

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA****head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**Title: **Monday, February 28, 1977 2:30 p.m.****Office of the Premier**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

**head: NOTICES OF MOTIONS**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Member for Little Bow, I would like to give oral notice to propose the following motion to this Assembly on Thursday next:

Be it resolved that the Legislative Assembly urge the government to adopt the following practice for the duration of this Legislature:

- (1) When a ministerial statement is made in the House, the minister shall, prior to or at the time of making the statement, deliver two copies of the text of the statement to the Leader of the Opposition, and
- (2) upon the day of introduction of a government bill, the member introducing it shall present to the Assembly for filing in the Legislature Library a copy of all studies, reports, and other documents upon which the principle and detail of the bill are justified, and
- (3) there shall be attached to each government bill an explanatory memorandum which shall set out the purpose of the bill, its practical effect, and the impact on previous legislation.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. KIDD: Mr. Speaker, it's a great pleasure for me today to welcome to this Assembly a man who really needs no introduction, our former minister of highways Mr. Clarence Copithorne.

MR. ASHTON: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege to introduce a group of students from Waverley school in the Edmonton portion of my constituency. They are accompanied by their teachers and a student teacher. I'll ask them all to stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to Question 217.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answer to Question 213.

MR. SCHMID: Mr. Speaker, I would like to file the manifest of Alberta Government Services' aircraft with respect to Executive Council and government agencies air travel for the calendar year 1976.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, the government has made a very important decision of a precedent-making nature. The resultant negotiations have been completed today, and the government believes it is necessary to inform the Legislature and the citizens of Alberta without delay.

The government recognizes the decision may be somewhat controversial and that some, hopefully very few, Albertans will disagree with the decision.

It is the government's view that a sound investment of a commercial nature should be one that is a good arrangement for both lender and borrower. If it is long term in nature it should reflect the lender's confidence in future stability.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of talk in recent weeks of the stability of the Canadian nation. This government has confidence in the stability of the Canadian Confederation and is prepared to make a major commitment to reflect its strong confidence that Canada will continue to be a viable and united nation from the Pacific to the Atlantic. Another factor is involved in this decision, Mr. Speaker. Since the election of the new government in Quebec, as a result not of its mandate but of its declared policy of seeking independence from Canada debt investment from outside Canada has appeared to conclude, rightly or wrongly, that Canada is a somewhat higher risk country for investment. Hence, indications are that borrowing abroad by provincial governments and agencies will be more expensive. This will compound the already serious balance of payments problems of Canada, which I mentioned in my remarks to the Alberta Legislature last October.

Mr. Speaker, members will recall that when we reported on the initial investment portfolio of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund, there were no investments in the Canada investment division of the fund. This, members are aware, is the portion of the fund, not to exceed 15 per cent of the total fund, which provides for the making of investments by way of loans to other provincial governments or to any person if the debt is guaranteed by any other provincial government or by the government of Canada. When introducing The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act to the Legislative Assembly 10 months ago, you will recall we stated that the Canada investment division would provide an opportunity to diversify the portfolio of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund by investing in other parts of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, the government has today concluded arrangements for its first loan from the Canada investment division of the fund. It will be a 21-year loan for \$50 million to the government of the province of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, the essential terms of the loan are for a coupon rate of interest of 10 per cent. The investment will be in debentures of the province of Newfoundland, which will rank equally with all other debentures presently outstanding or issued hereafter. The purpose of these \$50 million of debentures will be to meet part of the general requirements of the consolidated revenue fund of the province of Newfoundland for the forthcoming year.

I am tabling the communication received today

from the Minister of Finance of the government of Newfoundland confirming the principal terms of the loan. An announcement with regard to this matter is being made concurrently in Newfoundland by the Minister of Finance and subsequently by the Premier.

It is our view, Mr. Speaker, that this loan is a good arrangement for both lender and borrower. As lender, we will receive a rate of return on our investment comparable with other areas of potential investment available to us. The interest over a 21-year period will provide a significant cash flow to Albertans for those future years when our resource revenues are less buoyant.

From the borrower's point of view, it provides the government of Newfoundland with a new source for its capital needs, and hence reduces the demands it will have to make upon New York or other money markets outside Canada. It provides a rate of interest that on a commercial basis will certainly not exceed and may be less than the rate it may have to pay on other borrowings abroad in the near term.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly, this loan by the government of Alberta to its sister province at the other end of this great nation is a reaffirmation of the confidence of Albertans in the future of a united Canada.

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

##### **Education Goals and Objectives**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Premier and ask if he'd outline to the Assembly the plans the government has for the involvement of the public or public hearings on the question of reassessment of goals and objectives in education. What type of public format is there going to be?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it will occur in a number of ways, and perhaps the Minister of Education may wish to supplement my answer. As the Speech from the Throne noted, one portion of it would relate to debate in the Legislative Assembly by members of the Assembly. Perhaps the Minister of Education, either now or by participation in the throne speech, may wish to elaborate upon that.

Secondly, as members are aware, the Curriculum Policies Board, which has been established as an advisory committee to the Minister of Education, has been meeting on a very concentrated basis over the course of the last number of months and will be making recommendations to the minister from time to time which he will make to us, and they of course involve also the question of goals and objectives of education.

Thirdly, we invite, as we have and as I reaffirm, any interested groups both within the established constituency groups involved in the education process — the Alberta School Trustees' Association, the Separate School associations, the Alberta Teachers' Association, the Alberta Home & School Association, and so on — to make any submissions they may wish to the government on this matter. We then would make an assessment of where we are in the matter and look to a report to the Legislature in the fall.

The minister may wish to supplement my answer.

MR. KOZIAK: The Premier has rather exhaustively dealt with the subject matter, and I think very well. The only additional point I would like to make is that it is my intention, Mr. Speaker, to place on the Order Paper within a day or two a notice of motion for debate whereby members of this Assembly would be able to enter into a debate on the goals and objectives of education and what priorities should be attributed to some or all of these goals and objectives.

I would hope that during the course of this debate members of the public feel free to contact their representative in this Assembly and provide that representative with their particular feelings on the goals and objectives. In this way the organizations referred to in the Speech from the Throne would also be able to contact their representatives in the Assembly, or leaders of the various political parties, to provide them with the type of information, or their particular views on this subject.

MR. CLARK: A supplementary question to the Minister of Education. Has the government given any consideration to the idea of an education forum, perhaps a two-day education forum, where a wide cross-section of people interested and involved in education across the province would get together for some sort of cross-fertilization of ideas, prior to the government bringing its position paper to the Legislature next fall?

MR. KOZIAK: That matter hasn't been given a great deal of consideration. What must be kept in mind is that, as the Speech from the Throne has pointed out, the decision which will be made is a decision of this Legislature and not a decision somewhere apart from this Legislature. To take away from that might lessen the effect of the goals, objectives, and priorities we would hope to attribute to our elementary and secondary education system.

MR. CLARK: A supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister yet received recommendations from the educational curriculum committee which was established last August?

MR. KOZIAK: Yes I have, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, is the minister in a position to table those recommendations with the members of the House prior to the discussion that the minister's motion will precipitate?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, those recommendations were not with respect to the goals and objectives of education.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, is it the intention of the minister to keep confidential all the recommendations of the education curriculum committee?

MR. KOZIAK: The recommendations of the Curriculum Policies Board are there as recommendations to me as the Minister of Education. Those upon which I have acted have been made public, as will those upon which I will act in the future.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last question to the minister. Would the minister outline to the members of the Assembly how we are going to have

this open discussion, if in fact he is not going to level with the House on all the recommendations he is receiving from the curriculum committee he's set up and also the Minister's Advisory Committee on Student Achievement? How are we going to have that open kind of discussion without all the information the minister has?

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, I would hope it would be this Assembly that would make the decision and not some group apart from this Assembly. However, with respect to the goals and objectives of education, I would be pleased to share the recommendations of the Curriculum Policies Board with members of the Assembly.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. At this stage, is it the intention to introduce amendments to The School Act?

MR. KOZIAK: That is not anticipated at this stage, Mr. Speaker.

#### **Fish and Wildlife Officers**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the second question to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife and ask if he's had a chance to respond to the fish and wildlife officers who have requested an investigation into the management of the fish and wildlife division of the minister's department.

MR. ADAIR: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't at this particular stage. I am aware that they had a meeting on the weekend and that the association was formed some three years ago to provide the members with input at the bargaining table. I knew they were meeting. I read in the press that there were in fact a number of concerns, and I've asked my officials to respond with a report to me.

MR. CLARK: A supplementary question to the minister. In the course of the last three years has the minister taken the opportunity to sit down with the fish and wildlife officers, and was he aware of the kinds of concerns that were brought forward on the weekend?

MR. ADAIR: Two points to the question, Mr. Speaker. Number one, over the last two years in my responsibilities as Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife I met with the now past-president of the association to discuss a number of points, not all of which are listed in this particular article.

MR. CLARK: A supplementary question to the minister. Specifically, has the minister investigated the question of forced retirements?

MR. ADAIR: No, not at this particular point, Mr. Speaker. I was not aware of it until I saw that article.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, specifically, has the minister investigated the question of promotions within the branch itself and concerns that have been expressed by officers who have been in the department some time who have been passed over by recent appointments?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, very clearly, there are no investigations going on in the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife now relative to any of those particular concerns. They have not been placed before me officially at this stage.

#### **Trade and Tariff Policies**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier and ask if he'd advise the Assembly when the government will be in a position to table joint western submissions, if in fact joint western submissions will be made, with respect to tariff and trade policies which relate to the area of chemicals and plastics.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't anticipate that we would have any joint submissions with the western provinces, because quite obviously Alberta is the only one of the four with a really significant interest in that area.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Can the Premier outline to the House whether the selected initiatives in trade and tariff matters include any further action on the assurance of natural gas supply to the Pacific northwest in return for lowered tariffs on Alberta petrochemicals, as outlined in the House last fall by the hon. Premier?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, that's still of course an on-going matter of discussion. It's among many of the various alternatives being perused — establishing both in terms of a reassessment of the supply situation within the province of Alberta and the advantages relative to trade and tariff negotiations on a bilateral basis which were mentioned in my letter to the Prime Minister tabled in the House on Friday.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. It would be a fair statement that the assurance of additional natural gas supplies, in return for lowered tariffs on Alberta petrochemicals at this point in time would be an important policy objective of the Alberta government, as it relates to bilateral tariff negotiations.

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it's one of the various options we're perusing, and of course it doesn't relate strictly to petrochemical tariffs. We've made it clear on a number of occasions that agricultural products, access for agricultural products, and reduction of trade barriers have a higher priority than petrochemical tariffs.

MR. NOTLEY: A further supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Beyond accommodating obvious emergencies such as the recent snowfalls and cold weather in the United States does the government, in light of previous statements about possible assurance of natural gas supplies in return for lowered petrochemical tariffs, foresee at this point in time any substantial increase in long-term exports of Alberta natural gas to the United States?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it's rather hard to tell. As a result of our effective Alberta petroleum incen-

tive plan of December 1974, there's been some improvement in the natural gas supply situation in Alberta. At the same time, there's been some reduction in the demand situation by way of Canadian requirements. It may be that the National Energy Board's report of some time ago relative to the supply/demand curves of natural gas understated supply and overstated requirements for Canada. So it would be a matter of ongoing assessment from our point of view, hopefully with the federal government.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Premier. In light of the possible development of world-scale petrochemical industry and its export potential, when does the government foresee having the information on supplies of natural gas available, to be able to make a policy judgment on this important matter particularly as it relates to upcoming bilateral negotiations?

MR. LOUGHEED: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's an ongoing matter. These evaluations with regard to supply have to be assessed from time to time, and as I mentioned in my previous answer I don't think I can add more to it. I think early indications are that the National Energy Board may have had a significantly higher requirement for Canadian natural gas in their forecast than is proving to be the case. It's a matter of evaluation, of pulling those two aspects together.

This matter with regard to negotiation on a bilateral basis involves, though, as I would like to repeat, agricultural products before petrochemicals.

#### **Pornographic Magazines**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. the Attorney General. What progress is being made in the government's program to have pornographic magazines displayed less prominently, particularly out of the reach and sight of young children?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, when I initiated this program last fall, I didn't really anticipate it would be all that successful, and I'm really very delighted to report to the House that the wholesalers advise me the response at the retail level has been overwhelming and excellent. Some of them have said 100 per cent of their retail customers have complied with our request to exercise discretion in the display of these materials, and discretion — in fact, prohibition — when it comes to the sale of these materials to youngsters. I have been very pleased that such a small initiative should realize such excellent results.

#### **Alberta Game Farm**

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. It's a follow-up to a question I asked on Friday last regarding the Alberta Game Farm, Alberta participation, and municipalities' abilities to raise funds.

I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House if it is true that, via the major cultural recreation facility program, Edmonton and the County of Strathcona could in fact raise \$100 per capita or up to approximately \$4 million which could be used for the purchase of the Alberta Game Farm.

DR. BUCK: You guys are still waffling.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, when the program was announced and kicked off in 1975, it did provide \$100 per capita to any municipal authority, whether a hamlet, village, ID, county, municipal district, or whatever. The key is, though, that the city of Edmonton, the County of Strathcona, or whoever it may be must make the priority choice as to what they want those funds to go to. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is in essence available to any community, municipality, through their master plan program. They can do that, whether it be the city or any other community.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Following on the comments of the minister, is it true that the municipalities, hamlets, villages, and towns across the province could apply for these funds via this program and then, if they wished, jointly or separately purchase the Game Farm as an all-province effort?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, yes.

#### **Mental Health Review Board**

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. A brief explanation is necessary.

In the February 25 *Hansard* the minister responded to a question from the Member for Little Bow about the incident at Alberta Hospital, and it was mentioned that the board of review is involved. Revolving around this board of review, how is that selection made, to whom does it answer, what are its terms of reference, and has this board in fact been effective?

DR. BUCK: Put it on the Order Paper.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think it's important that this be discussed because there appears to be some misunderstanding. I'm happy to advise the hon. member that the board of review reports to the Attorney General. It was established, I believe, in 1969 and its purpose was to review criminal cases where the person was judged to be insane. It does review those cases and it has been extremely effective.

About 90 people were incarcerated at Oliver in 1969. They had no appeal. Under the board of review it is now down to 26, and many of those people were discharged into nursing homes as being not dangerous, and no longer should they be restrained there.

I would have to say that I commend the previous administration for setting up the board of review. It has been highly regarded across Canada. Indeed, the Alberta board of review is very highly regarded by other boards of review and has been commended for its work.

What they do as work and their assessment is based on the quality of the professional advice they get and the quality of the board of review. So they are forever faced with the dilemma of, has a cure been effected, and if it has can that person then be released. Their other alternative is to say no forever, and we have then to question whether that's what we want and what the citizens of Alberta wanted in '69, and whether they still want that in 1977.

### Cow/Calf Programs

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate when the cheques will be going out to the successful applicants for the \$50 calf grant, and what time period we're looking at for all the cheques to be out?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, of the approximately 26,000 applications, 16,000 to 18,000 are now in the process of cheque printing. We would expect the first cheques to be in the mail about March 10. It is still our goal, in spite of having extended the deadline for applications by one month from December 31 to January 31, to have all cheques out by the end of March, with the exception of a limited number which may be subject to appeal or some difficulty with respect to information on their application form.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the minister have any figures on the number of applications for the \$50 calf grant that have been refused or turned down?

MR. MOORE: No, Mr. Speaker, I haven't. Indeed, it would be unlikely that I would have that type of figure if you consider those who may have inquired at a district office and been advised that for some reason or other they were not eligible for the program.

I would, however, be quite prepared to provide, at a later date when I have it, information to hon. members with respect to the exact total of persons who did apply, the average support payment to each one, and the total number of dollars involved. Together with that I could provide the information on the basis of numbers only of those applications which were refused for some reason or other in terms of ones which had been forwarded from DA offices to the Edmonton office.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Since the program is greatly enhanced through the averaging the minister recently introduced, is any consideration being given to using the 1976 income in that averaging?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, in the month of November consideration was given to changing the method of applying for the grant in terms of averaging. As a matter of fact, representations had been made from a variety of sources with regard to changing it to a five-year or a two-year average, or using a 1976 figure as well.

After giving that matter a great deal of thought, it was our consideration that if we moved to a 1976 income tax provision, we would have to wait until the 1976 tax returns — many of which are not submitted until the end of April in 1977 — were validated by the federal internal revenue service. Indeed we may have had to extend the period of applications into June or July of this year, and it would have been difficult for us to get payments out until perhaps the fall of 1977. After having reviewed the matter of the third year of low calf prices, it was my feeling that one of the important aspects of the program was to get the dollars out as quickly as possible. It wasn't possible to do that if we were going to change the

program in that regard.

We did, however, look at the situation with respect to persons who had made substantial sales during 1975, particularly of their basic herd, and therefore had a higher income that year. That is when I announced a cabinet decision to change the program, in fact, so you could use your taxable income either in the latest year or the latest two years prior to September 1, 1976. That provision of averaging over two years helped a lot of people to qualify who otherwise might not have qualified because of excessively high income, largely on account of disposing of basic herd.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the \$8,000 ceiling, admittedly averaged over two years but including the basic support payment, does the minister have any statistics as to what percentage of applicants received less than \$50 per animal because they'd be over the \$8,000 ceiling? In other words, they would receive some but wouldn't receive the total amount because they would be over the \$8,000 ceiling.

MR. MOORE: No, I simply don't have. I have asked my staff to place priority on ensuring that the information with regard to the processing of cheques is developed first. As soon as we are able to get the cheques out, I expect I will have a fairly complete review of what categories we were looking at in terms of those who applied.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I can't promise I will have the exact information the hon. member is seeking. But I'll try my best to provide the kind of information that might be useful to members in judging where the income problems are in different parts of the province and at what levels people did apply. I think I can probably provide a great deal of that, Mr. Speaker. But it would likely be during the latter part of this legislative session, perhaps in late April.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the fact that we have a federal program of sorts, is the province going to continue with any sort of scheme? The announcement last year was a one-shot proposal. Is any consideration being given at this time to some modification or supplement to the federal program, or will it just be left up to the federal program now in place?

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not a case of leaving it up to the federal government at all. As hon. members will recall, for more than two years we requested that the government of Canada implement a federal cow/calf stabilization program under the amended Agricultural Stabilization Act of 1975. Indeed, at meetings of ministers of agriculture and at the western premiers' conference, both the Premier and I have led the way in getting provincial agreement — as a matter of fact, agreement last July from 10 provincial governments — to have a national cow/calf support program implemented. In December of this year lengthy meetings in Ottawa again resulted in the federal government making a long overdue commitment, announced on January 4, to accept its responsibilities under the national Agricultural Stabilization Act to bring in a program for 1977.

Quite frankly that program should have been in place a year earlier. It wasn't. That is why this province came in with a support program now just in excess of \$43 million which without any question is the best provincial cow/calf support program in Canada.

It would be our intention in 1977, after having successfully negotiated with the federal government to bring in a program very similar to the program we have in Alberta, not to have a provincial support program in the coming year. I might add however, Mr. Speaker, that I have not ruled out the possibility that the cow/calf loan program which was implemented in 1974 may be continued beyond 1976, but it would not be my expectation that the support program would be.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, just one final supplementary question to the hon. minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps the hon. member might continue with his question, but as the spring sittings wear on we should perhaps regain our understanding of the word "final".

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I promise this will be the final supplementary question.

In light of the fact that total payments under the various provincial cow/calf programs this year are in the neighborhood, I believe, of about \$125 million and the federal scheme is based on a payout of about \$70 million, is it the view of the Alberta government that the federal scheme is adequate?

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, the \$70 million really is a figure that can't be relied upon, because the federal program is based, as our program was based, on what the market price for calves will be during the course of 1977. Bearing in mind that a substantial portion, perhaps 80 or 90 per cent, of the calves are sold during a three-month period beginning in September, it would be difficult for anyone, without knowledge of what that market's going to be, to assess the cost of a program.

It would be my hope, quite frankly, that appropriate measures will continue to be taken with respect to affecting the market place in such a way that no payout at all will be necessary from the federal program. Indeed our continued representations with respect to the level of offshore beef coming into Canada — which by the way, Mr. Speaker, has been reduced from 220 million pounds plus last year to about 144 million pounds in 1977 — will have some effect. Indeed the initiatives we take with respect to trade agreements and tariff barriers between ourselves and the United States and other countries may hopefully have some effect in improving the price to our cattle producers so that a support program at any level is not required.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary on a point of clarification. Did the hon. minister say that the program is in excess of \$43 million, and does the minister foresee that it will go over that \$43 million?

MR. MOORE: Well, Mr. Speaker, when we originally announced the program, [on] the best information we had available — and I admit it was rather sketchy.

when you try to determine how many producers might be eligible on account of their taxable income being lower or higher than \$8,000 — it was our estimate that 23,000 producers would qualify for an average payment of \$1,700 each, at a cost of \$40 million.

In addition to that support program, we announced in that same package a continuation of the cow/calf loan program. That was estimated to cost about \$1.8 million. Mr. Speaker, we did have within the budget of the Department of Agriculture for the existing fiscal year, 1976-77, an amount of \$1.8 million for the cow/calf loan program. So with the passage two weeks ago of a special warrant for \$43 million, we will now have provided funding to the amount of about \$44.8 million for the total cow/calf support and loan program. It would be my expectation that that will be sufficient, and the amount will be very, very close to that.

#### **Planning Act**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the quick-acting Minister of Municipal Affairs. I'd like to know if the minister can indicate if the long-awaited provincial planning act will be presented to the spring sitting of this Legislature.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes it will, Mr. Speaker.

#### **Social Assistance Recipients**

MR. KUSHNER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. I know an awful lot of people have moved to the province of Alberta from other provinces, particularly those receiving social assistance. I wonder if the minister is in a position to inform the House if the minister has last year's figures, and particularly how they compare with this year's.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't have the specific information the hon. member is seeking, although we may be able to obtain it. If I understand the question correctly, he's talking about the number of people who have come to Alberta and who are now on social assistance. Because it's an area that is not too easy to define, I think he should suggest to me exactly the specific information he wants. Is it those who are seeking employment? They come into Alberta and may be eligible or may require some help under the Canada assistance plan, but they soon go out of our system and go to work. Consequently they appear as a statistic but soon disappear into the work force, or move on, and we lose track of them. For that reason it's a little difficult for me to be specific with the question the hon. member has placed before me.

MR. KUSHNER: Maybe I can clear the air a little. I think I appreciate the way the minister has elaborated on the question. Would the minister be kind enough [to] give us both: those who are permanent and those who apparently came here, received social assistance, and then in fact got into the work force.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'll be pleased to review the question in *Hansard*, then perhaps suggest to the hon. member that he place it on the Order Paper. I believe it's going to be difficult to answer orally.

#### Commonwealth Games

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. In view of the province's great contribution to the Commonwealth Games in '78 to be held here in Edmonton, I'd like to ask whether any type of agreement was made with the participating countries to assure they would attend the games. I'm thinking in particular of the potential boycott by African countries.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, the question is one that really should be addressed to the Commonwealth Games Foundation. With respect, I can't really say whether they have. The city of Edmonton as the host province certainly has members on that committee. We are committed with them to the contribution we made, along with the city and federal government, to ensure the facilities are there for a successful Games.

MR. COOKSON: Perhaps a further supplementary. I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, because of the province's contribution. Could the minister advise whether any contribution or commitment was made monetarily by the participating countries, if they intend to participate in the Commonwealth Games?

MR. ADAIR: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I would have to take that as notice. I would have to try to find that information for him.

#### Packing Plant Odor

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to Minister of the Environment. Has the minister or officials of his department met recently with representatives of Canada Packers Limited to discuss the issue of odor pollution from the Canada Packers' meat packing plant in southeast Calgary?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I know as a result of representations from citizens in the region neighboring the plant there have recently been telephone discussions. There have been some on-site inspections, but I don't know if there have been formal meetings. It's an ongoing matter at the moment.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister or his department had discussions with the head office of Canada Packers in Toronto with regard to, as the minister says himself, the longstanding problem?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I would have to go back and find out if there is a past record of communication with the head office. I know there has been some pretty substantial ongoing discussion with the local Calgary office on the matter the leader refers to.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate just what action has taken place, or has any action taken place in the course of these rather protracted discussions that have been going on between his department in Calgary and the people affected?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, what we have tried to do, Mr. Speaker, is find out at what time and with what frequency these upsets, or whatever you want to call them, occur. We have given several people who have called in the telephone number and name of the person to communicate with, and try to respond as quickly as we can to pin down the source of the problem.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. There has been no action other than giving out the department's telephone number?

MR. RUSSELL: Well, I think that is an unfair interpretation to put on it, Mr. Speaker, because . . .

MR. CLARK: What then?

MR. RUSSELL: Well, if you just have patience we'll answer your question.

When a citizen complains of an odor we are trying to find out where in that southeast industrial area it's coming from, and what is causing it. I think quick response to telephone complaints is a good way of finding out. We know what some of the causes are and, if necessary, emission control orders will be issued to the company as there have been in other cases in the province.

#### Sport Alberta

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. Is it the intention of the government to replace Sport Alberta with the Alberta Games Council?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, yes. On February 1 there was an announcement that we would be separating the responsibilities of the summer and winter games, placing them under the Alberta Games Council. Sport Alberta, in fact, would then operate as it had initially been laid out to do: the responsibilities of working liaison with government and with the various sport governing bodies in the province.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary. Will the government continue to fund Sport Alberta?

MR. ADAIR: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary again. Will members of the Alberta Games Council be government appointed, or appointed by the various sports bodies?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, right now we are looking at a combination of some of the representatives from the sports governing bodies, some from the citizens at large, as well as departmental officials.

### Grain Sales

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Premier concerning the upcoming trip to the Soviet Union. I would like to ask the Premier if he could advise the Assembly whether it's the government view that any long-term pact on grain sales would apply to all Canadian grain exports, or whether the government envisages a special arrangement for the province of Alberta.

MR. LOUGHEED: Well, Mr. Speaker, no decision has been made as to whether or not that trip will be made. It is still in the discussion stage. However, quite obviously, if we were involved as we were in Japan, or in any other trade initiatives, quite clearly what we are talking about is recommendations to the Canadian government with regard to grain arrangements or trade arrangements which would affect all of Canada.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. In light of the fact that a long-term pact on grain would affect all three prairie provinces to a very large extent, has the government given any consideration, in order to dramatize the importance of this matter, to a joint mission of all three premiers?

MR. LOUGHEED: Well, Mr. Speaker, it may not be necessary to deal with the matter in terms of a mission involving all three premiers of the basic grain-producing provinces. But certainly if we make an evaluation that we think there are advantages to Canada from such an approach, it would be a matter that I would bring, either at the forthcoming western premiers' conference or at a subsequent one, to see whether or not there is concurrence by my colleagues in the other provinces.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. In view of the Soviet Union's position of dealing with wheat board officials themselves, as opposed to salesmen working for the board, is it the government's view at this point that it would be necessary or useful to have officials of the Canadian Wheat Board accompany the Premier on the trip?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, again subject to the conclusion as to whether or not the trip will be made, my answer to that would be no. We've received a specific invitation, which we have not yet accepted. It's an invitation directed to me as the Premier of Alberta. It would give me an opportunity to discuss the matter with senior people in the Soviet Union, recognizing that that country is a very important market for grain produced in Canada and that Alberta is a very important grain-producing province. We have had full and complete discussions and briefings with the Canadian Wheat Board, involving the Minister of Agriculture and myself, with regard to such a tentative trip. They fully briefed us with regard to the past history of the matter, and they have briefed us regarding the prospects. They are aware of some of the aspects of the trip that may be discussed.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the hon. Premier for clarification. Do I take it from the hon. Premier's answer that in view of the fact that agreements would have to be made by the federal government, such a tour — if it is taken — would be largely a fact-finding visit to the Soviet Union, and that that information would then be relayed to the appropriate federal authorities for action?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, to a large degree it would be fact-finding, but it would be fact-finding for the government of Alberta to make an evaluation as to whether or not there should be a change in policy with regard to our sales approach for Canada. I think in this federal state it's highly advisable for provinces which have large stakes in these matters to be fully informed, to make the recommendations to the federal government, and to have them backed up with the best available information. I've found by experience that the best available information is sometimes to be specifically talking to the people who make the decisions.

In addition to that, I think it's very important that all Albertans realize we're in the position that we depend very largely for our prosperity upon our agriculture industry. On the grain side the export share, particularly for wheat, is very, very important. We've had a declining proportion of the Soviet Union market over the course of the last four or five years. I'm sure all Albertans share my concern that that not continue and that every effort be made to reverse that trend.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. Premier. Has the Canadian government or the Canadian Wheat Board given any indication that it would give its blessing to such a visit?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we certainly have had the full co-operation of the federal Department of External Affairs in the preliminary planning of such a visit. The invitation was given to us as a result of Premier Kosygin's visit here in the fall of 1971. We were going to go in the summer of '73, but the Western Economic Opportunities Conference intervened and we had to cancel the trip. We approach the trip the same way as the recent trip to China of the Premier of Saskatchewan. It's important I think for the premiers of the provinces. We should have some ability, in terms of sales, to communicate on behalf of our province the opportunities available here and hopefully improve our market access.

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary to the hon. Premier. Is this the first instance when the premier of the Soviet Union has invited the premier of a province of Canada to visit his country?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, my recollection was that one other invitation was extended at the time the premier of Russia, Mr. Kosygin, was here. I can't recall which other one. I don't know whether it was accepted or not.

I did want to point out though that, by the same token, the Minister of Agriculture and I, when we visited with the Canadian Wheat Board a week ago last Friday, were somewhat surprised to hear that the point had been made that I was the only premier the



commissioners had ever really met with in any sort of discussion with regard to their approaches in terms of marketing or anything. They had never had a meeting with other premiers, other than a cursory briefing by one commissioner with regard to the trip to China by the Premier of Saskatchewan. They felt it was a very worth-while three and a half hour session, as did Mr. Moore and I.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier — a lighter note on such a very important topic. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier would consider taking half a dozen non-cabinet MLAs, in order that they could expand their knowledge in this so very important area for Canada and Alberta.

#### **Planning Act** (continued)

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I was so overwhelmed that the minister is going to move ahead with the planning act, I was rendered temporarily speechless.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can you make it permanent?

DR. BUCK: I'd like to ask a supplementary to the hon. minister. Can the Minister indicate if the planning act will be brought in and passed at this sitting of the Legislature, or held over to the fall sittings so people can make presentations if they so wish?

AN HON MEMBER: Ram it through, or . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we have not yet decided on the course of handling the new planning act through the Assembly. We will look forward to the reaction from both the opposition and interested parties, and we will weigh it as we proceed. It's my intention to have the bill introduced as soon as possible in March, and we expect we'll have a lot of reaction to the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: We have time for one question without a supplementary from the Member for Bow Valley.

#### **Brooks Hospital**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. When will the decision be made to award the tender for the new hospital in Brooks?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I can't give the hon. member a specific date. I know the project is near the final stage of approval. If the costs are what we consider reasonable in terms of the final estimates, we will be in a position to approve the project going to tender. I believe that is now imminent, but I can't give a specific date for it.

## **ORDERS OF THE DAY**

### **head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

#### **2. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:**

Be it resolved that:

- (1) The select committee of this Assembly created by resolution of November 24, 1975, to study and report on trucking regulations be relieved of its obligation to report to the Assembly during the Second Session of the 18th Legislature;
- (2) The committee be authorized to continue to sit after the prorogation of the Second Session of the 18th Legislature and during this session;
- (3) Members of the committee shall receive remuneration in accordance with Section 59 of The Legislative Assembly Act;
- (4) Reasonable disbursements by the committee, for clerical assistance, equipment and supplies, advertising, rent, and other facilities required for the effective conduct of its responsibilities, shall be paid, subject to the approval of the chairman;
- (5) The committee shall report to this Assembly during the present session.

MR. HYNDMAN: As this motion is procedural and does not make any substantive changes, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe any elaboration is necessary.

[Motion carried]

#### **2. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:**

Be it resolved that:

- (1) The select committee of this Assembly created by resolution of December 15, 1975, to study and report on The Ombudsman Act be relieved of its obligation to report to the Assembly during the Second Session of the 18th Legislature;
- (2) The committee be hereby authorized to continue to function after the prorogation of the Second Session of the 18th Legislature during this session;
- (3) Members of the committee shall receive remuneration in accordance with Section 59 of The Legislative Assembly Act;
- (4) Reasonable disbursements by the committee for clerical assistance, equipment and supplies, advertising, rent, and other facilities required for the effective conduct of its responsibilities, shall be paid, subject to the approval of the chairman;
- (5) The committee shall report to this Assembly during the present session.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, my comments with respect to the previous motion apply here as well.

[Motion carried]

#### **5. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:**

Be it resolved that the Assembly adopt the following amendment to *Standing Orders*, to be effective until the prorogation of the Third Session of the 18th Legislature. Standing Order 8 is amended by striking out suborders (2) and (3), and substituting the following therefor:

- (2) (a) The order of business for the consideration of the Assembly on Tuesday afternoon shall

be as follows:

Written Questions  
 Motions for Returns  
 Government Designated Business  
 Motions other than Government  
 Motions  
 Private Bills  
 Public Bills and Orders other than Gov-  
 ernment Bills and Orders  
 Government Motions  
 Government Bills and Orders

- (b) When Government Designated Business is called the Assembly shall consider any item of business which the Government Whip has designated by written notice to the Clerk prior to 12 noon on the previous Friday under Motions other than Government Motions, Government Bills and Orders or Government Motions.
- (c) The Clerk shall cause any designation pursuant to clause (b) to be printed in Votes and Proceedings for that Friday.
- (d) A motion that has been designated under this suborder may not be designated a second time.
- (e) Debate on Government Designated Business shall not continue for more than one hour.
- (3) (a) The order of business for the consideration of the Assembly on Thursday afternoon shall be as follows:
- Written Questions  
 Motions for Returns  
 Motions other than Government  
 Motions  
 Public Bills and Orders other than Gov-  
 ernment Bills and Orders  
 Government Motions  
 Government Bills and Orders
- (b) On Thursday when Motions other than Government Motions is called, the Assembly shall consider the next such motion on the Order Paper unless the Leader of the Opposition has designated by written notice to the Clerk prior to 4:00 p.m. on the previous Tuesday a motion from those set down by other than Government members on the Order Paper for that Tuesday under Motions other than Government Motions, in which case the Assembly shall consider that motion first.
- (c) The Clerk shall cause any motion designated pursuant to clause (b) to be printed in Votes and Proceedings for that Tuesday.
- (d) A motion that has been designated under this suborder may not be designated a second time.
- (e) Debate on Motions other than Government Motions shall not continue for more than one hour.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, this motion is essentially the same as one passed during the last session. It is temporary, to have effect until the prorogation of the third session. It provides for government and opposition designated procedures on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons.

I should mention at this time, Mr. Speaker, it is the government's intention to bring forth another motion

somewhat similar to this to provide an opportunity for opposition MLAs to have two resolutions on the Order Paper at the same time. This motion will be brought forward at a future date.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to oppose the motion, but I would like to point out that if every Tuesday and Thursday there is a designated resolution, it leaves practically no time for resolutions introduced by members who have equal rights with others to have their resolutions debated. In a future year, I would like to see these alternate at least, so that private members who don't happen to be in with the Leader of the Opposition on this side or in with the Government House Leader on the other would have some chance of having their resolutions debated.

MR. HYNDMAN: In closing debate, Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. Member for Drumheller has made a good point. Even though we pass this motion now, we might try something informal for this year and if something works out, perhaps make a change for the forthcoming session. I think he has a reasonable point.

[Motion carried]

4. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:

Be it resolved that the Assembly adopt the following amendments to *Standing Orders*:

Standing Order 55(2) is struck out and the following is substituted therefor:

- (2) The report of a committee is the report as determined by the committee as a whole or the majority thereof, and no minority report may be presented to or received by the Assembly. A committee may, in its discretion, include any dissenting opinions in its report.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, it's important to note that this applies to all committees of the Assembly. It refers to Standing Order 55, which members will find in their new *Standing Orders*.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to compliment you and your department on this very useful and convenient new format for the rules of the Assembly.

The second sentence of the proposed resolution is the operative one. As members know, the present rules say in effect that no minority report may be presented to or received by the Assembly. The government is suggesting here that it would be helpful for the Legislature, and much less rigid, if a dissenting opinion could be expressed through the vehicle of a committee making its report, if it wishes to, setting forth that there are some dissenting opinions on these two or three points. That is the purpose of the motion.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I certainly support the motion. It seems to me it is much more flexible than the former situation, where we could find ourselves with dissenting opinions but there would be no way of making those opinions formally known in the Legislature.

The only concern I would have — and it's not a concern sufficient to cause me to move an amendment or to vote against this motion — is that it seems to me we may get ourselves in a situation, Mr. Government House Leader, where some legislative

committees will include dissenting opinions and some won't. Since the legislative committees are in fact paid for by the taxpayers, and since we are servants of the taxpayers, I think there's a pretty strong argument that obviously the opinions of the majority should be made available in the form of recommendations, but also that the minority opinions, if any, should be included.

Again, I don't feel strongly enough about it that I would move an amendment at this point in time. But I think it's something we might well consider in future. I think there is a lot of merit, when members of the Legislature have studied something over a period of months or in some cases several years and have come to less than a unanimous conclusion, that the public which is footing the bill should have the benefit of the minority as well as the majority opinion.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, several years ago in this Legislature, a committee could present a minority report. In looking over some of those, it seems to me the only thing that was accomplished through that was the muddying of the waters. What it amounted to was that the member or members were unable to carry the judgment of the other members of that committee. In every instance during my tenure in the House, the same members were unable to carry the judgment of the members of the Legislature.

Consequently, in my view it's really a waste of time to have a minority report. The Legislature sets up a committee to give a recommendation, and if you're going to water down the recommendation in three or four or five ways through the various members, then the whole thing is a waste of public money. I believe the Legislature wants a majority opinion of that committee, after having it thrashed out.

On the other hand, every member on the committee is a member of this Legislature. He has a full opportunity to advance his thoughts here if he thinks he can carry the judgment of the members of the Legislature. So I think the rule is a good one. I think it clarifies the issue very, very well.

[Motion carried]

1. Moved by Dr. Hohol:

That the select standing committees of this Assembly for the present session be appointed for the following purposes:

- (1) Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders, and Printing
- (2) Public Accounts,
- (3) Private Bills,
- (4) Law and Regulations,
- (5) Public Affairs,
- (6) The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act;

which said committees shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such things as shall be referred to them by the Assembly, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers, and records;

To which the following amendment was moved by Dr. Buck:

That the motion be amended by adding after the words "Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act" the words "which committee shall be chaired by a member other than a government member".

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Hyndman]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I urge that the amendment be defeated. This was the amendment moved by the hon. Member for Clover Bar rather early in the session. Thinking of the hon. member in posing the amendment, perhaps related to a parallel which he saw with respect to the Public Accounts Committee, I suggest the Alberta heritage trust fund committee is an entity completely different in substance and kind, and the same parallel argument does not apply. Public Accounts, of course, reviews the expenditures of the Legislature, and there is no question that the Legislature has complete priority with respect to expenditures and the spending of money. The heritage savings trust fund relates to matters concerning investment. That has traditionally been and is now a prerogative of government, which point was debated at some length during the passage of the bill.

DR. BUCK: You're spending public money . . .

MR. HYNDMAN: Investing. Investing is the word. The honorable gentlemen opposite don't seem able to make the distinction sometimes, Mr. Speaker. [interjections]

In any event, I think that is the first reason, Mr. Speaker, why it would be inappropriate to have the heritage savings trust fund committee chaired by a member of the opposition.

The second reason, of course, is that the heritage savings committee is a completely new and unique concept. The fund itself is perhaps unique in the world. No one can predict at this time how this committee is going to function, because nothing like it has ever before been established in parliamentary history.

So at the very least, I think the suggestion of the honorable gentleman is totally premature. Perhaps some years down the road it may be possible to reconsider it in light of experience.

AN HON. MEMBER: There may not be anything . . .

MR. HYNDMAN: But I think the honorable gentleman would wish to consider the experience and see how we can first get off at the proper pace and in the proper way with the committee.

Therefore I think it appropriate and necessary at this time to recommend that the amendment be defeated.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I had frankly hoped that this debate would be quite short this afternoon. I had really hoped, Mr. Speaker, until Friday morning, when the Premier announced the government wasn't going to support this particular proposition.

The Government House Leader makes a very grave distinction between investments and spending. The distinction can be made. But we should recognize that the amount of money in the heritage savings trust fund at the end of this year or next will likely be equal to all the money in the provincial budget. We spend four, six, seven weeks in this Assembly going over the expenditure of funds in the budget. If we want to draw a very narrow line and say, ah, but this is an investment, I must remind the members of the House once again that this is an investment made behind closed doors which has no reference to any

member of the Legislature other than Executive Council. They'll have the investment power, Mr. Speaker, to handle the largest investment portfolio in Canada.

And we're being told here today that we musn't move too fast, that maybe in 10 years it would be appropriate to have a member of the opposition chair the committee that's going to view the report. It may well be that if we don't have a member of the opposition chairing the thing, in 10 years there will be nothing to look at. [interjections] Well, that argument has a great deal more common sense than the one put forward by the Government House Leader.

The proposition clearly is that the cabinet make the decisions on the investment fund without any reference at all to the Legislature. This proposal would put one lonely member of the opposition as the chairman of the committee that's going to review the operation of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. I ask myself, what in the world could the government be scared of? Why not plough this new ground? Now is the opportunity to do it, rather than talk in terms of doing it 10 years down the road, because the principles and procedure outlined this year in the course of looking at the heritage savings trust fund report will in all likelihood establish the approach that will be used for some years to come as far as the fund is concerned.

Secondly, I would point out to members of the government side of the House that we are looking not only at the 80 per cent the cabinet has the power to invest without your say-so at all; also included is the 20 per cent we deal with each fall. The 20 per cent that doesn't have to have a supposed guaranteed rate of return is being lumped in here too.

So the proposition clearly is: do we want to ensure the widest possible look at the investment decisions made by the cabinet, make a member of the opposition the chairman of the committee; or do we in fact want to go the other way and have a government member chair it, a member of the same government that's investing the money — and I say, an amount of money which by this time next year may be greater than the provincial budget.

One of the objectives with which we have approached this session is the public right to know. We raised the matter on the first day because it was the only opportunity we would have. I earnestly think the public have a right to know precisely what is going on as far as the investments in the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. That can be guaranteed if a member of the opposition is chairman.

I'm not suggesting it won't happen if there is a member from the government, but there is a kind of precedent being established. The guarantee is there, whichever of the six members of the opposition would be appointed. I feel they would carry their responsibilities seriously, and I think the argument squarely rests on the public's right to know, the public's right to be satisfied that these decisions being made behind closed doors are at least going to have the scrutiny of a committee chaired by a member of the opposition.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to emphasize the importance of the utmost scrutiny of this particular fund. It is public money, and the investments should be checked and rechecked. I think

the committee becomes one of the most important standing committees ever appointed.

But I can't see how appointing a member of the opposition is going to accomplish that. As a matter of fact, in my view, it's taking somebody out of the very small opposition and making them chairman, where they don't have a vote, where they can't take part in the debate, and where they can't contribute other than by chairing a meeting.

I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that you don't contribute. You contribute in a very splendid way, but you cannot take part in the debates in this Legislature. The chairman of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund act could not take part in that debate either. As a matter of fact my idea, and I think the parliamentary definition, is that the chairman carry out the wishes of the committee. So it is far more important to me to have members on the committee who are going to endeavor to find out everything that's going on. I am sure the cabinet is going to be most co-operative in letting the committee know everything that is going on, because one mistake by this investment committee, the cabinet of this province, could be the undoing of the entire government. So much money is involved. I'm sure the Premier has emphasized before the gravity of the situation as he and the members of his cabinet view it. I don't think that can be overemphasized.

When I've spoken about this out in the hustings, I've not supported the view taken by the two opposition parties to my left, because I don't think their position is right. In my view every investment, every cent of that fund, has to be answered for to the people of Alberta and to the Legislature in one form or another. Consequently, in my view the appointment of the chairman isn't the important thing.

But I would like to say every individual group in this Legislature should be represented on that committee. I hope it's not going to be a committee where only some groups are represented. I would think all three groups in the opposition should be represented. If there were a Liberal member here — heaven forbid — I would think he should be represented too. That the members on that committee do their job is more important to me.

The chairman, after all, is going to chair the meeting. He's not going to lead the committee down through paths of flowers or in any other particular way, if the committee is wide awake.

So I don't support the resolution. But I do go along with the argument that this is probably the most important committee that has ever been struck in a legislature in this country.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, rising to take part in the debate: the amendment to the resolution we have before us today is rather a cautious amendment, but one which I submit is worth support by the members of the Legislature, for a number of reasons.

First of all, it should be noted, Mr. Speaker, that it was not the custom in this Legislature that a member of the opposition chair the Public Accounts Committee. For many years we had a very small opposition in the Legislature, and I suppose the arguments presented by the hon. Member for Drumheller could easily have been directed toward the Public Accounts Committee too. But that didn't stop — on February 15, 1968, I believe, Mr. Speaker — the now Premier

of the province and the Deputy Premier [from] moving a motion that the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee should, in fact, be a member of the opposition.

Historically there has always been the argument that, in order that justice be done — but at least as important, that it be seen to be done — the chairman of the Public Accounts Committee should be from the opposition. I think the same argument can be applied, with respect, to the chairmanship of the heritage trust fund committee.

I agree with the hon. Member for Drumheller when he talks about how important a committee it is. No question about that. But I think it's important that Albertans feel this is going to be as open a discussion as possible of all the investments made by the provincial government under the act. That being the case, I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and to members of the Assembly that, just as in 1968 the people of Alberta felt the Public Accounts Committee could be more fairly and openly handled with a chairman from the opposition, so, I submit in 1977, the people of Alberta would feel that this important committee would be more fairly and openly chaired with someone from the opposition. It doesn't necessarily mean that members from the government would not be competent, honest, what have you. I'm suggesting that in terms of the appearance to the people of Alberta, there's a very strong argument for a chairman from the opposition.

The major argument presented by the hon. Government House Leader — and I really don't know how seriously he took this argument himself, because he went on to say that in 10 years or so maybe they could review the position, that indeed this was a rather unique approach, the heritage trust fund, no question about that, and that down the road, maybe, the government would look at a different approach. I think he referred to the amendment of the hon. Member for Clover Bar as premature.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the argument is presented that there is somehow a very important difference between an investment and an expenditure. The Leader of the Opposition has pointed out that, I suppose, if you really strain you can make that distinction. If you really strain. But what we're really talking about, Mr. Speaker, is the question of a lot of money, a lot of public money.

If one goes over the history of our parliamentary process — and we could argue that, as we did last spring — there are many authorities in the area who will argue quite convincingly that the power of the purse strings is not directed to expenditure as opposed to investment; it's directed to public money being used to alter, change, or affect the jurisdiction. Now, Mr. Speaker, with that in mind I think that what we see here is a rather tenuous effort, albeit adroitly argued by a very skilful lawyer, to draw a distinction between expenditure and investment. But at this point in time, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about almost \$2 billion worth of money, within a year perhaps as much as the provincial budget, over the next decade, \$10 billion of public money. Mr. Speaker, that being the case, in my judgment all the arguments raised last spring are valid today.

Now let's just bring that to the question of this particular amendment. All this amendment proposes, Mr. Speaker, is that in light of the importance — an

importance that quite frankly I thought the Premier himself placed very well on this committee in the debate a year ago, that this was one of the mechanisms by which accountability was to be ensured — it would be in the interest of the public that the chairmanship of that committee be in the hands of an opposition member, so there would be no question that there would be a full and open debate and that the public's right to know would be fully guaranteed.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview indicated that to realize a distinction between an investment and an expenditure he had to strain. Knowing that fact, I'm sure pleased, and I am sure the people of the province of Alberta are equally pleased, that the heritage fund isn't at his disposal. For if it were, there would be very little left.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition makes the point that this Legislature spends from four to seven weeks studying the estimates of the budget and that the budget and the fund are nearing the same size, in terms of dollars. Reflecting back, Mr. Speaker, on how the estimates of various departments and the budgets are examined by this Assembly, I recall that they're done in Committee of the Whole. My recollection is that that committee is chaired by a member from the government side.

[Mr. Speaker declared the motion lost. Several members rose calling for a division. The division bell was rung]

[Three minutes having elapsed, the House divided]

For the motion:

|       |            |            |
|-------|------------|------------|
| Buck  | Mandeville | R. Speaker |
| Clark | Notley     |            |

Against the motion:

|          |           |              |
|----------|-----------|--------------|
| Adair    | Hohol     | Paproski     |
| Appleby  | Horner    | Peacock      |
| Ashton   | Horsman   | Planche      |
| Backus   | Hunley    | Purdy        |
| Batiuk   | Hyland    | Russell      |
| Bogle    | Hyndman   | Schmid       |
| Bradley  | Jamison   | Schmidt      |
| Butler   | Johnston  | Shaben       |
| Chambers | Kidd      | Stewart      |
| Cookson  | King      | Stromberg    |
| Crawford | Koziak    | Taylor       |
| Diachuk  | Kroeger   | Tesolin      |
| Doan     | Kushner   | Thompson     |
| Donnelly | Leitch    | Topolnisky   |
| Dowling  | Lougheed  | Trynchy      |
| Farran   | Lysons    | Walker       |
| Fluker   | McCrae    | Warrack      |
| Foster   | McCrimmon | Webber       |
| Getty    | Miller    | Wolstenholme |
| Gogo     | Miniely   | Young        |
| Hansen   | Moore     | Zander       |
| Harle    | Musgreave |              |

|         |          |           |
|---------|----------|-----------|
| Totals: | Ayes - 5 | Noes - 65 |
|---------|----------|-----------|

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is lost. Are you ready for the question on the main motion?

[Motion carried]

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

Moved by Mr. Miller:

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

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

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

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Clark]

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to have the opportunity to lead off the debate this Monday afternoon. I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that I spent a rather long weekend looking at a rather long speech and came to one very quick conclusion: likely this speech will go down a great deal more for its quantity than its quality. I look back at the speeches of the last two years, and I see a very major change in the format and the whole approach to the speech here.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker — and perhaps I am making an admission that I shouldn't, but I plan to make it anyway — last evening as I was putting the finishing touches on this speech in my hotel room in Edmonton, I had the opportunity to watch the tail end of the show *The Wizard of Oz*. I don't want to draw comparisons between all the characters in *The Wizard of Oz* and various aspects of the speech, but there are three characters I'd like to make reference to.

First of all would be the Tin Man; members of the Assembly who are snickering will recall it was the Tin Man who really had no heart. I look at some aspects of this speech, Mr. Speaker, and come to the conclusion that it's very hard to find a heart in the government with regard to some aspects of this speech.

I also recall the Lion who needed a great deal of courage. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there are at least two major areas in this speech . . .

MR. FARRAN: What about the Scarecrow?

MR. CLARK: . . . where if the government had had some courage it would have dealt with issues now, rather than try to slide them under the rug.

With regard to the Scarecrow — and the hon. member who made the comment from across the way — I've chosen not to comment on that area for some rather obvious reasons, something to do with parliamentary courtesy, I'm told. So I'll resist any temptations as far as the Scarecrow is concerned. But basically I come to the conclusion that from the standpoint of courage and from the standpoint of heart, this government didn't have a heck of a lot of those when they put this speech together.

The first area I'd like to dwell upon is the question of national unity itself. It's interesting, the announcement made by the premier this afternoon about the \$50 million to go to the operating budget of the province of Newfoundland. Very candidly, I reserve judgment on the wisdom of that investment

until we've had the opportunity to look at the details involved. Let me simply say this, Mr. Speaker: once in a while the opportunity comes for a province to give some very major national leadership. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that Alberta had that opportunity last Thursday afternoon, when the Speech from the Throne came down in the Alberta Legislature, the first Speech from the Throne since the Parti Quebecois had been elected in Quebec. We, the richest province in Canada, with over \$2 billion dollars in the Alberta heritage savings trust fund, had the opportunity to speak out clearly and straightforwardly on the question of national unity. We didn't have the courage to do that. We find it on page 20 in the Speech from the Throne: one paragraph about national unity.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we had a glorious opportunity to dispel the idea of the people of Alberta being blue-eyed Arabs. We had a glorious opportunity to point out that yes, Alberta has reached a new plateau in the opportunities available to the people of this province within Canada. For I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of Albertans want Quebec out of Confederation. My assessment from across the province, and my colleagues' assessment, is that basically the people of Alberta earnestly desire the province of Quebec to stay in Confederation.

One of the reasons I was surprised that we didn't take the opportunity to speak out on this in the Speech from the Throne was that for years now the province of Quebec and the province of Alberta have had a great deal in common from the standpoint of provincial rights.

It seemed to me that the Speech from the Throne was a remarkable opportunity for this Legislature to say, not only to Albertans but to people across the length and breadth of Canada, that yes, we think Confederation is worth saving, we're prepared to work earnestly in that direction; but at the same time to point out to our fellow Canadians the kinds of contributions that we, the people of this province, are now making to Confederation. We are making the non-renewable natural resources so bountiful in this province available to our fellow Canadians at considerably less than the world price.

My assessment of the mood of Albertans today is that we are prepared to continue to make that contribution to Canada, if we can see some significant moves in the direction of concessions coming our way in the areas of transportation, tariffs, and trade. I think we should make that point very clear to central Canada and the federal government, time and time again. It would be my hope, Mr. Speaker, that before long the Premier himself would go to Quebec, and feel that he has a role to play in this question of the great Canadian debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't rush him.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I have been waiting with bated breath for some sort of recognition from the Conservative caucus in Ottawa, that they are as enthused and committed to making changes in the tariff and trade business as are the Conservatives in Alberta. I have been waiting rather anxiously to hear some kind of commitment from the federal Tories in Toronto. I haven't heard this at all.

It might be that a number of the cabinet ministers

could well spend their time on some of their federal colleagues to get some sort of commitment, well prior to the next federal election, to the kind of treatment Alberta and western Canada can expect as far as transportation, tariffs, and trade are concerned. It seems to me that would be a significant contribution.

We have to recognize that we in this province are in a fortunate position from the standpoint of — I suppose one could say, very bluntly — some leverage in this question of the national debate coming up. I frankly think it is going to be a difficult two years for Canada, though I am confident in my own mind that in two years, or whenever the referendum is held in Quebec, the people in the province of Quebec by and large will decide to stay in Canada. I regret very much that on Thursday last we didn't seize the opportunity to give leadership as far as western Canada was concerned and lay out to the people of Canada our idea of Canada in the future. I think we failed miserably in that area, putting something down on page 20.

I think of the comments made on several occasions by my colleague the Member for Little Bow about going back to the Fulton/Favreau formula and the section that deals with delegation. I think that has tremendous possibilities to enable provinces and the federal government the kind of elbow room needed so the provinces can meet their legitimate aspirations within Canada. I think it's as important today as it was last November 4, when we voted on the motion that we should not bring our constitution home to Canada until such time as an amending formula has been agreed upon. In that amending formula, I believe much importance should be placed upon this concept of delegation, the possibility of provinces, with the federal government delegating just with those provinces, so it would not affect the opportunities and legitimate rights of the various provinces.

I conclude my comments, Mr. Speaker, in this area by saying we didn't have the courage to speak out on national unity last Thursday in the Speech from the Throne. I think that is regrettable.

Mr. Speaker, the second area I would like to comment on, and where I think frankly we ran afoul in the speech, was an inability to recognize that yes, prosperity is available to a large number of people in our province today; we're very, very reliant on non-renewable resources. A recent survey by one of the national banks in Canada listed all projects over \$5 million that were in the wind with regard to various provinces. In the summary I've seen, there wasn't one proposed project in Alberta over \$5 million dollars that wasn't directly linked to our non-renewable resources. More and more, a higher percentage of income comes from that area.

But I think what gets lost in this government's mind is that we are so busy building things, the government tends to forget that a large number of people in this province are not getting the benefit of the good life. It would be good for all members to go to Fort McMurray from time to time to see the problems we still have and are going to have for some time yet.

Then, ask what kind of planning the government has done as far as the pipeline coming down from the Arctic [is concerned]. [interjections]

Yes, the hon. minister says, which one. The likelihood of a major pipeline coming through Alberta is extremely great. The disruption that kind of proposi-

tion will cause in Alberta is immense from the standpoint of working people, accommodations, and our economy. It is all right for some hon. member across the way not to be concerned about it, but the fact is, if we were really concerned about looking at the problems of our people from a long-term planning basis, we would already be involved in that area. I see nothing to indicate that at all. Look at the question of future oil sand plants. What approach are we going to use there?

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that a number of members on the government side would very much like to forget the situation of the pipeline from Edmonton to Fort McMurray. It will be interesting tomorrow to see how many of the members on the government side stand up and take part in the debate, because I happen to know that a large number of them were advised of what was going on some time before the decisions were made. It would be nice, I suppose, on the government side, to sweep that particular issue under the rug, but that isn't the choice the government has.

The point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is that while we have \$2 billion in our Alberta heritage savings trust fund, we have one of the highest rates of increase of crime of any jurisdiction in Canada. We have increased problems as far as alcoholism, mental health, and marriage breakdown are concerned. Look at the living conditions of some people in Fort McMurray. Some of the hon. members should go to downtown Edmonton or Calgary in the evening and look at the problems of new Canadians, native people, and the working poor. They are not really sharing in the good life; I don't think they'll be greatly enthused today about \$50 million going to Newfoundland.

I look in the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, and I find no place, no place in that speech, the commitment to moving to deal with these problems in a systematic, well thought out approach. Frankly it seems to me, with the kind of money this government has, that money spent in the area of preventative things would be an eminently wiser investment than money in Newfoundland. I see no place in that speech, Mr. Speaker, where the government had the heart to really commit itself to those problems.

It's easy to go out to the various official openings and be hail fellow well met, and so on. But unless we get on the ball in these areas where the good life isn't filtering down, the legacy we're going to leave for the future isn't more money in the heritage savings trust fund. It will be in larger institutions, larger jails, more family breakdown, and all the related problems. There's not a jurisdiction in this world more able to cope with this kind of thing from the standpoint of finances than we are in this province. Yet we didn't have either the heart the understanding to move in that particular area.

Mr. Speaker, the third major area I want to touch upon for a few minutes is this whole question of the relationship between governments and business, and the question of productivity. Before very long, we in this Assembly have to make some decisions as to whether we stay in the anti-inflation program or whether we don't. The federal government has to make some decisions. Tomorrow and the next day I believe members of the Alberta Federation of Labour are coming to make their point known to members of the Legislature.

I've had the opportunity, as I'm sure have many other members, to sit down with a number of business people of this province in the last two to three months. The kind of concerns that come to me centre around productivity, what's going to happen after the anti-inflation program comes off, what about economic stability within the province and certainly within the nation itself. During 1974-75 as a nation we had a zero or negative productivity gain. Between those years the real value of family income declined across Canada, and I emphasize that's across Canada. In 1976 we were somewhat better. Three-quarters of our productivity increase comes from secondary manufacturing, and a quarter comes from agriculture, mining, pulp and paper, and other primary industries.

Some time we have to recognize that the service sector really adds little to the measurable productivity of the nation. If we're going to continue to progress and to offer higher real incomes to people and to offer more leisure time, it seems to me it must come from the competitiveness and efficiency of our primary and secondary industries. How are we doing in those areas? As I understand it, we're not doing very well as a nation.

The challenge seems to confront us, really, in three areas. It has to confront us from the standpoints of labor, business, and certainly government itself. I've been told, and I know other members have, that you can compare our productivity in Alberta with several places south of the border — Denver, Houston, a variety of other areas — and we don't shape up that well. More and more we see Alberta business, Alberta investment money, moving south of the border, and Canadian investment money moving out of the country.

I believe this question of productivity is important for us to recognize. I believe we must look at it from the standpoint of labor, the collective bargaining relationship between the public agencies and organized labor; from the standpoint of business, the courage to take the export battle to their competitors — and it may well mean dismantling some of the self-serving and self-protecting mechanisms of some industries and some occupations; and certainly from the standpoint of government, more direct and explicit accountability by all levels of government, how they raise and how they spend their money.

In Canada and in Alberta it seems to me that we need to look much more broadly at the question of productivity. We need an increasing emphasis on the performance of Alberta's small business community. It seems to me we need some policies that will strengthen independent retailing. We must move in the direction of an increased share of government purchasing which is available to the owner/manager sector of our business community. We should be moving in the direction of encouraging groups of small businessmen so they can take advantage of purchase promotions or export sales. We should be encouraging the ownership transfer to key employees or members of the family.

I think we should also remember, Mr. Speaker, that productivity by the owner-managed sector of our economy is as important as the capital-intensive, professionally managed sector of our society. I leave this, Mr. Speaker, as the third area that I have the gravest concern about, in saying that in the area of productivity and the area of relationships between

government and businesses, this particular [throne] speech didn't have the courage, once again, to deal with the issues at hand. I asked myself, why didn't it have the courage to deal with some of these issues? We're in the middle of a term, likely two years before an election. I don't think any of us in this House really expected Santa Claus to arrive this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did.

MR. CLARK: He will arrive next year. When we look at the Speech from the Throne — already some of the departments have been told by the ministers, well just hold off fellows, wait till next year. Just kind of cope with things this year, and we'll really look after some of these areas as we approach the session next year.

We didn't expect Santa Claus to arrive this year. We didn't expect a speech that was going to come to grips with all the problems of the province. But frankly we can't afford to wait very much longer in the area of productivity, the whole question of relationships between government and their businesses. We'll have more to say about that tomorrow on the question of the pipeline from Edmonton to Fort McMurray.

It seems the government simply didn't have the heart, didn't have the courage, to deal with these three areas: those people who aren't living the good life in Alberta, the question of business relationships with government and productivity and, most important, the question of national unity.

As my colleagues and I prepared for the winter session, Mr. Speaker, we really attempted to look at three areas and express three concerns. One of the concerns we've already had the opportunity to express here this afternoon is the question of the public's right to know. We proposed the amendment by Dr. Buck, the Member for Clover Bar, because we earnestly believe the public has a right to know what's going on in the area of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. I recall last year, during the motions for returns, we were denied information on the Alberta Export Agency. Later on during the session we were able to get some of the information, and members on both sides of the House will remember what happened.

There's the question of the remand centre in Calgary. I should say, quite frankly, that during this spring session we will certainly be raising this question of the remand centre in Calgary and the Ombudsman's report. But for some unexplainable reason, the Solicitor General isn't prepared to make it possible for me or one of my colleagues to go to the remand centre under similar circumstances to which the Ombudsman went. It seems to me one can ask, why not? What are we trying to hide? To go to the remand centre in the middle of the day as opposed to going there in the middle of the evening when the problems allegedly develop — I don't think it's unreasonable that the public should expect that we should have that kind of access to information.

Last year we were refused the studies with regard to the petrochemical industry. I think the citizens of this province expect this Legislature to be a part of the age of accountability. We're not going to be able to carry that commitment of accountability forward if we're going to have this kind of stalling, dragging



feet, and actually refusing to do public business in public.

A second real concern we approach the session with is the question of new value for the taxpayer's dollar. We don't believe there has to be an increase in public servants in this province for the next year. We don't believe there have to be a lot of ego-boosting trips for cabinet ministers to various corners of the world. And we don't believe we have to become involved in any more ventures where you have a combination of big government and big unions and big business sticking it to the taxpayer to the tune of \$5 million.

We talk about new value for the taxpayer's dollar. How would you like to be a member of a health unit that saved some money this year and at the end of the year be told, well thanks for saving the money, but we're going to take it off your budget for next year. That happens, and a number of members across the way know about it. Hospital boards that have some money left at the end of March have been told, okay, the money you've got left will be taken off your budget for next year. Does that encourage good expenditure patterns by hospital board members and people in health units? That does nothing to try to get new value for the taxpayer's dollar.

What about the interest lost by school boards? Certainly with the heritage savings trust fund we've now got the ability to come somewhat to grips with that problem. All we've got to have is the courage and the heart to do it. What about the interest that recreation boards and local communities have lost in not getting cheques from the recreation branch of the Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife? Surely we can do better in those kinds of areas, and I just mentioned two or three of the areas.

One of the amusing areas that came to my attention—it wasn't amusing, it was downright annoying—was on a recent trip I took to the north. I was informed that in one of the northern communities on the very same days there were two officials from the Alberta Housing Corporation giving bids on the same piece of land, and one didn't know the other was giving a bid. You know, that's getting new value for the taxpayer's dollar.

DR. BUCK: That wouldn't happen in Yurko's department.

MR. R. SPEAKER: No, never.

MR. CLARK: Not much.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The minister sent both of them.

MR. CLARK: We talk about new value for the taxpayer's dollar. It would do many members of the front bench a great deal of good to go up to the Faust/McLennan area and look at those houses that were built for the native folks in those areas. Then as recently as last week when we were commenting on this, the minister responsible for native affairs said, well, you know it's taken me all this time to clear away the problems of the former administration. We made lots of mistakes but, my gosh, are we going to hear that excuse six years away?

MR. R. SPEAKER: It would kill the initiative first.

MR. CLARK: Four hundred homes promised one year and something like 400 homes the next year, and the speech talks about rising expectations. We say to the Metis people of this province, look at the 700 or 800 you can expect. Then the Minister of Housing and Public Works comes along and says, well, you know it'll take three years. Talk about raising expectations, unfair aspirations. Having a heart, just a bit of decency, would help in those kinds of expectations.

The third area we wanted to emphasize during this session, in addition to the public right to know and the idea of new value of the taxpayer's dollars, is the question of the erosion of local autonomy and the centralization of power in the hands of the public service and the cabinet here in Edmonton. I am very hopeful that the Minister of Municipal Affairs will be able to convince his colleagues that we should do a great amount of deconditionalizing of grants. I am hopeful The Planning Act doesn't place all the power in the hands of the Provincial Planning Board or some other provincial government agency.

I am hopeful that when the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower talks about changes in the field of universities and colleges, we're not going to mean restrictions in those areas. I read where the Speech from the Throne talks about greater public input. I know very well that the members on the front bench, and the members in the second and third rows too, are well acquainted with the chancellor of the University of Alberta.

AN HON. MEMBER: You're right.

MR. CLARK: You know, the chancellor is the chairman of the senate. The senate is really the public arm of the university. Now if you don't think we're getting input from the senate, the answer certainly isn't just to add more people to the board of governors. It's a much, much more serious problem than that.

So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my comments with regard to the area of our orientation to the session. Time and time again, Mr. Speaker, you and the members in the Assembly are going to hear us talk about the public's right to know what in the world is going on. Time and time again, Mr. Speaker, in the course of the estimates you're going to hear us insist that we know from the Provincial Treasurer the new positions that are being established, and we gave the Provincial Treasurer fair warning in the fall session. Perhaps I should now indicate to the Treasurer that we're in the process of preparing a memo to the Government House Leader asking that the estimates for Treasury be the first ones studied this year, so we can look at the budget from the standpoint of how it was put together.

I hope the government will seriously and favorably consider the idea of studying the estimates from Treasury first. It seems to me an advantage of that would be the chance for all members to really look at how the budget is put together and to hear from the Treasurer himself with regard to programs in a variety of areas where there are expansions, and what kind of cutbacks they're going to make in this area, what they are going to do in this area. We hope the government will have serious concern for that

approach.

Mr. Speaker, the fourth area I'd like to touch upon deals with some of the themes in the speech itself. Page 2 of the speech talked about restraint: "... continue [the] responsible objective of restraint in government expenditure, size, and growth", and so on. Then it goes on to say people

may be asking too much of the government, that expectations must be reduced, and that desirable but non-essential activities must be the personal responsibility of the citizen, the parent, the family, and the community.

Very commendable. Very, very commendable.

I just digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker. One thing I've observed about this government in the last two or three years is that one wants to watch very carefully what comes out with the Christmas wrapping each year. A year ago it was the Auditor's report on the grants situation. This year it was the pipeline question from up north. And there was a very small announcement too — \$20,000, I think, to take two rooms in the basement of the Legislature Building and make an exercise room for members of the Legislature. That came at just about the same time the Premier was talking about non-essential activities being the personal responsibility of citizens, of parents, the family, and the community. Mr. Speaker, many members took the physical fitness test from the Y last year. The Y gave most members an honorary membership, and the Y is about three or four blocks away. The Kinsmen Field House is not very far.

DR. BUCK: Jogging distance.

MR. CLARK: Jogging distance. And at the same time we talk about the personal responsibility of the citizens, parents, and families of this province. "Expectations must be reduced." Quite often, Mr. Speaker, quite often little things belie the real attitudes. I think this case is a sad example. My constituents in Olds-Didsbury would give dearly, would give very dearly, to have that \$20,000 for a home care program in Sundre, where we've been trying to get one for three years. I venture to say there isn't an MLA who couldn't take that \$15,000 or \$20,000 and put it to some people uses in his constituency. We [talk about] certain responsibilities and [say] expectations must be reduced. If we've got to reduce expectations, can't we reduce ourselves without doing it at the public expense?

Another announcement, Mr. Speaker, came from the office of the Minister of Agriculture within, I think, the last two months. It was that the department was going to take on some new employees, and their prime purpose in getting around the province was to help farmers plan for retirement. Now for the life of me, I can't see that being a government priority today. If farmers can weave their way through the myriad of problems with governments and politicians, they stand a very good chance of being able to draw up their own retirement plans ...

AN HON. MEMBER: If they're still alive.

MR. CLARK: ... if they're still functioning, still afloat. I find that another example of being completely away from the thrust of this matter of restraint.

I note that page 3 of the speech talks about 10 per

cent restraint guidelines. It applies to our dear friends, the municipalities, school boards, postsecondary education, hospital and health units. Once again we're going to be fighting restraint on the backs of school boards and local governments.

In the same paragraph in the speech it said, though, that in some areas the Legislature will be making exceptions. Well I say to the members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, that as long as we continue to push more jobs, economic expansion, we have to give municipalities the economic wherewithal to come to grips with the problems of growth. We can't continue to fight restraint on the backs of closing hospital beds and on the backs of cutting back on preventive social service programs and health units, and those kinds of areas, when we have \$2 billion sitting aside.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude my comments on the area of restraint by saying, is restraint to be achieved by the transfer of expenditures from the general revenue fund of the province to the Alberta heritage savings trust fund? I believe on at least four occasions the Speech from the Throne talks about things that are going to be done and then obliquely or directly refers to their being financed out of the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. I think people are starting to see through the sham, if that's what we're going to use the heritage savings trust fund for.

Just three other areas, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question of the speech itself. The speech talks about rising expectations. I have a list of four or five areas here. In 1975 the expectations of the people in Grande Prairie were increased considerably when a hospital was announced. Now in 1977 their expectations should be increased once more, Mr. Speaker, because it has been announced again. And by 1979 when the elections are along, likely we will get to digging the first bit of dirt, or maybe we'll have the official opening.

MR. NOTLEY: Ribbon cutting.

MR. CLARK: Talk about rising expectations. In 1975 the matrimonial property act — the Speech from the Throne talked about initiatives in that area. In 1977 it isn't even included in the Speech from the Throne. We're being told the Conservative caucus can't come to grips with the problems. We're going to wait for good old Conservative Ontario to solve it, and we'll follow their lead. I didn't really think this government very often wanted to wait for leadership from Ontario. I hope this is a momentary lapse. I would impress upon the Attorney General that this is a difficult and important area, and not to sluff it off and laugh it off; it is important.

I have already dwelt on the question of native housing.

The Kirby report: go back the last three speeches from the throne and it says virtually the same thing. Some lawyers I have spoken to in both Edmonton and Calgary — and I should say not lawyers who are members of my political party, for obvious reasons — tell me we've had Kirby for three years. We've got higher paid judges, higher paid Crown prosecutors, more staff, and longer remands until cases can be heard. I think it's time we found out what is really happening as far as the Kirby report is concerned and what kind of progress we are making. My informa-

tion is that it's pretty slow. Ofttimes we in this Chamber tend to forget that the only dealing a very, very high percentage of people have with the court system in the province is at the provincial court level.

I'd like to move on to agriculture and rural Alberta, business development, and northern affairs for just a moment and say that one of the areas I would hope the Minister of Agriculture would speak on during this session is the question of contingency plans the province has if the moisture situation doesn't improve.

I'm also at somewhat of a loss, Mr. Speaker, to understand what's happening as far as agricultural land in Alberta is concerned, especially the question of foreign ownership. For at least three years we've raised the matter during the session. When I look at this Speech from the Throne, it seems that three things are happening: we're going to impose a fee on foreign students who come into Alberta while they're going to university or college and then go back home, but we're going to let people from Europe and other parts of the world come to Alberta and buy our agricultural land. In fact the Minister of Business Development and Tourism encouraged them to come over. At the same time we've got a number of well-respected Alberta-based businesses which are not only talking about but are in fact moving portions of their operations south of the border.

I can't understand what's happening in this area of agricultural land at all. We've once again had a lapse of courage, an inability to come to grips with the problem. Yes, it's a difficult problem. The feds have been trying to do something about it for some time. Surely we have the legal wherewithal to come to grips with it, even if not on a long-term but on a temporary basis. In my own constituency, within the last two months we've had more land acquired — people from Europe who got money from the French government at a third of the interest rate my constituents can get from the Ag. Development Corporation. Still we sit on our hands, and the Minister of Business Development and Tourism goes to Europe and says, come on over.

Mr. Speaker, considerable reference was made in the speech to volunteers. In fact reference was made to volunteer agencies and the contribution they make. I have to report to the Assembly that it's going to be a long time before one group of volunteers volunteer again. At one of my own pre-session meetings a man came to me and said, I never voted for you, I likely never will. But, he said, I went out in my own district and got 200 farmers to sign up for — well, I won't tell you the adjective he used for the rural gas program — this program. We were told — and when we get into the estimates we'll give you the names of the officials of the department, who the two ministers can't remember, who told these volunteers who went out and tried to sell the government program that the price of gas would go up something like 4 per cent per year. This volunteer said to me, as far as you politicians are concerned, the next time you come out with a program, be it something like REAs or rural gas or something else, you get someone else to peddle your papers. I won't get involved in this kind of program ever again. And, he said, I would discourage my neighbors and anyone I had influence with from getting involved in this kind of action.

Not long ago I was out to one of the eastern Alberta

gas co-ops having horrendous problems. Fifty per cent of their gas is going out through holes in pipe they used because they were told by the government they shouldn't bring in pipe from the United States. And we talk about the rural gas program and the problems there. I say to the members of the Assembly that one of the most often heard complaints I get is the question of utilities costs, natural gas costs, and gasoline costs. Members should be well aware of that, of the implications in their particular constituencies.

As far as northern development is concerned, there were 28 words about northern development in the 21-page speech.

"Special emphasis on trade development" from Business Development and Tourism and an international marketing branch of Agriculture: I'm going to want to know very carefully the people who are heading up those areas and who's involved. Because if it's the same old crew we had in the Export Agency, we'll be here a long time before those estimates are approved. If the ministers don't have some very definite plans laid out, members can just extend their time for the session. The sitting will be considerably late, because we're not going to put our stamp of approval on just a reshuffling of the same people who bungled up the Export Agency — and one of the same ministers.

With regard to three areas: one is the libraries. I commend the initiatives in that area. Now that libraries are more important than pheasants, maybe, I look forward to the initiatives put forward by the minister.

I look forward to the senior citizen home improvement program. But once again we talk about rising expectations. Back in 1975 this government led people to believe that everyone over 65 years of age would be eligible for this.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. CLARK: You're two years late.

DR. BUCK: But they got the election out of the way.

MR. CLARK: The people have longer memories than they used to have, Dr. Buck.

I look forward with considerable interest to the father/son lending program from the Agricultural Development Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, the last area I want to touch upon today is the question of education itself and that portion of the speech that talks about a reassessment of goals and objectives of basic education. There is a very peculiar — no, very interesting — part of a sentence in this speech. It says, "shift in emphasis . . . may be indicated". I interpret that to mean back to the basics, maybe. I notice also we're going to give further consideration to provincial examinations. Well, it was this government that removed them in 1972.

I was pleased today to hear the Minister of Education at least squeeze the door open a little bit so we're going to be able to look at the recommendations of some of his advisory committees. I had hoped by the end of this session, but certainly at the absolute latest by this fall, it's essential that the government, the Legislature, and the people of this province once

again restore some confidence in their education system. Basically I think we've got a reasonably good education system in this province, in fact a pretty darn good education system. It's got some shortcomings; I'd be among the first to agree. But let's also remember that there is a large number of concerned teachers and a large number of concerned trustees who have given many years of their best service to this education system.

What I hope would come out of this spring session as far as education is concerned is a positive statement by the Premier that he has faith in the educational institutions in this province, that basically he feels the teaching profession in this province is a strong group, that the trustees in this province over the years have been strong trustees, and that collectively in education we have some problems, but let's collectively resolve those problems too. I really believe that here is another area where the government needs to have some courage to stand up and speak out directly on where it sees education going and not to wait for one or two more years to do that.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that the government didn't have the courage to speak out frankly and straightforwardly on the question of national unity. I regret very much that the government hasn't had the heart to commit itself to those people who aren't sharing the good life in Alberta today. I regret very much that they didn't have the courage to deal with the problems of business/government relationships and the question of productivity. We will be dealing with the business/government relationships a great deal more in the future.

I would just conclude with these remarks. My colleagues and I are involved in the process of rebuilding a political party. Our basis for that political party is quite straightforward. We are strongly committed to the individual initiative system. We are strongly committed to the concept of limited government. We see revenue sharing being an important ingredient in that concept of limited government. We see strengthened local governments as being one of the most effective ways to come to grips with the growth of provincial government bureaucracy. We are committed to the concept of responsible free enterprise. We see the government playing the role of establishing an economic climate, of establishing the rules for business to function in the province, and playing the role of arbitrator where need be.

We see this government embarking upon an approach which is going to lead them into more conflict-of-interest situations than they realize. Take the Alberta Energy Company right now. The Alberta Energy Company is involved in power plants, pipelines, petrochemicals, oil, gas, lumber, and coal. How many Alberta businessmen, how many Canadian businessmen with strong Alberta interests, go before the cabinet or before government regulatory boards and find themselves and their businesses competing against their own money through the Energy Company or some other vehicle?

This conflict of interest is exemplified by the pipeline from Edmonton to Fort McMurray. The Premier and numerous members of his cabinet knew what the stakes were before the decisions were made. To make no decision is in fact to make a decision that in the long run is not in the best interests of the people

of this province. When I talk about responsible free enterprise with a strong humanitarian concern, that's what I'm talking about.

Fourthly, Mr. Speaker, the foundation we are building on for the 1980s is a foundation committed to responsible financial management in the best interests of the people of this province. I look at overall government expenditures: 1971 to 1976, an increase of 409 per cent. I look at the increase in fees and commissions: over '71 to '76, a 309 per cent increase; travel expenses up 172 per cent, and I could go on. There will be another day for that speech.

But I just leave the members with this last thought. On several occasions in this Assembly the Premier has spoken as if Alberta's resources, in his judgment, would be gone in the vicinity of 10 years. Yet at the very same time the leaders of this government are saying that, you've got responsible people in the municipal finance area who are going around the province and saying, you know, we should be involved in sharing this new assessment. Municipalities say to them, what's going to happen in 10 years? They say, well, in 10 years after all, our non-renewable resources are going to last for much longer than that — 20, 25 years, and then we're going to have coal and all the benefits there. Someone had better bell the cat. Whose figures are we using? Whose projections are we really relying on?

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we could have used a great deal of courage and a great deal more heart in the composition of this Speech from the Throne.

MR. BUTLER: Mr. Speaker, it certainly gives me great pleasure to rise in my place this afternoon and speak on behalf of the constituents in Hanna-Oyen.

I just can't resist making a remark or two to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Perhaps being a country boy, I grew up to be a bit of a scrapper, and once in a while it still comes out. Sitting in the caucus, I can assure you that this government does have heart, and a lot of the people in the area think so. They've done a lot of things to show it.

We can't deny there are probably more marriage breakdowns per capita in Alberta than in any other province. But if you look around, you'll always find that affluence leads to marriage breakdowns. If you don't believe that, look at Hollywood. They trade down there like a rancher trades horses. That's a fact: alcoholism and marriage breakdowns go hand in hand with affluence. It's rather too bad. I'm sorry that happens, but it's a fact.

Alberta has plans to look after the underprivileged better than any other province in Canada. As long as I'm a member of this caucus, I hope it continues to do so.

We're quite aware of the problems in rural gas. I think every member sitting on this side of the House has had all kinds of problems with it, particularly any rural member. But if we hadn't done anything, we wouldn't have any problems. We started to do something that had never been done before. There were no blueprints to follow, no other plans. There was no plan like it anywhere in the world to look at and see its mistakes. Certainly mistakes were made. But I commend the people who have led these gas co-ops. They've done a darn good job, and a lot of them have worked hard. I'm sure this rural gas will work, and work well down the road because these mistakes are

being corrected.

In closing I would say to the Assembly and to the hon. Leader of the Opposition that he's made quite a fiery speech. It reminds me of a drowning man grasping at straws. With that, I'll carry on with my own business.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to say how much I really enjoyed the Speech from the Throne. I think it was a very progressive speech. I very much enjoyed seeing the Lieutenant-Governor, in his full regalia of buckskin, reading the speech. It only proves the diversity of Alberta, and it probably couldn't happen anywhere else. But I couldn't help feeling a little sorry for him sitting up there under those lights in his full dress and buckskins. I'm sure the heat must have really got to him.

As a young man, I had the opportunity of working with many of our native people. I learned many things from them that have certainly helped to enrich my life and give me a lot better understanding of our natural heritage, particularly of our wildlife and our forests. While I had the privilege of working in the forests, many things I had learned as a young man from our native people certainly helped me out.

We hear many things about the buoyancy of our Alberta economy, and most of them are true. This poses a real challenge to this government and to every one of us. It's a lot harder to stay on top than it is to get there. That's why I support the Alberta heritage trust fund. It is a purpose with a vision, and that purpose is to build for the Alberta of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, in passing I would like to make a remark or two on education. In my opinion, we as parents tend to pass too much on to the schoolteachers. In many cases I think we abdicate our responsibilities. We hear many times that the three R's should be brought back into the schools. I certainly support this concept. But there are two R's that should be taught at home previous to that: respect and responsibility. If we teach those two R's at home, respect and responsibility tempered with a little love, I am sure we would be laying the basis for a good education in the future.

I'd like to dwell for a moment on the housewife. It pretty near drives me up the wall when I hear some lady say, I'm just a housewife. The housewife is the most important person in any community. If she is a mother and a homemaker, preparing the child for education and teaching those two R's at home, respect and responsibility, she is the most important person in that home, in any community and, I would go so far as to say, in any educational system. There lies the foundation. Much is taught to children before they start school, particularly before the seventh year, that they never forget. One example is worth a thousand words.

Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to see in the Speech from the Throne that our libraries are going to be better funded in the future. I hope they're well used.

Mr. Speaker, I'm particularly pleased to see that agriculture is receiving its rightful recognition as our number one industry in the Speech from the Throne. It's not only our number one industry in Alberta, it's our number one industry across Canada. I am particularly proud and pleased to be part of a government that has the foresight and the fortitude to get off its hands and get out to try to find some new markets. If you don't look for them, they certainly won't come to

you.

I'm really proud it's taking an active part in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, commonly known as GATT. In the past, agriculture has too often been sold down the drain to support other industries. It's high time some government started to move and turn this thing around. I'm pleased that our Alberta government is taking that initiative. I am sure they'll get support from other provincial governments when they see that something can be done instead of saying, hands off, that's a federal affair, provinces shouldn't get into it. The past few years have been tough years for cattlemen in Canada, and possibly tougher for cattlemen in the western provinces due to the freight rate structure from west to east. I may have more to say about that under transportation.

Still speaking on the cattle business, I think that much may be said in favor of our cattle marketing system in Canada. There's a wide choice of market systems for the producer and several choices of market for the consumer; that is, the consumer can go out and buy his meat in several different ways. One has to look back over the past few years. A record number of cattle have been processed in Canada in the last two years. A record amount of beef has been imported into Canada, and there hasn't been any bottleneck in our system. The system has worked well. It has moved more meat out than it ever has until the per capita consumption of Canada has gone up to an all-time high of about 108 pounds. So I think there's much to be said for our market system.

The most interesting part of these statistics is that approaching 50 per cent of the meat consumed in Canada today is being consumed in the form of hamburgers or ground beef. I don't know what's happening to the States. I'm sure the cattle business will see better times ahead if governments at all levels leave the production to the producer and the marketing to the market place.

The grain producer at the moment seems to be looking ahead to some tougher years. The price of grain has dropped, but we don't know how long this will last. If we have some major droughts in parts of the States . . . Many things can turn that around. I would say to the grain producer, don't be too pessimistic at this time. Many things can turn around and make your future a lot more bright.

In speaking to transportation, Mr. Speaker, with your permission I'd like to go back to the beginning of transportation in Canada. It intrigues me very much when you look back and see how the Fathers of Confederation at that time could see that it would be impossible to produce grain on the prairies, make that long overland haul to get it to a port, compete with the markets of the world, bring the farmer a fair living, and still bring compensatory prices to the railroad. In my opinion, that's why the railroads, particularly the CPR in the beginning, were given concessions such as land, timber, and minerals. It would take too long to go into here this afternoon. I would just like to say that before any of these railroads are allowed to be abandoned, the whole financial picture of the railroads and all the related companies be examined. These companies were made possible through the franchise of the railroad, and of course the franchise of the railroad was made possible [in] that they serve the prairies.

I think part of our east to west transportation might

be solved if we were to standardize our trucking regulations on the main east-west highways, if a truck could pick up a load of cattle in Calgary and take them right to their destination in Toronto. But they're plagued along the way with different provincial weight limits and different regulations. I think if we could standardize those so the truckers could get in, not only cattle but other commodities could be hauled. I think we badly need standard regulations clean across Canada on our main east-west highways. I think the trucks could bring up some major competition, which I think would be a good thing.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to say once again that agriculture is the main industry in Canada. It's the main industry in the Hanna-Oyen constituency, and I'm sure I speak for all the people in the Hanna-Oyen constituency when I say that I'm proud of the leadership this government is showing in going out and hunting new markets. The people of the Hanna-Oyen constituency certainly wish this government and the Premier all the luck in the world when seeking these new markets.

Thank you.

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I too want to make some comments on the Speech from the Throne. But at the outset I wish to congratulate my colleague, the honorable gentleman from Lloydminster constituency, a gentleman from rural Alberta, a man of the soil. In moving the Speech from the Throne he spoke from the heart, even though possibly the Leader of the Opposition feels the Speech from the Throne didn't have any heart in it.

I appreciated the tribute he paid to you, sir. I wish to associate myself with the compliments, also with the tribute and the compliments he paid to our Premier as he spoke of the changes in rural Alberta, positive changes reversing the trends we experienced in the 60s, when there was no desire to stay on the farm.

I too know rural Alberta. I know it personally, since I was born in the same district in which the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower was born, a place called Two Hills, where our Lieutenant-Governor comes from. I agree with the members representing the rural portions of Alberta that Albertans producing agricultural produce and grain do not agree with some of the statements.

For example, may I quote from the statement in the *Edmonton Journal* of Friday, February 25: "... the premier's promised initiatives in international trade 'so much baloney'." Well, the person who made this statement can only see where he is sitting. If he continues to speak with that attitude there isn't too much prospect of his situation changing or his sitting place changing. When a young couple — and again I'll refer to my own sister and her husband, or a young couple [such] as I met on Friday night at His Honour's reception, a Mr. and Mrs. Wagner from south of Stony Plain, recipients of farm family awards — these are the type of people we've seen return to rural Alberta since 1971. They like farming and in both cases left professional positions in the city to take over the family farm. They do not agree that the Premier's directions towards selling our agriculture products are "so much baloney". They look forward to greater initiatives and more being done to sell their produce. Everyone knows that buyers are available.

But good sales personnel with initiative to sell is a top practice in free enterprise. Some of our attitudes in this nation have to be changed. We cannot wait for the customers to come to our nation.

A comment or two on the address today by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. As the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen indicated, he's a scrapper. I just want to make one statement. His remarks were that we had the opportunity to speak out on national unity, but we had only one paragraph in the Speech from the Throne.

If I may try to rephrase what he said this afternoon, without any reference to a printed document, he felt we should make our fellow Canadians aware of our contribution to Canada. I could just hear the Leader of the Opposition bemoan in his remarks if we did elaborate on everything we have been doing for the unity of Canada, and even claiming we were patting ourselves on the back when we really didn't deserve that credit. Why can the Leader of the Opposition in Alberta not take a cue from the Leader of the Opposition in Ottawa and follow the example? When the Prime Minister of our nation made what I and many Albertans feel was one of the finest addresses about Canadian unity to the American people in Congress, the Leader of the Opposition endorsed it. He didn't bemoan that he was taking the credit away from someone else.

I'd like to refer back to the article in the *Edmonton Journal* of February 25, and to refer to the honorable gentleman from Spirit River-Fairview, who is more fortunate than the other gentleman as he has a seat in this Legislature but does not seem to learn. Out of the same newspaper I read, "... he fears the provincial incursion into international trade could contribute to the splintering of Confederation ..."

I looked up the definition of "incursion". According to Thorndike it means "raid; sudden attack". It uses as an example, "The pirates made incursions along the coast". I guess the hon. Premier of Saskatchewan, Mr. Blakeney, through his trip to China to gain additional markets for potash, was contributing to the splintering of Confederation. I do hope the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview hasn't hesitated, but has let his friends and colleagues in the NDP in Saskatchewan know how he feels that their Premier of his political affiliation made that trip, and that he believes that is a splintering of our national unity. I just hope the electorate of his constituency and the rest of Alberta knows that the leader of the New Democratic Party in Alberta vowed to help protect federal Liberal government priority. What priority? The priority of importing beef while our producers are losing the market?

As our Premier indicated, we're well aware the federal government has jurisdiction over international matters. But even the Liberal government in Ottawa, I am convinced, would appreciate help and co-operation in improving Canada's ability to trade as it will benefit all of Canada, not only Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to make some remarks about a trip I made last September, on behalf of the Alberta Legislature, to the 22nd Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in Mauritius. As a delegate representing Alberta, I had the privilege of joining many other Canadian delegates. May I say that the Canadian delegation, even though [it] represented all four political parties in this nation, worked

harmoniously, worked as a team in an international setting. Just a few of the people I joined were Hon. James Jerome, Speaker of the House of Commons; the Hon. Jacques Flynn, Leader of the Opposition in the Senate; the Premier of Nova Scotia, the Hon. Gerald Regan, who was chairman of the session. Representatives from every province across Canada joined and worked together for two weeks.

I have gained a great appreciation that when we expect the developing nations, who less than a century ago were one step removed from the Stone Age and now have to compete in the Jet Age, and have their governments organized properly and democratically, is just asking too much when they have received so little preparation. Delegates such as the hon. Mr. Elinewinga, the leader of the delegation from Tanzania and minister of the department of national education in Tanzania, pointed out to me in my many discussions with him that the troubles developing nations have are extensive. We discussed more than parliamentary procedure and parliamentary concerns. We even got into discussions about the upcoming Commonwealth Games in Edmonton. I for one have gained a little more appreciation of why they have boycotted the Olympics in Montreal and what we have to do as Canadians and particularly as Albertans to help the foundation here in Edmonton to gain their respect and their participation in the games.

Mr. Elinewinga pointed out to me, when I asked him, that one of the biggest crises in his nation is the lack of teachers, because they can't even have compulsory education in their nation. He did point out that in a country such as his they have hundreds of teachers who are trained in Canada, Canadian citizens working very effectively and very co-operatively.

During one of our discussions at the conference in Mauritius, on the subject of brain-drain, the delegates from the African nations urged that we slow down the brain-drain and urge some of their people to return home. This was with special reference to the medical profession. They were interested in some of the accusations I was faced with several years ago when I introduced a resolution in this Assembly to examine the percentage of staff from foreign countries at our postsecondary schools. I was accused of being a racist. It does sound familiar with some of our present issues.

Another point that was somewhat alarming was the number of member nations of the Commonwealth that are now communist. This was pointed out by several delegates in our discussions and during the second day of our conference, on the subject of the smaller territories of the Commonwealth: their defense and future. I had the opportunity to speak on this subject. I spoke following a delegate from Guyana, who in his address very eloquently praised the co-operation and support they were receiving from the U.S.S.R. But he did condemn the two nations of Britain and the United States. At this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read for the record of *Hansard* some of my address. I opened and indicated that:

I am one of the provincial delegates from Canada. My name indicates that I am of a background that is accepted as an ethnic background. However, Canada has honored all ethnic groups and given them all an opportunity. My people came from

central Europe. They were given this opportunity by one of the greatest ladies that has lived in this world, and that was Queen Victoria. I therefore wish to take this opportunity to speak on a very particular area that the honorable delegate from Guyana raised. But as a family of the Commonwealth of nations, may I quote the Prime Minister of Mauritius.

Just the previous evening, the Prime Minister of Mauritius had addressed our assembly. He indicated that we the family must get along. He was referring to the delegates of the Commonwealth. As members of a family, we disagree, sometimes quite harshly. But we must impress on each other, when required from time to time, where changes should take place.

This being my first experience at such a conference, I had wished to urge that our countries' leaders can do more through the arm of the Commonwealth than is being done — do something and not stand by. As the delegate from Australia had pointed out, his government was not doing anything while the people of Timor were being annihilated. As the delegates from Africa had indicated, while the people in Africa were in real difficulties and problems, the rest of the Commonwealth was sitting back and their leaders weren't really trying to impress on the leaders of those nations how to make changes.

I indicated that my grandparents came to this nation in 1898 from the Ukraine, which is now part of the U.S.S.R., and that since then there are some 10 million people of Ukrainian descent throughout the world but that some 50 million people still populate their homeland. The Ukraine has a seat in the United Nations. But to deal, to correspond, to make applications to visit that country, one must do it via Moscow, the capital of Russia. As Princess Anne, through one of the reporters of the London *Times*, indicated when she was a competitor in the equestrian trials in Kiev in 1971, here was a nation of some 50 million people with no foreign embassies or foreign policies, yet with a seat in the United Nations.

In 1973 we in Alberta hosted a delegation of parliamentarians from the Ukraine. The head of the delegation, Mrs. Valentina Shevchenko, commented to me that she was surprised that I may introduce that delegation in this Alberta Legislature in Ukrainian and English. Her exact comments to me were: "You were permitted to use Ukrainian in your Legislature?" You know why she asked that? Because they are being discouraged through many different influences from using Ukrainian in their own homeland. I continue the address I made there:

I only hope that in every conference such as this one we continue to influence our leaders to be concerned about the members of the Commonwealth. The members of the Commonwealth must continue to preserve peace and freedom and not break relations as we have done with South Africa some years ago. Rather than break relations, let us stay together and resolve the problems through discussions and mediation, and not say, I won't talk to you any more. Because this is not what happens in any good family.

In my closing remarks to the president of that session, I indicated:

I want to just indicate that as was mentioned by several delegates here today in the Common-

wealth Conference, we should be one of the two powers or one of the powers of the world but with a greater influence in a peaceful measure in directing that millions of people may be able to gain their freedom and retain their freedom and live in peace.

That was what I had indicated then, without any prior notice from this Assembly, Mr. Speaker, but I trust it is acceptable. That was most of the address. I want to indicate that as an offshoot of this, I've had some continuous correspondence with interested members who were present. In all fairness, this was possibly the first time anybody had raised concern at a Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference for what is happening behind the Iron Curtain. I took the liberty. As you know, in this Assembly some reference made to me, in a jesting way, has been 'super like'. So I thought I would just try it out.

I want to refer back, that I do urge we trade with other nations, that the trading be continued and broadened as we do it on a friendly and personal basis. I'm always an advocate of this. If we can trade and talk to other nations, even though they may be behind the Iron Curtain, we do break down the barriers. However, I would like at the same time to encourage that some mention be made officially, whenever the opportunity arises; that we as members of this Assembly look at the agreement signed by so many nations at the Helsinki accord; that we encourage the nations that we talk to, that we trade with, to live up to the agreement they signed.

Already in Canada we have a precedent. The House of Commons on February 15, and the Senate on February 17, unanimously passed a resolution conveying to the Soviet government the deep concern of the Canadian parliament and people at the arrest of some organizers who were trying to carry out the agreement of the Helsinki accord. The Senate resolution also asked for their immediate releases and urged the U.S.S.R. to honor their commitment made at Helsinki: commitment to the re-unification of families, commitment to the implementation of human rights, and other commitments they agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the members of this Legislature to join me in supporting the Premier as he plans his trip, possibly in the next year or two, to the Soviet Union, particularly as this is an official position of the Canadian government, and we in Alberta cannot just say, me too. I'm confident that our Premier is aware of these concerns from the correspondence he's received from Albertans. I look forward to this being in some way an official position of the Alberta Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, in the time remaining I wish to make some further remarks on the Speech from the Throne pertaining to education. I am pleased that the recommendations from MLAs, the Curriculum Policies Board, and the public will be looked to. I cannot accept the argument that the trustees and school boards are in any way not included. The complete Alberta school trustees' resolutions package is in the minister's hands, and the submission to cabinet was given a good hearing.

Following this, I was one of the MLAs, with many others, who attended the zone meetings. We met with trustees and discussed problems and the future goals of education. However, a shift to basic skills cannot mean two things, but is really one thing. That

is what I hear from parents in my constituency. We shifted away from the basic skills — reading, spelling, writing — for some reason. Whoever directed the educational system to reading by sight without knowing what word is written, and why it's written in the manner it is, appeared to be in error. Whoever dropped the idea of spelling was not really practical. This was done in many classrooms throughout the province and, as the hon. Member for Hanna-Oyen indicated, a shift away from respect and responsibility. This can really be taught in school, even though many may try to pass this off as the responsibility of the home, or you can't teach morals in school. I disagree. I feel it can be done.

I want to commend the Minister of Education and the cabinet committee that appreciated the role of private and independent schools during the past years in our society, providing a greater amount of funding for the schools, a greater increase in the past five years than took place possibly in the past 55 years.

Let us not stampede when some individual in responsible office makes a statement and this becomes the way it should be, unless we are assured that this individual has the collective opinion of many persons. For example, I wish to publicly commend the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health that The Marriage Act will not be amended to reflect the recommendations put forward by Dr. Randall Ivany in June 1975. The minister's position reflected input from many sectors of our society that the minister's office carried out before a decision was made — a compliment to her judgment.

In greater numbers, my constituents support the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care for bringing about a greater accountability by those who use up that budget. Even during some restraints he is continuing to enlarge programs under his department.

In my constituency of Edmonton Beverly, Mr. Speaker, housing is a topic of daily discussion, with many older homes in older districts in the constituency and a large number of new homes in the new districts, with many new homes being built and many older homes being remodelled and rebuilt, particularly the complement on the senior citizen home improvement program.

The hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works was not very popular when he in his way made the public aware that the increased cost in the price of homes was occurring because of certain sectors of our free enterprise community. What has taken place? I am advised that the price of homes has dropped by about 20 per cent in possibly the last six months. A leveling off because people didn't continue to stampede to buy homes, but became shoppers. As the cliché is, it is now a buyers' market in Edmonton.

The constituents of Edmonton Beverly appreciate the recommendations of the final report of the Electoral Boundary Commission, reversing the recommendation of the first report and retaining the name of Edmonton Beverly. Some of the constituents in the community of Highlands are pleased and appreciate that the recommendation places them within the constituency of Edmonton Highlands where they really live, rather than Edmonton Beverly. They did indicate that they will some day in the future enjoy having the younger member for Edmonton Highlands



serve them [rather] than myself. However, somebody's loss is somebody else's gain.

Mr. Speaker, if I may, just about two more minutes to complete?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. DIACHUK: The constituents agreed almost unanimously — and I don't want to overlook this — with the Minister of Transportation to assist the city of Edmonton with the 125 Avenue by-pass, the filling of the gap in the Yellowhead route, which is so much overdue, to alleviate the congestion on 118 Avenue, which goes through practically all the constituencies in the northern part of Edmonton. This will improve it not only for the visitors and the tourists but for the citizens who reside in Edmonton. As one of the hon. members in this Assembly indicated, he could get from one point in Edmonton to another sooner on horseback. Some people may have to resort to horseback because of the congestion on 118 Avenue.

I have mentioned in previous addresses that the Capital City Park program is receiving great endorsement. This fall the hon. Minister of Culture and I had the privilege of opening the new facility for the handicapped in Rundle Park. Through the initiative of many volunteers — the Associated Canadian Travelers, who saw fit to raise the funds for such a project, it is now a reality for the handicapped people of Edmonton. But the invitation has been extended to the residents of northeast Edmonton, the Edmonton

Beverly constituency, to use that facility. It isn't exclusively for them. However, there are always some critics. This we can't overcome. But the Capital City Park is one of the best investments in my constituency for the future generations.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to participating, during the 18th Legislature, in the different legislation and other business that is before us. I thank you very much.

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

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview adjourn the debate?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that 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 adjourned at 5:33 p.m.]

