

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Tuesday, October 19, 1976 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege in order to correct a reply I gave yesterday to a question during the question period. I would like to correct the record for *Hansard*. I was responding to a question from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview dealing with the Dunvegan Dam studies, and I concluded my answer by saying: "I understand some of the information has in fact been given to residents in the area." That part of the answer is incorrect, Mr. Speaker. The information has not yet gone out to residents in the area, although it has been requested.

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 237****The Rural Electrification
Association Contract Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a private member's bill, No. 237, The Rural Electrification Association Contract Act.

The purpose of Bill No. 237, Mr. Speaker, is to enact in legislation the proposal of the Alberta Union of Rural Electrification Associations for a new master contract between the power companies and the REAs in the province of Alberta. Under the terms of this legislation, REAs would be allowed to serve all customers, including industrial customers, within their franchised area.

[Leave granted; Bill 237 introduced and read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, as required by statute I would like to table the annual report of the Alberta Opportunity Company.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table the report of the Western Provincial Task Force on Elementary Consumer Education. As the report is extensive, I have arranged for a short summary to be distributed to the members.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table responses to Motions for Returns Nos. 179 and 181.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure today to introduce a group of Calgarians. They are 49 members of the Women's Canadian Club of Calgary, and have journeyed today to observe the Legislature in session. All hon. members will appreciate that the Women's Club holds regular meetings at which prominent Canadians are asked to attend and speak. I don't think they're particularly on a talent hunt today, but I think members will be mindful of their presence, perhaps anticipating invitations.

Might I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the 49 women in the members gallery stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**Department of
Housing and Public Works**

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, a provincial government team designated by the Alberta Housing Corporation board of directors has successfully negotiated an agreement with Germany's Hessische Landesbank, assignee of the Main Bontal Bank, to pay back without penalty the \$2,200,000 loan, equivalent to DM8,140,000, borrowed by the Alberta Housing Corporation in 1969, terminating the loan seven years before maturity date.

By terminating this loan, the provincial government will realize a saving of approximately \$2 million in interest charges and insulate itself from the increasing value of the deutschemark.

The circumstances of the loan were brought to fore during the public inquiry into the affairs of the Alberta Housing Corporation, carried out by the Honorable Justice Cairns in 1974. Alberta Housing Corporation borrowed \$2,200,000 and obtained net proceeds of \$2,002,000 or DM7,407,400 from the Main Bontal Bank, amortized over a period of 15 years at 9.375 per cent interest per annum. Legal action has been started to recover the \$198,000 deducted from the loan.

The result of the inquiry had generated a desire and need by the Alberta Housing Corporation to terminate this loan under the most favorable conditions. For this reason, a negotiating team was appointed to work toward this objective. After lengthy negotiations an agreement was reached between the province of Alberta, the Alberta Housing Corporation, and Hessische Landesbank.

The terms of the agreement were that the Alberta Housing Corporation pay back the face amount of DM8,140,000 or the equivalent in Canadian dollars, which is \$3,208,103 based on the present exchange rate. This amount was forwarded to Germany on September 30, 1976.

Since Hessische Landesbank bought this debenture from the Main Bontal Bank at a 9 per cent interest

rate, the difference between the original 9.375 per cent and the 9 per cent — that is .375 per cent — may be claimed by the creditors of the Main Bontal Bank. The Hessische Landesbank will resist any claim for the payment of the difference.

However, if the creditors should be successful in court in claiming this amount, the province and the Alberta Housing Corporation will undertake to indemnify the Hessische Landesbank for this claim, which is estimated at the present exchange rate at approximately \$61,000.

This settlement, and the fact that no penalty was paid, enabled the province to terminate an unfavorable debenture under the most favorable conditions that will not add any further amount to the originally obtained high-interest loan through the settlement.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

U.S.A./Alberta Trade

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier and ask what representation has been made by the Premier to the federal government following the trip the Premier took to the United States when, I believe, he met with Governor Judge of Montana, with officials in the state of Oregon, in Houston, New York, and Washington.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the nature of the representation we intend to make, and are in the process of making in a variety of channels, involves an approach to the federal government in two basic areas, agriculture and petrochemicals.

In the area of agriculture, what we are proposing and presenting in various ways through officials arises out of a hopeful negotiation on a bilateral basis for agriculture trade relationships between Canada and the United States. What we want to respond to, as some of the remarks I made in the House last Wednesday, is an unfair trade and tariff relationship where the ability of Canadians, particularly western Canadians, to process boxed beef in this part of Canada and ship it into the extensive market in the United States can be improved by a reduction in their ad valorem tax, which works out to between 10 and 15 cents a pound in comparison with the duty Canada extracts, the nominal 3 cents a pound for the shipment from the eastern or central part of the United States into central Canada.

In short, to improve our agricultural processing position in Canada it seems to us that in shipping cheap beef south of the border and then buying back the expensive cuts in central Canada, what we're doing is producing jobs not in the western part of Canada where agriculture is developed, but we're producing jobs in the central part of the United States, and we want to reverse that.

The approach follows a number of different directions. It involves, through the Canadian Ambassador to the United States, Mr. Warren, discussions I've already held with the U.S. Ambassador, Mr. Enders, [and] communications between the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs and the Department of Agriculture with the other provincial

governments and with the federal government.

The second aspect of the trip, and I would like to reconfirm, is the view with regard to petrochemical tariffs. The hon. members may be aware that the situation in Canada at the moment is that we allow chemicals and petrochemicals to come into this country at one-half the duty the United States charges Canadians. Quite obviously because of the situation of our petrochemical industry in Alberta where we face the domestic market, as I mentioned in my remarks last Wednesday, being so much in the control of the Petrosar project in Sarnia financed by the federal government, we need to do everything we can to improve our tariff position to strengthen the job opportunities for Albertans.

What we're proposing would require negotiation not along the [the lines of] General Agreement of Tariffs and Trade, Mr. Speaker, but a bilateral trade negotiation between Canada and the United States. They have a gap period in terms of their natural gas needs, and we felt that with the new supplies being discovered in Alberta today it might be possible to trade off in terms of jobs to provide better assurance of natural gas supply in the northwestern United States and in northern California, on the basis that they would strengthen and improve our position of jobs in Alberta by reducing on a bilateral basis petrochemical tariffs into the United States.

The response I received from the Governors of Montana, Washington, and Oregon was positive. Equally it was a significant response, although further discussions will be ensuing with some important senators in that area. I have yet to follow up with the Governor of California, who at that time was otherwise occupied.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Is it possible to table in the Assembly the representation made by the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to the federal government with regard to the agricultural aspects of the Premier's reply?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it may be that we would have to give notice. These things are being developed at the moment, rather than in formal presentations. They are being developed on a number of fronts with regard to discussions with various federal officials. Perhaps the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs may wish to respond or to add to my answer.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to check. I believe that most of the representations to date have been made at a number of levels, largely in a verbal way, but I would check and ascertain whether there is in fact any correspondence as yet.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. Has the minister made representation to the federal government on a minister to minister basis specifically dealing with the agricultural aspects of the visit to the United States?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, representations have been made at a number of levels, as the hon. Premier mentioned: by himself, by the provincial

Minister of Agriculture, and by myself and various officials. So I would have to assess. The thing is going ahead at a number of levels, and it is not simply a case of one single letter. In order to be effective we have been working on far more levels than just that.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, is the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs in a position to come back to the House and table with the Assembly a compilation of the representation that Alberta has made to the federal government, since the trip to the United States, on the question of the agricultural portion of that trip?

MR. HYNDMAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat uncertain as to what the hon. member means by a compilation. I would suggest, in order that we have some precision as to what is asked, what is requested, and what is to be answered, that if he'd put it on the Order Paper we will attempt to provide it.

As I say, I don't know what there is in the way of official correspondence. There may be none as yet. Other matters may relate to interdepartmental memos, of course, which are not 'tableable' in the Assembly. If he wants to put a question on the Order Paper with regard to the posture of the government or what communications there are, I would be very happy to consider it.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one further supplementary question to the minister. Did the minister say there may have been no correspondence with the federal government on this matter?

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is quite possible that there is no formal correspondence as yet, in the sense of a letter signed by me on the specific issues raised with the appropriate federal minister. As the hon. member knows, representations to the federal government are made in a number of ways, at a number of levels at appropriate times in the best interests of the province and of securing an effective result. So at the moment, I don't recall a formal letter from me on those specific issues, but I will check and assess it.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Is the premier in a position to indicate whether there has been any formal representation to the federal government with regard the tariff aspect of the Premier's trip?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I have had conversations on this matter with the Prime Minister. The hon. member will recall that this was a very basic part of the presentation by the Government of Alberta at the Western Economic Opportunities Conference. What the hon. leader should be aware of is that over a period of some years we have faced a position by the federal government that these matters should all be tied together as part of a tidy package derived in Ottawa under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, a multinational basis. On a number of occasions they have said to us that they do not look towards bilateral negotiations between the United States and Canada.

It was the feeling of the leader of government in this House, with his colleagues, that we should not

accept that as the final answer, and we therefore should take some initiatives to attempt to see if we can obtain support in other areas, in particular in the northwestern United States and with the senators and congressmen. It is our judgment that in these matters so vital to Alberta we are not prepared merely to accept the point of view of the bureaucracy in Ottawa that this tidy package, which in the past in these settlements on the last Kennedy round we have clearly suffered by, is something that is acceptable to us.

So it is not a matter of writing a letter and getting a negative reply. It is a matter of using every way we can, every pressure point we can to alter the federal bureaucracy point of view. Frankly that is what we should be doing instead of writing a simple letter, getting the usual negative reply, and giving up.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Premier. Is the Premier prepared to outline, either verbally or in the form of tabling in this Assembly, the kinds of representation the government has made to Ottawa since the Premier returned from the United States? That is all we want.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition had any iota of understanding and awareness of this situation, which he apparently does not by the question, he would recognize that that would be absolutely the wrong way to go about it.

The approach we should make is to see wherever we possibly can to get support to change a fundamental position by the Government of Canada, which is to tie everything into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. As far as I am concerned, I intend to talk to the United States Ambassador to Canada, to the Canadian Ambassador to the United States, to governors, to congressmen, to senators, to members of parliament, to leaders of the opposition, to other premiers. I intend to use everything I can to make a basic change of policy. I don't intend to follow the practice of the previous administration: write a letter, get a negative reply, and forget about it.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I restate the question. Will the Premier outline in this Assembly everything he has been able to do since he returned to this Assembly from the trip? Will he outline that to the Assembly in a written form and level with us?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'd be delighted to level with the Leader of the Opposition, because by levelling with him he would so apparently see that for a change some action is being taken in this area.

What I would be happy to do on any occasion that's appropriate in this House — and some new developments are occurring that I think are most significant and will happen within the next two months — is that when these developments have passed by, I am prepared to give an undertaking that when the next occasion occurs in this Legislature that I can give a full and complete report on the matter of trade and tariffs after these upcoming events, I would welcome it. But I am not going to be involved in a request that merely deals with documentation. The question that I am prepared to set forth is the record of this government in trying to do something that has been neglected in this province for 38 years.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. The Premier mentioned that he held discussions with several American governors concerning a possible trade-off, if I heard him right, concerning petrochemical tariffs on one hand, and an assurance of supply of additional natural gas to the northwestern U.S. on the other hand.

My question to the Premier, Mr. Speaker, so that Albertans might be in a position to judge this course of action: was any indication given to the governors of the northwestern United States that the Premier mentioned as to the amount of additional natural gas we would consider appropriate to constitute a reasonable trade-off on lowered tariff barriers for petrochemical products?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, there was no discussion in that sort of detail. What was expressed to the governors at the time was that we were working contrary to the expressed federal policy in Canada at the moment, which is a phase-out of natural gas exports. We felt that if we could get some support from them, we had a slight chance — and we said it was a slight chance — to reverse that direction. We felt that the only way we could appeal to Canadians on this issue is that what we were discussing was something pretty simple: were the new jobs going to be in Ontario or in Alberta? That was the issue.

ASH/Deerhome Inspection Report

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the second question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health and ask if she has had an opportunity to find if a report has been done by government officials with regard to the conditions at Alberta School Hospital/Deerhome. Has the minister had a chance to peruse the report, and can she indicate its findings to the House?

MISS HUNLEY: I believe the hon. Leader of the Opposition is inquiring about the public health inspectors' report. Would that be so?

I have not received a copy of the report, but the inspections have been done. They've been done at our request, because for some reason they are not actually expected to visit and report on public institutions. However, we are in favor of having those inspections done. One has been done. I have not read it. I understand that the report is quite favorable. I have asked for a copy of the report to be delivered to my office.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In light of the controversy surrounding the matter, would the minister be prepared to consider tabling a copy of the report after the minister has had a chance to review it?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll consider that.

MR. SPEAKER: Before going on to the next questions, I should perhaps express some concern about the length and nature of the exchange between the hon.

Leader of the Opposition and the Premier.

Of course it's a difficult task to draw an exact line between giving information and debating, but I would suggest first of all that the Chair is not the only guardian of the procedures of the Assembly. It's open to any hon. member to raise a point of order on an occasion of that kind. Secondly, I don't think we should go further in that direction; otherwise the question period would become what it has not been intended to be, which is a period for debate.

Labor's Day of Protest

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Provincial Treasurer. I'd like to find out what action has been taken on those employees who walked off the job during the day of protest on October 14.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, members will recall that some time ago I indicated that prior to October 14, we had advised members of the civil service that anyone away from work that day without a valid reason, such as illness, would not be paid — that was following the usual practice of not being paid when one doesn't work — and that after the event, when we had all the necessary information at hand, we would consider what further action might be taken.

We have now been able to give careful consideration to the situation, and have concluded that those employees who took part in the October 14 withdrawal of services will receive a letter of reprimand. In addition, Mr. Speaker, for those employees who had earlier received a letter of reprimand or similar sanction for a similar withdrawal of services, there would be a two-day suspension.

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. How many employees were involved in the actual walkout?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated in the House a few days ago, the percentage was very, very small. I do not have the actual number, because one needs to find out who was away for a valid reason, such as illness, and who was away as part of the withdrawal of services. I think it will be some time before we have that figure.

Senior Citizen Housing Report

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Housing. I'd like to ask the minister if he has received the study on senior citizens' housing and needs, commissioned to Mr. Bev Brooker.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the Alberta Housing Corporation has indeed received the study of the commissioner engaged to study that area. The commissioner's name was Mr. Brooker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Will the minister be tabling a copy of that report in the Assembly?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, the report is a study commissioned by the board of directors of the Alberta Housing Corporation. The board will be having a meeting within the next two weeks, I think. At that time it will give consideration to whether or not it wishes to make the report public at this time.

Business Development —

Intergovernmental Liaison

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism. I'd like to know if the minister can indicate if he has had discussions with the recently appointed federal minister responsible for business development.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I have not, although I did take a moment to drop a letter of congratulations to both the new minister of small business and the new Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

DR. BUCK: Can the minister indicate if the government is in a position to indicate when there will be some liaison? The information I have received [is] that the ministers responsible for this generate much business activity. Will there be some liaison between the federal minister and the provincial minister in the near future?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, the liaison is ongoing. It has been the practice of the department during my colleague's term, the last term, and my term in this department to have continuing liaison with the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce and other federal departments. Our departmental officials are in touch on almost a daily basis with the officials of the federal ministry, as well as other provincial industry departments. It's not something new, Mr. Speaker. It's an ongoing thing and has been under way since we became the government.

Chiropractic Training

DR. WALKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Advanced Education. In view of the fact that no academic institution or any government body in the world recognizes chiropractic instruction as a legitimate academic process, as it is [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The hon. member's preamble is certainly argumentative, and perhaps he would like to come directly to the question.

DR. WALKER: Would the minister please elaborate on his statement in the House on Monday in which he assured us that chiropractic students receive Alberta funds in the form of both grants and loans?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, during the course of debate on second reading of The Students Finance Act, one hon. member mentioned in support of a clause in the act that students who can't get a certain kind of training or education in Alberta can get it elsewhere with support from the Students Finance Board. The

hon. member mentioned two such activities, students who seek to be veterinarians and those who seek to be optometrists.

To make the record complete for *Hansard* and for the information of the House, I mentioned that in addition students who seek the practice of chiropractic also get assistance in one Canadian college and in one in the United States. The number of students is about 84.

Student Financing

DR. BUCK: Supplementary to the hon. minister on a point of clarification. Sorry, hon. Minister Dowling. Mr. Speaker, I might explain that rattling paper drives the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism wild because he's listening to it on a hearing aid.

MR. CLARK: That's not the only thing.

DR. BUCK: One of the disadvantages of growing old, Mr. Speaker.

My question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Advanced Education is: how extensive is support to students who are taking courses in the United States, and does it apply to them?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, under the Canada student loan program through which we administer a good number of our provincial programs, the total cost last year was \$134,000. Through the direct Alberta student finance loan it was \$101,000, for a total of about \$235,000. About \$51,000 is eligible for remission.

DR. WALKER: A supplementary to the minister. Are there any other unaccredited institutions to which we send students?
[interjections]

Gas Co-ops — Faulty Pipe

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones. Have the minister or any officials in his department received complaints from rural gas co-ops where they have developed leaks in their lines in the last three or four years as a result of faulty pipes?

DR. WARRACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have, and we've been conducting some inspection work to determine the exact nature and location of those problems. That work is going on at the present time.

That important question has been drawn to our attention in at least three instances across Alberta, one in the member's constituency.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What is the government's policy when it comes up with a report on this? Will any assistance be provided to rural gas co-ops that have had this problem?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, we'll be making that determination as we get the detailed and specific

information on hand. We don't want them to leak, certainly. That's a fundamental kind of policy position, I guess.

DR. BUCK: Very astute.

DR. WARRACK: Pursuant to that, we would be undertaking, in conjunction with the owners of the systems, a system by which the safety and continuity of service can be preserved.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate the source of the poor pipe?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question turns out to be a highly debatable matter in this way. First of all, in the production of the pipe the quality depends considerably on the nature and quality of the resin that goes into the pipe. So that's two steps. Further to that, there's the transport of the pipe to where it needs to be used; and fourthly, the construction in the process itself. Basically what we're finding is that everyone blames everybody else.

MR. CLARK: A supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate whether his department has checked to see if most of the problems that have developed in these lines come from a particular batch of resin which was acquired some time ago?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, to try to make that particular determination is one of the matters that is under review. We don't have a final conclusion as yet, at least I don't, on that particular matter.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister indicate what arrangements have been made with the rural gas co-ops that already have had to take out faulty pipe which had been approved by the ERCB officials? What arrangements have been made with these gas co-ops where they've had to replace line already?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I was really answering that question when the hon. Member for Bow Valley posed it. We feel we want to have the specifics and circumstances on hand for all the problem areas before we make a determination on what would be the best and most appropriate approach to deal with those problems.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister, just so there's no misunderstanding. Have no commitments been given to any rural gas co-op with regard to the faulty pipe they have already had to replace — no commitments at all made by the minister?

DR. WARRACK: Well, I'm a little concerned about no commitments at all. When they were brought to our attention we certainly made a commitment immediately that we would assist and lead the review of exactly what the problem was and how serious, its location, and the other dimensions of this kind of problem. So that kind of commitment has been made. But I'm not aware that there has been a

financial commitment as yet with respect to the exact handling of this remedial work.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to give us any indication as to when the government will be able to make a determination on this particular question?

DR. WARRACK: When our review is complete.

Gas Rebate Plan

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the hon. Minister of Utilities and Telephones. Is the government planning to continue its excellent program [of] rebate to the people?

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, that is an important and timely question. I appreciate the word "excellent" used by the hon. member because, as all members of the Legislature certainly are aware, the cost of natural gas for home heating and other residential use in Alberta is much lower than anywhere else in Canada because of the some \$150 million — actually more than that — that has already been committed in the natural gas rebate plan.

The natural gas rebate plan is committed to the end of this fiscal year, and that commitment is complete. We are actively reviewing the question of whether to commit that plan further, and this determination will be reached in conjunction with the budgetary process.

I might add while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, that we had an excellent representation and brief from the Federation of Alberta Gas Co-ops asking that the recommitment be made.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, so we can nail down this review procedure. Mr. Speaker, does the government anticipate making an announcement on what the program will be, or if it will be continued, by the time the Federation of Alberta Gas Co-ops has its convention in the latter part of November?

DR. WARRACK: I'm speaking at that meeting on November 24, and I'm hopeful we will be in a position to give some indication at that time. I indicated that to the Federation of Gas Co-ops' board when we met recently.

Taber Employees' Dispute

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Labour. It concerns the situation in Taber where some 32 employees are presently out of work. Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. minister is: has the minister taken any action to facilitate discussion between the Taber town council on one hand and those employees who were dismissed as a result of some of them being involved in the October 14 demonstration, and others subsequently walking out to protest the suspension of those who were involved?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the short answer to the hon. member's question is that I have not had discussions. However, I've been informed of the situation by the hon. Member for Taber-Warner, the hon. minister Mr. Bogle. My understanding of the situation at the present time is that the developments that have taken place are a little changeable. We would certainly respond to any request to the department to become involved in this particular incident.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the government received reports of any similar action by other municipalities in the province of Alberta?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think the situation in Taber could almost be described as unique. However, that isn't to say that there haven't been some cases where an individual employee or so might have been dismissed by employers. The thing that made the Taber situation unique is that I believe 12 employees were involved, making that quite a significant number of the employees of that particular employer.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister flowing from his original answer. I took the minister's answer to mean that if there were a request the department would look seriously at providing consultation, hopefully to facilitate a settlement.

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister, to clarify that. Does it mean that if the Department or the Minister of Labour receives a request from any of the suspended employees, the department will move to attempt to facilitate a reconciliation or resolution of this problem?

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, the question is very, very clearly hypothetical. Possibly the hon. member might wish to repeat the question if the eventuality comes to pass.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can rephrase the question so that it's less hypothetical. Is the government prepared to intervene at this stage to attempt to settle this dispute?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I think it's only fair to the parties where there is a dispute between employer and employee to rely on them. My own interpretation of it certainly includes that one of the parties request that assistance. Certainly if assistance is requested, we would set about to obtain more direct information than we have at the present time, in the sense of up-to-date and complete information, and see if that made a basis for giving consultation to the parties, on the assumption they were willing to receive it.

Beef Exports to U.S.A.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Has the minister been in contact with the federal Minister of Agriculture

since the announcement Sunday that there's going to be a quota on beef exported to the United States?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I've not personally been in direct contact with the federal Minister of Agriculture, although the staff of my department have been in contact with staff members of the federal Department of Agriculture, the federal Industry, Trade and Commerce people, as well as a number of people in Washington who are connected with the U.S. Department of Agriculture and are involved in the negotiations.

U.S.A./Alberta Trade (continued)

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. It flows from answers he gave to the question first posed today by the Leader of the Opposition concerning natural gas supply vis-a-vis changes in the tariff structure. In my recollection, Mr. Speaker, the Premier indicated he had talked to the U.S. Ambassador to Canada. Mr. Speaker, my question is: from the conversations the Premier held with the American Ambassador, was there favorable consideration by the U.S. government to this proposal of assuring additional gas supplies to the northwest U.S. in return for lowered tariffs for Canadian petrochemicals?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, on two grounds it would be inappropriate to respond to that question. First of course, the nature of the discussions between the Ambassador and me would not be ones I could disclose without concurrence.

Secondly, I think I can say that the discussions were not of that nature. They were of an exploratory nature: for the Ambassador to understand more fully the point of view I expressed — and I believe the Canadian Ambassador Mr. Warren would say had expressed forcefully — when we met with the State Department in Washington; and for us, because he visited not only with me but with other ministers, a greater awareness of some of the views of the U.S. administration.

We hold to the view, though, that in these matters of bilateral trade negotiations it can't simply be a matter between governments. It will require effective communication between the provincial governments and the governors, senators, and congressmen of the United States that are most affected.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question for clarification. The Premier's most recent answer puzzled me a bit. Do I take it there was no formal discussion with Mr. Enders of this trade-off? If that's true, Mr. Speaker, was that kind of formal discussion held with the governors of the United States the Premier referred to?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it's difficult to respond to the use of the word "formal", because we're quite aware in Alberta that this is a decision that has to be made by the federal government. It

involves a matter of international commerce, so to that degree it's certainly within the jurisdiction of the federal government. What we're trying to do with this approach and other approaches is to change the existing view of the federal government on these matters, which seems so consistently to favor central Canada. We're recognizing that the large use of our natural gas is not to heat homes in central Canada. It's used for industrial purposes in central Canada. So if it's industry at stake, I'd like to see the jobs in Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Premier, just to try to clarify the government's position. In the light of the answer given by the hon. Premier that Alberta would look to U.S. governors, senators, or wherever Alberta can find support, would it be the view of the government that, if necessary, the initiative for bilateral change could very well come from the United States in dealing with Canada on this matter?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I have no way of knowing [from] where the initiative would come. All we can do is express to the various people involved what we think is an action that is in the Canadian interest, and that is an action that assures that we are able to develop a diversified economy and provide jobs in western Canada. We think it is a reasonable situation — recognizing their needs; long term contracts are involved — to see if we could set aside some portion of natural gas supply for a few years while they come up with alternate supplies in these areas; that we are prepared to purchase our natural gas when other parts of Canada were not interested in it. We think that that is important for us to recognize, particularly — as I mentioned, and I will continue to repeat — because the natural gas diversion that is going to be moved away from these areas where we might be able to sell our products and create our jobs is going for job creation and industrial use in central Canada.

Metric Conversion — Speedometers

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Deputy Premier and Minister of Transportation. Now that the travelling public is slowly getting to understand the metric system on our highways, is the government taking any steps to convert speedometers to metric?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, the question of metric conversion of speedometers would be dealt with by the federal Metric Commission relative to what is required there and in automobile manufacture. The commitment we and other provincial governments have is that, as far as highways are concerned, the speed limits would be converted September 1, 1977, and that is going ahead on schedule.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary. Is it the intention to remove the mileage signs before the speedometers are converted?

MR. HORNER: Well, hopefully, Mr. Speaker, the federal Metric Commission will be making available to

car owners Plexiglas adapters so they will know at what speed they are going. I understand this is feasible. So our commitment, that now has been joined by nine of the 10 provinces in Canada, is that the change-over date would be September 1, 1977.

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary. Will the conversion enable the driver to know when he has covered a kilometre?

DR. HORNER: Well I am not sure of that either, Mr. Speaker, but I hope we might be able to have some kilometre spacing on our highways so we could get people used to that and so they would know, in fact, what a kilometre is and its relation to their former habit of a mile.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. On a point of information I have a '75 half-ton, and it has both speed things on it. Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate to us what the legal limits will be in kmh? When you look at the conversion thing, about 95 kmh is 62 mph.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I think we've already announced that in the conversion we'll be going to the nearest round figure at five miles. In other words, 65 miles per hour becomes 100 kilometres per hour. We'll try to make it as simple as possible for the hon. member so that he doesn't get caught speeding.

Hiring Practices — Grande Cache

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Labour which is a follow-up to the question I asked the hon. Premier.

Is the Minister of Labour in a position to indicate if he has had an opportunity to peruse the information of an allegation made in the Grande Cache area that former employees of McIntyre Mines who either quit the job or were fired could not go back on the job site in a capacity with any other company?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, it is true that the allegation was made by a gentleman who wrote a letter to the Premier. We have had the opportunity, through the Alberta Human Rights Commission and officials of the Department of Labour, to look into the matter. The response that went back to Mr. Thomas, who wrote the letter, was basically that the company denies the allegations, therefore putting at issue the question of whether or not the statements made by him are in any sense fair. It seemed to us at that point that it was a dispute between the two parties.

Beyond that, I think it is important to assure the hon. member that the company included in the assurances it gave that in the event one or more supervisors were contravening the company policy by behaving in the way described, they would again tell the supervisors that that was against company policy and that the employees of subcontractors were indeed allowed on the premises, which was the issue.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

[Motion carried.]

head: WRITTEN QUESTIONS

208. Mr. Notley asked the government the following question:

- (1) What steps were taken to collect the loan to St. Paul Livestock Auction Mart Limited, which was repaid to the Treasury Branch out of the general revenue fund pursuant to Order in Council 791/76?
- (2) What policy guidelines were followed in determining that the loan to St. Paul Livestock Auction Mart Limited was uncollectable?
- (3) Was St. Paul Livestock Auction Mart Limited still in operation at the time the loan was paid out of the general revenue fund?
- (4) Has any attempt been made to seize assets of the company to recover a portion of the uncollectable debt?
- (5) What portion of the loan was repaid by St. Paul Livestock Auction Mart Limited before it was determined that the remainder of the loan was uncollectable?

MR. SPEAKER: I take it that Question 208 is accepted by the hon. Attorney General.

MR. FOSTER: Agreed.

220. Mr. Taylor asked the government the following question:

Has the provincial government made representations to the federal government regarding the new proposed immigration policies, and if so, what was the nature of such representations?

MR. FOSTER: We'll accept 220.

head: MOTIONS FOR RETURNS

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move the following motions for returns stand and maintain their place on the Order Paper: 204, 209, 213, 215, 222, and 223.

[Motion carried]

210. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

Copies of all correspondence from January 1, 1973, to October 13, 1976, between St. Paul Livestock Auction Mart Limited, and

- (a) the Alberta Export Agency,
- (b) the Provincial Treasurer,
- (c) the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose an amendment to Motion for a Return 210. It reads as follows: after the phrase "Minister of Agriculture" the following should be added: "subject to the concurrence of St. Paul Livestock Auction Mart Limited".

211. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

every trip made outside of Canada by employees or other persons acting on behalf of a Government of Alberta department, board, commission, or agency which was paid for from public funds during the period April 1, 1975, to March 31, 1976, including:

- (1) the date of each trip,
- (2) the destination of each trip,
- (3) the purpose of each trip;
- (4) the name of each government employee or other person acting on behalf of the government who went on each trip;
- (5) the total cost of each trip.

[Motion carried]

212. Mr. R. Speaker proposed the following motion to this Assembly:

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

All land and buildings leased by a Government of Alberta department, board, commission and agency outside the cities of Edmonton and Calgary as at October 13, 1976, giving in each case:

- (1) the address of the leased space,
- (2) the total amount of leased space,
- (3) the rate of rent,
- (4) the name of the landlord,
- (5) the name of the occupant,

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might make just a few comments on this motion. I think the hon. member, in putting this motion on the Order Paper, doesn't realize the extent of the information required here. For example, by including Crown corporations as agencies we will be involved in attempting to identify the various easements that Crown corporations have across the province, for which we pay a charge in most instances, and which are classified as a lease. In addition to that, we have a considerable amount of public housing, senior citizens' housing, and various types of building on leased land.

Though we're prepared to agree with the motion for a return as stated, I would seriously suggest to the hon. member that if he wishes some particular type of information, he would make the task much simpler for us if he identified that type of information rather than the extensive amount of generalized information that this motion for a return now implies.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, in response to the minister's comments, I'd be prepared to hold the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member, unless we take this as an answer to a question, will be closing the debate. Is the Assembly ready to have the . . .

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

[Motion carried]

214. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

Every trip made outside of the province of Alberta by Jake Ens of the Alberta Export Agency on behalf of the Government of Alberta during the period April 1, 1975, to September 1, 1976, including:

- (1) the date of each trip,
- (2) the destination of each trip,
- (3) the purpose of each trip,
- (4) the name of each person acting on behalf of the Government of Alberta who accompanied Jake Ens on each trip,
- (5) the total cost of each trip.

[Motion carried]

216. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

With reference to O.C. 1012/76:

- (1) a list of those coal leases for which the \$1 million in compensation in payments were made as a result of changes in the government's coal policy;
- (2) for each of the above leases:
 - (a) its location,
 - (b) the name of the company (companies) or individuals to which the lease was issued,
 - (c) the date of issue,
 - (d) the total amount of consideration received by the government for issuing the lease,
 - (e) the total amount of compensation (or "refund") paid by the government in respect of changes in the coal policy.
- (3) a list of those coal leases for which payment of compensation has been authorized from funds additional to those warranted pursuant to O.C. 1012/76;
- (4) with respect to leases listed under (3) above, the same data requested under (2) above.

[Motion carried]

217. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

A list of office spaces which have stood empty for a period of one week or greater while in the possession of the Government of Alberta during the period March 16, 1975, through September 30, 1975, showing:

- (a) the address or location thereof,
- (b) the number of square feet involved,
- (c) the total cost to Alberta taxpayers of holding that space during the period of time it was empty,
- (d) the rationale for holding it empty.

[Motion carried]

218. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That an order of the assembly do issue for return showing:

- (1) a list of all direct loans and/or loan guarantees issued by the Agricultural Development Corpora-

tion to Northern Alberta Agribusiness Ltd., showing the date of application, the date of issuance, the term, the interest rate, the lender, the precise purpose of the loan, the amount, and the security offered therefor;

- (2) for each loan listed in (1) above, the purpose stated on the loan application for the loan, the actual application of the funds, the extent of repayment, the date of foreclosure or recall, the extent and nature of recovery by the province, and the net loss to the Alberta Treasury;
- (3) the full extent of the land holdings of Northern Alberta Agribusiness Ltd. and/or the principals thereof within a 100 mile radius of the Fahler Alfalfa plant, as made known to the Alberta government or its agencies:
 - (a) prior to the plant going into receivership
 - (b) as of September 30, 1976.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I move that Motion 218 be amended by striking out in Section 3 all words after the word "within" and substituting the following:

... a 25-mile radius of the Fahler alfalfa plant, as made known to the Minister of Agriculture as of September 30, 1976.

[Motion carried]

219. Mr. Notley proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

- (1) a list of all guarantees issued under the Alberta Export Agency Loan Guarantee Regulations;
- (2) a separate listing of all such loans for which the Alberta government was required to pay, and showing for each the total amount of principal and interest which was payable by the Alberta government;
- (3) for each loan listed under (2) above, an account of the total recovery by the Alberta government, the form of such recovery, e.g. property, buildings, land, patents, et cetera, and the terms and conditions, such as buy back, which were attached thereto.

[Motion carried]

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

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

- (1) the total cost of the preparation of the Government of Alberta Telephone Directory, June 1976, prepared for Alberta Government Services;
- (2) the number of copies printed of the document referred to in (1).

[Motion carried]

224. Mr. Clark proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

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

A list of names of all persons who attended the

luncheon sponsored by the Premier of Alberta at the first ministers' conference on August 18, 1976, at the Edmonton Plaza Hotel.

[Motion carried]

head: **MOTIONS OTHER THAN GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

1. Moved by Dr. Buck:

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.

[Adjourned debate: Mr. King]

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, prior to adjourning debate on March 25 of this year, I had spent a few minutes expressing some concerns about the resolution and about the comments that had been made by the mover during his remarks. Because so much time has transpired, I'd like to reiterate those comments very briefly before I close.

The first was that the proposal in the resolution is ambiguous to say the least. I had argued that there might be some merit in it if the mover was unclear in his own thinking and wanted the opportunity to clarify it in the course of debate. On the one hand, to limit individuals does not limit the aggregate amount of land in the province that may be purchased by non-residents. On the other hand, limiting the aggregate amount of land which may be owned by non-residents creates problems of equity and administration; for example, the problem of deciding who among non-residents is going to have the right to buy land and the question of deciding how this right is going to be administered.

I suggested that the resolution avoids some very critical questions that we have to consider within the context of the non-resident ownership of land. There's the question of degree. What is an appropriate foreign ownership of land? And at what point does the amount of non-resident ownership of land become inappropriate in terms of the number of acres that are held in the province, in terms of the value of the land that is owned by non-residents, and in terms of the features that are attractive about the land; for example, whether or not it is located on the corner of 101 Street and Jasper in Edmonton, whether or not it is valuable recreational land.

There is no consideration in the resolution or in the comments by the honorable mover about the impact of a prohibition on the ownership of land generally and about the practicality of a rollback; that is, having decided that it is not desirable for foreigners to own land in the province, foreigners including people from Saskatchewan or British Columbia, what is the position of those people who are fortunate enough to have acquired land before we make this change, whatever it may be, and why should they continue to enjoy an advantage which none of their fellows can enjoy? In other words, what is the feasibility of a rollback? What is the feasibility of acquiring that land which is presently owned by non-residents?

There was no consideration of the constraint we

are placing on sellers in what purports to be a free market, and the consequences of this. There was no consideration of using a taxation mechanism as an alternative to some kind of legislative prohibition or control.

Another of the concerns I have is quite simply that the proposal of the hon. member may be *ultra vires*, particularly in the light of the recent Supreme Court of Canada decision respecting legislation in Prince Edward Island. Whether or not it is technically *ultra vires* of the provincial government, it certainly seems to me that it is counterproductive to national unity. Because what it is proposing, we must remember, is not the control on ownership of land on the basis of whether or not you are a Canadian citizen or a landed immigrant, but on the basis of whether or not you are a resident of this province.

As I said earlier, it would not catch students from a country in Africa or southeast Asia who are here for only two or three years, or west Europeans here on a work visa for two years before they're transferred back to the head office of their company in London, England. Rather, people who could be citizens of Canada but not residents of the province would be caught.

The resolution presupposes an inability to co-operate with the federal government and/or the provinces on this question. It apparently rejects the recommendation of the Land Use Forum and in the process rejects the possibility that the foreign investment review legislation of the federal government could be amended to accommodate our interests or that the foreign investment review authority might delegate some of its responsibility under federal legislation to the provinces for the purpose of controlling the non-resident or foreign ownership of land.

As I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, I acknowledged that there might be some value in an ambiguous or obscure resolution if we might hear from the mover of the resolution some clearer thinking in terms of his own position on the question. Such was not the case, so I have attempted to list some of my concerns. Other than those I have enumerated, I thought it was an excellent resolution.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I consider it a pleasure to enter the debate on the resolution sponsored by the Member for Clover Bar. Mr. Speaker, I almost always enjoy the remarks by the hon. member opposite. I particularly enjoyed his remarks last night on the topic of land use. I recall that he was fulminating and chastising us one moment for our lack of generosity, our restraint program vis-a-vis the budget, particularly the school budget. A moment later he was giving us a very bad time indeed for our contribution for the Capital City Park in Edmonton, and asking where our priorities were. How could we justify the Capital City Park contribution, which is so much appreciated by the citizens of this city, when we had a restraint program on the educational budget? Lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't a moment later that he was fulminating and chastising us for not purchasing the Alberta Game Farm on the edge of the city. At that time, Mr. Speaker, I wondered where his priorities were, and how he could justify a recommendation like that in a restraint period.

Mr. Speaker, trying to define his political philoso-

phy—where he stands on the spectrum: right, left, or centre—reminded me of a good friend who at one time was in a choir. He was tone deaf and had trouble relating to the music. His choir leader told him that about the only time he hit the note was when he crossed over it. Mr. Speaker, the only time I'm able to identify the political philosophy of the member opposite is when he crosses over from right to left or back again.

Anyway, what we're speaking about here, Mr. Speaker, is the Land Use Forum report and the recommendations thereunder. It encompasses a very broad topic. The Forum was set up in October '73 in response to the concern of the government on land use generally. It made a very encompassing and wide report.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's interesting at this time to take a look at some of the recommendations of the report and how they might have been implemented. That is an indication of the government's ability to listen to the people.

Recommendation No. 8 dealt with assessing land factors before allowing major change in use. I think an excellent example of how the government has responded to that recommendation is our response in the Dodds-Round Hill area where, after due consideration by various government departments, an application for a major power project was turned aside with the direction that the power companies might look elsewhere for power. Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent example of the government having listened to the people on the basis of a very complete report.

Mr. Speaker, I'm aware that some of the members opposite had some very uncomplimentary remarks to make about the report. I frankly think it was a very good one. There are particular areas where we may not agree, but in general it is a very substantive and worth-while contribution.

Another indication of the implementation by the government of the report is Recommendation No. 9. That had to do with municipal boundaries and annexation decisions. Members will recall that in the spring session of the Legislature we passed legislation which brought the annexation final approval on the basis of Local Authorities Board recommendations, back to the government table here, so that final decisions are made here. Again, an implementation of the land-use report.

A further example, Mr. Speaker, is Recommendation No. 10, which dealt with the location of major extractive industries. Again, cabinet approves the location of industries and directs new industries to particular sites in the province.

Another implementation example is Recommendation No. 20, the land-use secretariat. Rather than adopt this recommendation in detail, the government has responded by appointing a new Associate Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Mr. Dallas Schmidt, which is a substantial implementation of this recommendation.

Recommendation No. 49 dealt with the establishment of major parks and suggested that the government should have an active program in this regard. Two major metropolitan parks are prime examples of the implementation of this recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, other examples of recommendations which were accepted by the government were No. 82 and No. 83, which dealt with the communal proper-

ties committee. Both these recommendations were adopted in total. Recommendations dealing with management of urban growth, Nos. 97 and 105, have been implemented, and the government is now taking an active leadership role in many, many ways in managing urban growth in the Calgary and Edmonton areas by the implementation of restricted development areas. I understand that members opposite fully support the RDA declaration in Calgary. At least that was the way I understood their remarks a day or two back.

Mr. Speaker, another example of an implementation of the report is No. 159, dealing with reclamation of land. That is now an important part of resource development approvals. In fact it's a very substantial budgetary item and one of the areas where, I understand, we have had growth in the public service. It's growth that I am sure is cheered and acclaimed by the people of the province in general. There was a shortage of action in this area prior to our government coming to office in 1971. Fortunately that neglect has been reversed. We now have a very active Department of the Environment, with a very active staff.

Mr. Speaker, an example of our ability to assess proposals in the report and either accept or not accept them was No. 65, which dealt with trespass proposals. The recommendation was that people be allowed to walk on private lands, subject to certain conditions. Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the listening we did in our constituencies and throughout the province, we concluded that that was not an acceptable premise at this time. Accordingly the chairman of our caucus land-use committee has on behalf of the committee and the government rejected, at least for the time being, implementation of that recommendation.

Mr. Speaker, the recommendation that the government be urged "to introduce legislation which would limit the amount of Alberta land which [might] be purchased and held by non-residents of Alberta" is a very complicated question and area. First of all, Mr. Speaker, it is a very serious recommendation. It is the taking away of someone's right to deal, as he has been able to do historically, with his property as he might wish, provided it does not adversely affect another person. I don't think we can accept that lightly. There may be valid reasons for moving in this area generally, but it's something that needs a very thorough and full assessment.

The Member for Edmonton Highlands has dealt with some of the difficulties in this area. He has talked about the citizenship act changes that might be necessary to permit us to legislate the way we would like to. We're all aware of the situation in Prince Edward Island and Saskatchewan, where they have legislated against land buying by non-residents of those particular provinces. This has worked to the disadvantage of many people who are not residents but may previously have been there, or perhaps live in a border area and farm on both sides of the border. Many, many problems can arise in this area, and I would be interested, as was the Member for Edmonton Highlands, in what recommendations the sponsor of the motion might have to resolve some of the difficulties.

Through public statements and the disclosure of his correspondence with the Prime Minister, our Premier has indicated his efforts to have the Citizenship Act

amended, so that we might consider legislation here which might preclude persons not resident in Canada or not living here from buying land. The problem would be whether it should be restricted only to provincial residents or to landed immigrants or to residents of Canada at large.

Mr. Speaker, at this time there is no concrete evidence that the question of non-resident land buying is a problem. The Land Use Forum report indicated that it was not. Our government, through the Attorney General, has implemented a monitoring system through Land Titles whereby non-resident land buying is tallied and a report is made to the Legislature from time to time. Indications are that to date this has not been a serious problem. However, none of us can be sure that the monitoring system is entirely accurate. It may be that you can find ways around it. I'm sure that through trust arrangements and other set-ups industrious lawyers might jeopardize the buyer. At least for the time being, they may be able to subvert the intention of the monitoring system.

I am told by a good many people that foreign land buying is not the major problem in the present high land prices, but in fact it is investors from the urban areas who are interested in buying as a curb against inflation, or alternately as a place to spend some time out of the hurly-burly or the rush of city life; that they are prepared to pay prices, Mr. Speaker, that are beyond those that are justifiable in terms of economic return on farming; and that it probably isn't the foreign or the non-resident land buyer who is raising the prices beyond the capacity of the young farmer, but rather this internal buying. The motion would not stop that.

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

However, whether or not the question of non-resident buying is or is apt to be a major factor in land prices is still a very emotional issue in the province, and I am sure a good many citizens would gladly cheer the type of legislation that would restrict non-resident buying. Whether or not that cheer and acclaim would come from members of the farm community or owners of land is another question. Mr. Speaker, even though there is no tangible or concrete evidence at this time that there is a problem, it is the kind of situation which might become a real problem before we know it. So it may in fact be wise to consider passage of some preventive legislation.

I'm thinking, Mr. Speaker, of a situation in the OPEC countries, where there are funds in the billions of dollars that might be poised to invest here in land. I can think of no better spot than Alberta. If I had a lot of money and were living in a European or OPEC country or one of the far eastern countries, with their unsatisfactory and unstable government conditions, and if I wanted a safe place to invest that money, I could think of no more stable place than the province of Alberta with its very, very responsible and stable government.

That brings me to the point that although I say there is no concrete evidence at this time that non-resident land buying is a problem, I suggest it might be. It could come on us without our being aware of it. The problem would then be real, and we would be in the position of trying to turn back the

clock by introducing retroactive legislation either to dispossess non-resident persons who might have purchased land or persuade them that they should give it up.

Accordingly, I think the government has responded by indicating that we are seriously considering introduction of some kind of legislation that would prevent non-resident land buying. I don't think we are committed to it at this time, but we are certainly aware of the concern in the province on this question and are interested in preserving the family farm as a way of life for Albertans. We think it is a very substantial part of the Alberta economy. It is a way of life we would not want to see overturned overnight because of our failure to act perhaps courageously, perhaps precipitously, but in any event because of a failure to act.

But if we did act along the lines suggested by the hon. member, we would have to define who is a resident and who is not a resident. Once a resident, when does he lose his status if he goes visiting around the world, or leaves? At what point in time would he lose resident status? Then what happens? Would he have to give up his land? Would he be forced to sell it? Once having acquired residency and property, could he then maintain it? What happens on the death of a person? Does it pass on to non-residents, or must the estate divest itself of ownership of the land?

Mr. Speaker, there will be many, many opportunities to circumvent this kind of legislation. I am sure it would be very difficult to draft legislation which would effectively preclude those who might be interested in circumventing the legislation from so doing. I'm thinking of the ability to set up corporations, dummy corporations, and so on, the residency or citizenship of which might be very difficult to trace or determine. Again there is the possibility of arranging through trustees the purchase of land, which might not lend itself to determining whether or not it was owned by or on behalf of a resident.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that many other jurisdictions have passed legislation along these lines. It is recounted in page 112 of the Land Use Forum report. We note that Denmark, New Zealand, Switzerland, Mexico, Sweden, Barbados, Ireland, and Japan all have some type of restriction on non-resident land buying, as in fact do many states of the United States.

However, this does not mean we should rush into this matter precipitously. We're occasionally chastised for not acting hurriedly on this matter, but I say again there is no tangible, concrete, firm evidence that it is a problem at this time. So I suggest we can consider the matter very, very fully.

I welcome the opportunity for the discussion today. I think it is worth while. I would like the member opposite to respond to some of the questions, either through debate here or privately. But I really don't think he thought out his motion fully and that he's really come up with something which would solve the problems of non-resident land buying.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, the resolution is one way of handling a matter that is considered very serious by many, many people in the province of Alberta. I want to make one or two comments on the resolution. The resolution would handle this very serious

problem by "legislation which would limit the amount of Alberta land which can be purchased and held by non-residents of Alberta".

The problem that worries most people in Alberta today, as I see it, is twofold. Number one, some of our prime agricultural land is being purchased by people who are not residents of Canada. And I say "of Canada". Because that appears to be the concern of many people with whom I speak, and the people I have the honor to represent. The thought is that some day down the road we don't want to wake up and find that a relatively large percentage of our good agricultural land is in the hands of people who are not even residents of this country. So that is a serious problem.

The second aspect that worries many people is the inflated price that non-residents are prepared to pay for good agricultural land. If they paid the price that the land could repay in produce over an amortized period of time, most farmers would accept that. But many of the prices being paid for land in this province by non-residents of Canada are away beyond what the land can ever pay back in production. That worries many people.

It has some serious sidelines. It not only adds to inflation, but it inflates the land to the point where young men and women who want to farm find that the price of land is away beyond their ability to pay, or the amount that they would pay. Most of our young farm people are realists. They know the production of land and they know how much land must produce in order to pay back the capital and give a living to the people who purchased the land.

There is a third aspect that bothers me somewhat. I wonder why the highly trained business people of other countries — whether it be Arabia, Germany, Belgium, France, or whatever country — are prepared to pay so much for the land, or a price for the land which they can never hope to get back at today's production and today's prices. As a matter of fact, [at] some of the prices they will be lucky if the returns from that land would pay the interest on the investment, let alone ever repay the capital.

So they're either building up a tremendous problem for themselves later on, or they have so much money they don't know what to do with and want to get rid of it some way or another, knowing that land is real property and perhaps they want their investment in real land. Or they have some other incentive in which they might hope to corner the market some day and then charge whatever the market will bear. I don't know. But I do know that these men are not ignoramuses. They are men of good business training, good sense, and good business ability. So I wonder many times why they are prepared to pay so much for the land.

These are the facts that appear to worry the people I have the honor to represent. Number one, some of our land is going into the hands of foreigners who or are non-residents of this country; secondly, there is an inflated price of the land; thirdly, our young people can't buy the land for that reason; and fourthly, what is their real objective in paying so much for the land.

Many solutions have been suggested. At the last series of meetings it was my pleasure to conduct in my constituency prior to the regular session earlier this spring, I heard from farmers, businessmen, town people, and city people. There was a multitude of

solutions. Nowhere could I find consensus for a solution by simply saying by legislation, we will not permit this land to be sold.

Every time that matter came up, a farmer in the audience would stand up and say, are you taking away my right to sell the land I own? Since when is the government controlling my land? Why can't I sell it for the highest price? If you are going to limit my sale, who's going to pay the difference I could get had I sold it to a non-resident of Canada?

These are serious problems. I believe there is a solution, and I hope I will be able to present to the House at this session one which I think has merit. I plan to do that within a few days if I'm able to do so. But the present solution is the one we are considering: simply saying we will not permit more than a certain amount of land to be sold to non-residents of Alberta.

My first objection to the resolution is "non-residents of Alberta". I think that's putting a wall around Alberta and becoming provincial rather than Canadian. Today we see so many things that tend to balkanize this country. I just don't like to see that type of thing. Surely if I'm a Canadian I should have the rights of a Canadian whether I'm in Ontario or P.E.I. or British Columbia, and people from Nova Scotia should surely expect to have the rights of Canadians whether they live in Alberta or New Brunswick or Saskatchewan. That is my first objection. Had it said "non-residents of Canada", I certainly would have felt a little better towards the resolution.

The second thing that bothers me is how it would be administered. Would we say to each municipality and county, you are going to be permitted by law to sell X per cent of your land to non-residents. Then the farmers who got on the market first would be able to sell their land to the non-residents, and that amount of land would go to foreign ownership. What would be the situation when we got to the limit? What would the other farmers say? Suddenly we've inflated the price because non-residents of Canada come in and pay large sums of money. What would the other farmers do who wanted to sell? Will they retain that high price? The market value has now been set. I see a terrific problem that municipal councils or county councils would have to face and resolve. How would they suddenly stop when they reached the X per cent? Is it right to give some people in the municipality the right to sell at a highly inflated price and then say to the rest, you can't because you can't find a Canadian buyer at that price, so we won't permit you to sell your land. I see all kinds of problems arising in dealing with the rights of individuals and our ideals and traditions of the right of property, the ownership of land.

If it were done provincially and we simply said X per cent of the land of Alberta would be sold to non-residents, the provincial government would be in a little better position than the municipal councils or the county councillors, because they have the entire province with which to deal. If it were done provincially, perhaps a suggestion from one of my constituents at the pre-session meetings last year might be one way to do it. He said, why don't we sell the marginal land in this province to the non-residents and keep the prime agricultural land for Canadians? It sounds possible and plausible. Perhaps we can sell

the muskeg and the swamps to the people who are not residents of Canada and let them go to the work of improving them and so on. But that creates a problem too. As I've said before, the people and their agents from other countries want good land, and I'm doubtful they would be interested in second-class land or swamps or muskegs as long as much other land is available.

As the population of Canada increases, excellent uses will be found for our muskeg areas, swamps, hillsides, valleys, and so on. But as long as you have land that is economically sound to develop, people are not going to spend the extra money required to develop poorer land. So even if it were done provincially — so much good land, or all bad land — you reach the percentage point. Then what? You've got the same problem all over again. Because now you've got the end of the non-resident buying. What do you say to the others who want to sell? What do you say if that price did inflate the land? So you have the old problem back again.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say this is one possible way of handling the problem. The problem is real to many people in this province. The people of this province are expecting the legislators of the province to find a satisfactory solution, and I think a number of solutions have to be considered. Maybe the final solution will be a combination of things. But I think we have to be very careful in exploring and researching all possible solutions and ways of handling the problem before we jump in and find we haven't solved the problem but have actually created many other problems that are going to be just as difficult as the one we tried to solve in the first place.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am not able to support the resolution. I commend the hon. member for bringing it in as one possible way of handling the problem, because many people in this province are looking for a solution. I want to close by saying that I'm sure every hon. member of this House, irrespective of what side of the House he or she sits on, doesn't want to wake up X years down the road and find that much of our land is in the hands of people who not only aren't Canadians but who don't even live in our country.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I too want to make a few comments on the resolution introduced on March 25 by the hon. Member for Clover Bar. In reviewing *Hansard*, I have found that the addresses made on that date were quite appropriate. I am confident that the mover of the resolution wrestled with the intent. Whether, as some members have mentioned, he intentionally or accidentally worded it so vaguely, it gives us all an opportunity to ramble in a great range on this topic.

But I want to say I thought that the key words he introduced in his resolution were: "which would limit the amount of Alberta land", because some day that might be a way of coming about with some sort of legislation. It is worth repeating, and possibly reviewing, the comments made for instance by the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff, the hon. Mr. Horsman. In his presentation he raised the question of agricultural land and ownership of recreational land versus ownership of residential and commercial areas within cities and towns. Any time we come to some legislation I think we must separate those two

areas, because I can see the difficulty of trying to legislate [on] foreign ownership of land within cities or industrial land when we're trying to attract foreign investment to this country.

The Supreme Court of Canada has decided that the jurisdiction of the provinces to deal with foreign ownership of land is questionable. But the government of Canada, in consultation with the various provinces, has agreed to allow the governments to deal with foreign land ownership questions. That's a move in the right direction. It shows that our friends in Ottawa are also concerned, and possibly through some consultation we may come up with a formula that the hon. Member for Clover Bar really hopes will be arrived at from his resolution.

I think we don't want to. I hope we never move in the direction our neighbors in Saskatchewan have. I can really agree with the hon. Mr. Horsman that it would even restrict families in our province when some of our young people are maybe in the type of work that takes them away from Alberta, and if they were to inherit land they couldn't really own it if we went about with the type of legislation they have in Saskatchewan.

The hon. Member for Lacombe, in his wise ways — I think the key comment that merits repeating is: "why are we restricting those just across the border from Alberta?" I agree with that statement, because that would reject the possibility of Albertans — a good example is my own son, who is in the armed forces and living in New Brunswick. He couldn't really own any land jointly with me if any type of restriction on foreign residents was brought about, as the resolution indicates. I would really hope that we don't restrict ex-Albertans, or possibly even future Albertans, from owning land in Alberta.

In the presentation and review of the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands, with the background he has on agricultural land and farmland, I think it is worth mentioning that he indicated the resolution applies to both urban and rural land. Perhaps the honorable gentleman from Clover Bar intended, and I repeat intended, to do it this way just to confuse us. That seems to be something he attempts to do: confuse us. This is rather difficult, but he is continually trying to do it. Even when I had to clarify his position yesterday afternoon, or the information about the absence of the premier, it's nice that we have an opportunity to let the hon. Member for Clover Bar know that we just don't take their accusations lightly. We would like to correct them whenever the opportunity arises.

I do want to say that I think there is something we must be aware of. I have been informed that some of the purchase of land is serious in that I am advised this is one loophole by which people are able to gain immigration to Canada. It apparently provides quite a few points for their acceptance as immigrants to Canada when they own land and when they have some agricultural or farming background from whatever country it might be, whether it's Germany or even Asia Minor. I would hope this never really becomes widespread, because some of those poppy seed growers from Asia Minor might qualify to come here and grow some of those beautiful flowers.

That is why we must somehow influence our friends in Ottawa to review the immigration regulations. When I was advised of that recently — it is not

fair that a person can gain access to Canada as an immigrant by buying up some land, possibly taking a course or two in some agricultural college in his country, and then gaining immigration status in Canada. This is really a back-door approach. But as you know, in any regulation, any legislation on the books in any country in the world, somebody is always finding some loopholes and is able to gain entry to a country.

As one member of this Assembly who owns some farmland — I agree with the hon. Member for Drumheller — I hope nobody ever restricts my ability to sell it to the highest bidder. If we do bring that about, I hope we would also bring about some formula to compensate the owner of that land if he can't sell it to the highest bidder. I think the formula would be quite complicated. But I hope it's possible to come up with some formula that would compensate people who cannot sell their land to the highest bidder at the highest price but must sell it lower.

In closing, I hope that out of this resolution and the Land Use Forum that the hon. minister from Calgary reviewed for us this afternoon, we could come up with some legislation. Because I too hear, even in my constituency in the city of Edmonton, concern raised by the people that we are not really coming to grips with the foreign purchase of large tracts of land. I did check some of those figures quoted by the hon. Member for Clover Bar, and I have to say they are quite accurate. I compliment him for it. I checked them out, not that I mistrusted him but just to believe them. Therefore I look forward in the next year to debating legislation we bring into this Assembly to wrestle with it. But I think part of it has to come through the legislation in Ottawa that applies to immigration, because that is where some of the abuse is taking place now.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BUTLER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks with regard to the motion before us this afternoon. First, I would like to congratulate the hon. Member for Clover Bar for proposing this resolution and bringing this motion before us.

Foreign ownership of land has the potential of being a real problem in Alberta, particularly in the rural areas. But speaking more strictly to the motion, Mr. Speaker, I think the motion is a little narrow. I don't think we can restrict the ownership of Alberta land to Albertans alone. The way the motion reads, it would be to residents of Alberta. It really makes no difference to the rural areas of Alberta whether a person owning land, if he is a non-resident, lives in Calgary, Lethbridge, Edmonton, or Grande Prairie — particularly if the land is in central rural Alberta — or in Kindersley, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, or Toronto. So I don't think we can restrict this to residents of Alberta. It really would not serve the purpose.

I think the real problem lies in the money coming over from Europe. I believe people in Europe can borrow money at lower interest rates than we can, in some cases, and put their money into land in Canada, in Alberta in particular, where they are hedging against inflation and have no intention of ever coming and being residents. But in order to get to the real problem we have to have the immigration laws changed so we can do the kind of thing we need to do.

I had several other notes — part of what I had to say was said by the hon. Member for Drumheller. I concur with his remarks, particularly where we have to make some arrangement where a man can have some compensation when he has not been allowed to sell to the highest bidder.

So, in the essence of time and to prevent repetition of some of the things that have already been said, much of the ground has already been covered, I would just like to close by saying that I think it has the potential of a real problem, but to restrict the purchase of Alberta land to Albertans is not the answer.

Thank you.

MR. BRADLEY: I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

[Motion carried]

2. Mr. Tesolin proposed the following motion to the Assembly:

That the provincial government be requested to consider the effect of the non-compulsory nature of Grade 12 departmental examinations on the quality of education in Alberta today.

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Taylor]

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that remain to me on this resolution dealing with the quality of education in Alberta and considering the effect of the non-compulsory nature of Grade 12 departmental examinations on the said quality . . .

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Are we limited to 4:30 this afternoon?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, we can carry through to 5:30.

MR. TAYLOR: I would simply like to review one or two of the major points in regard to education. In the first place, I think we should define education and know what we're talking about when we're using the words "quality of education". Education is defined in many, many ways, but in my view an education fits a person to cope better with the problems of everyday life and to become a better citizen of the country in which he happens to live. If education does that — makes us better citizens or better able to contribute to the country of which we are a part — then I think we could say that that person is well-educated or has learned the best way of using the potentials that lie within him.

I have two or three definitions of education that are a little different from that. At one time Lord Brougham wrote: "Education makes a people easy to lead, but difficult to drive; easy to govern, but impossible to enslave." I think that's another way of saying that an educated person should be able to make a better contribution to his country than that same person without an education. Emerson wrote in 1831: "The things taught in schools and colleges are not an education, but the means of education."

There are many, many ways of doing it. Some are not as flattering as Emerson's. Martin Fisher once wrote: "Education is the process of driving a set of prejudices down your throat."

I suppose everybody speaks from his or her own point of view. But I think we could generally say that an educated person is able to use the potentials that lie within him to a much better capacity than he would without that education. If we accept that as the apex, the climax, or the objective of education, I think we can examine what helps to bring you to that point.

The question raised in the excellently worded resolution by the hon. Member for Lac la Biche-McMurray doesn't really express it one way or the other, but asks the government to consider the effect that removing Grade 12 examinations has had on the quality of education. In other words, are we now closer to reaching our objective in regard to education than we were when we had Grade 12 examinations? I suppose if you stopped a hundred people on Jasper Avenue and asked them that question, you would probably get a hundred answers. They would probably be about half and half in regard to whether the quality of education is better or worse now than it was then.

I've heard this matter of quality of education being debated by teachers, by school boards, by the general public for many years, and at no time has there ever been unanimity. It was debated when I first started teaching school. Now several years later, it is still being debated. In the meantime, thousands of boys and girls have gone through the mill. They've gone through a lot of other things. In regard to determining the quality of education, I'm not so sure that you can put the whole emphasis on whether or not you have Grade 12 examinations. There are many, many other factors that come in to that. And Grade 12 departmental examinations are only one item in a great many.

In the late '30s there was a move afoot in this province to move somewhat from the basic and into what they called enterprise education. This became a must. Each teacher was required to learn how to handle an enterprise in their school, and hundreds of teachers had to go to summer school to find out what this new method in teaching enterprise was. I remember going to summer school that year and listening to one professor who said, if a boy or girl in your classroom has fun and is enjoying rolling a pencil back and forth on his desk, let him do it. He's getting educated. Well, I thought that was a very ridiculous way of teaching. It certainly was never permitted in my classroom, and I could see no education in that type of thing.

But I did see some good points in the enterprise system in regard to teaching boys and girls how to think, and giving them the opportunity to draw conclusions. For instance, a school inspector, the late Major Frame, who was an outstanding teacher and an outstanding superintendent in this province, once told me a story when he was visiting my school and dealing with an enterprise that I had on a coal mine in which the boys and girls had built a coal tippie and incidentally learned all the things about coal. He was very pleased with the enterprise, and I was too. As a matter of fact, he came up first on a Saturday and spent two hours operating the tippie, seeing how this coal was being moved over and over again through the tippie just like in a real tippie. It was a Grades 4, 5, and 6 project, and I think the boys and girls learned a great deal from it.

But he told me a story at that time about a school he had visited in which they had been studying the dairy industry, learning all about milk and the cow. He asked some of the students questions to find out how well they had learned their lessons in this enterprise on the cow. The hon. members will recall that in the enterprise system you divided into committees. Each committee was given an assignment on some part of the cow. He said to one little boy, now would you tell me about the milk that comes from a cow. The little boy said, well sir, I would like to but I can't do that. The inspector asked, why can't you? He said, well you see sir, I was on the horns and hoof committee and I didn't learn anything about the milk. So there are difficulties in the enterprise system too.

But they had good points. But I've found from actual experience that the enterprise system took time from the basics. While it was supposed to be essentially a part in which you taught English and math along with everything else, I found that in many cases the boys and girls became so enthused and excited about the particular project that they didn't have time to do the calculations and the English part of the enterprise.

Today there is a move again back to basics. I really support that move. I think we can get too far from basics. The hon. minister touched a very important point the other day when he said, if the hon. members of this House and the general public — or something to this effect — keep asking us to add this, this, and this to the curriculum, there are only so many hours every day and so many weeks every month in which teaching can take place. If you're going to spend it on everything else, you're going to take away from the basics.

I really think that in our curriculum today we should have a very firm rule that a definite number of hours — whatever the right number is, I'm not prepared to say. There are people better qualified for that. But I think a definite number of hours should be spent on English and math. After all, those are the tools we need when we get out into the world: English and math, primarily. Nobody has ever asked me a trigonometry question in my work as an MLA over the last several years — never at any time. Nobody has asked me a geometry problem, or an algebra problem, or a biology problem. But many people have asked me questions about English, about math. These are important items. They are part of our life. If we don't have a grounding in math and English, we are not able to achieve what we want to achieve in many, many other things. So I say we should be spending a definite number of hours in our schools, from Grade 1 right up to Grade 12, on these two basics, math and English.

As a matter of fact, several years ago an inspector who came to my school, where I had 11 grades, said to me: when you're teaching math, you should be teaching English; when you're teaching social studies, you should be teaching English; and when you're teaching geometry, you should be teaching English. In other words, English was a basic thing in every subject. I learned a great deal from what the late Captain Edwards told me in that regard. If you're going to use proper English in the English class only, and then misspell your words and use words like "ain't" and so on in every other subject, you're not really accomplishing what you want to accomplish.

The final thing is that we're going to be able to use the language to the best possible advantage in the best possible way.

Mr. Speaker, I think three things are important in regard to this resolution. Number one, I think it's very important that we have some bench marks. If we don't have bench marks, I don't know how a teacher is able to teach properly. I certainly wouldn't know what to do if I went into a classroom in Grade 8, Grade 11, Grade 12, or any other grade and didn't know what the boys and girls were expected to know at the end of that 10 months. How would I spend the time profitably during those 10 months? I made it a practice, chiefly because of what Captain Edwards, Major Frame, and Dr. Coffin, the principal of the normal school when I was there, had taught me through inspections: number one, at the beginning of the year tell every one of your classes where you expect them to be generally, in math and in English particularly, at the end of the year. I made it a practice to do that, particularly in the last seven or eight years that I taught school.

At the beginning of the first week, I would say to each class — to Grade 3 for instance — by the end of the year, you're going to be able to add any numbers I say to you: eight or seven, nine or six, you'll say the answer immediately. You'll know your separations, you'll know your combinations quickly. It'll be part of your life. And you'll be able to write a little story of three or four sentences about your dog. You'll be able to spell all those words — I'd have a list of words in our spellers — without even looking at them.

I remember a little boy one time in Grade 1. I told him, by the end of the year — and I showed him the book — you'll be able to read this book without any pictures just as well as I can. He shook his head and said, oh, I'll never be able to read all that stuff. But at the end of Grade 1 he was able to do it.

I found that had two real purposes. Number one, as a teacher it gave me an objective towards which I had to drive and strive. Secondly, it gave pupils where they were expected to be at the end of the year. I also found that parents became interested in those bench marks and tried to check to see at the end of the year whether we had reached them or not. If we didn't reach them, something was wrong either with the teacher or with the pupil, or something had to be checked and analyzed in order to give the greatest good to that child. So I say bench marks should be established.

In conclusion — I see my time is practically gone — I'd like to say that I think our bench marks, particularly in our basics, should be clearly set out by the Department of Education. I don't think they should be left to every individual teacher, irrespective of how highly qualified or how good each individual teacher is. Because you're going to have a different bench mark in every grade, and boys and girls move from school to school. I think those bench marks should be fixed in math and English particularly. When we come to Grade 12, I feel very strongly that we should have a very definite bench mark, maybe not in every subject, but certainly in English and math. I would like to see the hon. Minister of Education — whether he does it every year or every third or fourth year — have Grade 12 examinations in English and math and tabulate the general average in the province. It will help to establish a bench mark towards which

teachers and students may strive. In doing that, I think we'll certainly improve the quality of education in the province.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak to this resolution which requests the government "to consider the effect of the non-compulsory nature of Grade 12 departmental examinations on the quality of education in Alberta today." I think it's a timely and important motion brought in by the hon. Member for Lac la Biche-McMurray. We had good debate on this motion this spring, and I enjoyed listening to the remarks of the hon. Member for Drumheller today.

I've had some experience teaching high school subjects, Math 30 and Physics 30 to be precise. So I would like to indicate some of the concerns, some of the advantages and disadvantages as I saw them.

It was also pointed out to me the other day that I should be able to speak on almost any subject because of my academic qualifications. I said, why is that so? They said, well you've got a B.Sc., an M.S., and a Ph.D. I said, well, what difference does that make? They said, well, we all know what "bs" means, "ms" is more of the same, and "phd" is piled higher and deeper.

I indicate that this motion is timely, Mr. Speaker, because there is considerable public attention today on a number of issues in education. We're all aware of criticisms regarding the alleged decline in student achievement levels. Universities are claiming that an increasing number of freshmen are deficient in basic communication skills, and employers are complaining about new employees being unable to read and write. Our newspapers are showing the results of public cries of back to the three Rs or back to the basics.

Now while it may be true that there has been a proficiency decline in certain basic skill areas, I don't think it can be attributed solely to the elimination of the Grade 12 examinations which occurred in 1973, although I think there is some evidence to indicate that this may have had something to do with it. I think that any decline that has taken place probably began a little earlier than 1973. A number of years ago, approximately one in 400 Albertans went to university. They were generally referred to as "academic types", well grounded in language and most of the other academic areas. But today it is reported that one in 62 Albertans attended university. As a result of the increasing numbers attending university, one could hardly expect the same calibre of student with respect to the same academic skills referred to before, particularly, Mr. Speaker, in view of the lower entrance requirements today.

In addition, we have a higher percentage of students today who, after beginning Grade 1, go on into different high school programs, programs other than academic, general, and vocational. So that when you're testing this more diverse population with regard to a decline in skills, I think you're bound to see a lower level.

Mr. Speaker, I think the public is also concerned if not frustrated in not knowing whether they're getting value for the dollars they spend on education. There's a recent article in *Maclean's* magazine entitled "Are Canadians Getting Their \$12 Billion Worth?". They quote a section from the recent OECD report that says:

The quality of education [in Canada] seems to have become a public issue precisely because of the high costs that have had to be paid to ensure equality of access. Taxpayers everywhere want assurance that what appears to them to be extraordinarily generous levels of school financing are yielding commensurate returns.

The OECD report, Mr. Speaker, also says: that Canada's allocation of resources to education has developed from a clearly generous level to an "extraordinarily generous level".

In Alberta increases in educational funding have continued, I think, to reflect the high priority that Albertans place on education. It was interesting, Mr. Speaker, that last evening Mr. Notley, who is not in his seat at the moment, indicated through some statistics he had that education was not first in Canada in terms of expenditure per capita, but it was third. Mr. Speaker, I think on a consolidated local and provincial basis, and this is the only fair basis on which comparisons can be made, Alberta ranks first in Canada for basic education on a per capita basis.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the *Statistics Canada Daily* dated September 1, 1976 indicates province by province the expenditure on education, basic and post-secondary, for the year 1975. The average per capita expenditure on education is the highest in Canada by far, and in that year Alberta spent \$655 per capita on basic and postsecondary education. The next highest among the provinces was Quebec with \$598. So with regard to the remarks of the Member for Spirit River-Fairview last night, I think his comments in this area were totally false.

Mr. Speaker, in order to determine whether we are getting our value for the money we're spending on education or to judge the value of our schools, as the Member for Drumheller pointed out, I think we need to have measures, standards, or bench marks. I think many Albertans feel we lost those bench marks or standards with the elimination of the Grade 12 and Grade 9 examinations in 1973. Probably there were many valid reasons and concerns which led to the termination of those exams. To refresh some members' memories, at that time the situation was that final examinations were compulsory in approximately seven subject areas, with the final mark the student received based upon a combination of the teacher's grade and the grade they received on the departmental examination. It was 50-50.

Some of the disadvantages or problems that existed with those examinations have been pointed out before, and I can mention some again. The one that constantly comes up is that there was too much stress on a student, too much anxiety for a student to perform, for so much was dependent on one exam on any given day. I don't think this is a major problem, although it is a problem for some kids. But certainly I would think that allowances could be made in situations where that could be identified.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I remember that in many cases the teachers taught for the final examination. They tended to gear their instruction around materials and skills that they knew would be necessary to pass the exam, rather than present the whole body of knowledge on which the exam was supposed to be based. Also, Mr. Speaker, there were teacher complaints that the final examinations weren't keeping pace with the changes and developments in particular subject

areas.

Another complaint was the multiple choice nature of the final exams and that these tended to test for rote learning rather than for understanding and application. I well remember, Mr. Speaker, one Grade 9 final examination in science a number of years ago. Particularly, I remember one question: how does lightning affect the fertility of the soil? If the student had been studying his work, he would have memorized the fact that lightning somehow ionizes the air and nitrogen ends up in the soil. But one of the answers on the final exam obviously came from a young farm boy in Alberta. He apparently hadn't memorized the right answer, but based on his previous experience, he decided to give it a whack. His response to the question of how lightning affects the fertility of the soil was: it scares the you know what out of the cows. Only he didn't say "you know what".

Mr. Speaker, another disadvantage of examinations at that time was that they were based on what was referred to as the "normal curve", which really didn't establish a standard. In other words, if 10 per cent of the students were to get an H in the course, it didn't matter whether that 10 per cent had marks over 80 per cent or over 50 per cent; they still got an H. I think that was one of the disadvantages of the old exam system.

Mr. Speaker, there was considerable pressure over the years from the Alberta Teachers' Association and other groups for greater freedom in curriculum development, with the teacher determining the final grade or final mark for the student. They were pressing for greater flexibility in curriculum development, and would provide for greater opportunity to give individualized instruction to their students. They felt that the teacher was probably in the best position to evaluate skills and abilities of students that couldn't be evaluated on a multiple-choice examination question, and I think there's a certain amount of validity to that.

Also, Mr. Speaker, without departmentals there is an emphasis on year-long learning rather than having a student cram for the final exam. This was considered to have its good points. However, Mr. Speaker, I think there are a number of advantages in having Grade 12 final examinations, or some kind of standard we can refer to. I've classified these advantages into four headings. The first deals with the selective process. I think we have to have some kind of final exam system in our high schools so that an employer or a postsecondary institution to which the student is transferring can make a selection with regard to whom they employ or whom they admit.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I think there are certain motivational advantages in having final exams. Many students desire to achieve on these final exams. It gives them a feeling of self-satisfaction, of accomplishment that they were able to get over a certain hurdle, and the pleasure of meeting the challenge of that final exam. Of course others were motivated by the fear that they were going to fail.

I think this problem of motivation is a greater problem than a lot of people think today, Mr. Speaker. I have been teaching at Mount Royal College in Calgary, and a couple of years ago I had a student who put forth zero effort in trying to learn anything in his mathematics course. I talked to him one day after class and wondered why he wasn't motivated to

study mathematics. He said, "Look, mister, I've got 50 bucks in my pocket, I've got a new car out in the parking lot, and I've got a girlfriend. What else should I desire? Why should I get an education?" So if we have a number of these people studying, it's pretty hard to motivate them.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I think there are advantages to having some form of standards for Grade 12 examinations for the purposes of scholarships and providing financial aid to students if they go on to postsecondary institutions.

The fourth category, Mr. Speaker, is the advantages pertaining to having a standard. By having a standard, a teacher has a basis for comparing his or her evaluation system, whatever that might be in the school. Also, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to have an external judge examine or evaluate the product that comes from the school, rather than the teachers evaluate the product they were working with, where biases may creep in as to whether they like or dislike a particular student. Also, Mr. Speaker, I think students and the parents of these students like to have information regarding the quality of the performance of their son or daughter.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have gone over some of the advantages and disadvantages associated with having some kind of final exam system. I think it's interesting that in the last several years — and this was pointed out by Mr. James Balderson at the University of Alberta — since we got rid of the final exams in 1973, there has been what they refer to as a mark or grade inflation. The number of high grades awarded to students has gone up by 14 per cent, while the number of failing grades has actually decreased by 14 per cent. He claims that marking standards have, in fact, slipped since the departmentals went out.

Mr. Speaker, I know that The Alberta Teachers' Association has been and is currently opposed to the reinstitution of these final examinations, but I think many of the teachers are not. At least many of the teachers I have talked to, Mr. Speaker, feel they would like to have some kind of standard or benchmark which they can refer to. I do know that the Alberta School Trustees' Association feels that departmental final examinations at both the Grade 9 and 12 levels should be reinstituted, with the teacher determining 50 per cent of the students' grades, and the mark they obtain on this test counting 50 per cent of the students' final grade.

Since we have eliminated the final examinations we still have — I think it has been referred to as Grade 12 appeal examinations. The document tabled in the House the other day by the minister, Roles in Student Evaluation and Research, indicates that:

Since September 1973, the standardized multiple-choice provincial Grade XII examinations are available in seven subjects normally used for matriculation (university entrance) purposes

. . . Although popularly known as 'appeal' examinations, the tests serve more than an appeal function.

I think one of the purposes I referred to earlier, the purpose of applying for scholarships, was that students will take these appeal exams if they want to apply for a scholarship.

Mr. Speaker, as the minister pointed out in the

House before, at the present time there are Grade 10, 11, and 12 achievement tests, sometimes referred to as power tests. They have been designed to test the major skills and abilities of students in high school. Testing programs have been carried out in the province in order to collect data to establish provincial and regional norms. The tests are meant to provide school boards with a standard to measure the performance of their students against the norms of their region or of the province as a whole. But apparently the current format of those tests makes them inadequate as final exam instruments, in the sense that the old departmental exams were.

Roles in Student Evaluation and Research, would indicate that these power tests:

. . . emphasizing interpretation and application rather than particular content, are designed for use in situations where the stock of fact items in course content differs somewhat from class to class but the overall concepts and techniques studied are those in the Program of Studies [in the Department of Education] for that specific course. For example, a Physics test question on electricity may require the student to apply Ohm's Law . . .

I'm sure you all know what Ohm's Law is.

. . . in a situation not previously used as an example or experiment in class. Since the physical law has broad applicability, the student's skill in applying the law in new situations is tested through the question [on the achievement test].

Mr. Speaker, since the province has a responsibility to monitor and evaluate our educational system, I am inclined to think that the administration of these achievement or power tests, whatever form they eventually take, should not be optional for school boards. They should be compulsory and should be used to assist the teacher in determining the final grade for that particular student. I would like to see these tests instituted as soon as possible.

I don't think the compulsory nature of a standardized examination in any way implies that teachers are untrustworthy or incompetent, as some might say. Rather I think it would provide them with a basis for their evaluation of the students. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us, including the teachers in this province, want some standard by which we can judge the effectiveness of our educational system.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would support the resolution, with recognition that the quality of education cannot be evaluated solely on the basis of whether or not we have non-compulsory Grade 12 examinations. Bearing this [in mind], Mr. Speaker, I certainly support this resolution.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Calgary Bow covered so many of the points that I had intended for my remarks that they will now become very brief. However, there are a few matters I wish to raise with regard to this resolution.

I think perhaps the resolution, as has been pointed out, is a very timely one in that as recently as October 12 the hon. Minister of Education announced the initiation of a review of achievement of Alberta students to determine how well Alberta students are doing in our educational system without the requirement of writing examinations.

Perhaps we may wish to look at some of the

reasons for the concern with regard to educational standards and the competence of our students as they leave our elementary and senior high schools. Although there are very many that could be enumerated and perhaps some that we have not yet delved into, I think one of the reasons that has been stated, and if not stated, that I'd like to include, is the apparently inadequate performance of students moving into the institutions of higher learning: in their examinations, the inadequacies that are being reported to be found; the inability of students who complete their Grade 12 to cope with the basic three Rs, as we often refer to them; their inability to comprehend, to spell, to read and learn what they may be reading.

The constant complaints over recent years from the commercial world, from the private sector, from business or industry of the lack of ability to perform in the jobs they undertake; the basic skills that are required to be able to [enter] the job market; the finding of perhaps a locked-in academic qualification narrowing down choices in future jobs. It seems partially, perhaps, the atmosphere of the open campus, leaving students the total freedom to determine the courses they will take; the rate at which the student will apply himself in working; what is referred to as the lack of requirement for the student to perform to some recognized standard, leaving that standard to be set by the student himself or herself.

I think there has been a great deal of concern about quality of education rather than quantity. Certain issues have been dealt with in the report for discussion and consideration of goals of basic education. There is an attempt to describe the needs of education in various aspects — the individual needs.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

The report suggests that perhaps some of the needs of the individual are for food, shelter, clothing, health, recreation — the ability to cope and to provide these for oneself and for those for which one takes responsibility.

Another individual need is a feeling of safety and security. What does that have to do with education? I believe that basically the knowledge of being able to cope in a society and in an environment that would provide safety and security apart from those agencies that give this service in our society is certainly a necessity — a feeling of positive achievement on the part of a student in the developing years.

Then there are societal needs and expectations. Of course, societal needs can only be met on the part of individuals if they are given the skills with which to cope. Some are desirable. Some are not. In our education, the nurturing of a healthful and productive environment — one doesn't come by this by accident. One must be properly psychologically trained and made knowledgeable to have the capability of determining what a healthful and productive environment is: preparing members to assume useful roles and perform necessary services in developing effective communication.

Those are a few of the items listed in the report which bear some consideration. We may not agree with them totally. However, they are a basis on which to commence our dialogue and make some final determinations.

I think it is important that we recognize in our educational material whether there is proper management of the course material and content. In our educational system we have many books that provide perhaps all the information we need to learn about our country, our government, our responsibilities to ourselves and to our nation. But if these are not properly managed and assembled in the classroom and effectively delivered, there is a loss to the individual student in learning to understand and cope with them.

The need is for evaluation determining the effectiveness of not only the pupil's progress in the classroom and in preparation for life, but whether in fact the teacher is effective in delivering the message for which he or she is in the classroom. It seems reports continue to come that institutions of higher learning have lowered their standards of entrance to accommodate those who are now coming from elementary and high schools into the higher institutions, because they are unable to cope with the higher standards that previously existed. Perhaps the advisory committee the minister has appointed will be able to determine whether the allegations are in fact true or whether they are simply fallacies.

But simply to determine that we should have a reinstatement of examinations at a Grade 12 level is not adequate. Although I support the resolution for review, I would suggest that perhaps the review needs to go beyond the Grade 12 level. It needs to go down into the lower grades, because it's not at the Grade 12 level where we can resolve the problems if they in fact exist. We really need to go down to at least Grade 9, but my suggestion would be at various intervals prior to Grade 9. The training and the proper direction of a student must come from the very early grades rather than at the end of the term. Because at the end of the term, of course, there is no possibility at that point to redirect students if they are not progressing or not making the achievement necessary to give them the skills which would enable them to cope effectively in today's changing society.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise at this late hour in support of the motion and to urge all hon. members to support the motion when the decision is made to put the question. In doing so, I first must congratulate in particular the hon. member for Lac La Biche-McMurray for placing the resolution on the Order Paper, and congratulate all hon. members who contributed to the debate. The preparation that was put into the remarks they made this afternoon and in the spring session appears very evidently from their remarks. They are to be congratulated for their work in this regard.

I won't go into the history of examinations, because earlier in the session I filed with the House and with hon. members for their information a document entitled Roles in Student Evaluation and Research, to which reference was made by the hon. Member from Calgary Bow.

We are at a time in education, Mr. Speaker, when people are questioning the abilities and achievements of students who are in the system and who complete the system. We see that quite readily by the remarks made in the media. The remarks would seem to challenge the abilities and achievements of students

today as opposed to students of yesteryear. As I mentioned when responding to a question from the hon. Member for Calgary McCall earlier in the session, we do not have definitive evidence available that would indicate that there has been in fact a decline in the achievement levels of students. Nor do we really have definitive evidence that can point to an improvement in the achievement levels of students over the last number of years.

We can make conjectures. We can say, for example, that today as compared with a generation ago, twice as many students who enter Grade 1 will ultimately find themselves in Grade 12. If that be the case, in comparing the achievements of students a generation ago, one would assume that those who were in Grade 12 were those most academically inclined, those who were least academically inclined having dropped out at earlier grades. The fact that we have been able to retain those students that might have otherwise dropped out of Grade 12 throughout the province might lead to the conjecture that there has been a watering down to some degree. Thus those students who are more academically inclined in comparison of marks would have the benefit of a larger base of those less academically inclined high school students who might not otherwise have been there.

We can also make conjectures about television. Facts and statistics would indicate that between the ages zero to 18, a child today will have spent, by the time he reaches 18, twice as much time before a television set as he will have spent in school. Certain conjectures can be made from that. One could take the route of saying, well if those children and students are getting all their entertainment value from a television set, perhaps they are doing so at the expense of reading. If they are doing less in the way of reading, then the basic skill of reading which they are taught in school isn't fortified in their after-hours activities. So there could well be this decline in the skills that flow from reading — such skills as spelling, comprehension, the ability to structure a sentence properly and grammatically. Those are conjectures. At the same time one might say that since a picture is worth a thousand words, the students today, having lived through this television era, probably have a larger stock of factual knowledge than the students of a generation ago who didn't have the benefit of television. So one must weigh whether the benefit of the larger stock of factual knowledge perhaps outweighs a small deterioration, how small I don't know. These are conjectures in the level of skills achieved by students.

A further conjecture can be made from the fact — and we all know this — that the amount of knowledge in the world doubles every decade, so there is just that much more to learn in the same period of time. And if more and more inroads are made into the curriculum to attempt to have the students of today more knowledgeable on more issues, on more facts, those inroads may in fact affect the time that can be spent on basic skills. I must add, though, that the hon. Member for Drumheller developed the topic very well when he said that language should be taught with all these additional subjects that might be brought in. That is a useful entry in the debate.

Others might say there has been a reduction in achievement because of the lack of incentive for

personal achievement, which might flow from such things as departmental examinations, or from the general attitude of society that it is not necessary for me to achieve, because if I don't the state will look after me. So many conjectures can be made, but we really don't have the facts. For this reason and many others, I felt it was necessary that in this day and age we take certain steps to determine what in fact are the levels of achievement of students in our basic educational system today.

The subject of this resolution is that we "consider the effect of the non-compulsory nature of Grade 12 departmental examinations on the quality of education in Alberta today." When we get to the examination question, of course, that matter received a good airing in this House this spring and today. I'm not going to deal with examinations as such, except to state that the departmental examinations as they then existed did not provide a bench mark. They did not provide a means by which correction could be taken with respect to those students who failed. Basically they only provided a measure of achievement for a specific year in which students who took the same exam in the same year could compare their progress with that of others in the province.

The matter of the ability of comparison, not on a plane of one year but on a plane of a number of years, is a much more difficult subject and one which is being addressed by the high school achievement tests, to which reference was made this afternoon by the hon. Member for Calgary Bow. I should point out at this time, Mr. Speaker, that it is my intention to make a ministerial announcement later on in the session on the high school achievement tests, so I won't dwell on that subject today.

There is another aspect to the whole debate presently going on with respect to the achievement of students and whether or not the level of achievement is lower than it was in previous years, and that is inflation of marks. That is what I want to bring to the attention of hon. members this afternoon.

During the years 1966-69, principals throughout the province would submit to the department confidential marks of students in their schools in all departmental subjects. A record of these on a global basis has been kept and collated. At the same time, the marks submitted by school systems subsequent to the elimination of the compulsory nature of the departmental examinations are also available, as were results while the compulsory examinations were written by students. The interesting thing is that in English 30 during the years 1966-69, students who were awarded A and B marks by the school systems represented 37 per cent of the students throughout the province. The results of the departmental examinations over the seven years starting in 1966 to the last year they were administered would indicate that 36 per cent of those writing would get a mark of A or B, very close to the 37 per cent figure I indicated earlier.

However, in the era that I might call postcompulsory departmental examinations, the percentage of students receiving A or B marks has increased dramatically from 36 per cent to 54 per cent. So that 54 per cent of the students in the '72-75 years are receiving marks of A or B, as compared with 36 per cent during the seven-year period referred to in this table when departmental examinations were adminis-

tered, and 37 per cent during the 1966-69 period of confidential marks of the principals.

Now that disparity doesn't exist in all subjects. For example, in the confidential marks the principals submitted during the years 1966 to '69, in physics, 56 per cent of the students received A and B. The departmental examinations awarded A and B to 54 per cent of the students writing Physics 30X, and the marks submitted subsequent to the elimination of the compulsory departmental examinations indicate that 56 per cent of the students enrolled in Physics 30X were awarded marks of A or B. So there is consistency there.

But in many subjects there has been this inflation in marks. This either means that students are in fact doing better in the years 1972 to '75 than they did in the previous seven-year period, or that the marks they are being awarded for the same work are being inflated. The problem does not exist in the Grade 1 to Grade 12 system only. An article in the Alberta Teachers' Association magazine, January-February of 1976, written by Professor Anderson at the university, comes to the same conclusion:

The following relevant data are taken from six main courses in the Department of Educational Psychology, the biggest department in the Faculty of Education . . .

The sentence goes on, and a table is set out showing increases in various levels. Then he goes on:

Particularly disquieting characteristics of this table are the virtual absence of failures, the disproportionately large percentages of students in the superior categories, and the fact that all average grades are greater than the lowest passing grade acceptable in graduate studies.

He suggests that there has been an inflation in the

awarding of marks.

So for this reason, Mr. Speaker, in closing debate — because we have not only the challenges with respect to suggestions of lower levels of achievements, but we also have the challenges as a result of the monitoring of marks, which indicates a probable higher level of achievement since the elimination of the compulsory examination, the whole area of achievement of students must be studied carefully so that we can provide definitive evidence to the public as to what levels are in fact being achieved by the students in this province. The passage of this resolution by this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, would provide the advisory committee I referred to earlier with another aspect of study necessary to be able to answer this particularly perplexing question.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. MEMBERS: Question.

[Motion carried]

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

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

[The House rose at 5:35 p.m.]

