility in Winnipeg for processing fish, but this had cost them a great deal of money. There had been a wastage of millions of pounds of fish that had gone bad because it had not been properly cared for. I could not see anything really positive in the programs they had for the development of the commercial fishing industry in Canada.

Then I have to think back to some of my own days, when I was in the commercial fishing business. I might be out on one of our northern lakes in the wintertime, Mr. Speaker. It could be perhaps 40 below, a wind blowing and snow coming down, and your mitts freezing up. Your feet were cold and chilly, you were pulling those nets out of those fish holes in the lake, and you were counting those fish. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, there weren't too many coming out of those net holes. You began to wonder how much you were going to get for those fish.

Then I think of the fishermen doing that sort of thing today. They're paying 20 or 30 per cent to preserve this Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation. I cannot see that there's any reason we cannot market our own fish here in Alberta, we cannot process it. I think, Mr. Speaker, we're now in the position of using the words a famous Canadian used not too long ago about another facet of our society here in Canada when he said, "shoo-fly". This is what we should say to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

Also, Mr. Speaker, still dealing with commercial fishing, I'll tell you one good thing came out of that meeting I had with the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation in Toronto. I talked to some people from the United States who were there. I think they were pretty sharp operators and knew what they were talking about. They said they market what we in Alberta consider to be rough fish.

Not too long ago, I was in the United States. In a supermarket, I was walking along one of the fish counters. I looked at a fish. I looked at it once. I looked at it twice. I picked it up and examined it. It said "mullet". There was another little sign on it, Mr. Speaker, that said "\$1.95/pound". It was frozen, it was round, solid. I thought to myself, well. Because back here in Alberta, Mr. Speaker, we have millions and millions and millions of pounds of that same variety of fish — only we call them suckers. But these people at the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation, Mr. Speaker, told me they take that type of fish, put it through a deboning machine, process it, package it, and sell it. It is used in fish and chip shops. It makes fish cakes. They said they have a real good market for it.

I asked the people at the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation in Toronto that time, why don't we do that? What would it cost to set up such an operation? I said, we have millions of this kind of fish in Lesser Slave Lake, in Lac La Biche, and many of the other northern lakes in between. At that time, they said we could have set up a deboning plant for maybe \$50,000. We could have processed that fish



here in Alberta. We still have that resource available. This, I think, Mr. Speaker, is something we should be looking at for the future.

Mr. Speaker, it has been mentioned by several of the speakers that in the northern part of this province we need to develop better facilities for television reception for the people of northern Alberta. I think that's highly essential. However, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to be a little bit cautious on that too, because the CBC in many areas of northern Alberta has already developed a captive audience where there are no other television stations. Then, of course, they can subject the people to whatever type of programming they wish. We have no alternative but to receive that type of program.

I don't know the value of the CBC is such that we can, as a nation, afford to subsidize them to the tune of \$300,000 or \$400,000 a year. I wonder if perhaps we should not be recommending to the federal government or trying to influence some of the people in government down there that they should dispose of this other octopus, compared to the Freshwater Fish Marketing Corporation.

DR. BUCK: Three or four hundred million.

MR. APPLEBY: Then, Mr. Speaker, let them compete with private industry. You know, we bought PWA, Mr. Speaker, but we make a profit on that. But they have the CBC, and we have to subsidize it. It's quite a different picture. I think this is what we should be saying shoo-fly to as well.

But I do think the CRTC could go into the north country, take the established towers the CBC has in certain areas or else build more, and make channels available on those towers to other broadcast mediums, radio and television, so that the people in the north would not have a distorted viewpoint of what's happening across this great nation of ours.

DR. BUCK: Joe Clark [inaudible].

MR. APPLEBY: Well now, that just reminds me of something — mentioning the name of Clark. In the period since the fall session, Mr. Speaker, and [before] this sitting we have today, the hon. Leader of the Opposition saw fit to take a discovery trip into northern Alberta. I think this was, you know, something that could be commended. He met various people in that part of the country. He talked to them. He expressed opinions that he was appalled at what he found — the lack, he said, of assistance for municipalities, the lack of roads, hospitals, education, that sort of thing. I think it was very, very unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, he did not make a similar trip five or six years ago.

If he had, Mr. Speaker, he could have made a comparison on this recent trip. He would have found throughout the northern part of this province many things that were different, because for years and years previous to 1971, we have been coming to Edmonton in a very humble manner with our petitions, our requests, and our needs in northern Alberta. We hadn't had a very strong audience here in the city of Edmonton, the capital. But since 1971, the contrast has been so great, if you were to take the percentage increase in all these types of facilities, it's almost beyond comprehension.

We have processing plants for agriculture in places like Legal, Mayerthorpe, Boyle, and Falher. Then we have meat-processing plants, and we never had these before. The assistance to municipalities, hospitals, and schools has been increased time and time again, far beyond the dreams of what we ever hoped to have before 1971. I think it's unfortunate that comparison was not made by the hon. leader, because it was something that should have been done.

Mr. Speaker, in the beginning I mentioned the excellence of the speeches that have been heard through this Assembly, and particularly those of the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. Even though these two members have sat in this House for less than one year, I think they personified very, very clearly the sense of responsibility to the people of Alberta they have accepted. I think, Mr. Speaker, that also personifies very, very clearly the attitude of all the members of this Progressive Conservative government and the feeling of responsibility to the people of this province we have and will continue to have.

Thank you.

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to add my comments to the Speech from the Throne, particularly from the viewpoint of my own Three Hills constituency, as a member of the Government of Alberta, and also in some areas I'd like to elaborate on later in my own departmental responsibilities.

One of the things I want to do at the outset is to congratulate particularly the members for Lesser Slave Lake and for Calgary Bow on their contributions to the Speech from the Throne. I think I would best do that by echoing the comments my colleague, Frank Appleby, MLA for Athabasca, just made, because I think they were entirely appropriate and entirely the case.

By way of outline, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to submit some general observations on the Speech from the Throne as it pertains, in my view, to Alberta and to my own constituency, and from there reflect on certain areas of important responsibility within the Department of Utilities and Telephones and save, hopefully, enough time to make some comments on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund, which is a concept very dear to my own philosophy and one that has been a part of what I have worked toward in my time in this Legislature.

Certainly, I recognize there are a number of other areas that will require comment from time to time, perhaps in some of the legislation before the House, and in other instances such as resolutions and, for that matter, question period. But there will be limited time, and I will not have time to deal with every possible item I would like to.

As I reflect on the 1976 Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, I think of two particular themes that, in my mind at least, are particularly important. One of these has had considerable emphasis in this House so far in the debate. The other has had very limited emphasis, and I would like to reinforce what emphasis it has had. On the one hand I see, as the theme of the 1976 throne speech, a theme which one might describe as responsible restraint.

Secondly, much more difficult to describe — and I think important and reflected in the Speech from the Throne, but relatively unnoticed so far in the debate

— is that there is a recognition of the people of Alberta. That is an important and integral theme and part of this speech. Because the people of Alberta, all aside from government programs, past government, present and for that matter future governments have accomplished a great deal that is an entirely separate and independent matter from government policy, be it provincial, federal, or municipal. I think it's essential to recognize that. That has been recognized in the Speech from the Throne, 1976, and I think that, if anything, we don't do that enough.

Let me elaborate. On the first theme, that of responsible restraint, I'd like to draw all members' attention again — and I do it because, from many of the comments from time to time, it seems there is a desire to overlook the fact — that roughly a month prior to a policy statement by the federal government, and prior to any such statement by any other provincial government in Canada, the hon. Provincial Treasurer for Alberta, Merv Leitch, did submit the plan as we saw it forward on September 17, 1975, on the question of 1976 budget planning and the responsible restraint therein. [This was] also, incidentally, notice to those who would need, for their own budget purposes, to be advised of the intention and direction of the coming fiscal planning period so that they might be in a position to adjust, modify, and adapt in order to serve the public interest and the responsibilities they have. Let me quote particularly one sentence that's part of the excerpt: "The government is proposing a decrease in the rate of growth of its budget and the budgets of those agencies which it funds." That, Mr. Speaker, I think was the beginning of a central theme that I find in the throne speech, the central theme of responsible restraint.

At the same time, on page 1 of the 1976 throne speech, I'd draw all members' attention to some of the added directions, some of the new programs and improvements of existing programs contained within the 1976 throne speech: expanded housing and accommodation, law enforcement and justice, workers' health and safety, land-use planning for people, improvements in education curricula. I read them off by way of emphasis to make the point that above all I want to make on them: that is, that these new programs and improvements are all people-oriented, an extremely significant observation, I think.

In the areas that are not a part of the new and expanded programs, there is the consolidation that's a part of what we're doing. I think no better example of the paring of outmoded programs could be given than for Bill No. 1 to be a repeal of 42 statutes of legislation left over from the old government. In that consolidation, no one will suffer. The expansions are where priorities are needed. We need to remember that overall and in a large number of people-oriented areas, we in Alberta are the largest-spending provincial government in Canada. Surely that's an important bench mark from which that measure should be made.

It's very easy to conclude, I think, on the first general theme I've mentioned, that the restraint proposed in the 1976 budget does, at the same time, offer expansions of new programs and improvement of existing new programs, and there are many that have been brought in since 1971 for the benefit of the people of Alberta. It is a balanced, reasonable,

and responsible restraint, and I think that's an important theme, a theme that the people are not only ready for, but had been asking for. We've come to that time in our history.

Secondly, I wish to re-emphasize the point that it just cannot be regarded as too important to recognize that there are such major areas where the people of Alberta themselves, by their co-operative enterprise and spirit and often the sense of community, have, in fact, all aside from government involvements at any level, achieved a great deal in Alberta. I particularly think of that because of the rural gas program. There are problems there. With a program that size you'd anticipate them. But let me say that I know of no better example of harnessing the co-operative enterprise of individual people and citizens in our province, or harnessing the sense of community and neighborliness involved in what the people of rural Alberta have already accomplished in the area of rural gas programming. I'll challenge to debate, at any time and any place, the Leader of the Opposition or the gentleman from Spirit River-Fairview, who are constantly bad-mouthing the program.

I might add by way of second example, and there are others as well, the fact that much of this province's prosperity and future — and it leads directly to the question of the heritage trust fund — does come from the initiatives and risk-taking by the people in the petroleum industry, regardless of where they came from in the first instance. I think we cannot overemphasize a recognition that all of us have benefited and prospered, as will future generations of Alberta, from those initiatives and that risk-taking by those people. I think they deserve credit for that.

It's particularly important to stress this in the theme of a recognition of our people. Because that comes directly to what most people would probably agree is the major item before this Legislature in this 1976 sitting, and that is the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. I'd like to come back to that later, except to say this. It's clear to me that Albertans, and certainly my constituents of Three Hills among them, want to provide not only for themselves in their present lifetimes and the lifetimes of their children, but want, for future generations, to unselfishly reflect their attitude of having a forward outlook that warrants recognition and that reflects credit to the people of Alberta in wanting to assure the future prosperity of Albertans, rather than for us to selfishly use it all up now.

Mr. Speaker, going towards major items of responsibility I have of a departmental nature, I'd like to come to the matter of the programs for natural gas. I think the main objectives to recognize are the basic resource management objectives undertaken in the initial instance by the Alberta government as we came to responsibility in 1971 for the management of Alberta's public resources, of which natural gas is a part.

There are essentially three which reflect on natural gas policies that I am involved in. First of all was the fact and the clear observation that prior to 1971 Albertans were not receiving fair return for their publicly owned resources. That fair return has now been established as a policy management objective for resources in Alberta, by way of price, by way of royalties, and those efforts continue. That's one

objective. Another is the objective of resource processing and upgrading by way of the balance and diversification of the economy of Alberta that will support our prosperity in the future.

A third objective, that was particularly welcome as far as rural representatives were concerned, including myself, was making the clean, convenient, continuous fuel of natural gas available to the people of Alberta who, for the most part, had not had that opportunity before, though they had been denied it in earlier times — to make that available by way of a method of government financial assistance that at the same time involved financial contributions from those who would benefit, largely harnessing their own enterprise, initiative, and spirit of community that then became the guiding force behind the rural gas co-ops that have experienced considerable success.

I draw to all members' attention, with respect to the basic management objectives in the resource of natural gas, our statement as early as November 1972, tabled in the Legislature, entitled *New Natural Gas Policies for Albertans*. At the same time it's very clear that the fair return now for the first time in Alberta's history being obtained for natural gas and other resources as well — though that process is not complete insofar as certain other resources such as coal are concerned, but those matters are forthcoming — is that that is also where we are able to have the financial capacity to provide rural natural gas to the people who had been denied it for so long, had asked for it, and had had no response from the sleepy government of the day.

There are two basic areas, Mr. Speaker, that involve my own responsibility. I want to be clear about them because there's been considerable distortion — largely without success out in the public of Alberta, I might add. That has to do with the natural gas rebate plan for Albertans that's based on Position Paper No. 18, tabled in the Legislature in May 1974, and with an outline of the Alberta government's three-year commitment to a price protection plan for Alberta users of natural gas.

This plan has gone forward, and at the completion of its three-year time will have benefited Albertans by at least \$150 million. That's \$150 million that they don't have to pay because they're in Alberta and that, if they lived somewhere else in Canada, they would have to pay.

As well as drawing to all members' attention the fact that this very considerable benefit has been available to Albertans — and our resource management policies mentioned earlier have given us the financial capacity to do this — aside from the distortions that have been presented both inside and outside the Legislature on the matter of the price of natural gas, I would also like to bring to the attention of all the paragraph in Position Paper No. 18 that refers to the fact that the provincial support price level will be adjusted yearly according to three factors. It's in black and white.

The first is the "costs of production". The second is "the inflation level in the Canadian economy". The third is — and perhaps I should say it twice or underline it, if that's possible in a verbal way — "and to the market value of the depleting resource", which has turned out, to the good and the success of the people of Alberta, to be the major element of all with respect to the price of natural gas.

Because of the rebate plan, the people of Alberta need share only partially in those costs. It is simply, when you've got it, a position paper tabled and available to all members of the Legislature. It is just not responsible to claim that any other position has been taken by the government on the question of natural gas.

I've also reviewed the remarks in *Hansard* of my predecessor. He continuously reflected on the content of the natural gas rebate plan policy paper when we were talking about the price of natural gas and questions of policy formulation at the time. So that matter, whether or not people want it politically or otherwise to be dead, is dead. It is there in black and white for all to see. If someone wants to distort it, I'll take them on by way of debate, any place and time.

An important question does remain however, Mr. Speaker, because beyond the commitment of 1976-77, which is the coming fiscal year in which Albertans will benefit by some \$70 million from the natural gas rebate plan, as it stands now, it is also the case that the commitment goes only to the end of the coming fiscal year, namely March 31, 1977.

During the intervening time, the support price — or the support bench mark, if you like — in the natural gas rebate plan will be 56 cents, which is less than half what it presently is at the Toronto city gate. On top of that, effective July 1, as everyone knows, there will be a new pricing agreement with respect to oil and natural gas, at a higher figure in the process of being negotiated.

Despite that increase in the price of natural gas in Canada, effective July 1, 1976, the 56-cent support price level will remain. It will in fact be the case that Albertans will be paying far less than half of what they'd be paying at the base point price at the Toronto city gate beyond that date. Let me remind all members that that includes the coming winter's heating. I suspect that we'll not have another year as mild as the winter we've just enjoyed.

Beyond 1976-77, however, beyond the present three-year commitment, there is the question of what to do. I've had considerable suggestion from my colleagues that we need to give some serious thought to a rejoining — perhaps in a considerably modified form, but in any case a rejoining — a redetermination, of the natural gas rebate plan for beyond April 1, 1976.

That's a matter we intend to give very serious consideration to. It seems to me it would be reasonable to give that matter the serious consideration that's warranted, after July 1, 1976, when the new price configuration is known. This would be what I intend. I know that's a question on the minds of a lot of members, wherever they sit in the House, and I want to be clear about my intentions in that regard.

I'd like then to move to the other major part of the gas policy that reflects on the Department of Utilities and Telephones responsibility that I have, and bring all members' attention, with very limited comment, to the *Rural Gas Policy for Albertans*, Position Paper No. 11, again tabled in the Legislature, April 1973. It outlines the intent and the mechanisms by which the rural gas program was set forward to be implemented in rural Alberta.

There's been much talk of problems, but I would like, above all, to make this point, and I have on the

many occasions of meeting with the many natural gas co-ops and individuals in them. The nice thing about this kind of problem is that it's got to be a happy problem. I can remember what it was like travelling in rural Alberta, farm to farm, door to door, in the hamlets and villages, when all was doom and gloom. Recalling the rural Alberta doldrums prior to 1971, there was a kind of hopelessness, and all problems were ones of shrinking population, of the young people going elsewhere, no construction, no progress going on, and I remember them very well.

Comparing those problems, without exception, people I've discussed them with have readily agreed that these are truly happy problems of progress. How different it is now, and how delightful it is to be dealing with problems of progress rather than problems of regression.

By way of brief review, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point these matters out. The initial rural natural gas plan involved a \$1,700 contribution. That's essential to remember, particularly in light of the apparent misunderstanding — because I'm sure he wouldn't distort anything — of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. The plan was a \$1,700 contribution by the potential user of natural gas in rural Alberta. This would be joined by a \$1,300 outright financial assistance grant to a maximum — if required — to supply the natural gas in the rural gas co-op in question. Beyond the \$3,000 level, it was then agreed to provide 50-50 cost sharing if costs, properly determined and reviewed, were beyond \$3,000 per user. That has been done.

In addition, the cost of basic gas supply by way of transmission lines has been — in contrast with the original design of the program — undertaken as financial assistance by the provincial government. Essentially, this means that equal cost gas is provided at the end of the pipeline instead of at the beginning. There are areas in a particular situation where they required large expensive transmission lines for basic gas supply. As a result of this, Mr. Speaker, they were in a position where they simply could not look at the total costs of the transmission lines. Cost had to be included. Essentially, the program helped rural people even further by making the cost of gas equal from Gas Alberta f.o.b. the franchise area instead of the head end of the pipeline.

Other adjustments were made to accommodate the unusual circumstances of irrigation in southern Alberta, also the more northern parts of Alberta where they get more moisture and have more of these kinds of problems with respect to grain dryers.

I would like to give particular emphasis to the recently-made announcement that assists rural gas co-ops by way of additional financial assistance. I refer to my announcement of February 26, 1976 that provides for further financial assistance to rural gas co-ops whose costs exceed \$3,750 per user. There was a recognition that construction costs had escalated in that area of programming — as almost everywhere else — on the basis of the fact that inflation had gone on in Canada to an unfortunate extent. Moreover, it's also the case that, while it was always very, very clear that the price of natural gas to Alberta users would increase with the market commodity value of that gas — though not fully — it nonetheless had gone up in price beyond what had been originally predicted by anyone.

Further, Mr. Speaker, it came to everyone's clear attention as experience was obtained in the program that there were special kinds of cost problems in some areas of the province, such as sparsity in south-central Alberta, for example; the irrigation canal crossings in southern Alberta; the muskeg geography problems in north-central and northern Alberta; and also, in some areas of Alberta, particularly in Drayton Valley and Medicine Hat, to recognize that it was costly to have a large number of other already-in-existence pipeline crossings to pay for. For those reasons, the adjustment was made, despite a position taken by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview in his contribution to the throne speech debate which very much surprised me — I think he called the brief from the Federation of Alberta Gas Co-ops something like the most damning document that he'd seen by anyone, which has got to be a marvellous overstatement.

I'd certainly like to draw to his attention the very gratifying letter of response from the Federation of Alberta Gas Co-ops thanking the government for recognizing the problems by way of the adjustment of the financial assistance formula and the extent to which it would very dramatically help the rural gas co-ops in Alberta. I would very much suggest — and it's too bad he's not in his place so that he could hear me say this — that he get out around and talk to the people of rural Alberta, so that he might be in a position to be informed of their attitudes and the gratitude of these people on this matter.

DR. BUCK: Nobody shoots Santa Claus, Allan.

DR. WARRACK: By way of the present status of the program, I might point out, Mr. Speaker — as the throne speech does, on page 9 I believe — that while the target level for this year was to make natural gas available to 10,000 new rural gas users, we have already gone beyond 11,000. I ask all hon. members how many construction programs they know of that are ahead of schedule in these days of inflation. Since the beginning of the program, that comes to a total of some 25,000 new users to whom natural gas is made available. I emphasize "new users" as contrasted with people. When you consider the number of people per household, or per farm, that comes out to about 90,000 people in Alberta who, without the rural gas program, would likely not have any opportunity to enjoy the clean, convenient, continuous fuel of natural gas, as has been the benefit of their city friends in Alberta over the years.

I ask all to consider these matters and to judge for themselves if the program is a success. I'd certainly like to recognize the individual co-ops and their members. A tremendous amount of effective work has been done by them. The department staff, particularly Assistant Deputy Minister Doug Brooks, has been involved in the program pretty much from its outset; and now, more recently, Deputy Minister Jim Dodds; the federation of gas co-ops and its leadership for the positive, constructive input they've had from time to time, including their brief, even though one member of the Legislature has criticized it in the comments made on it.

Above all, for more details, I refer all hon. members to the December 18 Public Accounts legislative meeting, when there were considerable

detailed discussions, for example, on what the composition of the price of gas might be. There's the cost of gas itself, from Gas Alberta, plus the cost of operating the gas co-op, plus the capital amortization that might be necessary. I'll point out that for those who made the decision not to take the government's suggestion of \$1,700 initially per user, they are in a position where they have to — if they charged only \$1,300 instead of \$1,700, for example — make up the other \$400 in the gas rate. They made that conscious decision at the time that they had a lesser capital contribution than was the suggestion of the government. Despite the comment of one of the members of the Legislature, that's hardly something to blame the government for.

As I anticipated, I see that I am relatively short of time. On the matters of telephones, I would refer to the excellent comments made by my colleague, and member of the commission, Dr. Neil Webber for Calgary Bow, who seconded the speech and, I thought, despite the criticisms of the Leader of the Opposition, made remarks that were very well stated and helpful to the Legislature. I'd like to add what a pleasure it has been to work with him.

Two very brief comments on the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund. I know there will be other opportunities to discuss it, but I want to say two things. First of all, why is there a fund? It seems to me that's the most important question of all. Were it not for the resource management policies that got fair return to the people of Alberta, there wouldn't be a fund to talk about. There wouldn't be any item of legislation. This was done on behalf of the people by the Alberta government in contrast with the old government that, I'm afraid, was the timid extreme, which yielded no fund. On the other hand, the far left murmurings that we hear from time to time strike me as being accurately described as the "stifle" extreme, where no one would put his initiative, couldn't afford to take the risks, and therefore there would be no fund. There would not be the development in the interests of the people of Alberta. I was pleased to notice that a province near us recently unshackled itself from that kind of stifling government.

So that's my first point. Why is there a fund? It's because of the resource management policies obtaining fair return for Alberta's resources. It would not be accomplished on the timid extreme or the stifle extreme, but has been accomplished in the province of Alberta during very recent years.

The second point is — and this is one that will receive a lot of emphasis from all, and the one that gets considerable acceptance and emphasis from my constituency — who does this money belong to? If we're using the non-renewable resources that belong to the people of Alberta, the present and future generations — if we're using them now, would anyone argue out of any motivation other than selfishness that it ought to all be available to us? Surely we have a responsibility to provide and plan in the economics and social nature and services of the Alberta of the future, as to how we're going to afford the prosperity and level of services for our people in Alberta if we don't provide it from the non-renewable resources that will be unavailable to them because they're being utilized now. I'd be very interested to hear the kinds of arguments people would mount in suggesting that's not a wise policy, not only for the

present generation of Albertans who care about the future, but for future Albertans as well.

In conclusion, I say that I support the concept of the Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund very strongly. I support it by way of its concept as far as resource management is concerned, as far as financial management is concerned, and also out of an attitude of concern and consideration for future generations in Alberta who, indeed, ought to share in the fruits of the highly beneficial kinds of opportunities that are unusually ours in Alberta.

I'd like to say also that my constituents in Three Hills support it. The legislation that was tabled in the fall, and will be brought back — not necessarily with exactly the same provisions as in the fall — essentially provides criteria that yield an assurance to future generations that would not be there without any such act. That is a kind of self-disciplining of ourselves as a government. Those points need to have considerable emphasis, but I think [that is] better done on that particular item of legislation.

Finally, I'd like to say — and this isn't entirely restricted to members of my own party — that on various occasions in my responsibilities in Utilities and Telephones, and Lands and Forests before that, I've appreciated the co-operation, assistance, and helpful advice of members of the Legislature. Most of the major items are really beyond political difference and are within a consensus of what's best for the people of Alberta. I want to say I've often found that reflected by members from all positions in the Legislature, and how much I appreciate that help.

Thank you very much.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The minister has slightly exceeded his time. But if the Assembly agrees, I'm sure that the question could be put.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: Thank you Mr. Speaker, and thank you members. Can the hon. minister give me any indication of what the average cost per hookup for natural gas is across the province? Is there a higher cost in certain areas and a lower cost in other areas? Could you just give me a ballpark figure of how those average out?

DR. WARRACK: I can give a general figure on that, Mr. Speaker. All these figures are subject to considerable variation, as I'm sure everyone will naturally appreciate.

My understanding is that of the co-ops completed thus far, the average costs have been in the order of just under \$3,400. Now that range is from . . . I know some in southern Alberta, I can think of one in particular that has a number of irrigation crossings where it's much, much higher. [Also], for example, crossroads cover a large part of my area, and areas of the Member for Innisfail and the Member for Olds-Didsbury, [and] the job got done in 1975, including construction, for just under \$3,000. That's some idea of the variation on completed gas co-ops.

The average costs we have per user on the ones presently under construction indicate a level of about

\$3,800; again, subject to considerable variation, and to the fact that they would normally tend to include some final cost that may not have been completely planned for. In some instances it's a really complicated situation. They sometimes run into terrain they weren't able to anticipate initially.

The only other item I could add by way of information that comes to my mind immediately is to recognize that, to some extent, the easier in the sense of less costly co-ops, aside from the inflation impact, for the most part tended to be ones it was possible to undertake more quickly and more readily. Some of the ones remaining, either by way of being under construction now or not significantly started yet, are somewhat delayed by the fact they were facing more difficult cost circumstances.

In addition to any consideration of inflation in construction costs, aside from that, I think it would still be reasonable to anticipate there would be an increase in the cost per user of the future natural gas co-ops which are completed. It was partly in anticipation of that, as I said under construction cost figures and also the special cost problems involved, we felt an adjustment in the financial formula was reasonable.

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

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, as to business of the Assembly, next Thursday night is the annual Alberta

Teachers Association dinner, so the Assembly will not be sitting that evening, nor on Monday or Tuesday evenings as plans now stand.

I would think that the pace at which the throne speech debate is now moving, it might be in a position to be voted on perhaps as early as late Monday, more probably on Wednesday. Members who wish to speak should bear that in mind. Therefore, on Wednesday and Friday of next week, members should be prepared for second readings of all bills on the Order Paper, including the second reading of the bill introduced today, The Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation.

At this time, I might advise the Assembly that next Wednesday or Friday, depending on the pace of business, I may ask for leave of the Assembly to continue with Motion No. 8, with respect to the Land Use Forum. A number of members have indicated interest in continuing the debate on that, so I would ask unanimous leave to move to that, perhaps late next week if there is time before the budget at 8:00 p.m. next Friday.

I move that we do now call it 1 o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree with the suggestion of the hon. Government House Leader?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until Monday afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

[The House rose at 12:50 p.m.]