

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**Title: **Thursday, March 25, 1976 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 3  
The Appropriation  
(Interim Supply) Act, 1976**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 3, The Appropriation (Interim Supply) Act, 1976. 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 purpose of the bill is to provide interim supply until the appropriation act can be introduced and passed by the House.

[Leave granted; Bill 3 introduced and read a first time]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, today is an especially red-letter day for me. I have 36 students who came up from Forestburg to watch us in action this afternoon. Mr. Speaker, they are accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Bunney, and by Mr. Miller. Mrs. Bunney has been coming here with her classes since 1958. I would like to introduce them to you and to the Assembly. I ask them to stand and be recognized by the Assembly. They are sitting, sir, in the public gallery.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I have the pleasure to introduce to you, and to members of the Assembly, 25 students from the Grassland School in the Athabasca constituency. Grassland is a hamlet on the road to Fort McMurray. You can identify it in that manner. Except for three, all of them are in Grade 10. Today they have with them their teacher, Mr. Brian Davis. Their bus driver, Mr. John Pysyk, is also with them in the public gallery. Would they stand and be recognized by the House.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the hon. Minister of Labour, I'd like to introduce a group of Lendrum Grade 6 students, accompanied by teachers and parents. Some 58 of them are in the members gallery. I'd ask them to rise and be recognized by the House.

CLERK ASSISTANT: Tabling Returns and Reports. Ministerial Statements.

MR. LEITCH: If it's necessary, I'd ask leave of the House to revert to Tabling Returns and Reports.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file some supplementary information to be considered with the estimates. The first document, Mr. Speaker, is a Reconciliation of Historical Data. This traces the votes in the 1974-75 estimates, and indicates in what program or subprogram the funds in those votes are found in the 1976-77 estimates. Mr. Speaker, we will have a copy to deliver to each member of the Legislative Assembly.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, because there are going to be some transitional pangs in moving from the historical form of the estimates to program budgeting, and in the hope that it will be of help should the members of the Legislative Assembly want it, I'd like to file some detailed estimates of expenditure for the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, these break down the agricultural appropriation in great detail and are not something that I would anticipate filing ordinarily. In the event it is of help to the Assembly on this occasion, and at its request, I'd be pleased to file similar information for other departments. It is extensive, Mr. Speaker. Agriculture, for example, comprises about 38 pages.

I should also add an explanation of the documents, Mr. Speaker. They do not trace the funds in particular detail from last year's estimates and show them in this year's estimates. For example, take an item such as rentals. It couldn't be traced into this year's estimates from last year's, because we've gone to a completely different budgeting system. The amounts in last year's rental appropriation would be divided up among a number of subprograms. However, if any hon. members want that information, it will of course be available when the minister is putting his estimates through the House.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of the supervisor of consumer credit, as required by The Credit and Loan Agreements Act.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the annual report of the Department of the Solicitor General.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of Social Services  
and Community Health**

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, the news of the influenza epidemic is quite disturbing. The government has today requested the federal government to order, on behalf of the province of Alberta, sufficient vaccine to meet our needs. It was necessary that we take immediate action because the vaccine is in short supply. We wished to ensure that we had sufficient for the preventive measures we must take on behalf of our citizens. There has not been time to work out

administrative details. They will be worked out later as required.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

**Attorney General's Staff**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Attorney General. Have commitments been made to the professionals in the Attorney General's Department, namely the lawyers, with regard to incremental increases in their wages in the coming fiscal year? Have commitments been made by the minister or senior officials in his department on behalf of the minister to the various law officers of the Crown?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, no payments that I'm aware of have gone to any lawyers in the employ of the Crown, other than the payments to which they would be entitled under the agreements they now function under, which were effective April 1975.

Beginning last fall and going some time into the future, I have endeavored to resolve the matter of the additional salary increases to which some members of the department may be entitled, in view of the market circumstances with the bar. Some members of the department may be entitled to an increment beginning in January 1976. I have had discussions about some of those individuals and have made some recommendations with my department. But to my knowledge, no final decision has been made yet in this area.

MR. CLARK: A further supplementary question to the minister. Are these negotiations going on in the Attorney General's Department while the normal public service is being told that merit pay and increments will not be following through until all the civil service negotiations are finished? Are the negotiations with the legal people in the Attorney General's Department separate from the general, overall freeze?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the Provincial Treasurer, might wish to comment on the subject as well. My concern at the moment is to ascertain whether some of the department's lawyers may be entitled to an increment and, if so, how much that increment should be. I'm simply saying that we have not yet settled upon a decision whether certain members of the department should receive an increment effective January of this year.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Have the minister's discussions with officials of his department been in terms of two and three increments in the course of the pay increase that will become available?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I have not been approaching the discussion in terms of whether a particular person is entitled to one or two increments. We have been endeavoring to ascertain whether we can establish criteria for advancement and promotion within the department that reflect the concerns of law officers, as opposed to what might otherwise be

described as public service criteria. If we feel we can establish those criteria, we can then exercise our judgment responsibly and place the legal members of the department on a scale that is reasonably consistent with the private sector, taking into consideration of course the fact that we are not looking at parity.

I think it's clear that the lawyers employed by the Crown, who have anywhere from one to almost ten years of experience, are not really out of phase with the private bar. There is capacity within the public service salary situation to adjust lawyers and keep them competitive. Mr. Speaker, the problem I feel I'm experiencing with lawyers of the Crown is essentially more experienced senior counsel.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to supplement my colleague's answer in the area of the hold on increments and other salary matters. The hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to it as being a hold until the conclusion of negotiations. If I said that or something that left that impression, it was not the accurate impression.

I should perhaps explain the reason for the hold in this way: we have entered into an agreement, with the federal government, making the anti-inflation regulations applicable. They deal with salary and determine the amount of salary increase that can occur during the year that will begin with the new contract, effective April 1 of this year, whenever it may be signed. We simply wanted to be sure that in such matters as increments, reclassifications, and the salary terms that will develop as a result of negotiations with the CSA, we were not going to be in breach of the guidelines.

We wanted to be very sure of our ground. We wanted to avoid getting into the trouble. We didn't want to get into it and then have to correct it afterwards. So until we can be sure where we are in respect to the guidelines — they are being fleshed out all the time, Mr. Speaker, by decisions of the AIB — once we're sure of our position there, I would expect we would proceed in the ordinary way.

I should say that procedural things, such as sittings of bodies that determine reclassifications, merit, or things like that, are going on.

MR. CLARK: A further supplementary question to the Attorney General. Is the province now in the process of recruiting future law officers of the Crown, or lawyers, from the province of Ontario? Also, is the Attorney General's Department going to take articling students into the department directly from university?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, in both cases, yes. We have had a team in central Canada interviewing applicants for both the criminal and civil sections of the department. We've had a number of applications from that region of Canada. Of those we have interviewed so far, we have found some we feel are of the calibre we would like to employ.

Without taking the time of the House, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition that we spent some time in the House last fall discussing the recommendations of the Kirby Board of Review. I would underline the fact that Mr. Justice Kirby and his colleagues pointed out some of the serious deficiencies in the criminal justice system in this province, and underline further the fact that

part of the reason is that some people in this system are seriously underpaid.

I know that perhaps not too many members of the public have too much sympathy with some professionals in our society who clearly get paid more than others. However, the simple fact is that there needs to be some adjustment in some areas of the criminal justice system to bring about the reforms Mr. Justice Kirby recommended. This is one area.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question to the Attorney General. What instructions has the Attorney General given his recruiting team going to Ontario, as far as salary discussions with lawyers they're trying to recruit?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, my people discussing this subject in Ontario and elsewhere are aware of the existing parameters for salaries within the structure of the Government of Alberta. They are also aware of the fact that we are attempting to make some change in that with respect to certain professionals, including lawyers, although no firm and final decisions have been made.

Obviously the instructions to the people negotiating with applicants outside Alberta are that they must live with the existing guidelines, in the anticipation and the expectation that there may be some increase in that. But obviously there can be no commitment at this stage.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Is some of this recruiting, in Ontario and elsewhere, for Alberta Crown prosecutors who are so badly needed?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, indeed so. We have appointed five new provincial court judges in the last short while, including a chief judge this week. I'm very proud of and very pleased with this.

A few additional appointments to that court must be made. We will need Crown attorneys to provide the Crown counsel services to the courts that these judges will be sitting in. Moreover, we will need an additional number of Crown attorneys to service the existing workloads in the provincial court system, which as we all appreciate is seriously overworked, as has been pointed out by Mr. Justice Kirby. In short, yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary. Would the hon. minister know how many Crown prosecutors or Crown attorneys are required to keep one judge working full-time?

MR. FOSTER: I don't know that I could pull that figure out of the air, Mr. Speaker. In this department we currently have approximately 110 positions for legal officers. At the present time, I think we have about 90 on our staff. So with the existing complement, we are 20 short; that's both civil and criminal, Mr. Speaker, to say nothing of the additional numbers of people we need in the criminal justice system. I'm not quite sure how many. I can get the statistics. So we are seriously short, particularly in the criminal justice section.

### Coal Policy

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my second question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. In view of that long awaited coal policy, at what stage are negotiations between the coal industry in Alberta and the department or the minister?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the question was placed somewhat the same way the other day. I had to point out to the hon. member that we're not negotiating with the coal industry. Rather, the government is developing a coal policy, and in the course of developing that policy, is carrying on a consultation process with the industry to try to make sure that the policy is in the best interests of the people of Alberta. That is going on. The coal policy, in its various elements with many alternatives, is being considered by a committee of cabinet. Any comments other than that would be sheer speculation till they have been approved.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the minister's comment that, to use the words exactly, "the government has developed a coal policy", when is the minister prepared to make that coal policy, which you just referred to, available to members of the Legislature?

MR. GETTY: I don't know where I was quoted as "has developed".

MR. CLARK: It's here.

MR. GETTY: The government, Mr. Speaker, is in the process of developing a coal policy and the timing will certainly be when cabinet has approved that policy.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In the course of the development of this policy, is the government giving consideration to the concept — the unwise concept I might say — of profit sharing with the industry?

MR. GETTY: I can only respond, Mr. Speaker, by repeating what I said previously. The coal policy proposals are made up of many elements and alternatives. They are being considered by a committee of cabinet. It would be unwise to speculate on any portion of them at this stage.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. In the course of the cabinet review of the developed policy, is the government giving consideration to allow the Alberta Energy Company to buy into coal companies that receive approval to go ahead with development in the eastern slopes?

MR. GETTY: I would have to answer the question exactly as I answered the last one, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last supplementary question to the minister in light of the minister's answers. Is the government prepared to write off the concept of profit sharing with the coal

industry? Is the government prepared to say now that it will completely forget about that unwise concept?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not trying to be difficult with the hon. member, but I've already answered that question three times.

MR. CLARK: Just trying to give you a chance to straighten the record and say, no.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. In developing the coal policy you mentioned, are you also consulting with men like Mr. Don MacDonald, the president of the UMW, who is a very responsible union leader?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, we've had one discussion with the gentleman he mentioned, who represents a large portion of the labor input to the policy. As the government's deliberations become more firm, I would like to indicate that it is our intention to discuss the various proposals with individuals like Mr. MacDonald.

#### Student Employment

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. It is with regard to summer student employment. Has the minister had discussions with the federal manpower minister regarding the likelihood of a tough summer for students seeking employment?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, we spoke in general of the labor supply and demand, including the possibilities of jobs for students this July and August in particular.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. The federal government indicated that its summer employment programs would provide 12,160 jobs. How many of these employment opportunities are in Alberta? Are there any federal-provincial joint employment agreements?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I would have to check the files for the exact number of jobs. I have it, and I'll do so. There are no joint agreements. But some of the federal programs are of course in every province, and to that extent they're in Alberta. These programs are managed jointly by the federal and the provincial governments.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Has the minister or his department done a survey of the number of students who require employment for the summer and the opportunities that will be available in Alberta?

DR. HOHOL: We do this on a trend approach from year to year, Mr. Speaker. The indicators for Alberta, unlike the nation, are that the job opportunities will be here. The creation of new, additional jobs is a constant activity in our province. We're not looking forward to a bad situation in terms of employment for young people in Alberta, despite reports that might indicate something different. Those reports are in the

context of reporting for Canada, rather than for regions or provinces.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Has the minister or his department investigated the effect of the current minimum wage on employment opportunities for the student? What I'm saying is: at the present time, are students with lower or inadequate skills prevented from getting jobs at rates less than the minimum wage?

DR. HOHOL: I wouldn't think so, Mr. Speaker. On the contrary, in fact, straight labor jobs are paying very well at the present time, so I would be very surprised. Having been involved with the minimum wage until a few months ago, I recall that the minimum wage was used in a different context. It's usually a supplementary wage to piecework, or a second job, or a second job in a family with low skills. But the labor force, in the literal context of the word "labor", is highly paid today.

#### Rural Telephones

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones, and it's a follow-up to a question I asked earlier in the House.

Could the minister indicate the recently announced policy of Alberta Government Telephones in regard to the individual line service in rural areas, relating to summer-cottage owners and farmers who have temporarily disconnected their phones during the winter months? Could he indicate the AGT policy on reconnection of these particular telephones?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, yes, I can. I apologize to the hon. member that my flu involved some additional days' delay of this answer, although I believe he did have an opportunity to discuss it with my assistant.

The individual line service matter the hon. member refers to was approved by the Public Utilities Board back in February. It has to do with the question of hooking up disconnects of individual line services that had been in place prior to the Public Utilities Board ruling.

During the coming year, when they want to have them reconnected, they will not have a problem reconnecting them in the normal way for this year only, in order to get past the transitional period. But in the future, the normal circumstances of disconnection, then reconnection, would apply. That's in the future, starting in 1977. In the coming year, when they go to reconnect, they'll have no problem.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will this charge be applied each time there's a reconnection of the individual line service?

DR. WARRACK: As I said, Mr. Speaker, not in the coming year; but I take it the hon. member is asking for beyond this coming year. The answer to that is, yes. The reason for the answer being "yes" is that, if the entire charge of the capital cost that's involved were to be levied at the outset on the initial person involved, it would be a very, very high charge indeed, much higher than is the case now. Whereas in the planning, it's recognized that over a period of time

people do move and disconnect. Other people move into the places where they had lived. Over the period of time there's a capital cost recovery that goes against those who use that service and therefore get the benefit of it. In the total pooling system that's allowed by the Public Utilities Board, total costs are then covered.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will customers on an individual line service be able to apply to be put on a multiline service?

DR. WARRACK: I would think there'd be no reason why not. Subject to checking any technical problem that might be involved, a person could do that; although a person who presently has individual line service and had obtained it at a very reasonable cost, might want to think very carefully about asking to go on a multiple-party service instead.

#### **Big Knife Provincial Park**

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the students from Forestburg, I would like to ask the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife if any future expansion is planned for the Big Knife Provincial Park at Forestburg.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, not at the moment. We haven't included specific plans for future expansion, although I have been down to the area, Mr. Speaker, and I've reviewed that particular site and the adjacent property with the parks people. On a visit to Forestburg within the last three months, I believe we had some discussions with the people at Alberta Power and with some of the people just south of the park area.

#### **Hospital Operations**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. Because of the restraint program, will there be a cutback in major surgery in hospitals like the Drumheller General?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday, while the individual decisions will be made by individual hospital boards, I can say that the definite general impression I have gained from hospital boards with which I've met and discussed the expenditure restraint is that if an individual hospital board makes the decision in fact to close down a minimum number of beds during this restraint year, it would be in an area that does not affect the immediate surgical needs. In other words, it would not affect the overall capacity of the hospital system to meet immediate and emergent surgical needs. It's in the elective surgery areas which are not pressing or are non-emergent immediate needs.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's also important to Drumheller in particular — although I've not talked to that board, perhaps the hon. member would like to clarify the particular situation there and I will attempt to as well. But it's important to our citizens that we put it in the context of what it actually does mean. It does not in any way affect these immediate needs for

surgery in the hospital system. That is what the boards have indicated to me generally, as I've met with many of them in Alberta.

#### **Livestock Industry**

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question again to the Minister of Agriculture, on the same lines as I did yesterday. Because of the restraint in our budget, I wonder if the minister has any studies or statistics in regard to the promotion of livestock and the beef industry in Alberta.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I think next week, during the course of estimates, it could be clearly indicated that any restraints within the Department of Agriculture budget will not affect any efforts we might be making in the development of the beef cattle industry.

MR. KUSHNER: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister have any statistics or studies on whether there is any problem in the beef industry? Will it affect our meat industry as far as employment is concerned? I understand some of them are working only to half capacity this year.

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I expect we do have studies and statistics along those lines.

MR. KUSHNER: A supplementary question. If we do, Mr. Minister, what effect will it have on the meat packing plants as far as employment is concerned?

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the hon. member could put a question on the Order Paper asking for that information, or a motion for a return to get the actual statistics, and then see whether it would be necessary to ask further questions.

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

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'm going to make another attempt at a question I posed yesterday. I would direct my question to either the hon. Minister of the Environment or the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

Could either of the ministers advise whether a study has been done to see if the Calgary Power project at Ryley-Dodds is stalled or delayed, it would have a detrimental effect on the Vegreville research station or a possible petrochemical plant along the tar sands corridor.

DR. BUCK: Hypothetical question, Mr. Speaker, "if".

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I know of no such study. Certainly we're assured there is adequate power supply to serve the Vegreville lab, if that was the intent of the hon. member's question. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones would have something to add.

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, other than whether there is a danger the lights might go out, I wouldn't anticipate it would have an impact on the Vegreville research station.

### Olympic Games

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, who I understand is in charge of sports. The question is: could the minister inform the House in which events in the upcoming Olympics Alberta athletes are participating and thus representing Canada?

Mr. Speaker, if the minister does not have this information, would he report to the House at a date in the near future?

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, come on.

MR. CLARK: They are not even picked yet.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, first of all I should clearly state that the Alberta government doesn't pick the athletes who will be going on behalf of the province. Therefore, I can't really indicate to you at this time who may be going.

I might indicate, though, that a number of Alberta athletes have an excellent chance of representing Canada at the Olympic Games. Once that list of athletes becomes known, we would hope we will get behind them and support them all the way.

DR. PAPROSKI: I'd like to thank the minister, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary question on that same topic.

Is the minister aware of definitive supportive programs for Olympic prospects in the athletic area, as they have them in other countries and provinces?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect to the hon. member, it would appear he's asking a question about something which does not come within provincial responsibility.

DR. PAPROSKI: With great respect, I would hope amateur sport comes within the purview of the province. I would beg leave to ask the question.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member wishes to seek documents or detailed information of some kind, I would respectfully suggest he might do so via the Order Paper.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary on that topic . . . another topic . . . a similar topic . . . any topic, really.

Maybe the minister could help me on this one, Mr. Speaker. Will Alberta be officially represented in the Olympic ceremonies?

MR. ADAIR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will. I believe the Premier will be representing Alberta in the opening ceremonies. I will be at the closing ceremonies.

### Ex-Civil Servants as Consultants

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Premier. I'd like to compliment the hon. Premier because he didn't elevate the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway. This province would have been in a bad state.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that a senior civil servant left government service several months ago

and is now setting up a consulting service to inform industry of how to lobby and deal with governments, I'd like to know if the hon. Premier has considered looking into some type of legislation similar to what the federal government is now contemplating in relation to senior civil servants leaving the service and then dealing with the government.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it isn't a matter that has been previously brought to my attention. I'd be happy to take notice of it, inquire into it, and report back to the House.

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the hon. Premier could determine whether or not it is M & M Systems Research Ltd. that is doing that. [laughter]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. In light of the fact that he's quite astute, can he confirm that he is asking for possibly the best type of information available?

### Calgary Police Budget

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Solicitor General. In view of the fact that the city of Calgary has increased its police budget by well over 100 per cent in the last four years, I am wondering if the hon. minister is not concerned that merely providing more money for policemen is necessarily going to alleviate the crime problem.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, certainly it's the hope of the government that the program for extra grants for enhanced law enforcement and crime prevention will be beneficial. This is fundamental to the policy. So far as the city of Calgary is concerned, Mr. Speaker, they must abide by the same conditions as other municipalities in the province, which is that they must reach a firm base of adequate policing before they will be entitled to extra grants. The decision, of course, rests entirely with the city itself. If the city doesn't reach the basic level on which these calculations have been based, they will not be entitled to the extra money.

MR. MUSGREAVE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does not the minister agree that there are perhaps other parameters than just numbers of policemen, such as the area of the city, the crime solved, the recovery of property, the ratio of technicians to police officers? Are these not also important criteria?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is seeking the hon. minister's opinion concerning the importance of criteria. Perhaps he could do that privately.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to determine if the minister does not think that there are other more important criteria than just numbers of people.

MR. SPEAKER: That's really the same question, but perhaps the hon. minister might answer briefly.

MR. FARRAN: I'm happy to answer that question, Mr. Speaker. Obviously the crime solution rate is a good test, as are all the other yardsticks the hon. member has mentioned. However, they are all in the area of value judgment. If you're basing standards for the paying out of money, you must deal with hard figures. So the criterion we have taken is one uniformed policeman to every 550 people in the metropolitan areas. This is a criterion which has some basis. We've canvassed other metropolitan areas. They believe that's the desirable ratio. The Canadian average is 1:500. So 1:550, in effect, errs on the side of leniency so far as budgeting is concerned.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Solicitor General. Is the ratio of population to uniformed policemen the only criterion the Solicitor General uses in the allocation of those funds?

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker. That is the basic condition. Any municipal police force must reach this standard as part of its own fiscal responsibility. However, the grants will be directed into approved projects for enhanced policing or crime prevention. We want to avoid the situation that took place in the city of Calgary last year when some of the law enforcement grant was diverted to other services.

MR. CLARK: Supplementary to the minister, so that there's no misunderstanding. Would the minister just outline very briefly the criteria, other than the ratio of uniformed policemen to population, which he's using in dealing with the city of Calgary on this matter?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, the calculation of the law enforcement grant — the first time, incidentally, any province has lent such substantial fiscal support to policing in municipalities. This Alberta first was calculated in 1975 on the basis of the last official census figure: 1:550 for the two metropolitan areas; 1:800 for the rural-urban areas; half the cost of an average RCMP constable for the preceding year. Those are the criteria.

The criterion for the new grants we are talking about is, we advance the old grant by 11 per cent to arrive at the basic grant. The new grants are then calculated again. On the last census figure, the average cost of an RCMP constable for the preceding year was 1:550 for the metropolitan areas and 1:800 for the rural-urban areas.

MR. GOGO: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, with regard to that question. Is there any city in Alberta other than Calgary that does not measure up to that formula for grants?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, subject to checking, other than Calgary, I'm not aware of any municipality in Alberta that is presently below strength.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the minister. I'd like to ask: then really there has been no change in the criteria as far as this year is concerned, other than the 11 per cent increase.

MR. FARRAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there has been a substantial change. The 11 per cent is added to last

year's dollar figure. The new calculation is again on up-to-date figures for the average cost of a Mounted Policeman — which is obviously higher — for the new population figures, and the same 1:550. But the essential difference is that the extra money is only for policing. It is a cardinal rule that it cannot be diverted to general relief of the mill rate, whereas the first basic grant was unconditional, though it was intended for law enforcement.

#### Airport Fees

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the minister responsible for Calgary affairs. Has the minister been approached by a representative of the Calgary mayor's office concerning the proposal by the city of Edmonton to increase the municipal airport user fee?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, no, I haven't.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to the minister. As the minister for Calgary, will the minister be taking any intervention steps to prevent or support this particular user fee hike?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I understand the question of the increased fee to be a matter within the ambit of the jurisdiction of the city of Edmonton. It would not be my intention to make any representations to them.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. There's some question with regard to the legality of this type of indirect tax.

Will the minister be reviewing municipal taxation legislation to determine whether this type of indirect taxation is lawful?

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the representation from the hon. member, I will certainly cause a legal opinion to be made in that area.

#### Doctors' Fees

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. I have been receiving quite a few inquiries in the mail in regard to extra billing as far as doctors are concerned — that this is being abused, especially for those on low or fixed incomes.

I wonder if the minister can clarify this and inform the House if it is in fact legal.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member, I would say two or three things. First, I would say that extra billing for members of the medical profession in Alberta has existed since medicare began in either 1968 or 1969.

My indications to the Alberta Medical Association in meetings with them were that, in my view, the extra billing was something that should not be abused. It had to be exercised generally in a responsible manner throughout Alberta.

Based on the sample monitoring we are able to do — we haven't got total monitoring, but based on just the reading of complaints we have been receiving,

which might come in by telephone through the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission or in fact to my office — it appears it is a greater problem in certain parts of the province than in others. But the overall situation in Alberta appears to be generally that the extra billing procedure by the medical profession, on a province-wide basis, appears still to be exercised in a responsible manner. I understand it is more difficult in Calgary than in the province generally.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Does the hon. minister acknowledge the fact that the extra billing only occurs in 1, 2, or 3 per cent of the cases, and the patient must in fact be informed well in advance of that happening?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I can't give a percentage of extra billing. We're going generally by the fact that historically — as I repeat again — since medicare began, the medical profession has had the right to extra bill. I have made it clear in unequivocal terms to the Alberta Medical Association and to the medical profession that they must exercise that responsibly, both in terms of the members of the medical profession who are extra billing and in terms of the citizens to whom they are applying the extra bill, such as senior citizens or those least able to afford to pay.

The response of the Alberta Medical Association, which represents the medical profession in Alberta in these kinds of matters, is that they understand and appreciate the government's concern, and that they intend working with their members if in fact an individual member is not exercising it in a responsible manner. That's where the matter sits at the present time.

DR. PAPROSKI: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister please acknowledge that in fact the patient must be informed in advance, and then he has a choice to reject or accept?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member is making representations to the minister, which are really not an appropriate use of the question period.

DR. PAPROSKI: Maybe I could rephrase it, Mr. Speaker, because I think it's important that everybody is aware of what in fact does happen.

Mr. Speaker, would the minister inform the House if he is aware that the medical profession always informs the patients in advance?

MR. MINIELY: I would like to, Mr. Speaker, because it is right. The legislation in Alberta does require that no citizen in Alberta has a responsibility to pay an extra bill if the physician does not advise him in advance. That's correct.

MR. KUSHNER: A supplementary question along the same lines. If it can be justified that the matter is being abused, has the patient any course of appeal?

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the hon. member, but he really is asking for an outright legal opinion, and perhaps that should be done under other circumstances.

The hon. Member for Calgary Mountain View, followed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

MR. KUSHNER: I have no further questions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It was my understanding that in addition to the supplementary, the hon. member had a question he wished to ask.

#### Licensing of Physiotherapists

DR. BUCK: I'd like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health. In light of the fact that Alberta is the only province which does not license its physiotherapists, I would like to know if the hon. minister is considering bringing legislation in to license them.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm under the impression that we do have one act licensing physiotherapists with certain qualifications, though I would check that. I've received representation for additional self-regulating legislation. This is under review by a special committee within the government, which will be making recommendations to the government in that regard.

DR. PAPROSKI: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. In view of the information that physiotherapists are licensed across Canada except in the province, would the minister give this special consideration because this is the only province that doesn't have that provision?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would advise hon. members the submissions being made on behalf of the physiotherapists only line up along with the many other requests we have for legislation. They will all be considered in due course.

DR. PAPROSKI: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I believe the minister does realize this is the only province that doesn't allow licensing or hasn't got licensing provisions.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is repeating a representation which he has already made.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

##### head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview is absent from the House this afternoon. He has asked me, on his behalf, if we would agree — and we do — to his motions for returns No. 139, 140, and 141 standing and retaining their place on the Order Paper and I would so move.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree to the motion by the hon. Acting Government House Leader?



HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Motion carried]

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I would move that the following motions for returns on the Order Paper stand and retain their place on the Order Paper. They are as follows: 118, 123, 129, 130, 131, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 142, 143, and 144.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the hon. Acting Government House Leader might provide the table staff with a list, in case we've missed some of the numbers. Have the hon. members the numbers sufficiently in their memories to deal with the motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it the Assembly accepts the motion.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Motion carried]

128. Dr. Buck proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

1. Costs incurred for the use of provincial government owned, rented, or leased aircraft during the period between May 15, 1975, and November 12, 1975, on flights for the purpose of transportation of:
  - (a) cabinet ministers and assistants;
  - (b) deputy ministers and assistants; and
  - (c) all other government personnel.
2. Identification of each provincial government owned, rented, or leased aircraft making each flight and identity of government personnel involved in each flight, covering the period between May 15, 1975, and November 12, 1975.
3. The same information requested for (1) and (2), covering the period between November 13, 1975, and February 29, 1976.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend Motion for a Return No. 128 to read under item 2:

Identification of each provincial government owned, rented, or leased aircraft making each flight and identity of the primary passenger for each flight, covering the period between May 15, 1975 and November 12, 1975.

MR. CLARK: The hon. minister is moving the amendment. Why does the minister feel it necessary to insert the words "primary passenger"?

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that on flights like these, the Ministry of Transport of the federal government only requires the name of the primary passenger. When a flight was taken, say, by a government official and his directors or branch directors, those names were sometimes not listed.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, might I just simply ask the minister: isn't it the government's practice to keep

the lists of the people in the log? Why couldn't we make them available?

MR. SCHMID: Yes, a log is being kept every time a government aircraft is flying, but since the question also refers to leased aircraft, I understand that's where that comes in. The leasing company usually only inserts the primary aircraft passenger, according to my understanding.

[Motion carried]

145. Dr. Buck proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the Assembly do issue for a return showing:

All moneys paid by the Government of Alberta to Les Mabbot between September 1, 1971, and December 31, 1975 including:

- (1) each government position occupied,
- (2) amount of money paid when employed in each position,

(3) appropriation number of each payment.

[Motion carried]

#### head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

1. Dr. Buck proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the Government of Alberta to introduce legislation which would limit the amount of Alberta land which can be purchased and held by non-residents of Alberta.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this motion, I have made several pleas in this Assembly to the hon. members of this Legislature that there's a serious problem in Alberta as it relates in many cases to the buying of prime agricultural land by non-Canadians. I have tried to indicate to the hon. members on the government side how serious the problem is. I always seem to get our typical Conservative government promise that something will be done, and as typical Conservative government promises, nothing seems to be getting done.

Mr. Speaker, as the hon. Member for Drumheller said so eloquently, we all, or nearly all of us, came to this province, to this country, from some foreign land. But most of us came to this country to build our homes, to settle down, and to become Canadian citizens.

The intent of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, is not to limit people coming from other lands to settle in this great province of ours, to become citizens and to engage in agriculture, in industry, in any endeavor that will benefit the people of this province and benefit the man who is going to be working the land.

The concern we have, the concern that many people in Alberta have, is: what is happening to some of this prime agricultural land being bought by non-Canadians? Mr. Speaker, I'm looking forward with great anticipation to the participation of the government members to indicate why the government is not as concerned about this problem as we are.

Mr. Speaker, speaking on this motion, might I be permitted to reflect on a bill which I introduced last session on the topic of non-resident land ownership. I'm sorry to see my honorable friend from Edmonton Jasper Place, Mr. Young, is not here, as the hon. member felt I had not tried to bring to the attention of Albertans that there was some alternative.

Since we've discussed that bill, we've all had the benefit of reviewing the report of the Land Use Forum. That report, Mr. Speaker, deals to some degree with the question of land ownership, but it concentrates mainly on whether non-residents or foreigners should be permitted to own any Alberta land.

The report rightly concludes, in my opinion, that no complete prohibition of land ownership should be placed against non-residents. I have made this same statement on a number of occasions. However, what I have added to that statement, with some conviction I hope, is that dealing especially with agricultural land, there should be a limit on the amount of land which can be owned and controlled by any individual not resident in this province. For the information of the hon. Member for Edmonton Meadowlark, the limit which I have advocated is a maximum of 640 acres for any non-resident. In my constituency of Clover Bar, we've seen a situation where in excess of 3,000 acres of agricultural land has been purchased by non-resident interests.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to the members of the Legislature and the people of this province a case which finally ended up in the Supreme Court of this province. A man had given an option to sell his property — 320 acres — then decided he didn't want to sell this land. Some budding young lawyer had gone ahead and cashed the deposit, so in effect there was a contract. Quite obviously, the man lost his case because a contract had come into force. But the point I'm trying to make is that a man who really was not willing to sell his land to a non-Canadian, to a foreign interest, was forced by that contract to sell his land.

Mr. Speaker, I know we cannot protect people against their ignorance of the law and the fact that the man in the first instance was interested in selling, then decided against it. But the point I'm trying to make is that it did go into the hands of non-Canadians, into foreign ownership. So we have another 3,000 acres of prime agricultural land taken out of the hands of not only Albertans but Canadians.

Because of the speculative nature of this type of land purchase, the cost of farmland has far outstripped its value in relation to productive capacity. It can be argued that other factors enter into rising costs. But it's my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the massive purchase of land by non-residents is one of the major factors in inflated land costs here. When agricultural land with a limited productive capacity sells for several hundred dollars above its productive ability, there is definitely something wrong.

It's quite interesting to find that the Agricultural Development Corporation is being very, very hesitant about some of its loans. When you're going to go into land where quite fierce competition from non-Canadians buying in the area has forced the price of land up, when the application comes to ADC, the board rightfully, in its wisdom, says to the farmer making the application: no, we will not grant you a

loan in that area because the cost of that land is so high there's just no way you can repay this loan. I compliment them on their business acumen, but I certainly must lay part of the blame on the fact that this occurs in the hands of the government. They've made no effort to try to limit the amount of land being bought by non-Canadians.

The fact that much of this land is taken out of the hands of Albertans and non-Canadians places this land in a speculative position and really limits the amount of land this budding young farmer, or even a neighbor in the area trying to establish a viable economic unit — it limits him from going in and buying that land, because its speculative value has been increased by the outside capital coming in.

Mr. Speaker, within 25 miles of the city of Edmonton a transaction is going on right now. A large block of land is going up for sale. An Alberta citizen has offered \$310,000 for this property. The owners of this property are now trying to back out of this deal because they've had an offer by non-residents for \$125,000 above that price. So that's the type of situation the Alberta buyer is placed in and the type of competition he's competing with.

Mr. Speaker, we have a problem. I'm trying to bring to the attention of government members and members of the front bench that there is a problem and we want some action. This government has pledged its support for the preservation of the family farm. We heard this over and over and over in 1970 and 1971. Mr. Speaker, I take this to mean the family farms owned and operated largely by Albertans — that's what I consider the Alberta family farm. The wholesale purchases of land by non-residents don't really seem to be reconciled with that concept. It doesn't seem so to me.

The government has repeatedly stated that it can't act in a hasty manner to stop speculative purchases of land, and the people of Alberta are painfully aware of government inaction in this area and others. In five years this government has taken little direct action to solve the problems created by non-resident land purchases. It established the renowned Land Use Forum to study all aspects of land use in Alberta. And it is committed to a full and complete study of the Forum's recommendations.

But it's a mystery to me and to my colleagues that with the government's apparent recognition of the importance of the land-use issue, it has chosen to introduce study of the Forum report as a private member's motion, which will probably come forward for debate no more than two or three times during the entire length of this session. I would have thought it should have been brought in as a government motion, because it should have that type of prime importance and top priority. The government has also established, through The Land Titles Act, a monitoring process to determine the citizenship of individual and corporate purchasers of land. In that legislation a loophole has been included which permits the Attorney General to grant corporations exemptions from that requirement if he thinks it's wise to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we have tried without success to find out from members of the civil service in the appropriate departments how much land this process has monitored. Mr. Speaker, we will have to ask [for this] information in a motion for a return, because it is not forthcoming. So I assure the honorable government

members that in a motion for a return we will be asking for the number of acres sold to non-Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, we received some interesting observations on the question of the importance of the issue of non-resident and/or foreign land purchases. For example, this quote comes from the Federation of Alberta Naturalists that the hon. members have received, in reference to the Land Use Forum report:

Foreign ownership . . . has been dismissed as unimportant, it was pointed out that only 2 per cent of Alberta's farmland is under foreign ownership. However as only 17 per cent of Alberta's land is arable this 2 per cent is a [very] significant amount.

When we look at it in this context.

The price of our land is raised by the peddling of large acreages on the foreign market, thus [we are] raising the price of land to Albertans.

The quote from the Federation of Alberta Naturalists — a respected organization, I might add, Mr. Speaker — demonstrates concern for this very real problem.

In another area another group of concerned Albertans, the western Canada division of the Christian Farmers Federation, is even more direct in its assessment. The Christian Farmers state:

That legislation be passed which prohibits the sale of agricultural land to non-resident foreigners. Albertans are concerned about this problem.

As members of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, we are concerned about this problem. Many Albertans are trying to make their concerns known to the government. I'm sure members of the Assembly, especially in rural areas, have had representation bringing this concern to them.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Christian Farmers Federation when it says in its submission: "Although the amount of land owned by non-residents may be small now, this ought not to lull us into an aura of complacency." It is widely known that the numbers of acres being bought by non-Canadians is increasing. This serves to drive the price of land up.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure we all remember the Premier's statement last December on the subject of absentee ownership of land. That statement indicated concern by the government over this issue. The Premier said on that occasion that members should be fully acquainted with the issue so

they could consider the possible nature of restrictions upon land acquisition, and what exceptions might be valid in contemplation of the government introducing legislation in the House after we reconvene in 1976.

Mr. Speaker, we are still waiting for that type of legislation. We haven't seen this legislation on land use. When we do see it, Mr. Speaker, I trust it will have some areas of possible restriction on land acquisition as alluded to by the Premier over three months ago.

Mr. Speaker, I say to hon. members, I welcome their participation. I hope the question of the concerns being expressed to us on this side of the House and to members on the government side will come to light in the debate of this resolution. Mr. Speaker, we think it's a problem. The people out in the areas that are affected think it's a problem. And we're looking forward to government members indi-

cating to us if they think it's a problem.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few comments in respect to the resolution proposed by the hon. Member for Clover Bar. I regret that I missed the first few moments of his remarks. But in view of the specificity — or lack thereof — of what he said in the conclusion of his remarks, I don't think I missed very much. Regrettably, the resolution is very vague. I should like to comment on a couple of aspects which appear from the face of the resolution to contradict my views as to how we as legislators and Albertans should react.

The resolution refers to the introduction of "legislation which would limit the amount of Alberta land which can be purchased and held by non-residents of Alberta". I think we must pay particular attention to the last few words, which refer to non-residents of Alberta. I would suggest, in view of the fact that we are in the position where we can and already have debated the Land Use Forum recommendations, there is ample opportunity to debate this issue. In fact, it has been debated at some length by members on both sides of the House. The opportunity is certainly there to make our points of view known with respect to the ownership of land.

The hon. Member for Clover Bar referred to a statement by the Premier. Of course, it referred to legislation which might come before the House in 1976. But it would be completely premature and redundant to bring forward legislation on that issue without first having received and studied the Land Use Forum report. We are now doing that. I would suggest that the hon. Member for Clover Bar be patient. If he listens carefully, he will hear a lot on this subject — not only on the subject of the Land Use Forum, but in fact, when legislation comes forward.

Just a review of the subject with regard to foreign ownership of land. There are two things I think we should take a look at: the question of agricultural land, and the question of ownership of recreational land, which basically fits in the same category. Then there's the type of land ownership within residential and commercial areas such as cities, towns, and so on. I think we should take a different sort of look at those two types of land.

But if I may, I want to address my remarks to the question of ownership of agricultural land. This is an area of concern to me, coming as I do from the southeastern corner of this province, situated very close to the Saskatchewan border. I'd like to relate to the members of the House some of the experiences Albertans have encountered as the result of legislation passed across the border in our sister province of Saskatchewan.

I'm aware that at the present time, under the interpretation set out by the Supreme Court of Canada, it is not within the jurisdiction of provinces to deal with the question of foreign land ownership, other than to restrict that ownership to residents within the jurisdiction of the legislatures of each province. But we are also aware that the Government of Canada has agreed, in consultation with the various provinces, to allow the governments to deal with foreign land ownership questions. Appropriate amendments to the Canadian Citizenship Act have been promised and will be forthcoming, to

permit us to deal with that question. Mr. Speaker, until that is done, I would suggest it would be largely futile to bring forward legislation. That's one of the reasons the House has not yet seen legislation before it.

Nevertheless, we should discuss some aspects of the question at this time so all members of the House have an opportunity. One thing I wish to state quite clearly in the beginning of my remarks is that I totally disagree with the concept set out in this motion that we introduce legislation to limit the amount of Alberta land which can be purchased and held by non-residents of Alberta, without saying residents of Canada.

I am an Albertan. I was born in this province. I am now a legislator in this province. I'm proud of being an Albertan. But first and foremost — and I think this applies to members on both sides of the House — I'm proud of being a Canadian. I have ties with relatives in Saskatchewan, British Columbia, the maritimes, and all other parts of this country except the province of Quebec — and I'm not too sure about that, although my family has been in this country now for 200 years. The fact of the matter is, I do not believe that we, as Albertans, want to see restrictions placed upon other Canadians — whether they live in the maritimes or British Columbia — on owning land or being able to come into this province and be as good Canadians here as they are elsewhere.

So I reject the concept that we deal only with non-residents of Alberta, as indicated by the intention of the motion. After all, Mr. Speaker, aside from the native Canadians, we have all been immigrants to Canada within a relatively short period of time. I say, people who live in foreign countries are welcome to come to this country and bring with them their families, their skills, their money, to live here and become Canadians.

I reject the concept that we, as Albertans, should be so narrow-minded as to think we would reject other Canadians, from whatever part of the country they may come, or reject people from any part of the world who qualify under the Canadian citizenship law from coming into this country as landed immigrants to take part in the life of our country, including the right to own land. I reject that concept, and I hope that whatever legislation comes forward, we will make sure we do not restrict other residents of Canada [from] ownership of land.

I [will] just make a brief reference to the question of the Saskatchewan legislation with respect to ownership of agricultural land. I referred to it briefly before, Mr. Speaker, and I have had some experience in dealing with this subject, coming as I do from what I consider to be a border area. The ownership of Saskatchewan farmland is restricted. I don't have the exact citation of that particular piece of Saskatchewan legislation, although I have read and reviewed it. I have had to do [so] in Medicine Hat because many of my constituents live in Medicine Hat but own farmlands on both sides of the Alberta-Saskatchewan border.

If they have their primary residence or their home in Alberta, they are now finding themselves faced with some very difficult situations: first of all, in not being able to acquire farmland to add to what they may already own as part of their family farm units; secondly, in being required, gradually over a period of

time, to dispose of some of their farm holdings in Saskatchewan.

It's wreaking a real hardship on people who have been farming in the same manner, in the same general area, since the turn of the century or even before. It is dividing up economic farm units. It's dividing up families, in the case of second generations and what have you, requiring one son to take the part of the land which lies within Saskatchewan, and the other the part of the land which lies within the province of Alberta. I suggest that type of legislation is interfering with the proper management of the family farms I have observed in my part of the country. I'm sure all hon. members who reside near the Saskatchewan border can cite similar experiences and difficulties of their constituents.

When I first read that piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, it was before my election to this House. I made up my mind when I read it that, if I ever had the opportunity to do so publicly, I would speak against that concept, as I do today. As a member of this Legislature, I can assure all hon. members of the House that I will do everything I can to resist the same type of legislation being introduced into this House and passed, to affect the lives of people in adjoining provinces.

One other point I would like to mention relates to the policies which are already in existence, and have been for many years, under this government and its predecessors. That relates to the question of Crown lands, and grazing leases in particular. It is quite clear, and has been for many years, that it is not possible for foreigners to hold such grazing leases.

I suggest this has been a wise policy, which has been commented on already in the House in relation to the debate on the Land Use Forum, and is referred to therein as well. That policy, implemented by previous governments, has been followed by this government. There is no intention I have ever heard of any suggestion to change that policy, nor could I support such a policy.

I'm not suggesting for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that the administration of the lands branch is perfect. I have made suggestions with regard to the question of their lease assignment policies with respect to fees charged and that type of thing. But I have never suggested, nor would I ever, that we should open up to foreigners the assignment of grazing leases in this province. I mean by that non-Canadians, not non-Albertans.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, may I say that I cannot support the motion in its present form, although I appreciate the concern expressed by the mover of the motion. I suggest that the motion is premature, because we don't have the legislation before us, and we have very good reason for not having any such legislation before us.

We did not have the Land Use report until just recently. Nor, as I understand, do we yet have the right, pursuant to the federal government's responsibility under the Canadian Citizenship Act, to allow the Government of Alberta to deal with this question, without introducing the type of legislation which would restrict land ownership in this province solely to Albertans, as opposed to Canadians.

If we're going to implement any policies, I wish it to be quite clear, Mr. Speaker, that I would only support land ownership policies restrictive to non-Canadians,

and not just to non-Albertans as this motion would appear to indicate. In view of the fact that we are already discussing this matter under the Land Use Forum resolution, also on the Order Paper, the motion is redundant.

May I just [refer to] a comment made by the hon. Member for Clover Bar with regard to why the Land Use Forum was introduced as a private member's resolution. I suggest that he refer to the remarks made during that report, during that debate, and also to the Government House Leader's remarks to the effect that this resolution may be called a number of times during this session of the Legislature, to allow the fullest opportunity for all members to participate in the debate. In fact, it has been called on more than one occasion so far, and I have not noticed or heard anyone complain to date that they have not had an opportunity to take part in the debate on that motion, on the Order Paper in the name of Mr. Kidd.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the resolution in its present form, as I believe it to be too vague, redundant, and the other word I had was premature.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I thought I might just say a few words on the resolution the Member for Clover Bar brought forward this afternoon, even though I adjourned the Land Use Forum [debate]. I hope to have an opportunity to express a few words on that particular report at a later date.

The resolution the Member for Clover Bar has brought in deals in a small way with some of the recommendations of the Land Use Forum, except that his resolution would do two things. It would limit the amount of land a non-resident of Alberta could purchase. Secondly, it deals with other Canadians. The Land Use [Forum] deals more specifically with ownership by those other than Canadians.

I'm inclined to agree with the position the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff has taken. It's certainly undesirable, from my point of view, to restrict ownership of land in a province within the confederation of provinces in Canada only to those in Alberta. I don't know whether the Member for Clover Bar intended it this way or if he was really referring to those other than Canadians. It might have been an oversight on his part.

This whole question of land use and the problems that have occurred in the province of Alberta [in] the last few years — the last five perhaps — have to do with more than foreign ownership and foreign money. I often ask myself the question: why is it that money is coming in from other parts of the world particularly to purchase land in Alberta? The statistics we are compiling at the Land Titles Office indicate that it's not a significant amount. However, it may be fairly significant in terms of the arable land in the province. Not only that, it may not necessarily monitor — which is a very difficult thing to do — where the money is coming from, because it can't locate that source.

When I try to assess why the money is coming in here, I start thinking about the other countries of the world. If I had money to invest, I would invest it where it would probably bring me the greatest return and be the safest investment. I think the first thing we would look for, Mr. Speaker, is a country, or in this case a province, which has a good, stable kind of

government. I suppose we could say that about the former government in Alberta too. Certainly, over the past number of years, we've had a pretty good, stable kind of government. We haven't been dealing with revolutions or some of the things that are going on in some other parts of the world. So that would be a number one consideration. You look for a country in the world where you have some kind of reasonable, stable government.

In this respect, I think you look somewhere where they have a democratic kind of government — which is what we have — a government where we have members in government, members in opposition; where we discuss freely and openly with the public and all the people we represent the directions we are going; where we are subject to criticism by opposition and self-criticism. And we get our share of criticism by the media. This is where one would look for investment.

You can only look at a number of other countries in the world — South America is a classic example where I understand just yesterday there was another upset in Argentina and where inflation is running something like 300 per cent a year. I don't know whether or not they attribute that to the lady who was in charge of the government down there, but she's not in charge today. Whether you can attribute it to that or other factors, there are many other countries in that hemisphere where one would certainly hesitate to invest money.

Take many of the African countries and the situation they find themselves in — at the present time, Rhodesia and the state it's in. It probably has some of the best land in Africa and many parts of the world, but it doesn't have the stable kind of government one would want when investing money within the boundaries. There are many countries in Europe, those behind the Iron Curtain, where no one would want to invest money. No one in there invests money themselves, because they don't have any. There are other parts of the world where the amount of arable land is restricted and limited. In Japan, for example, it would be a practical impossibility to try to invest money in that particular area.

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

So you're looking for a stable area. I repeat, Canada — and particularly Alberta, although maybe I'm a little biased — is probably one of the most favorable parts of the world, in terms of security, in which to invest surplus funds.

Then you look for what you would want to invest your money in. Some people invest it in jewellery. The member from New Norway invests his money in antiques. I'm not reflecting on his wife when I make those remarks, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: He's the antique.

MR. COOKSON: You might invest your money in that sort of thing, or you might invest in bonds. Again, that goes back to the stability of the government, the type of government, and so on. Basically, it seems to me the pressures are coming on this particular area because of the stability we have and because we have a limited resource, which is, I suggest, good arable land.

So I think it's timely to discuss the problem, though I don't think we should stampede ourselves into making a decision. The former Government of British Columbia stampeded themselves into government, then they stampeded themselves into a lot of stupid legislation, and three years later they stampeded themselves out of office. So let's take this as a lesson in this province. I must admit the former government lasted quite a while, Mr. Speaker, but they slowly disintegrated until you have just what you have on the other side of the House.

DR. BUCK: Just the quality, Jack.

MR. COOKSON: It's fairly limited. That is the left side of the House. I want to make that distinction, Mr. Speaker.

So we are not going to, and shouldn't, react too quickly to the kind of recommendations in the Land Use Forum [report]. I know the members opposite, certainly the Member for Clover Bar, would like us to stampede into this. He would like us to box ourselves into a position where it's totally unacceptable to the public. That's their job. I commend him for it. He is doing an excellent job, but he is not winning too well. The reason he isn't winning too well is that we are fairly competent and we seem to be able to assess what his attempt is.

The province of Saskatchewan is another classic example of a province and a government which doesn't seem to be able to comprehend their real responsibility to the people. When they started on this land bank business — I would be very interested in statistics as to just what position they are in. But I can assure members of the Assembly that whenever government gets muddling into third-part contracting, buying land, and starting to negotiate and let it out to private enterprise, I sure would like to be on the end of private enterprise. I haven't yet seen where private enterprise couldn't do a better job and, generally speaking, outmanoeuvre and outnegotiate the government. It's as simple as that.

I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that we'll see the time in Saskatchewan when they either get dumped as an NDP government or reassess their situation with regard to getting involved in buying land and hopefully reselling it to private enterprise. If they don't, they are going to have a bigger deficit than they came up with yesterday. To cover the deficits, they are going to have to double the tax they are assessing against all the luxuries — like food — they now have in Saskatchewan. So let's not have that. What we're trying to do as a government is create an orderly development of the province and carefully assess what land resources we have and what we can best do to protect those resources.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: I wonder if the hon. member would permit the Member for Vegreville to introduce some guests before they leave the Assembly.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. BATIUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It gives me pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Legislature, 25 air cadets from the Two Hills Squadron 728 accompanied by their officers, Mr. Bidulock and Mr. Shipansky. I would ask that they rise and be recognized.

## head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS** (*continued*)

MR. COOKSON: Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I hope the air cadets are able to last until 4:30. I'll give them a little further dissertation on land and how it should be properly used.

What I was trying to say is that foreign investment is probably not our greatest and most serious concern here in Alberta, nor investment by non-residents of Alberta. It could very well be that the speculation in land is due to the people of Alberta themselves. The Member for Clover Bar is a classic example of a profession starting to wander all over looking for some safe way to invest money in case the monetary system collapses or people figure out how to keep their teeth from decaying, or whatever. I have them all over my constituency — not dentists, we could use a few extra down there but . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Move to Lacombe, Walt.

MR. COOKSON: . . . we have a lot of professional people wandering around buying land and they're Albertans. So why are we restricting those just across the border from Alberta? It's a much more complicated and more serious matter than that.

Some suggest, on occasion, that perhaps we should be able to protect people in agriculture the way dentists protect their profession, or doctors or teachers protect theirs. I think, Mr. Speaker, this would be a great place to debate that. I'm not so sure there wouldn't be a 50-50 agreement with that kind of concept. It certainly is in some of the older countries of the world.

We have some young people in our area from Denmark and Holland. I understand in some of those countries now you have to take two to three years in agriculture. You have to apprentice before you can actually practise the profession of agriculture. That's not all bad. Maybe we're not ready for it yet, but when I see some of the people coming onto the good agricultural land in this province under the assumption they're going to be successful farmers, I'm sure they must feel like I would if I had to go into a hospital to take someone's appendix out. It's that much of a contrast.

I see I'm getting some fan mail already . . . I'm good for a while yet, Mr. Speaker, if I have time. Thanks very much for the opportunity, but I'm really just getting warmed up.

Mr. Speaker, there's one thing in the Land Use Forum [report] that I would like to mention before sitting down. When we bring in the new planning act, let's have a serious look at the way in which our

good agricultural land — that's No. 1 soil and the lesser grades — is being dug up and cemented down for other uses. I think, Mr. Speaker, we have to come up with a plan whereby all the people of Alberta in some way or another have an opportunity to express themselves when top agricultural land is being taken out of production.

I can cite a number of situations. Not very long ago at Red Deer, a quarter section was bought by the city. It has two feet of black soil, and bless me, I don't know what's going to happen to the black soil. It'll end up on lawns somewhere, or wash down sewer drains and so on. We can't replace that soil. It takes literally thousands of years to get an inch of topsoil. So we have to look at some way of circumventing the covering of this top, topsoil with cement.

Now, it's maybe not as simple as that. I realize that centres have to grow and our industry has to locate. All I'm suggesting is that we can't leave it up to a particular municipality or particular planning commission to make the judgment decision that yes, that place has to grow so they have to have that quarter for that use, or whatever.

I can't help but continually hammer away at our consumers. We have millions of consumers across Canada. We're all consumers. But we have two major cities here in Alberta which have some of the cheapest food in the world, most of it produced right here in Alberta. I want to make sure they understand clearly that if we lose this topsoil, their food isn't going to be cheap any more. It's as simple as that. They should understand clearly that when a piece of land is taken out of production, likely it will never go back into production again.

One other thing, Mr. Speaker, and I'll leave the rest of my dissertation until the Land Use Forum comes up again. There is a lot of land which is not producing even a fraction of what it can produce. A lot of land could be put into production. We have to take a hard look at this. Let me cite another area near Red Deer which was simply a bog. It produced absolutely nothing but duck muck. It's a great place for the birds in the summer, mostly mud hens, because the migratory birds leave the area. But basically that's all it produced. Now they have stripped that, put in a sewer system, and in effect have changed the use of that land. They're going to use it for housing. Fair ball. They have literally made an unproductive piece of land into a productive piece of property. The thing is complicated. I don't know how in 10 or 15 minutes you can get across the point that it is a complicated thing, it's not simple.

I just want to say again we don't want to be stampeded into any moves we make. I am deeply concerned about foreign ownership of land. Legislation now is coming through the federal government — basically because of the initiation of this government and our Premier — to make it possible for the province to act in that area. Hopefully, I'm going to have an opportunity to express my support for that particular area of land control. I think we have to do a lot of hard thinking before we get stampeded into any action in these other areas.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. member who introduced this resolution can be more specific when he is working on other people's mouths than he is when he is working on his own.

The resolution apparently applies to both urban and rural land. Perhaps that was intended, but the debate of the hon. member who introduced the resolution was devoted entirely to a consideration of the problem as it applies to rural land.

The resolution would limit non-residents of this province who are Canadian citizens, as well as residents or non-residents who are landed immigrants in this country. The effect of it, with respect to its discrimination against Canadian citizens, would be to contribute to the balkanization of this country. With respect to the discrimination that it would apply to landed immigrants, either in this province or other provinces of Canada, it would have a detrimental effect on the development of the province. If we had had this kind of legislation in 1896 when Sir Clifford Sifton was Minister of the Interior and trying to bring people from Europe onto the prairie provinces, this would still be part of the Northwest Territories, and we would still be ruled from Ottawa rather than from here.

Now, the resolution is ambiguous, Mr. Speaker, but that in itself is not fatal. Resolutions are often worded ambiguously by members on both sides of the House in order that some specificity can be given to the theme during the debate. But if you have an ambiguously worded resolution, then I think there is some greater obligation on the part of the mover of the resolution to be specific about what concerns him. I would suggest the fact that the debate of the mover was not specific is one of the primary reasons the hon. gentlemen opposite are opposite, rather than the government. The hon. members opposite are in opposition at least in part, because when they are debating important issues such as this, they do not have — or at least they cannot enunciate — positive alternatives.

I would like to know — and it is obviously not going to be from the gentleman who moved the resolution; therefore, from some of his colleagues — if they can answer these questions, where they would stand on some of these issues. What is going to be the compensation for intervention of the government in the market place as it affects the desire of sellers to get the best possible price for that which they are selling? What is going to be the mechanism for the repatriation of land which is currently foreign-owned? How much are we as a government going to intervene in the market place to recover land presently owned by people who are not residents of Alberta? What are we going to do about land, the ownership of which moves outside the province by virtue of inheritance — the death of someone resident in the province, on whose death the ownership of the land moves outside the province or the country?

Mr. Speaker, the proposed limitations are unworkable. The entire territory of this province can as surely fall into the hands of foreigners at 640 acres a shot, as it can at 2,000 or 5,000 acres a shot. The only difference, of course, is that it's going to take a little longer, or that it's going to involve more foreigners. The limitation of allowing non-residents to own 640 acres of our land at a time has no effect whatsoever in the long term on the problem about which we are expressing such concern.

It may well be that an outright prohibition on the ownership of land by non-residents of this province is

the only answer to the problem in the long term. So I would like to ask one of the hon. gentlemen opposite if, when he speaks, he would tell us what he thinks about an outright prohibition. How are we going to differentiate between the limitations that will be imposed on urban land as opposed to agricultural land, or recreational land as opposed to agricultural land, or industrial land as opposed to recreational land? The value and significance of 30 acres of land devoted to an industrial purpose may be greater than the effect of 640 acres of land owned agriculturally.

The resolution says we would limit ownership of land by non-residents of this province, and thereby appears to reject explicitly the concern expressed by all the first ministers of Canada at their conference last year. They said the resolution to the problem lay in a co-operative venture which would allow Canadians to own land in any province of the country and would selectively deal with non-resident non-Canadians, non-landed immigrants. I would like to know if the hon. members opposite reject the concern expressed by the first ministers at that meeting. The resolution obviously rejects the recommendation of the Land Use Forum that the best way to achieve our goal would be by co-operation with the federal government in the administration of the Foreign Investment Review Act and its regulations. I would like to know if, by this resolution, the hon. gentlemen opposite are rejecting the recommendation of the Alberta Land Use Forum.

The Government of Canada has introduced amendments to the Citizenship Act, Bill C-20, which is presently in committee stage. Among the amendments to the Citizenship Act is one which would allow a co-operative venture between the federal government and the provinces individually to control this problem. I would like to ask the hon. gentlemen opposite if, by this resolution, they are rejecting the initiative of the federal government directed towards a co-operative settlement of this problem.

Mr. Speaker, by placing the item on the agenda of the first ministers' conference last fall, and by his statements in this Legislature, the Premier expressed quite explicitly the concern which the government and each member of the government has for the problem. By its consideration of the report of the Alberta Land Use Forum, and by correspondence with the federal government subsequent to the receipt of that report, the government has demonstrated that it continues to be concerned about the problem — more concerned today than three months ago, not less concerned. It is not enough to express concern about a problem such as this. What is required is: if you are unhappy with the initiatives that are proceeding, if you are unhappy with the pace of those initiatives, we on this side of the House would like to know what alternatives you have to propose.

In the wording of this resolution and in the debate which has come to us from the opposition to this point, it appears only that you have rejected the initiatives of the first ministers, that you have rejected the recommendation of the Land Use Forum, that you have rejected the initiatives of the federal government, and that, having rejected all the initiatives undertaken to this point, you have not one constructive alternative to propose to the Legislature or to the people. Mr. Speaker, in my view, that is simply not satisfactory. I think something better than

this must be done.

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

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, with regard to business from this point on, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview advised me yesterday he would be away today, and asked that his Bill No. 211 be allowed to stand and retain its place on the Order Paper. The same is the case with regard to the Member for Stony Plain, who is away ill today. I would ask leave of the Assembly to have Bills No. 211 and 220 stand and retain their place on the Order Paper, which would mean we go to Bill No. 201 at this time.

MR. ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### head: **PUBLIC BILLS AND ORDERS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT ORDERS**

##### **Bill No. 201 An Act Respecting Body-Rub Parlours and Nude Parlours**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in moving second reading of Bill 201, An Act Respecting Body-Rub Parlours and Nude Parlours.

The first thing I would like to do is outline the need for this type of legislation. At one time in other cities, this matter was looked upon as a very light item and not very important. In one of the major cities of Canada, Toronto, the nude body-rub parlors became very extensive. There were actually more than 50 within two or three blocks on Yonge Street in Toronto. The city was plagued with a multitude of nude body-rub parlors and businesses offering nude photography, nude ping-pong, nude dancing, and even nude meditation. Anything that could be done nude was apparently being done on Yonge Street in Toronto, until finally the provincial government and the metropolitan government of Toronto had to deal with the matter because of irate citizens, and legislation was brought in. Since that time, the matter has been controlled considerably, and now they do have authority to do a number of the things we are asking be done in this particular bill.

So Mr. Speaker, this bill is actually endeavoring to save Alberta a bad experience that a city like Toronto, and to a lesser extent Winnipeg, has already had. This bill will give the municipalities in Alberta the necessary muscle to deal with this matter before it becomes a serious problem.

In connection with the bill, I would first of all like to point out that there are three printing errors in the bill. In the first place, on the first page the word "manipulating" is misspelled. In the explanatory notes, "Yonge Street" is misspelled. And on the last page, it should be Section 10, not Section 11 as in the bill. If the hon. members would note those printing errors, it may save difficulties in studying the bill.



Mr. Speaker, is there any need for this type of bill now? Is this a problem in Alberta? Well, I can say it's a bigger problem today than it was a year ago, and a far greater problem than it was five years ago in this province. It appears that as some of the places have had to fold up in places like Toronto and Winnipeg, [it] has led these people to look around Canada to find a lucrative place to set up their shingles. Many are looking at Alberta. I just want to outline how extensive this trade has already become in Alberta, in our major cities.

I point first of all to the city of Calgary, and I'm just going by advertisements that appear in some of the newspapers. I counted the number of body-rub parlors and massage parlors in the city of Calgary that were advertised in one of the Calgary papers. I found that in this one newspaper, which is a recent one, 18 establishments were already advertising in the city of Calgary — and 18 is quite a number.

Now if you consider that this is not a serious problem with 18, when Toronto had 50 it was a very, very serious problem. Immediately you may say: why don't the sections of the Criminal Code look after this problem? Why is that Code not sufficient? Well, in the first place, it's an awkward thing to deal with. The Criminal Code, in my view, is not explicit enough. There are too many shortcomings in the Criminal Code to really deal with this problem quickly and definitely. So that is one of the reasons we introduced this bill.

I want to refer to one or two of the advertisements that appeared in the paper. I'm not going to give the names of the advertisements. If the members want those, they'll have to check the newspaper ads themselves. I don't want to give them any particular advertising. But I do want to indicate the type of business with which we're dealing.

Here's one that says: "Spring special, compliments, your choice, tub bath massage, steam sauna, facial or suntan treatment with any of our massages". The part I outlined is the tub bath massage, which obviously is in the nude, I would hope.

The next one is: "For the ultimate in massage, choose from one of our many girls". Another one: "Swedish French massage with bubble bath by . . ." and then they give the various names of the girls, ". . . special double massage, \$35, 10 a.m. till 1 a.m."

Another one: "Massage . . ." well, these are just simply massages, ". . . your downtown relaxation centre, five attractive masseuses". Here's another one: "Japanese Swedish French massage with bubble bath by . . ." and it gives the girls' names; ". . . try our special double massage, \$35, 11 a.m. to 1 a.m." And so the advertisements go, but there are 18 of them.

Now here's a dandy that may appeal to many people: "The finest massage parlor in western Canada is a claim that takes confidence to make, but at . . ." and then they give their name, ". . . we back it up with a dozen beautiful girls, \$100,000 spent on luxurious facilities, and their main interest is only in making you feel marvellous; although we are not a bargain, we offer luxury you can afford, with day-time specials starting at only \$5, with giant whirlpools, showers, sauna, and refreshments in your custom-designed harem lounge; all free with oil, with girl sessions; ladies and girls by appointment".

Another one: "Lovely mermaids in plush privacy, for a massage you'll never forget"; and, "An action massage with attractive college girls, only \$10".

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member intended tabling that information so we could all have a look.

MR. TAYLOR: I didn't hear what the hon. member said.

MR. COOKSON: Was it the intention of the member to table that information so it would be available to all the members?

MR. TAYLOR: No, the intention was to prove to all members that this is becoming a serious problem, and it's going to become more serious if we don't get some legislation to control it in our municipalities.

Now in the city of Edmonton — I'm going to read just one or two, to show that the problem isn't only in Calgary. There were only six in this particular paper, but I have seen papers with several more than six in them. Here's one of the messages from Calgary: "We wish to welcome you; try something unique, a massage with us at popular prices . . ." and the phone number, ". . . between 1 p.m. and 3 a.m., 24-hour service by appointment".

Two others are all I'm going to read: "Here's the first massage parlor of Edmonton . . ." and they have a special name, I don't know what the name means, ". . . masseuses, masseurs from France, Canada, Europe; for men and women, first-class visiting service to hotels and motels, 6 p.m. to 4 a.m., discreet and refined, open 24 hours from Monday till Saturday, ample free parking". And another one: "Come to the leading massage parlor, restricted adults, open 24 hours a day, gentleman's adventure".

So there are 24 advertisements already appearing almost daily in the newspapers of Alberta. Then we come to the special advertisements that go about the country, and there they have it too. One says: "If you have never been in Edmonton before, it is possible you don't know us yet, so call us at . . . abandon yourself to true luxury, open 24 hours a day, in private massage, French Swedish Oriental massage; attractive masseuses from France, Canada, and Europe; first-class visiting service to hotels and motels".

And if you want one other one, it's the last that I'll read: "Special massage. If you want one of our European massages by a beautiful girl at a reasonable price, call us now, she will be at your door in minutes; open 24 hours a day".

Well, this is growing. I had a call from a person who is a registered physiotherapist and who was quite concerned about the growing number of these types of parlors. She thought it was bringing some disgrace on her because she operated a good legitimate business. I don't know whether these are all legitimate or not. From the advertisements and the hours they operate — to 3 a.m. and 4 a.m., with house calls to motels at 3 a.m. — one questions whether they're completely legitimate. To permit something like this to start without any control, or practically no control, is simply asking for trouble down the road.

I'd like to deal with the way this bill deals with it.

It's not saying that adults in this province can't go to this type of massage parlor, if they wish to do so. Not at all. We don't want the government telling adults where they can go, what they can see, and so on. People should be aware of that and have the right to do that. But there should be some control so that innocent people are not brought into the control of this type of thing.

In the definitions, I'm now going to outline some of the provisions of the bill so we can see whether it goes beyond what the Criminal Code is actually doing. In my view, as an enforcement of this type of thing, the Criminal Code has failed and has failed miserably. The first thing, "body-rub" is defined. It should be defined. [It should be] known exactly what it is and what it excludes. It simply means "kneading, manipulating, rubbing, massaging," physical stimulation. It excludes medical and therapeutic treatment given by a qualified, licensed, or registered person. I think that should be emphasized. It does not include medical and therapeutic treatment given by a qualified, licensed, or registered person.

Also, this is one of the difficulties in the Criminal Code: what is "nude"? In the early days in Toronto, I understand some of the men and women who were operating in these parlors, in order to get around the word "nude", would put a Band-Aid on some part of their bodies. The rest of them would be completely undressed. A Band-Aid on their finger would show they were not completely nude. That, of course, is ridiculous. So in this bill we define "nude". With no clothes of any kind except a Band-Aid on her neck she was not considered nude. In this bill, [he or] she is definitely considered nude if he or she is not wearing clothes, and you can see the actual definition of "nude". I think [this] is a good move in regard to legislation, because it is not defined in the Criminal Code of Canada. For some reason, they shied away from saying what "nude" really means. Consequently, it's wide open and leads to this ridiculous situation where a Band-Aid on an otherwise naked body is considered "not nude". A nude parlor is also defined. Again, the establishments where they have registered therapeutic or medical treatment are excluded from the act.

Now what control does it give to the municipality? Because that's where the control should rest. The authority of the municipality is done by by-law. They will have authority to license. They will have authority to limit the number. The municipality will have authority to locate it so we don't have them all in one place — for instance, in Toronto, within two or three blocks of Yonge Street; or in Edmonton, within two or three blocks of Jasper Avenue; or in Calgary, within two or three blocks of 8 or 9 Avenue. The city council can locate them. Again, the city council has the authority to revoke a licence if these things become something other than good massage parlors. So the authority of the municipality is set out in simple, strong language, giving them authority to control this type of business operation.

Now there are other methods too. What if a person with a criminal record of child molestation or rape wanted to open one of these establishments? Under the Criminal Code there's nothing to stop the person from doing that. In this bill the authority is given to the municipality to look into the criminal record of the owners and operators. If that criminal record looks

bad enough, they can refuse a licence, or they can say the licence will be issued only if you have reputable people operating and running your establishment. I think this is important, that we don't open the door for known criminals or thugs who have been convicted maybe a number of times for moral offences and who then use that establishment to make contacts for ulterior purposes. This is not a light item, Mr. Speaker. This is an important item, because many contacts made in this type of establishment by young people can mean the downfall or the destruction of a young life.

Another item. Have you noticed advertising in the paper about coming to your home any time between 4 p.m. and 3 a.m., or to your hotel or motel room? This bill takes a pretty dim view of that type of procedure. The bill sets out definitely that the licence is for operation on the premises only. Not in a motel, not in a hotel, not in a private home, but on the licensed premises. That's where the licence applies, solely to that particular premise. I think that again is a very strong point in this particular bill.

Again we have another point in connection with the licence fees. Now, this point isn't quite as strong as it would have been a year ago. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs brought in legislation last fall which permits the municipalities now, by by-law, to prescribe different licence fees, to classify businesses, and to set out the hours a place may stay open. So that part now is really superfluous in this act. It's covered in The Municipal Government Act. I can compliment the minister on bringing that type of legislation before the House. It had been needed for a long time. This act, however, goes one step further and sets a fee of up to \$1,000 for this type of business. Now when we talk about that being a heavy taxation or a heavy licence, I think this type of business should be licensed heavily. I make no apologies for municipalities to charge that large licence fee. A legitimate place, with a different classification of licence fees, can certainly be treated fairly under that section.

Another item. Two summers ago when I was in Toronto, I noticed the mass of literature handed to you as you walk down Yonge Street. On one occasion, I had at least nine or 10 pieces of literature when I walked about four or five blocks. That literature is being given to all and sundry — given to youngsters 10, 11, 12 years of age, teenagers 13, 14, 15, to all ages. They simply pass them out, because they get a commission on how many they give out. The more they give out, the better it is. The wording on some of that literature was very questionable indeed and certainly in very bad taste. I wouldn't want some of it to be handed to my sister, or my mother, or, if I were married, to my wife, or even to some boys. It certainly wasn't a very good type of literature.

So this bill tightens up on that particular aspect. The literature has to be approved. Their advertising must be approved. This regulates the advertising material, the content of that material, and to whom it shall be given. I think this type of thing should be. If the operators don't have enough sense to do that, then the law should make sure they do.

Now, in connection with inspection, here's another very strong point in the bill. The inspection goes beyond what the Criminal Code does. The Criminal

Code requires a search warrant. A police officer may know certain illegitimate things or certain immoral things are going on in a certain establishment. By the time he gets a search warrant, everything is over.

It's like a few years ago. We used to say a policeman couldn't [give] a breathalyzer test at the time because a person had certain rights. Well, by the time you got a warrant to [give] a breathalyzer test, the chap would be sober, maybe stone sober. It was a ridiculous law. Eventually we changed the law and gave the police the right to [give] a breathalyzer test at the site where the person has [given] some indication he is intoxicated or inebriated. This is the same type of thing.

If something is going wrong in one of these places, if instead of a proper massage parlor it becomes a place of nudity or a cathouse and so on, the police officer would soon be able to step in at the right moment and make arrests, and properly so. Let the court hear the case. A health officer or a police officer can go into these establishments at any time, and I think this is a strong point. I don't think it's breaking anybody's rights.

Surely we have the right in this country to expect decency in our business premises. If that standard is not being upheld, why should we apologize for the police having authority to step in? What if a 16 year old boy or girl gets enticed, or for some other reason is found in this place, and the police officer saw the youngster going in? Do we want to ruin that life while they go and get a search warrant? By that time he is in and out, and maybe the seeds of destruction have gone into his life. But if the police officer can step in immediately, there is a much better chance of saving a life from being destroyed.

There is a quite a heavy penalty for a business taking juveniles in — anybody under 18. Fines go from \$200 to \$500 plus six months in jail, or both, if the court thinks it's serious enough. There is also a penalty for those under 18 years of age if they themselves produce false identification or false records to show they are 18 when, in fact, they are not. There is also a penalty for them where they can be fined from \$50 to \$200. It's an offence to operate one of these massage parlors without a licence: \$1,000 fine to a year in jail, or both. It is also an offence to operate off the premises, which is, I think, a very important item in this type of business, so there is a penalty for that, too.

Mr. Speaker, what I want to emphasize today is that this bill is not premature. This bill is required in this country now, if we're going to prevent a number of things from happening that may very well happen. I want to emphasize again that by delaying it and saying we don't need it yet . . . I'm going to ask the hon. members how many lives might be destroyed by some of these establishments which are already advertising that they'll come to your motel at 3 a.m. or are offering questionable services inside their establishments today with particular methods of preventing police from getting in until they can warn all customers, and so on. This type of thing may very well destroy lives and build the type of society we don't want.

Even though we live in a period where less consideration is given to high morals among our people, I don't think the people of Alberta or the people of Canada want this type of thing to run

rampant. Certainly, I think the majority would probably say there is a proper place for this type of parlor. Well, let it be properly licensed, let it be properly controlled, let's know what's going on. Let's make sure we're not going to give the opportunity for the destruction of young lives in this country.

By passing this bill now, we will put into the hands of our city councils, particularly our major cities like Calgary and Edmonton where this is becoming a problem day by day, the ability or the law with which they can control — pass by-laws and do whatever else is necessary to control these, to locate them, to make sure they are not going to overrun the city, and to make sure they are properly conducted. Mr. Speaker, this type of legislation in my view is very important.

Let's not make the mistake of Toronto and Winnipeg by saying, it's not a problem, we'll wait until it is. No one will be able to say how many lives have been ruined or partially ruined in Toronto and Winnipeg because legislators failed to take the step to deal with this moral issue while there was time to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I have great pleasure in moving second reading of Bill 201.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on this bill. Just examining the present situation, I don't think there is anything wrong with encouraging body-rub parlors by the use of advertising such as spring specials, suntan rubs, and tub experiences, advertising the hours. I'm quite sure if you advertised that you had 12 ugly masseuses available, you wouldn't turn on too many people to come to your operation.

What does concern me, though, Mr. Speaker, is another point of view. We don't see very many of these parlors being advertised for men to come and have a body rub by women. It's the reverse situation. I think it's an exploitation of the opposite sex, once again, in a most despicable way, in my view. If we are really concerned about the situation, then I think the thing to do is not to pass legislation to allow a municipal council to determine the hours, but rather to pass legislation to eliminate the parlors, period.

I have a topless restaurant in my constituency. It does a land-office business during the noon hour. From reports I have received, it's well patronized by businessmen; by service workers, such as telephone linesmen and electric light linesmen; workers from all kinds of government agencies, municipal, provincial, and federal; and by blue-collar workers.

The unfortunate situation, though, Mr. Speaker, is that the traffic has to go through a single-family residential area to get to it. So there is this continuous stream of traffic every working day for about two to three hours. While the traffic itself is a problem, I think the fact that they are going to this particular installation does indicate perhaps there is a need.

This is what really concerns me about our society. When we get to the point where we have to be titillated or have our kicks out of watching young girls or having young girls massage you, there obviously is something wrong in your physical make-up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mental make-up.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I agree with the hon. member back here. He says mental make-up, too. This is one of the difficulties.

I certainly support what the hon. Member for Drumheller is trying to achieve, Mr. Speaker. But I question some of the justifications he uses. I doubt if you can point to particular situations where these installations have created crimes of sex violence or things of this nature. Some people will maintain that the reverse has taken place.

What it indicates to me is that there is a tragic gap in our society that would say to our public, we have to have these parlors, we have to have these installations, because our educational system or the make-up of our society is such that we have to take a group of people who are probably of lesser intelligence, physically well-endowed and, in effect, exploit them because somebody has a mental quirk or hang-up that he can't get out of his system in any other way.

Touching on the idea of passing this to the municipal council, I think that's about the worst possible solution we could get into, Mr. Speaker. I think the local councils have enough problems. I think they're well-qualified to handle this kind of situation. But I do feel they are pressured, badgered, and cajoled enough as it is without having this kind of burden placed on them.

I come back to my first statement. If we feel this is the wrong kind of a thing, the intent of the bill sort of implies that: it restricts the hours, it controls the advertising, it restricts the number of days you can be open, it tells you the kind of fines you'll be subjected to. The bill is, in effect, a punitive bill. Perhaps we are trying to evade our responsibilities by accepting this, when we actually should be saying we want to ban it and we are going to pass legislation that in effect does just that.

The other aspect of it that does concern me is the tie-in with organized crime, the tie-in with prostitution, and the tie-in with all these syndicate operations that are the mainstay of large criminal organizations. The more outlets you provide, the more bases of opportunity they have to work from. Mr. Speaker, in my view, this again confirms why I think the whole problem — and it's not going to go away — is certainly going to be alleviated if the parlors are eliminated. I happen to know that some of the people in the city of Calgary who are involved are not what you'd call upstanding citizens. Perhaps the best way to eliminate their ability to do this is to take away their form of livelihood.

Another area that does concern me is that a legitimate part of the medical practice is physiotherapy. There is some overflow from this situation that is derogatory to that profession, which requires years of training at university level. It does a very good service in helping people who have been injured or have had surgery requiring physical therapy afterwards. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I think also I would like to suggest that, rather than pass this bill restricting the outlets, we should be introducing a bill that would eliminate the outlets.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, I think one of my hon. colleagues just asked me whether I had my Band-Aid. Well, I hope I do. I have more than my Band-Aid. I

think my view will be that it should stay that way.

Mr. Speaker, I think that we look upon the title of this bill perhaps initially with humor, initially with a kind of sensitivity, wondering whether in fact we dare speak out on it or express our views for fear we may be overly progressive or regressive, depending on one's point of view.

I have to commend the hon. Member for Drumheller, that he in fact brought this topic into the foreground, because indeed I think we are experiencing in our society today a kind of advancement on the part of some members of society whose interests and desires are less than the level of moral behavior our society today is prepared to accept, at least in a legalized sense.

I share the concerns — most of the concerns — of the hon. Member for Calgary McKnight and of the hon. Member for Drumheller. But I disagree with the hon. Member for Drumheller that in fact we should pass legislation to allow municipal governments to issue licences for establishments of this nature.

I'd just like to relate that, during the period of time in 1972 and '73 when I chaired a legislative committee on professions and occupations, apart from the fact that our committee heard representations expressing concern over the absence of guidelines or standards with regard to many services being offered to the public without a sufficient degree of standards that would require a performance greater than simply providing a business licence upon the payment of a fee, I think I can recall we had representations that reflected concern — but perhaps not in the words chosen in the title of this bill — in this particular area. I believe I recall the profession of physiotherapists and the masseurs who had extensive or substantial training to provide the service of physiotherapy were concerned that in fact our standards or the requirement for our sufficiently high standards were not in place in this province.

It's from that point of view that I really want to make my comments. I think what this bill will do, if it is passed, is really create a breeding ground for charlatans, as I think has been experienced not only in other parts of Canada but in other countries. I think that in the United States more and more we have seen statistics where this has been happening. In fact, many of the states are expressing concern with some degree of alarm. I think if we allowed this bill to be passed, we might in fact look and find the development that the nature of the real service being provided may be interpreted or the title may be used to interpret in its broadest scope, and we may in fact be legalizing a type of business that neither we in the House here — nor is our society prepared for us to legalize.

So with these concerns, I think we have heard society become more vocal on the matter of the increase in crime, the increase in promiscuity, the increase in morality. Although I'm not going to preach that, I believe we have to be sensitive to those feelings being expressed by our society around us. So really I think that — although I commend the hon. member for bringing this bill at least for discussion and consideration — setting humor aside, we have to look at it seriously, and hopefully consider in greater depth what in fact we must do, or the kinds of guidelines or standards we must put in place so that the licensing of these places will not continue or

expand, and in fact perhaps be curtailed and some of the businesses closed down.

Surely, if there is a requirement for therapeutic treatments, I think the capability and the kind of training that is necessary to provide that service is now in place. To open up a breeding ground for charlatans is something I don't think any one of us wishes to have any part of.

I also noted some of the advertising the hon. Member for Drumheller read that is being put out and dangled before the public to entice or induce individuals to accept the service under the pretence or the availability of beautiful girls or women to provide the service. I think this is simply another form of sex exploitation, whichever sex may be referred to. Surely, I think at this time we are not prepared to legalize this kind of service.

Mr. Speaker, those are the comments I wanted to make on this bill. I really do not feel that in all consciousness we can pass this bill and perhaps sort of pass the buck, so to speak, to the municipal councils to make the decision. Because I'm not sure that the decisions they will make will in fact have the kind of consideration and regard that we must [have] with respect to this particular type of service currently under discussion.

With that concern in mind, I would certainly want to vote against the bill at this time. But I would certainly like to impress that we must look at this whole situation seriously and put some requirements or restrictions in place.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, after that titillating speech from the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, I would like to ask that we adjourn debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### Point of Privilege

MR. FLUKER: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. With respect to the question I asked during the question period, I would like it clearly understood that I meant it as a joke. No inference or slur was meant or intended for any ethnic group. I would apologize for any misunderstanding and would ask that it be recorded in *Hansard* accordingly.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the comments made by the Member for St. Paul. Nevertheless, I rise on a point of order arising out of the question put by the Member for St. Paul this afternoon, and ask the indulgence of the House for not having raised the matter sooner myself.

The reference by the Member for St. Paul with regard to Canadians of French origin was, in my judgment, certainly offensive and unparliamentary and, [as] such, brings into question the respect as far as this Assembly is concerned.

I therefore ask for the unanimous consent of the House, Mr. Speaker, [for] such a waiver of Standing Rules and Orders as necessary to permit me now, without notice, to move that the question put forward

this afternoon by the Member for St. Paul, containing remarks regarding certain Canadians of French origin, and the reply to that question, be stricken from the *Hansard* record.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Leader of the Opposition have leave to introduce the motion without notice as he has requested?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. FLUKER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I would like to have it known that I agree and ask that it be made unanimous.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, rising on the point of order, I was not here when the question was asked. I certainly accept the hon. Member for St. Paul's withdrawal of the question. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like it recorded, because I think the statement made in the question is one of such importance that I, at least, would like to have my objection to it clearly expressed.

Mr. Speaker, I would refer members of the House to Bill 2, The Individual's Rights Protection Act, the second "whereas", which I think should be drawn clearly to the attention of members of this House:

WHEREAS it is recognized in Alberta as a fundamental principle and as a matter of public policy that all persons are equal in dignity and rights without regard to race, religious beliefs, colour, sex, age, ancestry or place of origin.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the hon. Member for St. Paul raised the question in jest. But we have a responsibility as members of this House, a House which unanimously passed Bill 2, not to use our position to hold up any ethnic group, or people of any origin, to ridicule or joke. I think it's extremely unfortunate the question was raised. I accept the fact that he has withdrawn the question. But as a member of the Legislature, I feel that today was a rather regrettable day. I hope people elsewhere in Canada will recognize that this question in no way, shape, or form represents the view of Members of this Legislative Assembly.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the remarks that have been made. I believe hon. members will realize the concern we all have and accept the apology made by the Member for St. Paul. I would only want to make three basic statements absolutely clear.

First of all, this government, this Progressive Conservative government was, in fact, the government that brought in Bill 2 and made it a bill having primacy in this Legislature, as well as Bill 1.

Secondly, as legislators we have presented, throughout our entire time in office, a recognition that we feel very much the need to have good relationships with the province of Quebec. We have those good relationships, and we are sure they would understand and accept the apology and the way in which it was made here.

Thirdly, I think it's very important that we in this Legislature accept an apology when it is in fact given.

MR. SPEAKER: To conclude the matter, do we have the leave of the Assembly for the hon. Leader of the

Opposition to move his motion? If he wishes to move it, we can deal with that. Otherwise, we can consider the incident closed.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I move, then, that the remarks made by the hon. Member for St. Paul this afternoon concerning certain Canadians of French origin, and the reply if any, be stricken from the record.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member, of course, is referring to the question period.

Does the Assembly agree to the motion?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

[Motion carried]

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree to the motion by the hon. Government House Leader?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

[The House rose at 5:25 p.m.]

[The House met at 8 p.m.]

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, may we revert to introduction of guests?

MR. SPEAKER: The people who have arrived are not guests.

MR. BOGLE: No, Mr. Speaker, I was not referring to the members of the Assembly who came in late.

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

MR. BOGLE: Tonight I have the pleasure of introducing to you and to members of the Assembly two members of my constituency, Mr. Tom Addy and his wife Gladys, who are in the members gallery. Tom Addy is the chairman of the Taber Hospital Board, has worked for many years on the board, and is very active in community affairs in Taber and district. Would the House join with me in welcoming them to Edmonton.

#### head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

1. Moved by Mr. Leitch:

That the Assembly approve in general the fiscal policies of the government.

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Yurko]

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, tonight is the night before an anniversary tomorrow, and that anniversary was significant of a pretty major accomplishment in this

province. In fact, I believe a record of unsurpassable proportions was established. The Alberta people indicated, to a very large degree, their very excellent brilliance in selecting a government of the nature of [this one].

MR. CLARK: Honesty will never be your problem.

MR. YURKO: Seeing that this is my first occasion to speak in the House during this session, I would like to thank my constituents and those who worked with me who did an admirable job in my constituency. Certainly they didn't set a record, but they were up there amongst the 65 percenters and above.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to publicly thank and express my appreciation to all the civil servants who worked with me in the Department of Housing and Public Works during the last year. I would like to place on record the fact that in my estimation they displayed professionalism in abundance. They also put forth a great effort, both in the public works side and in the housing side. I would also like to express a great deal of gratitude to my own personal staff in my office, who certainly kept me out of a great deal of difficulty and were responsible to a large degree for our productivity in the office.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I do want to express real appreciation to my deputy minister, who I know carried a very great load during the last year.

I would also like to express thanks, Mr. Speaker, to officials of other departments who have worked with us to make it possible for us particularly, not only in the area of public works, but also in the area of housing, to have a productive year. In particular, I would like to thank the people from Municipal Affairs and the minister, Government Services and the minister, and the Provincial Treasurer, who helped us in the department to no end during the last year. I would also like to say that MLAs brought before me many suggestions in regard to improving programs, and in regard to revising some programs to make them more meaningful from the point of view of supplying service to people.

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I have been particularly impressed with the oratory so far this year. My opinion is that the speeches in general have been excellent. Perhaps the material that's available in this session upon which to speak is very great indeed. I would like to say that a great distant relative of the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands by the name of Tacitus, who lived 100 years before Christ, once wrote on Roman oratory and said the following:

Great eloquence, like fire, grows with its material. It becomes fiercer with movement, and brighter as it burns.

In listening to some of the speeches in this House during this session, I was reminded of that eloquent quote.

However, I would say this in a lighter vein, Mr. Speaker. If we measured the quality of oratory in terms of blarney, surely the Irish would have it by a whisker. But I would also like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we measured it in terms of baloney, surely the Ukrainians would have it by a nose.

Mr. Speaker, before I said that, I indicated I was speaking in jest, because there is Ukrainian in my family too.

Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to speak seriously tonight on several topics. I'd particularly like to speak on inflation and then speak on some aspects of the department I have the privilege to head. Mr. Speaker, we are entering the last quarter of this century, the fourth quarter, but it coincides with the fact I am entering the third quarter of my life. I was privileged to be born at the beginning of the second quarter of this century. I would like to indicate some of the things that happened in Canada during the last 25 years, or the last quarter century.

Mr. Speaker, Canada is experiencing economic dislocation. The national crime is inflation, which is primarily a phenomenon that ceases to create wealth and viciously concentrates existing wealth progressively upward into fewer and fewer hands. Only the powerful and the cunning can cope with this national and international plague.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that economic issues are now foremost in the minds of world leaders, topping the agenda both domestically and from a foreign policy concern. The risk that the operation of the international economy may spin out of control presents a graver threat to world order than the nuclear arms race or the struggle between differing political ideologies. In fact, the very survival of the democratic form of government relates to containing inflationary pressures.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, that no country has ever had an inflation rate of more than 20 per cent and continued to survive as a democratic government. So the stakes are very high indeed. In fact, because urbanization has now stacked populations in clusters in unprecedented form, the probability of increasing chaos, lawlessness, and human deprivation is intensely more acute than at any other point in history if economic collapse or even constriction is prolonged. Canada, like all advanced nations, of necessity must contain its internal inflation problem. It simply has no other meaningful alternative if an increasing number of Canadians are to enjoy some of the prosperity of this land.

It is certainly very easy to blame Canadian inflation on some segment of society or some particular political party. But such hardly deals with the problem. I have said before that there has never been a greater need for all groups, all political parties, all persuasions to join in a common cause to cure this disease, a disease resulting from the natural expectations and generated greed of virtually all who are in a position to take more out of the economy than their effort puts in. It is a time, Mr. Speaker, for statesmanship amongst all politicians.

I would like to review very briefly my understanding of what led to the situation as it is today. I believe four primary economic phenomena characterized the Canadian economic matrix during the last 25 years.

The first is the phenomenal growth of the Canadian economy, primarily based on harvesting our vast resources for use both nationally and internationally. The real growth of our economy in the third quarter of this century was from a gross national product of \$17.8 billion in 1950 to \$157.4 billion in 1975. I'm quoting in real growth figures. In the course of utilizing these resources in what I consider to be almost a gluttonous manner, we built in Canada a physical plant system of unprecedented inefficiency. Only now are we realizing that, as energy costs are

skyrocketing. But I say, who could blame us? We became drunk with the wealth of our resources, so we used them.

The second economic phenomenon adopted by the Canadian nation was an intense preoccupation with security, security against everything: sickness, catastrophe, bankruptcy, health, unemployment. In fact, we insured ourselves against almost every eventuality. Our system adopted tenure as a right rather than a privilege loaded with responsibility. We provided tenure to our civil servants, professors, teachers, professions and thereby generated an increasing desire for tenure without productivity requirements in all organized labor and industry, and with the provision of tenure, productivity waned. We replaced the pride of doing with the enjoyment of loafing. We entrenched elaborate procedures and refined specialization as a substitute for performance, so not only established the basis for inflation, but built the structures as well.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, the economic direction of the Canadian system was an absolute preoccupation directed toward enjoying all the material goods at an increasingly younger and younger age. Home ownership is a vital necessity today at 25 rather than 35 or 45. A car is necessary at 16 rather than 21 or 31, and so on. In providing all these goods we established a vast credit system to give us what we wanted now, and increasingly mortgaged our future. Mass advertising created the appetite, and credit provided the means. Mass production and science provided the goods and lowered unit prices. But this type of real efficiency was soon overcome by obsolescence, redundancy, style, throwaway, and fraud. It was necessary to increase not only the supply of money, but also its circulation rate, so we could throw away more and more of the goods we soon tired of. So the money presses printed, and credit facilitated the circulation rates. Again the inflation machine was supercharged and well oiled, and demand-pull inflation flourished.

The fourth economic result of the Canadian experiment, Mr. Speaker, is a wage scale that was stretched almost to its elastic limits. The concept of global percentage wage increases over a 25 year period has produced ratios as high as 15:1 in the civil service wage scale, in industry up to 50:1, and in some cases even higher. Now such a stretched wage scale has produced leapfrogging by the powerful unions, professionals, and other franchised groups and created a fierce battleground. A wage-pecking order is virtually impossible to sustain. This type of stretched wage scale had a stimulating effect on cost push inflation. It is also interesting that a top-loaded, highly stretched wage scale provided governments with unprecedented finances by way of the universal income tax system.

Governments generally spend their revenues, and as these revenues increase dramatically yearly, they build vast spending machines in almost futile attempts to equalize by increasing the level of service. But politics dictates, in most cases, universality, and government processes are therefore at best very inefficient and poor equalizers. It takes real political courage to depart from the concept of universality. Their unlimited programs in spending at all levels of government simply multiply the potential for inflation.

In Canada, we're now in an economic condition

where all governments together spend approximately 40 per cent of the gross national product, while the private sector is responsible for spending about 60 per cent. In the United States the ratio was 18 per cent by government and 82 per cent by the private sector, so efforts by the private sector in the United States were capable of cutting the annual rate of inflation in half, and the president was proud to say that recently. But it took an almost inhuman effort on the part of the private sector.

Now, Mr. Speaker, such is not possible in Canada. Inflation in Canada must, of necessity, be fought in partnership by governments and the private sector. To reduce inflation in Canada by 4 per cent, governments must effect a reduction of 2 per cent by their own collective efforts. To do so, all governments need to realign their priorities and direct them increasingly towards the fundamental necessities of life rather than for aesthetic, cultural, and frivolous necessities during this period of economic uncertainty.

The Government of Alberta has been in the forefront of governments in Canada in acting responsibly to contain inflation. Last September, the Provincial Treasurer announced spending restraints of 11 per cent in the growth of government expenditures, and he performed, in my estimation, a miracle to stay within that 11 per cent.

We have identified housing for the low- and middle-income groups as a top priority. Improvements in the courts, law and order, which to some degree is an adverse fallout of inflation, was also identified as an area of high priority for government. In addition, large sums of resource revenues are being placed in a heritage saving trust fund for investment purposes rather than being used for spending purposes.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, it is going to take massive efforts by all the governments in Canada to contain inflation and recharge the economic machine of this nation so that positive wealth can again be created and be distributed in a more uniform fashion amongst all the citizens of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to speak a little about the department that I have the privilege of heading. First of all, I would like to say I will primarily concentrate on housing, to a large degree leaving the public works area to the discussion of the budgetary estimates.

However, there are a few things I want to say about public works. We have become increasingly more cost-conscious and have adopted methods, including project management, to control our costs. To a large degree, we are planning on a longer term base, up to five years, in the capital works area. It is only through longer term planning that we can control costs on an annual basis.

We are still respecting to a large degree the government's decentralization policies, and in fact are undertaking the construction of provincial buildings in a number of towns. And tenders — we're going to be dedicating \$9.4 million to new buildings in six centres: Bonnyville, Drayton Valley, Olds, Smoky Lake, Valleyview, and Whitecourt. In addition, seven provincial buildings located in Airdrie, Cochrane, Lethbridge, Fairview, Ponoka, St. Paul, and Westlock, worth some \$17 million, will be completed during this fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, we as a government have spent \$24

million in the last four and a half years on provincial buildings throughout Alberta, in association with the government's decentralization policies. I am making public this evening a short news release in regard to provincial buildings.

Mr. Speaker, shortly after I became Minister of Housing and Public Works early in 1975, I was convinced that the federal government initiatives in housing were insufficient to cope with the worsening housing situation in Alberta. New incentives were necessary. New programs were necessary by the provincial government in the area of housing supply, affordability, and in the area of repairing existing housing stock.

One of the programs we announced early last year, and initiated this year, was the senior citizens' home improvement program in the area of repairing existing housing stock. Mr. Speaker, I just want to indicate that 19,531 applications have been received to this date in this program, 15,964 have been audited for approval, 15,800 have been submitted to that fabulous machine, the computer, and 14,956 identification cards approved and bank accounts established have been sent out. Mr. Speaker, this program is being done by the public works section of the department, and I want to congratulate them on undertaking a most difficult task and moving forward very successfully. Again, I wish to thank an awful lot of MLAs who indicated various revisions that were necessary to this program.

Mr. Speaker, last May I wrote to the federal minister as follows in regards to housing:

We seek some measure of assurance that the federal government will be providing additional stimulation to the private sector of the Canadian economy to meet the housing needs of Albertans and Canadians. We recognize that government programs complement but are not a substitute for private enterprise initiatives in meeting the housing needs of Canadians. We suggest that the upcoming federal budget address itself meaningfully towards this objective . . . by giving consideration to the following amongst many recommendations that have been made to your government:

- (I) Additional lowering of the federal tax on building materials
- (II) Extension of the capital cost allowance principle in the housing industry for at least five years
- (III) Re-examination of the need to permit home owner mortgage interest payments to be deductible for income tax purposes
- (IV) Consideration toward the establishment of a human shelter mortgage money market . . . partially independent from the conventional financial markets which are unduly sensitive to the industrial, consumer and institutional sectors of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government did extend the capital cost allowance for two years, but I still believe they have a long way to go. I shall continue, on behalf of our government, to press for action in those four areas.

Because Alberta is a healthy and growing economic paradise, under a good government, I have previously



stated that the housing needs of our province are about 100,000 housing units over a period of four years; that is, between 1975 and 1979. Furthermore, there was a shortfall resulting from lean housing supply during the years '72, '73, and '74, so we have some catching up to do. We exceeded our expectations in 1975 and ended up with 24,707 housing unit starts.

We need 25,000 housing unit starts in 1976 just to hold the status quo, without necessarily doing any catch-up. I expect the entire housing industry in Alberta will require a commitment of \$1 billion in 1976 to meet the housing needs of Albertans. Now the provincial government's commitments, when all the figures are added, exceed \$400 million for this coming year. So you can see, in light of what we wrote to the federal government, Mr. Speaker, we will be carrying out our part of the bargain in terms of meeting the housing needs of Albertans.

In 1975, we of course increased our commitments rather dramatically after the budget was passed. We increased lending from \$65 million to \$183 million because of a number of programs. As I indicated, the percentage increases with respect to housing starts in Alberta last year were dramatic — a 30 per cent increase, compared to 2 per cent in the rest of Canada. Mr. Speaker, I believe that's performance, regardless of what the hon. Member for Clover Bar says and wonders who is responsible for it.

I'm not going to go into the distribution or the mix, because three things are changing. The starts have gone up dramatically, the mix has changed considerably, and the distribution has changed rather remarkably. A lot of houses are being built in the smaller centres of Alberta.

I should indicate, Mr. Speaker, that last year was second in housing starts only to 1971, when we had 25,602 housing starts. In that year we had over 11,000 apartment units. So there is a remarkable transformation not only in the housing starts, but in the nature, the mix, and the location of the housing starts in Alberta. Our decentralization policies are truly working.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this government's commitments to providing housing for low-income Albertans during 1975 is massive. The Provincial Treasurer indicated just some of the figures. However, I'm not sure time will permit me to give you a much better view than the Provincial Treasurer has in the budget. However, I am releasing a series of news releases today, Mr. Speaker, one with respect to the \$30 million allocated to public housing. The news release does indicate the tentative locations of those housing units among Edmonton, Calgary, Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, and the rest of the province.

In addition, this evening I am releasing a news release on the \$39.8 million allocated this year — that is, if the budget is approved by the Legislature, and at this time I have no reason to suspect it won't. This lists not only the location of the senior citizens' self-contained units that are being approved in the province for the coming year, but also the lodges. With respect to the senior citizens' self-contained units, I would like to suggest that a considerable preference and priority is given to the smaller centres in rural Alberta.

We will be approving 1,004 senior citizens' self-contained units: 500 in the smaller centres and 252

each for Edmonton and Calgary, though there is some possible consideration for additional units in the two large cities.

With respect to lodges, we are approving all the lodges that have presently been applied for, and most of these are in rural Alberta.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am releasing a news release on the \$10 million provided for the rural and native housing program — the \$2.8 million is allocated for a special and unique housing unit for handicapped in Edmonton — and a news release for \$24 million for land assembly, the \$242 million in direct lending and its distribution, and the \$18 million budgeted for land development in Fort McMurray, with a summary of what has happened in Fort McMurray.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't be accused of not giving the hon. member sufficient information. However, Mr. Speaker, I do want to end up — I know I haven't got very much time, but I do want to say a few things.

I was going to speak on the reorganization, but I will do this on second reading of the Home Mortgage Corporation bill. However, I do want to say that affordability has become the most difficult problem. A survey last summer by the Alberta Housing Corporation indicated that over two-thirds of Alberta heads of households were paid wages under \$12,500 per year. The population represented by this segment of earners is priced out of the home ownership market.

The upward price pressures on housing, particularly in Edmonton and Calgary, are increasing the segment that requires assistance for home ownership. In the resale market, an almost total lack of any form of professionalism in the real estate industry has generated, as I indicated publicly, a mild form of hysteria to buy at any price, thus pushing the average house price to over \$61,000 in Calgary and \$57,700 in Edmonton. This resale or secondary house market pricing has directly influenced the price of new homes.

The profits being generated in the housing industry are almost immoral in a period of apparent wage and price restraint, and I so told the industry yesterday. The actions of the entire industry often force governments into actions against their better judgments. However, I am encouraged by the recent actions of some of the more responsible builders and land developers who are looking to the longer term. There will certainly be a readjustment in the nature of community development. Some of the developers are now utilizing the greater flexibility and speed of decision-making brought about by changes in the subdivision transfer regulations last summer by the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Modular subdivisions are evolving in which land use efficiency is paramount — 10 houses per acre, with higher densities still permitting the retention of the single house concept. Pleasing mixtures of single, row, and multiple housing in modules are lowering, and will again lower, house prices to affordable ranges. I am encouraged and confident that responsible segments of the housing industry, with the help of governments, within the next two years will bring housing supply and affordability in balance with the normal demands of Albertans.

In ending, Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate that segment of the housing industry that's responsible. Furthermore, I would like to congratulate the entire industry for a remarkable performance in 1975,

which brought the expected housing starts from about 15,000 units predicted last July to almost 25,000 housing starts by the end of 1975.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I'm increasing my performance in the House by 100 per cent now, having been here a year. I've been listening to the comments to the Treasurer regarding the budget. I did my own thumbnail assessment of all the members of the House in the last 12 months. When I checked my assessment of the Treasurer, I came up pretty short. I found that I couldn't read him very well. However, we now have four blue books that are easy reading, Mr. Treasurer, and I've discovered something about that.

I want to talk very slightly about the budget, and I want to comment on two things. We've heard a good deal about them. I'm not going to dwell on them right now, but I'm going to come back to them. The two items, of course, the obvious keys to the budget, are the restraint and the heritage fund.

I think I'll take this opportunity to talk about the constituency a bit, just so they don't feel left out. Unfortunately, the school class that's in town tonight isn't here to hear this; it would help me, I think.

There's nothing very special, I think, about our constituency. Will I get shot for that? It's out in southeastern Alberta. A good part of it is called a special area, and I've often wondered why. The only thing that's special about it is that it's especially dry. That's what created the special area. You couldn't grow anything; consequently, you couldn't find any work and so on. So they made it a special area — not all of it. We do go into the Provost area, which is very good; the Killam area, which is excellent; back down to Coronation, where it gets a little marginal; then back down east where I come from, where Special Area No. 4 is.

In the period since I arrived there some 50 years ago, things have changed. We now have some natural gas development — scrubbing plants. We have some oil development. The ranches have gotten much bigger. The grain farms have grown. About 1940 it started to rain. Since that time, it has done just a bit of that, and it has changed the complexion considerably, both in the appearance and in the economics of the thing.

The thing that comes through to me about that constituency, Mr. Speaker, is they are a bunch of do-it-yourselfers. I think this is a credit to them. They don't even get very impressed with this business of government, in that they don't usually ask for very much. But having to do something about it, they sent me up here. At the annual meeting in Hardisty which, incidentally, I missed — that's the end of the oil corridor, isn't it — one of these hard-nosed types asked me what I do up here. You know, I'm being paid for something. So I did a bit of quick arithmetic and I said, well, how much do you want? I'm costing you about 60 cents a year in Edmonton. I think you've had your 60 cents worth now with me answering that question.

The fact is it does work into a fairly reasonable answer. Since that time, when I've had constituents approach me, they haven't been quite so aggressive. They've said, well, I've only got 60 cents worth coming. Do you mind if I ask you about this? It's

working, Mr. Speaker.

In order to set the stage — if that's a good term — for my comments on the budget, I think it is necessary that I give my qualifications for commenting on the thing at all. I think this is valid, because in education, medicine, or law, when someone qualifies for something he gets some letters after his name. The only letters I've ever had would be EXP I suppose, which would be experience — that is prior to a year ago — but I think that's valid.

I have something in the background of experience that does qualify me to comment on the Treasurer's budget, in that I have some particular advantages most of you in the House don't have. The Premier has heard me comment on that before. You'll have to excuse me, sir, if I repeat myself. I do have some advantages that most people here don't have — incidentally, 50 years in the area, plus a few more out of the area. I look across at the front bench and I look around me, and I think I'm surrounded by young people. I'm not sure that's very comfortable. I seem to be talking from this age thing a bit now.

My life started at the age of nine, not at zero as most of you have experienced. What I mean by that is that I've been in Alberta for 50 years, or will be shortly. I arrived here at age nine and the advantage I have — in order to make this judgment on the two items I've mentioned, I couldn't speak, I couldn't read, and I didn't have anything. This really qualifies you, because you're starting with a clean slate. I didn't have any preconceived ideas of what I had coming, what was going to happen, or what I was entitled to — anything. You walk off a train on the Alberta prairie at age nine, and it's snowing and cold, and you're amazed at what you see. But you can't find out very fast because you can't understand what anybody is saying. This does convert into an advantage. The advantage I became aware of — as I was gradually absorbing a bit of the English language — was this. Having seen what people did to eat and keep warm on the other side of the world, about 8,000 miles away — and even at age nine when you are at zero, you realize some things — I realized there was very, very limited opportunity, even at age nine. After I'd spent a very short time here, the thing that amazed me was the multiplicity of opportunity all around me. It still horrifies me when I listen to people saying, you should do this and you've got to do so-and-so, things are terrible. The only difficult thing I see is that there is so much opportunity around us it might confuse us in deciding which one of those opportunities we want. Mr. Minister, that relates again to your budget.

Now, having lived [through] this — and I'm not kidding around, I'm serious — a good deal of it took me right into the '30s where experience was tremendous. You know, I went through that \$5 a month bit. The Minister of Housing and Public Works just quoted some figures on the 1:15 ratio. Well, from five bucks even to what the Hospital Services Commission pays me — you know, that \$30,000 a year thing which I found out was \$100 a month. Even that ratio is pretty good, Mr. Minister. So I've had all these advantages.

I'm sorry the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview isn't here tonight, because while I admire his ability to get up and talk and the smoothness he displays here, what he's really lacking — and again I'm

straight-faced about this — is that I would like him to be faced with having to convert those quick assessments into something meaningful. I would like to see him meet a payroll for a couple of years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on.

MR. KROEGER: Now, Mr. Speaker — and I don't have to worry about the clock. Mr. Minister, you could have had some of my time. With that bit of background, I'm going to revert to the budget and the two items I mentioned.

We've heard a lot about restraint. Well, I don't want to talk about restraint in the sense we've been hearing about it here. I want to talk about the heritage trust fund in relation to that restraint. I think the 11 per cent guidelines are valid. I think the federal 10 per cent guidelines are valid as far as a restraint factor is concerned. I don't think they're good enough.

I have a price book at home — I wish I had it here — that was printed in 1941. It's a very small one, about a quarter of an inch thick. That little book contains the prices of all the equipment we were selling. In 1945 those prices were still the same. We went right through that period with one price book, and there was no change all the way through that time frame.

We now put our chests out and say, boy, we're holding her down to 11 per cent. There was a time when that could be held at an even keel. I think it makes sense. I can see no real reason for the figures getting larger and carrying around more of it. Nevertheless, we've got that, and even at 11 per cent I guess we're doing pretty well.

But the restraint thing interests me much more as it relates to the heritage trust fund. Because I can think of nothing that would have been easier politically — maybe any way you want to name it — [than] to just go the route of saying, here, we have this income flowing in. It came about, I think, through good management. That wasn't an accident. But the easy route would be to say, yeah, we can do more for hospitals, we can do more for education and for all the areas we keep hearing about. That would be the easy route. I think a much tougher route is to say no when you've got it. You know, you put the cookie jar out on the table and then tell your kids, you can't have it. That's pretty tough. That takes restraint.

So when I speak of restraint I'm speaking of it in the sense that the maturity of the government was shown in deliberately saying, no, we aren't going to spend it. The reasons are good, but the nerve it takes to do that I think ought to be recognized. I personally appreciate that a great deal.

Now, I want to comment just for a minute or two — and I find myself looking at that clock, just like hockey players do, to see when the penalty is over. Mr. Speaker, I recognize the role of the opposition. I appreciate the needling that the hon. Member for Clover Bar comes up with. He livens the House up at times, and sometimes he's serious. I appreciate that. I appreciate Mr. Taylor's remarks. They go both ways. I can understand Mr. Notley's remarks because of his lack of experience. I think the member from Bow City makes some very good points. The Leader of the Opposition is missing. I would like to

say something about him when he's here, but not in a derogatory way. And of course my friend and neighbor here — you know, the remarks across the House are most appreciated.

Nevertheless, I think the opposition has a job not to be funny or not to needle, but to really expose the things that are potentially wrong. I appreciate that. When they do that, I commend them. As it relates to the heritage trust fund though, and the restraint that I've talked about, I would ask that the opposition take a really serious look at this; that we not keep hammering at this thing and suggesting to people out there that we should be releasing this, that we are being wrong by holding it and exercising this restraint in the sense that we are trying to keep something from them, it's ours — it isn't our, it's theirs — and that we're working for them. I think there should be restraint on the part of the opposition as it relates to the heritage trust fund, because you could do some real damage that we can't repair by raising expectations out there.

Alberta, in any way you want to look at it, is an oasis whether you're talking about Canada or the world. There is no other place like it, and there is no other place to live in like it. I can tell you this because I've been to other places. I'm very serious about that. I don't expect to ask many favors of the opposition. Nevertheless, I do think they should be serious about this in the way they approach the criticism of the fund. With that, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, in the course of my speech I was instructed that I should include a tabling of a letter. It's self-explanatory. If it's required, it might be useful later on. I would like to table this document.

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I'm very delighted to have this opportunity tonight. It's going to be a year tomorrow since I got elected to this House, to our government. At this time I certainly want to express my appreciation to Mr. and Mrs. Wright, Mr. and Mrs. Takacs, Mr. and Mrs. Zip and their family, and many other friends who made it possible for me to be here.

At this time I want to congratulate our Provincial Treasurer, Merv Leitch, for the hard work and insight in the preparation of this annual budget. You know, he's a shy, modest person, yet strong, firm, and responsible. Those are the qualities for a good politician.

DR. BUCK: You should have been here when he was the A.G.

MR. KUSHNER: I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, and very excited to see the high priorities and allocation of funds for housing. With housing prices the way they are, some people have to spend as high as 50 per cent of their income on housing payments instead of the desired 27 per cent as set by Central Mortgage and Housing. I'm very pleased with the provisions for low-income housing, the low-cost mortgage financing, a very worth-while objective. Let us relate the events of the past two years to see the situation most Albertans find themselves in. The price of housing in Calgary and in Edmonton has doubled since 1974. Duplexes which sold in 1974 for \$45,000 and \$50,000, today are reselling for over

\$100,000.

Mr. Speaker, what concerns me very much is the proper balance between price controls and wage controls. We have at the same time experienced big increases in the cost of utilities, property taxes, groceries. The costs of maintaining an automobile have gone up as high as 30 to 80 per cent. Needless to mention, the rents have gone up in the last year and a half from 50 per cent to over 100 per cent. This creates a real hardship for many people, who virtually find it impossible to save enough money to make a payment to buy a home of their own. It is all right to talk about wage guidelines, 11 per cent restraints, with the cost of living going up as it is. It is hard to appreciate and understand, yet it is essential that we retain the guidelines. Yes, I can say that a lot of people are probably worse off today than they ever have been, in some cases probably worse off than two and three years ago.

Our senior citizen program is not only the best in Canada, but it is working. The minister has announced additional accommodation for senior citizens, which makes the citizens of Alberta proud. Senior citizens are beginning to feel that they are appreciated for some of the sacrifices they have made, and some of the better things we are enjoying today.

Housing is one of our top priorities. Governments got bogged down in red tape. Housing did not meet the building need in 1974 and '75 in Edmonton and Calgary. We got bogged down with applications from developers to bring more housing onto the market, but they have not yet been approved. I only hope the municipal government will take note of that. No wonder the speculators have moved into the housing field and pocketed vast amounts of money at our young people's expense.

All governments have to look hard into this critical area and streamline the procedure over the next two years, so faster and less costly approvals are given to the development of applications by people who want to increase the supply of housing. I believe, here in Alberta, our provincial government will lead the way in clearing up this problem with the municipal government, and we'll have the proper flow of new housing to meet the future needs without a repeat of the disastrous price increase of housing in the last two years. This does not mean we are prepared to set aside proper planning in order to achieve it, but a review of this policy is necessary, and I know the minister will act. He is acting in a very forthright way.

We are not short of land here. We have a lot of land around Calgary and Edmonton for housing. This is not Europe. But we are short of resources, and the land is so scarce. Where municipalities have gone wrong is putting too many restrictions on housing regulations. It is taking too long to approve new housing development. As a result, we have restricted the housing supply and have become victims of gougers among the builders and speculators who suddenly had a scarcity of commodity in their hands and took advantage of the situation. No one on this side of the House or on the other side of the House, or outside this House, can convince me that the cost of land, labor, and material has doubled in the past two years as far as housing is concerned. This is exploitation by a few. It also has to be said in all

fairness, Mr. Speaker, that two years ago financing for housing was difficult to obtain. Mortgage companies got better returns elsewhere.

For a moment, let's look at the area of hospital and medicare services. We are looking at a projection of almost \$1 billion, a third of our budget this year. It is an enormous amount of money. It is most shocking and alarming, yet citizens obviously want top-rate care. Frankly, I would like to see elected hospital board members, because I feel they are much closer to the people than appointed boards. To relate in a comprehensive way, it means giving a person \$1,250 a day from the time of Christ to today, a span of almost 2,000 years. It's a lot of money no matter how you say it, in what language you say it, and how fast you say it.

It is time we started to place restraints and look at the ways we can control those expenditures without loss of quality of life and services. I realize we are on a restraint program. But it seems unfair that it affects mostly the ordinary people and does not affect some of our management or bureaucrats, if I may use that expression.

We have to ask ourselves some hard questions in that area. Are we getting value here? Is this expenditure bringing the intended result? Are we creating and growing a monster here? Mr. Speaker, there's an old expression: those that work together, fight together, generally win together.

The percentages of the hospitals and medicare have increased from \$496.3 million this year to a projected figure of \$550.7 million. We have an increase here of just 10 per cent, and have placed the hospital cost even higher than education, which most people don't even realize. But the social services have gone even faster, from \$301.6 to \$344.9 million, over 14 per cent.

Let us remember, Mr. Speaker, welfare is part of life. Welfare is something that most people are not against if it is used expressly for the intended purpose, to help those who cannot help themselves. I strongly believe in prevention. So let us not kill the incentive to work, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately we find too many cases where it helps those who would not help themselves, and by far too many abuses. Let us cite a few.

Welfare officials state that abuses are very few and far between. This statement depends on the definition of abuse. To most people, Mr. Speaker, it is an abuse when the welfare department pays the rental on accommodation which is better than what any one individual who is working can afford. It is an abuse, Mr. Speaker, when the welfare department buys an automatic washing machine for an individual when many people can't afford even a simple wringer. A year or so after, it's worn out and being replaced. It is an abuse when an individual on welfare can be fitted with a set of false teeth. A few months later, if not sooner, they complain they do not fit properly. Another set is given and probably a third. Mr. Speaker, that is a matter of record.

The list can go on and on, but there are some reasons the working people object and complain vigorously, and rightfully so. Let us remember that when [anyone] advocates a welfare state, the welfare recipient has rights to those privileges. At the same time as we are granting those rights to the recipient, we are abusing the rights of the working individual

who does without those privileges, but must pay to provide them for someone else. Really, what is welfare for? It is for those who cannot work, such as the sick and disabled, but not for those who do not want to work.

I wish to make it quite clear that we have a very responsible job to do here. We have to bear in mind and [be] concerned to do the best we can for those who have elected us. I wish to use an expression or a saying: to do the best good for the greatest number at the least cost. There are concerns and problems, and we are here to try to solve them. As a member of the team, one of us notices and brings to attention an area being overlooked, and the whole team becomes better. My policy is to pledge myself to do everything within my power to make governments responsive to the needs of the people in my constituency of Calgary Mountain View.

DR. BUCK: Join the opposition.

MR. KUSHNER: The urban crisis existing in the cities throughout our province is a tremendous challenge, but with all elements of the community working together we can meet that challenge and move our cities forward. And Alberta, the great province, [will] remain the model for others to follow.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like to add my congratulations to the hon. Provincial Treasurer for his excellent presentation last Friday. I have listened to the speeches so far this evening, I have enjoyed them, and I have learned from them. I would like to take a few moments to ask for some indulgence from those here as I attempt to cover some of the areas of my constituency and the department I represent.

As the member for the Peace River constituency, which I am privileged to represent in this House, and in relation to the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, of which I am the minister, I feel I have a few comments to make this evening. And I would like to re-emphasize a couple of items the Provincial Treasurer mentioned in his speech.

One of the points I would like to re-emphasize was made by the Provincial Treasurer in his opening remarks: "Now, five years later, as a direct result of that level of increase in recent provincial budgets, Albertans enjoy the highest or one of the highest levels of government services in all areas." I think it deserved repeating, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased [about] the figures presented in regard to the increase and support provided over the past budgets of this government, particularly the increase and support to basic education, to health, to social services, and the special emphasis on programs for senior citizens and the handicapped.

However, Mr. Speaker, having regard for the somewhat unique geographical considerations of the north, and in particular my constituency, I am aware that there is a need and will be a need to direct continued emphasis at services aimed at that particular area of this great province.

Aside from the question of services, Mr. Speaker, another area of concern which I, as a northern MLA, would like to deal with is infrastructure. Specifically, I would refer to the question of water and sewer services for the communities of La Crete and Fort

Vermilion, and a requirement within the constituency for the upgrading of Highway 58 east from Rainbow Lake, an 18-mile stretch of road. I have asked for an overall assessment of the new improvement district roads and a general upgrading of existing roads where required. I also ask consideration for the request for a ferry between the Grimshaw and Tangent areas.

With regard to Alberta's rural gas co-ops, Mr. Speaker, I must commend the minister responsible for his efforts and support to those organizations which, particularly in northern Alberta, play a very vital role in the quality of life as it relates to all rural Albertans and particularly to my constituency. Of late, a request to review amortization of loans of gas co-ops over a 20-, 25-, or 30-year period has been received by the department with my sincere hope that they will receive due consideration and review. I am aware of the efforts being made in these directions by the ministers responsible for transportation, for utilities and telephones, and for municipal affairs.

Referring now to the subject of housing, I am pleased that its reference in the throne speech is reflected as a very major priority item in the budget speech. Once again, my particular concern as a northern MLA in whose constituency a program of such magnitude is welcomed by the residents, and more particularly by the native residents, and is of singular interest to the municipalities and senior citizens from Peace River to Manning to Rainbow Lake, from Grimshaw to High Level to La Crete and Fort Vermilion, is the request for senior citizens' housing units.

Earlier this evening, the Minister of Housing released a news release that covered some of those particular requests, and I'm very pleased to see that High Level, Grimshaw, Peace River, and La Crete are covered with units. I am somewhat disappointed in the fact that Fort Vermilion, one of the oldest communities in the province of Alberta, celebrating 177 years of service to the community and to the province, was missed in this particular year's appropriation. But I can assure the minister and my constituents we will keep trying for that.

Mr. Speaker, at this particular point I would like to take a moment or two to review a few of the major programs in the newly organized Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. Mr. Speaker, contrary to some of the thoughts that have appeared on the horizon that we have experienced cutbacks, I can assure you that they, in fact, have not happened. That mainly relates to requests for new programs that may have been set back somewhat and may experience a delay, but certainly they were not cut back in the true sense of the word.

Existing programs will continue, and the time that would have gone into any new programs that may have been requested, Mr. Speaker, will be used to advantage in consolidating the continuing ones, in making modifications where necessary, broadening and strengthening the success base so that all Albertans can enjoy the benefits of those particular areas that relate to the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife.

Mr. Speaker, in the recreation division, one such program is the major cultural recreation facility development program designed to enhance recreation opportunities throughout Alberta through capital as-

sistance in facility development. This program began last April 1, and to this point, Mr. Speaker, we have received requests for over \$18 million for capital facilities. That's \$18 million requested in the first year, Mr. Speaker. The benefits of the program are many, and I would like to point to three of the major areas of benefit, as I see them.

First, Mr. Speaker, the program has allowed the expansion of recreation-cultural opportunities in many communities where the financial resources would not normally have allowed such development.

Secondly, the program has encouraged many communities to review their overall recreational services and how they relate not only to their community, but to those communities that surround them.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, one of the points is the major economic effect the program has on the local scene. Grant requests worth \$18 million represent some \$55 million of actual facility development. This indeed has a considerable impact on the economy of all the centres involved in applications through that program.

Concurrent with the benefits of this program and because it is a relatively new one, I certainly am aware that some areas will require additional review. Over-development is one concern, operating costs are another, Mr. Speaker. But I can assure you that generally these cannot happen, because each community must indicate how they will operate the facility over the next five years of their program. I should indicate we have said no to a number of communities. In all probability we will be saying no to others. We will continue to require the master plan, the provision of operating information, before any approvals will be granted, and we must assure those communities that they do not lose that grant. It just may be delayed for some stage of that 10-year program.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to use three examples of communities that have co-operated to this point and have received their cheques. I've chosen three for the size of the communities and the areas. I'm going to start with the city of Grande Prairie, which was the first to receive a cheque under the major facilities program, a community with a population of 15,359. They built a 'recplex', involving a swimming pool, arena, recreation offices, and the ancillary facilities. They received a cheque for \$640,000, Mr. Speaker, and this particular project was number one on their master planning priority. There was very high community involvement. Community group support with cash donations included: The Royal Purple, Grande Prairie Flying Club, The Royal Canadian Legion, Knights of Columbus, the ACT organization, the senior Catholic Womens' League, the Kinsmen Club, and the Rotary Club. There was a long list of businesses and industries in the community that contributed to the project financially. An example of a larger centre that has already met the qualifications and has received its grant.

Another area, Didsbury, received a grant of \$372,900 for a recreation complex involving an arena, auxiliary ice surface, and large multipurpose room. The arena complex [was] completed 12 months after the original arena in the community burned down. They also have the cultural component in their facility. That's in a community with a population of 1,995.

Now, the regional agreement with the county allows the county to provide some 1,734 heads to be counted for the \$100 per capita, apportioned to that. They did receive the community support from the beginning, and letters of support were provided by the Didsbury District Light Horse Association, their figure skating club, the Didsbury Missionary Church, the K-40 Club, the West Didsbury 4-H Beef Club, Midway Community Club, the Legion and the United Church, another example of a smaller community.

But even getting down to a community of 170 people, Mr. Speaker, the village of Czar, combining with the village of Hughenden, the village of Amisk, and the M.D. of Provost, all worked together under a recreational agreement and received \$34,771.50. Again, [they] proved they can work together, by sitting down and discussing the recreational needs of the community and the area, and as a result have a very fine facility. The project was built with a curling rink, enlargement of the arena and the enlargement of a senior citizens' room.

The community has already received its portion of the funds, and letters of support were received from practically every portion of that particular community: Czar with 170 people, Hughenden with 145, Amisk with 136, and the M.D. of Provost with 1,040. Again an example of how small communities really can work together, and show they can work together by sitting down and discussing what best will serve the total area.

Aside from the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, which already bear regional designation in the program, we have had requests for regional status from other cities — Lethbridge, Medicine Hat, Red Deer and Grande Prairie, in particular. I should point out to the members of the Legislative Assembly that I have indicated to those communities that we will be reviewing that particular request, and recommendations will be made in the very near future as to the possibility of having them included in the regional status.

Now I did mention in that particular area, Mr. Speaker, the possible addition of other cities in the regional status. It does pose a problem relative to other towns, because when you really look at all areas of the province of Alberta I'm sure you can create a need for regional consideration for centres, whether it be Lac La Biche, Peace River, Athabasca, St. Albert or any of the other areas in the great province of Alberta. But in the immediate future, Mr. Speaker, we have had that request from the other cities, and we are giving consideration to it.

I should also point out, Mr. Speaker, it's my intention to introduce into the House during this session a recreation, parks and wildlife foundation act. This act will enable citizens in the province to contribute to the development of new programs or the improvement of existing programs in all areas of recreation, sports, fisheries, wildlife, conservation, and habitat.

Before moving on to the parks and wildlife division of the department, I would like to mention very briefly two other programs in the area of recreation that are somewhat unique in the province. The first, Mr. Speaker, is one called Shape Up Alberta. I'm a perfect example, Mr. Speaker, of what needs to be done.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, with a note of

humor, I had the opportunity to kick off the Shape Up Alberta participation campaign in Medicine Hat. With a little bit of humor, the chairman of the meeting was a short, very well-built young fellow who I asked to stand up, had everybody take a look at him, and I said, "Now that's what I would like to see." At that particular point, Mr. Speaker, I stuck out my stomach and said, "This could happen to you." A very alert photographer got a picture, and the headline in the Medicine Hat paper said, "Shape up or sag down." So I'm starting from scratch, Mr. Speaker, as a model of the program Shape Up Alberta.

The idea of a mobile fitness program was conceived about two years ago. The primary purpose of the project is really to improve the quality of life through fitness and nutrition programs in selected communities. The strategy developed consisted of a team of program organizers and instructors visiting these selected communities to motivate and acquaint the citizens in the area of physical fitness and nutrition. I might add, Mr. Speaker, it's working. We have many, many people in the province of Alberta talking about getting into shape.

One of the participation ads that I think most of our members are familiar with during the hockey games was one with Howie Meeker saying, "Walk a block". That's all there was to it. If you'll take that into consideration when you're leaving the Legislative Building tonight, if you'll leave your car here, walk home and walk back in the morning, and begin to shape up Alberta, we'll all be better for it, Mr. Speaker.

This year's program is currently being operated by the Alberta region of the YMCA and is being jointly funded by the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, and Alberta Social Services and Community Health.

The second unique area, Mr. Speaker, is that of Sport Alberta and the Alberta Games. Sport Alberta, as you may know, is a confederation of provincial sport associations whose general function is to promote and advance sport in the province. Of course, its main project is the organization of what I consider to be the very highly successful Alberta Summer and Winter Games which I'm sure each and every one of you are most familiar with. In 1974, the first Summer Games were held in Calgary. Some 20 sports saw some 2,000 athletes participating.

Participation is the key to the Games. The very first Games saw approximately 50,000 people in all areas of the province and of all ages, Mr. Speaker, taking part in the local, regional, and zone events. That involved people from 15 years of age up to 75 years of age.

I think one of the warmest things a person can see, if you're involved or interested in the Games at all, is an example that happened at the Winter Games this year at Banff. A 72 year old skier from Grande Prairie was walking arm in arm with a 15 year old skier who had just beaten him out in the event. They were talking about how to improve one's ability to match that of the young fellow, the young fellow learning from the older person, and the older person certainly learning from the younger fellow. Together they have added probably 10 years to each other's lives when that particular time comes.

The Summer Games of 1975, Mr. Speaker — again most successful. We had some 26 sports,

some 2,600 athletes, and approximately 65,000 people involved, again from 13 to 85 years of age, in the events leading up to those Games.

The first Alberta Winter Games were just completed the first part of March in the community of Banff — 17 events and some 1,500 to 1,800 athletes. Again in the winter sports, some 35,000 people from 13 to 72 years of age took part in the various regional games that saw the winners going on to the Games at Banff. The key, again, to that is participation, not necessarily the fact that you may win something by entering the Games, but the fact that you are getting out and taking part in the chance to motivate yourself toward a higher level of physical fitness. So we ask each and every one of you to support the concept of continuing the Games.

We have had some requests, Mr. Speaker, to continue the Games on an annual basis. We've reviewed that, and it's our consideration at this point in time that we will be holding the Games on alternate years. In other words, the next Summer Games will be in 1977. That will afford us an opportunity to review what has taken place to this point, and also to review the possibility of site selection. Because as we host the Games, we begin to run out of communities that in fact can muster the number of volunteers necessary to participate in the necessary work involved in the hosting of those Games. With the Summer Games in '77, our next Winter Games would move to the winter of 1978, following the Commonwealth Games that will be right here in the city of Edmonton.

There are arguments both for and against the concept of going every year. Of course, one of the things I think we must take into consideration is the athletes who are participating, not just those who are participating for participation's sake alone, but those who may rise to the top, the cream of our athletic crop who will in many cases be moving on to the Western Canada, the Canada, the Olympic, the Commonwealth Games, the Pan-Am Games, and the other events, representing not only Alberta but the great country of Canada.

With regard to the 4-H program, Mr. Speaker, we have a report on the status of that project. It's now being reviewed by my office, and we hope to be making some recommendations fairly shortly as to the future directions of 4-H relative to its position in the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife.

Moving into the area of parks and wildlife, I would like to start off by referring to those parks mentioned in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker. Kananaskis, the Carseland Wyndham park, and the Cold Lake provincial park will all see summer construction activity this summer. I think that's very important in our overall long-term plan for provincial parks, the expansion of new parks, and the expansion of existing parks. That partly relates to the question my colleague from Camrose asked the other day — as a matter of fact, it was earlier today, Mr. Speaker — about the expansion of an existing park.

AN HON. MEMBER: It seems like a long time ago.

MR. ADAIR: That's true, it seems like it was a long time ago.

Of general interest, though, Mr. Speaker, relative to the parks program, I think our parks program in this

province is probably one of the finest, not only in Canada but in North America. I think it is shown by the number of people, not only from Alberta but also from all over Canada and the North American continent, who take time to visit our provincial parks. We recognize that there has to be a degree of tolerance on the part of our citizens, relative to the number of spaces we have to offer for their use in the summer.

We have reached a stage in our development, I think, where the people of Alberta and the people of Canada are getting to the stage where they want to look at unstructured time. They want to be able to say, we want to go where we decide to go. And if we choose to sit down, we'll do that. In many cases they have chosen our provincial parks. At many times during the last number of summers, the majority of our provincial parks have been crowded to the limit.

We recognize that. We're working as quickly as we can toward the expansion of existing facilities within the existing parks and of course, as I mentioned, the creation of new parks, the Kananaskis, the Carseland Wyndham park, and the Cold Lake provincial park for construction this summer. One other park that will receive quite a bit of work this summer is the park at Young's Point on Sturgeon Lake in the Peace River country. That one has seen quite a bit of activity in the last number of years and will be a great improvement to the facilities of the Peace River area. I might add, Mr. Speaker, it's in the constituency of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, and not mine. I thought I should point that out in case some of my colleagues felt I was looking toward my own parks first. I might point out at this time that the one park in the parks system that probably needs the most work is in my constituency, and I hope to do something about that within the next three or four years.

It is my hope that the general parks upgrading program now in place and the fact that we're looking at a reclassification of the parks system — in other words, looking at the park as we see it now, the elite parks system we have and the possible inclusion of recreation sites in the parks concept — will provide increased benefits for all the people of Alberta and certainly more enjoyment for the citizens of this province.

Although I have requested a review of park fees, both overnight and the possibility of day-use fees, I can assure the members of this Legislative Assembly that we have chosen not to increase the camping fees or to implement day-use fees for the year 1976. I can also assure you, Mr. Speaker, that we are continuing to look at the assessment of what is happening in the other parks in the Dominion of Canada as well as in North America. Of course, there is continued planning and construction, not only in the rural parks in the province, but also in both Calgary's Fish Creek Park and Edmonton's Capital City complex.

Mr. Speaker, this year's budget reflects the desirable modifications to park philosophy which is directed to bringing parks to people, diversifying park opportunities, and protecting the natural resource heritage for our future generations.

I would now like to highlight two or three points within the fish and wildlife division which I am sure will be of interest to members of the House and to Albertans in general. We are embarking on a major program of problem wildlife management, a program

that is some two years into effect right now. It's a program of management of the wildlife populations which are really in conflict with man's interests, and which I think is rapidly becoming more and more a problem for us as man pushes his frontiers in ever-widening circles. Not too long ago, Mr. Speaker, the answer to problem wildlife was simply to kill the animals. This is no longer publicly acceptable or, I would say, indeed desirable. Instead, our program of problem wildlife management addresses itself to three major components: damage prevention, damage compensation, and population size control. Really, Mr. Speaker, this program has proven effective and is a leader in the field in all Canada.

With respect to those whose interests lie in the area of fishing, there are real concerns in the fact that we will be facing some problems in the very near future because of the federal regulation changes that will come into effect in January 1977, and that will place some extreme limitations on our ability to receive from the United States a supply of trout eggs for our Calgary hatchery and rearing station. If we should not be able to gear up to be able to create a supply of our own within the province before that time, Mr. Speaker, we may have a period where we will be very limited in the amount of stocking we can do. We hope to shorten the number of months or years; if I might say it, maybe that condition may exist for one to two years.

In anticipation of the increasing limitations, I should point out that we have nearly completed the reconstruction of the rearing station at the Raven. It's our hope that we will be able to begin production of our own brood stock for eastern brook trout and brown trout in the very near future. Concurrently, Mr. Speaker, we are still exploring ways and means of an in-province supply of rainbow trout eggs. That may involve the creation of another brood station somewhere in the province of Alberta, that will allow us to raise the adult fish to produce eggs so we have the capability of restocking the lakes to the present capacity or to a greater capacity.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about pheasants?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm just coming to pheasants as a matter of fact. With regard to pheasants — and I'll get back to my lines — the expansion of the pheasant hatchery and rearing facilities will progress this summer with the acquisition of a site east of Brooks. It's anticipated that this new facility will come on stream sometime in the year 1978. We have construction starting this summer and we hope to have a capacity of around 50,000 pheasants in 1978. At the present time our capacity is around 8,000 pheasants.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we are working with the sport organizations and groups, and one such is the Upland Birds Alberta group which is co-operatively assisting us to rear pheasants hatched from the present hatchery.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think we should indicate that one of the areas of concern — I never thought I'd get to the point where I'd get a note for standing up and speaking in the House, Mr. Speaker — is the fact that habitat really is a key to wildlife abundance in this province. We are most encouraged by the



enthusiastic co-operation we are receiving from the fish and game associations, the upland bird associations, the 4-H groups — and that's an interesting one, Mr. Speaker, because once we involve the 4-H groups in the raising of pheasants, it allows us at a very young age to get involved in the hunter-landowner problems that are created. A better understanding, I think, will be received by both groups.

Alternate programs for habitat restoration and preservation of pheasants and other forms of wildlife in settled Alberta, and our attempts to incorporate wherever possible the philosophies encompassed in the report of the Land Use Forum, are under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I should point out that our efforts in 1976, a year of restraint, will be directed to improving the quality and the quantity of life for Albertans through existing programs of recreation enrichment, parks upgrading and the allowable developments that will follow, wildlife habitat enhancement, and a program of production and conservation. Mr. Speaker,

Mr. Speaker, the quality and the quantity of life in Alberta is good. It is my objective, both as the MLA for the constituency of Peace River and the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, to see that that remains so in this great province.

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Speaker, [for] the Member for Sedgewick-Coronation and myself, if time was needed by the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife, we're only sorry he didn't come after us and maybe the Speaker would have given him a little more time.

Much has been said about restraint in this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, beginning with the Budget Address by the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and by speakers since. I guess it is fair to say that in inflationary times, an increase in total spending of under 11 per cent is, in fact, restraint.

Nevertheless, when I consider that in 1972 the total budget was \$1.2 billion and today that figure is \$2.9 billion, that enormous increase in a short four years, Mr. Speaker, frightens me and many other Albertans. So does the fact that over 92 per cent of the total increases in this budget are for social programs. It seems to me that all members of government — this government, the federal government, and municipal governments — all of us are going to have to give some serious thought [as] to [how] other governments can continue to project these kinds of increases, say from 5, 10, 20, 25 years down the road. In 10 years this province, even at the restrained rate of increase, would spend \$6.3 billion or five times what was spent in 1972. Could it be that those huge increases will continue to be in the area of social services?

I am very much afraid that the public is continually being educated to expect government to look after their social and recreational needs to an alarming extent. The popular jargon now, and we see it throughout the estimates of the expenditure, is delivery of health care, delivery of social services, delivery of community health. What a very long way we have come, Mr. Speaker, in one generation since the end of the Second World War.

My father, a typical Irish Canadian, raised six

children through a depression, taking cuts in a modest salary. Two cases of polio were handled, plus one major lung operation for family members. He paid for all of it. No medicare, no unemployment insurance, no Canada Pension plan, and only one social service, free well-baby clinic, yet he never had a cent of welfare, and was able to retire with enough resources to look after himself and my mother. Most Canadian families managed that way. Their children, those of us near the 50 mark, did not expect government to look after them from the cradle to the grave. But what about the present young couples, high school students, the university students, Mr. Speaker? These are the people who, it is said, demand these extremely expensive social services. I say, did they really in the beginning demand such services, or did the western social democracies grow up through socialistic legislators promising all these services?

I was interested to read a recent Associated Press story in the *Journal* from Copenhagen, Denmark. I would like to read a paragraph or two from that, Mr. Speaker. The headline is "Danes are starting to wonder if it pays to earn money":

No one suggests that a nation has gone rotten that provides everyone with good schools, virtually free medical care, dignified old age and the right to complain.

But Denmark acknowledges it is in trouble . . .

And since 1971, when they reached 44 per cent, taxes here have represented a greater part of the gross national product than anywhere else in the industrialized world.

Beyond the statistical horror show, the problem is that Denmark's troubles outpace recession and involve the functioning and growth of its super-welfare state.

Many Danes now believe that the country's recovery depends not only on the standard economic stimulants, but a deep decision on whether people want to continue in the direction the welfare state has brought them.

This direction is one in which 85 per cent of the population gets some kind of money from the state.

Because the days of cheap energy are over, because these energy costs will be very high, and because the high standard of living we have come to expect is absolutely dependent on energy supply, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that governments will be forced to look at quite different sets of priorities in the years just ahead of us.

There is one reason I feel it was a thoroughly sound move to keep corporation taxes low. We must encourage industry and commerce in Alberta if we wish to maintain our standard of living. I'm afraid the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is again not thinking straight. The entrepreneurs will not respond to preaching; they will respond to profits. This country needs their plants, jobs, and profits to keep us moving. A sound budget move, Mr. Speaker.

Therefore, instead of trying to deliver health care, social services, governments may have to return to the principle of sound insurance against serious illness that could bankrupt a family. People deserve and can pay for that protection.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that some brakes will also have to be applied in the other huge expense area,

education. We will have to concentrate on the essentials in both programs and building in this area. I sincerely believe, Mr. Speaker, that we will soon come to the point where we have no other options in these areas.

Therefore, it is our job as government members to take a position of leadership and get some facts of life across to our people. The time is coming when social services must mean looking after only those people who, through handicaps, are incapable of looking after themselves. In areas of recreation and culture, people will have to get along with much less public money. The working people, taxpayers, can only support so much taxation, and right now we are nearing the breaking point in Canada. One needs only to listen to thoughtful Canadians in many professions telling us this truth.

When governments and taxpayers are being asked to deliver so many services at such great costs, they surely have the right — they have the duty — to demand a good product. Many are the Albertans and Canadians who are presently critical of the product being produced in our schools. The fact is that a great many high school students are not graduating from that enormously expensive system with the essential educational tools they need to make their way in the world.

The fact is that many people are running to doctors for every snuffle or cut finger, because in their minds, doctors' services are free. We are being told by doctors that many unnecessary operations are being performed, especially in large cities where surgeons prefer to be. Doctors have always looked after both their rich and poor patients and with different rates of fees. But if medicare policies lead to making doctors into civil servants, with governments telling them what they can be paid, we will have continuing trouble with medicare, in my view, Mr. Speaker. Day care is another area where costs could mushroom and will need watching.

Environment, however, is a different matter. Here, I believe, is a proper role for government and one which will require more funding in the years ahead. The situation where we have lost acres and acres of good topsoil in southern Alberta is sad indeed, when we have the knowledge of how to prevent such a happening and did not put this knowledge to use. Clean air and clean water are the responsibility of government, along with preservation of good land. The government must spend money and accept responsibility by looking after the environment of Albertans.

The government has had a lot of catching up to do in what I would term needed social programs, Mr. Speaker. I am pleased with the progress in just five years in aid to our older people and our handicapped. I am particularly pleased that this year the government has recognized the tremendous contribution of Evelyn Unger and has brought her school under government assistance, along with the Winifred Stewart School.

We still have quite a way to go with slow learners and children with learning disabilities. Here, I believe we could make use of at least one summer month of special programs in our schools. I can see no reason why teachers should not work 230 days a year to

implement these programs under their existing salary contracts. With one month each summer, plus Christmas and spring breaks, teachers would still have more time off every year than most people in the work force. Plus, they also have quite a number of seminars and professional development days in their working year, time that comes directly off instruction time for students. I would ask that the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, give serious consideration to such programs for our slow learners and our learning disabled, and every summer use these schools for children with learning disabilities, and the handicapped.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say again that provision of 30 per cent resource revenue going into the heritage trust account is the wisest, most financially sound move ever made by any government anywhere in the world. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to be able to speak on the budget.

Thank you.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I request your leave to adjourn the debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow in the Assembly we would begin the business with second reading of Bill 3, The Interim Appropriation Act, followed by committee study of that bill. Then we would move back to the budget debate, Government Motion No. 1, probably for the balance of the morning.

On Monday, Mr. Speaker, during the afternoon in Committee of Supply, the Department of Agriculture. On Monday evening there will be the first meetings of the two subcommittees. Subcommittee A will begin Monday evening with study of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, followed on subsequent Monday and Thursday evenings with consideration of the Departments of Transportation, Environment, and Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. Sitting concurrently on Monday night will be Subcommittee B, which will consider the Department of the Attorney General, followed on later Thursday and Monday evenings with the Departments of Labour, Consumer and Corporate Affairs, and Municipal Affairs.

On Monday afternoon, Mr. Speaker, in Committee of Supply, I will be moving a formal motion, setting up these subcommittees.

Mr. Speaker, I move the Assembly do now adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock.

[The House rose at 9:51 p.m.]