

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA****Title: Wednesday, March 2, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure we're all pleased to see our Clerk back with us today. I extend to our Clerk on behalf of all members our sympathy in his recent bereavement, the loss of his father.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS****Bill 225****An Act to Amend The  
Motor Vehicle Administration Act**

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being An Act to Amend The Motor Vehicle Administration Act. This act, Mr. Speaker, will provide that when a person is convicted under certain sections of The Criminal Code the vehicle being driven at the time of the offence may be impounded or on subsequent offences may be confiscated.

[Leave granted; Bill 225 read a first time]

**head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, it's a great privilege for me today to introduce a very entertaining class from a very progressive community in this province, the grade 8 world government class from the J. R. Harris Junior High School in Barrhead. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Piard, two parents Mrs. Bukieda and Mrs. Reitsma, and their bus driver Mr. Wolfram. I ask them to stand and be recognized by the House.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce a class of 45 grades 8 and 9 students from D. S. MacKenzie Junior High School in Edmonton. They are accompanied by their teachers Donna Watson and Louise Covey. They're in the public gallery. I ask them to rise and be recognized.

MR. KOZIAK: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this afternoon to introduce students from the constituency of Edmonton Strathcona from a school that's celebrating its 75th anniversary this year, the King Edward School which originated when Strathcona was a community separate from Edmonton. With us this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, are 22 students from the grade 4 class at King Edward accompanied by their teacher Miss Buffie. They're in the members gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the House.

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the annual report of the Alberta Housing Corporation.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table a reply to notice of question No. 220 as required by the Legislature.

DR. WARRACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to file through this Legislature for the Legislature Library copies of the report done by Reid Crowther and Partners, the title being Recommendations and Action Toward More Efficient Operation of Natural Gas Cooperatives, Based On The Study Of Three Pilot Cooperatives.

**head: MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS****Department of Federal and  
Intergovernmental Affairs**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the Assembly of the position of the government of Alberta with regard to the constitutional proposals in the letter of the Prime Minister to Canadian premiers of January 19, 1977. Before doing, so by way of brief background members will recall that by letter of October 14, 1976 from the Premier of Alberta to the Prime Minister, which was filed in this Assembly on October 20 as Sessional Paper 100, Premier Lougheed informed the Prime Minister of the outcome of deliberations of the premiers over the course of the summer of last year. In that letter he set forth the positions of the 10 premiers, particularly with regard to patriation, the amending formula, and increased provincial jurisdiction and involvement in a number of areas to which the constitution relates.

On October 19, 1976 the Prime Minister sent an interim telex reply to the various premiers which was released, I believe, in Ottawa on that day. Members will recall on November 1 of last year the resolution, which was passed by this Assembly with an amendment, endorsing the government's position by a vote of 67 to one.

On January 19, 1977, a letter was sent by the Prime Minister to all premiers, and was tabled in the House of Commons on January 24, which contained some specific proposals with regard to the constitutional change in the draft resolution. In that letter the Prime Minister indicated that patriation was a priority national matter; he proposed the Victoria amending formula; he proposed increased western Senate representation; there were indications of second thoughts by the federal government regarding provincial involvement in the choice of Supreme Court of Canada judges; and the Prime Minister concluded by asking for the reaction of the various premiers.

I will now set forth the highlights of the Alberta response to that letter from the Prime Minister. Details can be found in copies of that letter from our Premier to the Prime Minister which I will file at the end of this statement.

... Patriation of the constitution [in Alberta's view] is not a priority matter for this province. There are many important questions of public policy such as the future direction of the Cana-

dian economy, unemployment, post-controls, achieving self-reliance in energy, the GATT negotiations and resolution of transportation problems which will demand the attention of governments over the next several months . . . [The] successful resolution [of these matters] would be [in our view] far more important in fostering national unity than a discussion on patriation . . . If, however, the other provinces believe some limited discussions on the constitution would be useful we, of course, would participate in these discussions . . .

The Government of Alberta does not believe that increasing the number of senators for Western Canada is a realistic proposal as far as meeting the concerns of this region.

Of greatest importance to this province is the amending formula. The Government of Alberta does not accept the proposed amending formula, i.e. the one contained in the Victoria Charter. The Victoria amending formula was never approved by the Alberta Legislature . . .

[We] strongly believe that any future discussion on the constitution whether it be for the purpose of discussing patriation, limited amendments or a general review, must be premised on the assumption that provinces are equals within Confederation. If at any time in our history this principle should be recognized, it is now. We cannot have first and second-class provinces within Confederation. We must be treated as equals when important issues relating to the constitution are being considered.

. . . [As to] the matter of provincial participation in the appointment of Supreme Court of Canada judges. [We are] concerned that the Federal Government now has second thoughts about including this matter in revisions to the constitution. Given the important position of the Supreme Court within our federal system, provincial governments should be given an opportunity to participate in the selection of Supreme Court of Canada judges.

. . . In [the Prime Minister's] March 30, 1976 letter [he] indicated that unanimous consent of the provinces would be required before any future amendment could be made to those parts of the constitution not now [amendable] in Canada . . . If patriation is pursued we assume . . . that it would be contingent on appropriate safeguards for every province with regards to future amendments to the constitution.

. . . This province believes that the consent of the Federal Government and all ten provinces must be secured before any fundamental change to the constitution is made. This concern applies both to simple patriation and to the suggested amendments contained in [the Prime Minister's January 19 letter]. To us it is essential in any discussions on the constitution that the provinces be treated and considered as equals, particularly if a wide-ranging review of the constitution is contemplated.

I wish to file at this time two copies of the full letter of reply setting forth the position of the government of Alberta.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

### **Hospital Planning**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the first question to the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care and ask if he can give us an explanation as to where the planning for the Grande Prairie hospital now stands. At what stage is the planning for the Grande Prairie hospital?

MR. MINIELY: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to describe relative stages, except to say that working with the Grande Prairie hospital board and the MLA for Grande Prairie, we have been placing high priority on the development of Grande Prairie as a regional hospital centre in northern Alberta. As it sits at the current time, the planning rests with the hospital board and with the community to delineate the services they would like to see in a new facility in Grande Prairie to meet the parameters of a regional hospital for Grande Prairie and surrounding area. The Grande Prairie hospital board has not presented the next stage of planning to us for consideration, but we have been working in a continuous way with them, with high priority on the development of the hospital.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister outline to us briefly the stage of planning for the Red Deer hospital?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I believe the Red Deer hospital has submitted a functional program with respect to the development of Red Deer regional hospital. The officials of the Hospital Services Commission and I have reviewed the plan they have submitted. We have communicated to the hospital board, and I have had conversation there with the MLA, my colleague the Attorney General. We are now meeting with the Red Deer hospital board on the plan they have submitted to work out details, express our concerns, and work out the final stages of a plan and design for Red Deer regional hospital which would be acceptable to both Red Deer and the provincial government.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, could the minister outline the situation with regard to the new hospital in Fort McMurray?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, rather than repeating myself, Fort McMurray is in the identical stage I just expressed with respect to Red Deer.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then I would like to direct a further question to the minister. The question is a result of concerns expressed to me by people from both Fort McMurray and Red Deer as to why the hospital board in Red Deer was advised this week that after all this joint planning and meetings with the Hospitals Commission and with the minister, in fact they have now been advised that they have to cut back their plans by 10 per cent and have 10 days to do it.

MR. MINIELY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader has made an assumption with respect to time. With respect to all hospital developments in the province of

Alberta — whether it be Red Deer, Fort McMurray, or the health sciences centre project announced in the fall sitting — it would be the responsibility of this Legislature and the citizens of Alberta to ensure that through the different stages of planning, the project is coming within reasonable cost to the taxpayer of what was anticipated.

If during the different stages of planning, architecture, or engineering and design, a large hospital project in the province is now projecting costs which are substantially higher than what the government, this Legislature, or the people of Alberta anticipated, then certainly I think it's expected that at that stage a red flag would be raised with respect to the hospital board, the provincial government, and the community that the design and plans should be reassessed to ensure that the project comes within reasonable cost to the taxpayers of Alberta.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, that we have within our capital construction in the hospital field — and it is substantial, it's the largest capital construction budget of any province in Canada in the hospital field. Nevertheless having said that, I think we have to ensure that each project comes in within reasonable cost to the taxpayer. I'm sure the hon. leader would agree.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the minister is: what is the reason for the Red Deer hospital board apparently being advised, in the last few days I gather, at this not eleventh hour but even 30 minutes past the eleventh hour, that they now have to cut back the whole project by 10 per cent?

MR. MINIELY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I wasn't specific: for the first time the project was coming in with costs estimated substantially higher than any costs that had been presented to the provincial government prior to that date.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister with regard to the Fort McMurray hospital. Why have the people who have been working on the new hospital in Fort McMurray now all of a sudden — once again at the very last moment — been advised that they have to cut their costs and their whole project back by 10 per cent?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter. I wonder if I could have the permission of the House to explain for the benefit of the hon. leader and all members the different stages of planning that these projects go through, because I'm not sure, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. leader understands the different processes of planning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CLARK: We're well aware of that.

MR. SPEAKER: If there isn't unanimous consent, perhaps we should stay within the ordinary parameters of the question period. As I understand it, the hon. leader has taken the position that he knows the procedure that is gone through. The question is whether or not the minister wishes to answer the question as asked.

MR. MINIELY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the question gives me the latitude to explain exactly how this kind of situation arises and I will proceed in that manner. Okay?

MR. CLARK: Just tell us why they were advised this week.

MR. SPEAKER: If we're going to go into a lengthy explanation of procedure, I question whether that is a proper use of the question period. It would appear that the question of the hon. Leader of the Opposition is fairly limited in scope.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer the question accurately without having some latitude to explain the planning, architectural, and engineering processes. Therefore it would be better on the Order Paper if the hon. leader would like to put it on.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister has complete discretion as to whether he answers the question or not.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact the minister won't answer that question, we'll try another one. A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can the minister explain why the hospital board in Grande Prairie has now been advised that they have to cut their plans back 20 per cent across the board?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I've indicated earlier, and if the hon. leader is interested in the various stages of planning that these go through, there are, to be as brief as possible, at least four to five cost estimate checks in the different planning processes with respect to hospital capital construction in Alberta. At each stage of planning the cost estimates are checked, and if at a certain stage of planning the cost estimate escalates far beyond what the estimates were at any earlier stage of planning, the red flag is raised and we sit down with the board and say, the project costs are getting out of control.

Mr. Speaker, it's really as simple as that. With respect to all the projects the hon. leader has questioned, the costs are simply much higher than what had been estimated previously.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then just one further supplementary question to the minister, in light of the minister's willingness to answer the question. In light of what the minister has said, is it fair to assume that [neither] the hospitals commission nor the minister was concerned about the costs at the Red Deer, Fort McMurray, and Grande Prairie hospitals until just this week, or last week, when the boards were told to cut back?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I was concerned about the cost the moment it was brought to my attention that the cost estimates had escalated substantially over what we had planned and what had been publicly stated. If we take the example of Red Deer — and I know I've had conversations with the Attorney General as the MLA for Red Deer — the cost had been publicly stated by this government. Now all of a sudden the costs are double what they were two years ago. Again, Mr. Speaker, I would say that this

has been communicated to the board and the community. I would say that I think it's my responsibility as the minister, on behalf of this government and on behalf of the people of Alberta, to keep costs within control.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Could the minister advise whether these directives or edicts that have been given to the hospital boards mean that the capacity of the hospitals will be reduced by 10, 10, and 20 per cent, respectively, and services reduced accordingly?

MR. MINIELY: Well, Mr. Speaker, certainly not. I think one of the questions that we in this Legislature, the government, and the people of Alberta will have to ask is with respect to the frills in public building construction.

My tours throughout the province — and I have indicated in the Legislature I think I've toured 70 to 75 per cent of the hospital facilities now in the province of Alberta. On an overall average basis they are second to none in the world, let alone Canada. I think we find frills in all architectural and engineering design that end up in costs. So reduction can be achieved without reduction in program and service content, or in quality of program and service content. I don't think that's a factor that should in any way be the first stage of reduction.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Supplementary to the minister for clarification. Is the minister indicating that because of these frills and the approach local hospital boards use, that they are not being responsible? Is that what he's saying? [interjections]

#### **Energy Company Annual Meeting**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I direct the second question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. The question is with regard to the upcoming annual meeting of the Alberta Energy Company. Who will be receiving the government's proxy for voting of the 50.1 per cent of the shares of the Alberta Energy Company, the \$75 million?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the government holds 50 per cent of the shares of the Alberta Energy Company. The hon. Leader of the Opposition seems to have difficulty accepting that fact, but it is a fact. Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the management and board of directors, as presently constituted, will have the government's confidence and support by proxy at the annual meeting on April 7.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question to the minister. Last year at the annual meeting, the president Mr. Mitchell had the proxy. Has the government decided this year that rather than Mr. Mitchell having the proxy as president, the board of directors will in fact have the proxy?

MR. GETTY: It will be Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one further question to the minister. What instructions has the government given to Mr. Mitchell with regard to exercising the proxy at the annual meeting in April?

MR. GETTY: To exercise that proxy in the best interests of all the shareholders.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Does the government plan to give any further instruction to Mr. Mitchell between now and the annual meeting?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Mitchell talks to me about matters having to do with the company in a policy area, with the act, or terms of reference under which he operates as president, then I may well discuss matters which will come up at the annual meeting. As of now, I don't have any planned.

#### **Prisoners' Medication**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. the Solicitor General and ask if he can advise the House whether he has had an opportunity to investigate concern by the AUPE that correctional officers in the Solicitor General's department, particularly at the Peace River correctional centre, are being required to administer drugs to inmates.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe this arises from a misunderstanding on the part of the AUPE. The correctional officers are not asked to dispense drugs. Medicine prescribed by a doctor is dispensed by a trained nurse, then put in an envelope for the correctional officer to distribute. On the outside of the envelope is the name of the inmate and the number of times he has to take these pills per day. It would be impossible to turn the correctional institutions into hospitals and have all correctional officers as trained nurses. It would not only be impossible, it wouldn't be practical on the grounds of security. All the correctional officers are being asked to do is what they do in all prisons, which is merely to distribute medicine and make sure the inmates take it as directed. They have no need for any special expertise in this regard apart from their knowledge of security.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is it not true that until recently medication has been distributed by trained nurses in the Peace River centre?

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker. One trained nurse has resigned from the establishment at Peace River, which leaves us a little short of trained nurses. Last year we had an increase in our establishment for the correctional institutions for trained nurses and it did take several months to hire them for these positions, because not every nurse wants to work in a correctional institution.

The particular female nurse to whom the hon. member refers resigned her position, and we're looking for another recruit to fill the vacancy. It might certainly be possible that a trained nurse from time to time distributes medicine as well as dispensing it. There would be no prohibition against that. During regular daylight hours it might well be more frequent than late at night. But certainly I can't accept the proposition that every guard has to be a nurse.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister for clarification. Is the minister saying that only distribution is taking place,

or have there been any cases to his knowledge where correctional officers have actually been asked to dispense drugs?

MR. FARRAN: Not in recent times, Mr. Speaker. But there was a report from a medical advisory committee and the Ombudsman that on occasions some time ago, two or three years ago, paramedics, correctional officers who have had some first aid training, were dispensing drugs. This no longer happens in the system.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Can the minister indicate if any of the provincial correctional institutes have pharmacists to do this, as they do in hospitals?

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker. We rely on the free enterprise local pharmacists as much as possible, and we have a very good working relationship with both the hospital and the pharmacies in Peace River.

DR. BUCK: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister had any discussion with the Alberta Pharmaceutical Association as to the necessity of having a graduate pharmacist do the dispensing in the correctional institutes?

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe we really need a government dentist or a government druggist on staff.

#### Hockey Prosecutions

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. Attorney General which concerns a serious incident recently in a hockey game. Is the minister aware of the serious hockey brawl last Wednesday in Lethbridge between the Calgary Centennials and the Lethbridge Broncos, which resulted in serious injuries and the subsequent suspension of both coaches? If so, does the Attorney General anticipate laying charges against those participants?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, the hockey situation in Alberta in the last several months has been relatively quiet in terms of criminal activity on ice. But there have been a few occasions when it has been necessary to apply criminal law, and assault and other charges have been laid, most of them successful.

The game to which the hon. member referred was a particularly difficult one, and a charge of assault was laid today. There may be other charges laid in that instance. I'm not prepared to give names at this point because the accused has not been notified. I can't say anything more than that. The decision on other charges likely will be made later in the week.

DR. BUCK: Supplementary to the hon. minister. Has the minister given any directive to hockey organizations that the onus to lay the charge will be on the person who has been assaulted? Or is the minister advising that his department will be doing the policing?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, there is no hard and fast rule in terms of direction from this department as to how the charge may be laid. Certainly if in our

opinion we feel charges are justified, we will see that charges are brought. On most occasions, however, they are brought by police officers who are in attendance at the games. Occasionally a private citizen will bring a charge. There have been examples of all three.

In the case in Lethbridge, to which I am now referring, one of the Crown attorneys was at the game in question, was aware of the situation. There was a follow-up investigation by the Lethbridge city police. The one charge that has currently been laid was laid by the Lethbridge city police after discussion with my agent.

#### Coal Gasification

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism. It concerns the coal gasification experiment carried out at Forestburg during 1976. Is the government reasonably satisfied with the coal gasification tests that were conducted at Forestburg?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, the evaluation of the material that was gathered as a result of the test is still going on. However, I can indicate that of the 160 tons of coal that were burned, the BTU value of that coal was approximately 100 BTU per square foot, which is considerably higher than was expected.

There are some other interesting developments as a result of that coal gasification program. First of all, a bibliography of all the information available throughout the world on coal gasification was gathered together, preliminary to the *in situ* study. In addition to that, the documentation on all the studies undertaken by the Russian, United States, and European coal gasification experts has been put together. That information is now intact.

The other interesting part of it is that the project itself was undertaken and funded by the Department of Energy and Natural Resources and the province of Alberta, the Research Council, and 14 other outside participants. I think that is also significant. There is a great deal of interest in this particular process throughout Canada.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary to the hon. minister. Has there been any indication that any of the members of the consortium who paid for the tests in 1976 will discontinue their contribution in 1977?

MR. DOWLING: Not to this date, Mr. Speaker. We have indications that there is need to continue the study. This summer for example the people involved from the Research Council will actually be descending into the burned area to determine how the burn took place, because they did something rather unique. They burned in two different sites, then brought the burn together. A determination of what actually happened underground will be undertaken.

It's sort of a site-specific type of process. In other words there is very little danger of duplicating something undertaken somewhere else because the type of coal, the overburden, the type of seaming are all unique to the Forestburg area. Probably another study someplace else would have to be undertaken differently.

MR. TAYLOR: A further supplementary. Was there any adverse effect on the ground water in the area, and has there been any evidence of subsidence?

MR. DOWLING: No. Those were two questions which I also asked when I visited the site some time during the summer. There is no evidence of subsidence at this point; however, we don't know the depth of the burn for one thing. The second thing is that the ground water has in fact moved back into the area where the burn took place. I understand that is a fact. However, that entire matter will be investigated further this summer. There will be some further site selection and perhaps the drilling for a further test will take place this coming winter, that is the winter of '77.

MR. TAYLOR: Just one further question with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker. Will the gathering of the low energy gas that will be produced in the coal gasification plant likely be done this coming year, or is it some years down the road? Secondly, will there be a progress report issued on the experiment some time this year?

MR. DOWLING: I can't comment on the availability of the report. If it's ongoing, of course, I think it would be confidential to the participants. As to the actual value of the gas produced, that also would be rather confidential, I would suggest. I can say though that I was rather amazed at the amount of hydrogen and hydrocarbon that was produced. The hydrocarbon is minimal, but it did produce a very hot gas and a number of other things because of the burning process.

#### **Rents — Fort McMurray**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I'd like to know if the minister is aware that notices of 20 per cent rent increases effective June 1 were received by residents of Fort McMurray who are renting duplexes and mobile homes from Athabasca Realty.

MR. HARLE: No, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware of it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, could the minister be so kind as to investigate this matter and report to the House?

MR. HARLE: I can certainly look into the matter, Mr. Speaker.

#### **Omega Project**

MR. R. SPEAKER: My question is to the Attorney General. It's with regard to the new project Omega. I was wondering if the minister could indicate the purpose of the task force that's working with Omega.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had done that in the fall, but if not I have been remiss and I'd be happy to discuss it in much more detail in the course of my estimates. Project Omega is an attempt by the provincial court reorganization agency structured pursuant to the Kirby Board of Review report to bring into play the new procedures and new technology

that will be essential if we are to streamline and modernize the courts.

You may have noted, Mr. Speaker, reference in the Speech from the Throne to certain priorities having to do with caseload management, criminal case processing, traffic court diversion — which legislation will be coming later this spring — and the like. It is an attempt, as it happens, by two particularly able people in the department who are working full-time on this project, in co-operation with other members of the department and the Solicitor General's department as I've said, to shake down our existing procedures and methods, explore new administrative techniques and procedures, and apply new technology in the process of the courts.

I would be delighted, Mr. Speaker, to go into it in some detail, report on specific program areas being approached by Omega, and have a discussion in the House if that's the member's interest.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary to the Attorney General. Will the Legislative Assembly be receiving a written report at an early date on this project?

MR. FOSTER: I didn't anticipate, Mr. Speaker, that the initiatives of Omega would be the subject of a written report to the members of the Assembly. However, the idea does have merit and I would be quite willing to explore some form of report to me, since they are responsible to me through the agency, which I might share with the members of the Assembly in order that they are aware of the work of the project. It is essentially an advisory group and subject to my direction, and of course government approval where necessary, an implementation group.

But I take as notice the interest of the hon. member, and I'd like to consider whether some form of report might be made available to all members of the House, which I think would be most beneficial.

#### **Crown Land Leases**

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. minister in charge of Crown lands. Is it the general policy of the government to issue five-year leases rather than the 20-year leases previously issued?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the policy as to legislation in terms of lease has been to a maximum of 20 years. Over the period of years we have leases that run for many variances of from two or three or five to 20. The leases being renewed at the present time are being limited to a 10-year period.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Some leases are different periods of time. Could the minister outline the criteria used in determining the length of a lease?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, the terms of the lease really depend on the land use itself. The longer term leases in the 10-year class are mainly leases in the grazing area that give the lessee that degree of assurance that gives him the opportunity for capital investment over a 10-year period. So they vary depending on the land use itself.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In cases where the government is reducing the size of leases in order to comply with the 600-head limit per operator, will some of this land be used for government-operated grazing reserves?

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, that is the intention at the time.

#### **Brucellosis**

MR. BUTLER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Agriculture. What is the present status of brucellosis in the province?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, that's rather difficult to answer. I believe it is well known that we have identified quite a substantial number of herds with brucellosis as opposed to a year ago, or two and three years ago. However, the difficulty is that there's been quite an increase in the testing being carried out to identify herds with brucellosis. So while the numbers we know are infected have increased substantially, it may be that that increase has been the result of additional testing and that the problem was there before.

I would say, however, that officials of my department are working very closely with the federal health of animals branch, whose prime responsibility it is to control diseases of that nature. We're hopeful with the increased work that's being done that we may be able to get the situation under control again.

DR. PAPROSKI: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether he has received any indication that there's been any human harm caused by the infection brucellosis.

MR. MOORE: Could the hon. member repeat that question, Mr. Speaker?

DR. PAPROSKI: Would the minister indicate to the House, Mr. Speaker, whether there's been any human harm caused by the brucellosis infection in animals?

MR. MOORE: Not that I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CLARK: I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife and ask if he's had a chance to do some checking with regard to counselling procedures used on discipline cases in his department.

MR. ADAIR: Yes, Mr. Speaker. If I may I would like just to repeat the question that was asked of me yesterday: "Is the minister in a position to confirm that a number of fish and wildlife employees have been sent to the counselling and diagnostic unit of the public service office where there have been discipline problems within the department?"

Mr. Speaker, I think I should indicate first off, number one, that no employees are sent to the diagnostic and referral unit, but they may go there on their own after being made aware of the services

provided; number two, information provided to me by the department is that no members have been sent to that diagnostic unit relative to discipline problems within the department.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the House whether the career development counselling sessions, under the direction I believe of Mr. Caldwell, are still being carried on within the department?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, again I would have to check that. I would assume they probably are. I am not directly involved in those counselling sessions, nor do I know who may in fact request them. But I would have to check that.

#### **Day Care**

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. I wonder if the minister would be so kind as to indicate to the House whether the task force dealing with day care is on its way, doing its job, or is it just being formulated at this time?

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have not had an initial report from the chairman of the task force on day care. They have been appointed, and I would have to inquire of the chairman whether they have had their initial meetings. I know they were rather anxious to commence their work, so I am assuming they have. But I would have to inquire to find out for sure.

DR. PAPROSKI: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether the task force has been given any direction by the minister regarding any specific priorities in the task force study.

MISS HUNLEY: I felt they would bring to the task force a great breadth of information, knowledge, and experience in many cases, and that they should be allowed great freedom in taking a look at the recommendations that had come to the department and making recommendations. I feel sure they will select their own priorities, and those priorities I'm sure will be in the best interests of the people of Alberta.

DR. PAPROSKI: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether she has studies, information, or statistics to indicate what number of spaces are required in the province of Alberta for those single parents on social assistance who want to work, who require day care spaces for their children.

MISS HUNLEY: No, I don't have that information, Mr. Speaker. I don't know that it is available. I believe the hon. member should put it on the Order Paper, and I can have it researched if the information can be obtained.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister a further supplementary. Could she advise if the task force has been given a deadline to present its report?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes it has, Mr. Speaker. I have asked them if they can to report to me by April 30, I believe, because there is some urgency in the matter.

MR. CLARK: This is the second task force after all.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether she feels in a general way that the number of spaces required for single parents who are on social assistance is substantive.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly that matter of opinion could be discussed with the minister privately.

#### **Prisoners' Medication** (continued)

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the hon. Solicitor General again and ask whether the hon. minister has had an opportunity to investigate the assertion by the Alberta Union of Public Employees that drugs are shipped to the Peace River correctional centre in bulk and are dispensed there, at the centre.

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I see nothing untoward in that if it is happening, but I will inquire. The whole point is a difference between dispensing by the trained nurse and distributing by a correction officer. If I could give you an analogy — not wishing to infer, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member's environment will be similar to that of Peace River — if a doctor prescribed a pill to the hon. member, because he had the flu or something, and his wife reminded him at a certain time at night that he was supposed to take the pill within three hours, that would be similar to the function of the correction office in distributing the pill.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister after that extremely informative answer. In view of the fact that one of the trained nurses at the Peace River Correctional Institution, I understand, has been fired and the other is away sick, and in view of the fact that the minister has indicated that there is nothing untoward in the drugs being shipped in bulk to the centre, who then is in charge of dispensing the drugs who is qualified now at the centre?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, the dispensing is being done by the hospital and the pharmacy in Peace River pro tem. The lady in question was not fired, she resigned voluntarily.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister for clarification. Is the minister telling the Assembly that the dispensing is being done at the hospital, that there is no dispensing being done at all at this time at the Peace River correctional centre?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I can only tell the hon. member that I am assured that dispensing is only being done by qualified personnel.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question for clarification, and I think it's an important

one. Will the minister assure the House that no disciplinary action will be taken against any correctional officer who refuses to distribute drugs if in his view the dispensing is not done under properly qualified people?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, no, I will give no such assurance. Any correctional officer who disobeys a lawful order by his superior is subject to discipline.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question then to the hon. minister. It's an important matter. In light of the Food and Drug Act and The Pharmaceutical Association Act which clearly spell out the legal basis for dispensing drugs, would the minister assure the House that there is a proper legal basis for the present situation in Peace River and that if the dispensing is not done by a qualified person, any correctional officer who refuses to distribute drugs under those circumstances will not face disciplinary action.

The reason I raise this, Mr. Speaker, is that I have a copy of a letter I'll table in the House from the director of the institute which indicates disciplinary action will be taken against an individual who feels that that person would be taking undue risk in doing something he is not qualified to undertake.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member will provide me with a copy of the letter he has, I will look into it and take the matter under advisement.

DR. BUCK: To the hon. minister, a supplementary on a point of clarification. Did the minister say previously that the control drugs that are brought to the institution have been brought there by a pharmacist? Or where are they dispensed from, the correctional institute or a private pharmacy in that community?

MR. FARRAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that it comes from both quarters. It can come from a pharmacist under prescription, from the hospital, or there are some drugs not by prescription which are dispensed by a trained nurse. But if the hon. member wants a more detailed report, Mr. Speaker, I would be quite happy to provide one in writing.

#### **Bean Button**

MR. GOGO: My question is to the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder if there is a special significance to the badge he's wearing today in his lapel.

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was presented to me this morning by the bean growers association of Alberta when I attended and helped to open Ag-Expo in Lethbridge, which is the largest seed fair of its kind in Canada.

#### **Public Utilities Board**

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to either the Attorney General or the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Did the hon. ministers meet this morning with the Consumers' Association of



Canada, Alberta branch, regarding the repayment of costs incurred at hearings of Public Utilities commissioners?

MR. FOSTER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my colleague and I did have, not a lengthy but I do think an excellent meeting with two representatives of CAC to explore ways in which we might ensure that interveners have access to the Public Utilities Board, that other voices besides corporate interests are expressed at the board, and that methods by which the expenses which may be incurred by interveners might reasonably be met, particularly in view of a recent decision by the Public Utilities Board with respect to interveners' costs.

Perhaps while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I might make the observation that some people seem to be looking right by the Public Utilities Board and the reasons for its recent decision. I think if you examine the reasons, you will find the Public Utilities Board is indeed encouraging interventions, but they are not prepared to pass costs through to other consumers which they feel are unwarranted by those who participate as interveners before the board.

My colleague and I, and indeed the Minister of Municipal Affairs will be joining us shortly in a meeting to discuss mechanisms by which the government might further assist and ensure that groups of various kinds, including the municipalities when appropriate, appear before the Public Utilities Board.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Will those conclusions reached at the meeting be transferred to the board of Public Utilities commissioners? And will this mean some change in their recent decision?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I think it would be premature and perhaps inappropriate at this time to say that there will be a change in the Public Utilities Board order. Not willing to give legal advice in the Assembly, let me offer the comment that I doubt the order of the board is appealable except on a matter of law. Therefore the board's order stands.

I think our concern as government is that there be both access and opportunity for interveners to participate before the Public Utilities Board, and in the event that all reasonable costs of interveners cannot be met by the Public Utilities Board in their judgment, and thereby passed through to other consumers, that there be other mechanisms in place which will ensure that a reasonable level of intervention is continued.

I think we all acknowledge that the members of the Public Utilities Board themselves are protectors of the public interest. They clearly have a role to play, but it's right and proper that other groups have the opportunity of appearing before the board and having their say, as it were.

It may be necessary to amend the public utilities legislation with respect to access by some interveners to certain kinds of information which is currently flowing directly from applicants to the board and may in some circumstances not be made available to interveners. That is a question that in particular my colleague the minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and I are looking at. Whether or not there is

need for other sorts of amendments to strengthen the capacity of interveners, I think it's too soon to say.

MR. TAYLOR: One further supplementary. Since the board of Public Utilities commissioners is there to protect the consumer's interest, is there not some anomaly in the taxpayer paying for both the hearing and the intervention?

MR. FOSTER: At first blush, Mr. Speaker, I would acknowledge there is an apparent anomaly. At the same time, let's recognize that the Public Utilities Board functions much like a court, which is based almost on an adversarial relationship for the purpose of getting facts and figures on the table. Certainly the Public Utilities Board has its own staff resources, but we're not anxious to see those staff resources developed with many many specialists and technical people, as has been the experience in some utility regulation capacities in the United States for example, and perhaps elsewhere in Canada. I can leave it at that.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General.

MR. SPEAKER: We have reached the end of the question period. Perhaps the hon. member could ask the question as a main question tomorrow.

## ORDERS OF THE DAY

### 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. Notley]

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to participate in the reply to the Speech from the Throne debate. In doing so, may I say at the outset that one could not help but be exhilarated and feel a real sense of pride in our province when we saw the Lieutenant-Governor, regaled in his outfit, open the Legislature on Thursday of last week.

Mr. Speaker, moving to the Speech from the Throne itself, I want to express a number of concerns during the course of my remarks. But before getting into the thrust of provincial discussion, I think it's important to take just a moment and look at the most important issue facing Canada today.

It was in 1896 that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, at the Empire conference — at that time the British Empire conference in London — said that the nineteenth century belonged to the United States; the twentieth century belongs to Canada. But as a result of the events in the province of Quebec on November 15,

there is some very real doubt. That is not to suggest that this country will not survive; I believe it will. But it is to say that we are now facing perhaps the gravest political challenge in the history of our country.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the victory of the PQ in the Quebec election makes the debate over the country's future the overriding political issue today. I can only say that it is rather strange, in view of the importance of this crucial factor, that it has been relegated to such an obscure place in the Speech from the Throne itself.

But while the question of Quebec is taking centre stage today in the country, only the most naive would ignore the fact that there is a profound alienation in western Canada. That's not to suggest that the people of the west are going to run out and join this new nationalist party. But it is to say that wherever you go there is a sense of frustration, and a feeling somehow that western Canada is being left out.

Economic reasons are important, Mr. Speaker. There is no question of that. The issue of freight rates, tariffs: the questions have been debated in western legislatures since the development of the west. But I suggest there are other reasons as well that the alienation exists. One of the reasons is just that feeling of being left out.

In debate over Canada's future during the 1960s we saw the emergence of the arguments between Upper and Lower Canada as to the future of this country. Mr. Speaker, Canada is more than Upper and Lower Canada. Canada includes the Atlantic region, and it includes the west where the cultural mosaic has always been rather more important to our way of life than perhaps [to] the rest of Canada. What I'm saying, then, is that there is in western Canada a feeling that if the debate is going to take place in this country about whither Canada, the people of this region want to have their say. That being the case, Mr. Speaker, it is rather surprising that this crucial issue was relegated to page 20 of the first throne speech where we would have an opportunity to enter this important debate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in addressing the question of whither Canada, it seems to me there are probably three things we should at all costs avoid being trapped into doing. The first is any attempt to quarantine the province of Quebec because we don't agree with the PQ government's views on separatism.

There is no question: I am sure the vast majority of Albertans and certainly everyone in this Assembly would oppose the independence of Quebec and would very much want to see the people of Quebec stay in Canada. But, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me it is wrong for us in any way, shape, or form to appear to be shying away from full participation with Quebec, simply because one of the planks of that governing party's platform is independence.

I think it would be wiser to adopt the rather sensible course taken by premiers Blakeney, Schreyer, and Davis, who have said, we disagree strongly with Mr. Levesque and his separatist views, but we are going to extend the hand of co-operation. We are going to provide an exchange of ideas and views and help. We are not going to penalize the people of Quebec or ostracize or quarantine them because we disagree with one particular aspect of their governing party's approach to Canada, however important that

may be.

I raise that, Mr. Speaker, because I was a little concerned the other day when the Premier was asked by a newsman whether or not we would see \$50 million from the heritage trust fund being loaned to Quebec. And the Premier said no, not unless we were sure they would remain in Canada. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think that is the wrong approach to take.

I think the last thing we in the rest of Canada should be doing — certainly any of us who listened carefully to the Prime Minister's eloquent speeches of last week — is preaching or handing out ultimatums. We should be prepared, Mr. Speaker, to look at this important issue in a spirit of reconciliation, friendship, and co-operation. We are not going to win the minds of the people of Quebec by a lot of pompous talk here in Alberta about, we're not going to invest a dime unless we have a lead-pipe guarantee that you're going to stay in the country.

The second mistake it seems to me we must avoid making is the rather simplistic argument I have heard from a number of people — but particularly from the present leader of the federal Tory party — that all our problems in Canada would be solved if we simply decentralized on a massive basis. It is rather interesting to contrast what the current leader of the Tory party is saying with the rather more reasoned views of Mr. Diefenbaker, former Prime Minister and past leader of the Tory party, who has made it pretty clear — and indeed even yesterday in Nova Scotia made it clear to the Nova Scotia Legislature — that moves in the direction of decentralization, if overdone, Mr. Speaker, would mean not one Canada but 10 Canadas; an undermining of federal authority to the point where we would not have an effective leadership, an effective sense of national identity at all.

The third thing it seems to me we have to look at, Mr. Speaker, is that we must state the case for the west in positive terms, not simply take narrow legalistic views on matters as they are raised. I must say that I listened to the debate on the constitutional amending formula and heard members across the other way predict dire consequences, in the fact that I had opposed that motion. I have not received one single letter of complaint on that question. As a matter of fact, I have received a number of letters supporting my opposition to that resolution, but not one single letter of protest. Most of us in public life would realize, Mr. Speaker, that if the public strongly disagree with you, they will make their views known. Well, Mr. Speaker, on this question of the legalistic resolution that we passed last fall, there really wasn't that much fire in the heather.

We've got to base our argument, our case for the west if you like, not on the basis of a besieged, siege mentality but rather that we want to make federalism work for the west. With that in mind I have to say I am a little astonished that we are already beginning to move into what one might refer to as an Alberta isolationism.

Not too long ago, the Minister of Agriculture indicated that unless Alberta is able to up its quotas from CEMA, it should withdraw from the federal egg marketing agreement.

[applause]

I see there is some applause for that proposal. But first of all, 78 per cent of the producers in a vote last year approved orderly marketing. Secondly, CEMA

was developed to end the chicken-and-egg war that was a divisive question in federal/provincial and particularly interprovincial relations a number of years back. Thirdly, there are periodic opportunities to expand the quotas under the CEMA agreement. And fourthly, the present agreement was signed by the minister, last July I believe. But now we're rattling the sabres again, and we're going to pull out of CEMA. We're going to renew the chicken-and-egg war as our contribution to the fight to keep Canada together.

Mr. Speaker, that's not in the tradition of Diefenbaker. It's not the sense, the dream, the hope we saw in '57 and '58 by the then leader of the Tory party. He was always a believer in making federalism work for the west, and that has to be the approach we take in the national debate in the years ahead. So, Mr. Speaker, I find we have not begun very well, particularly when one looks at just a few words on this matter relegated to the very end of the Speech from the Throne.

Let me turn from there to the question of just reviewing the state of the province. As I look at past statements in the Legislature, as I read carefully the Speech from the Throne, I see a slightly different tone. Oh, the same backslapping "we'll take credit for everything" attitude is there. That will always be there as long as this government is in office — you know, taking credit for the Arabs pushing up the price of oil, taking credit when the sun shines. When the rain comes at the right time this spring, they'll take credit for that. If it doesn't, it'll be the fault of the Toronto NDP.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that when one looks at the record, all one can conclude is that, quite frankly, the grand design is coming unravelled. Yes, the new west — so much we heard last year about the power of the new west — well, it looks like the new west is in retreat.

Let me just examine that question for a moment or two. Take first of all the question of petrochemical development. There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that our petrochemical industry is in some trouble. Small wonder we had the Premier going down to the United States in an effort to encourage additional export of natural gas in exchange for lower petrochemical tariffs.

But if one looks at the latest available information, two rather crucial things are obvious. Crucial point number one: now that Petrosar is a fait accompli, the Canadian market is going to be taken up by the production from that particular complex. So the only place a world-scale petrochemical industry in Alberta could possibly market its products would be in the United States. No question about that. No argument about that.

But the difficulty, Mr. Speaker, is that the evidence indicates that not only is there a surplus in American petrochemical supplies but worse than that, according to some circles, an over investment which means that that surplus today will be a surplus five years from now, 10 years from now, 20 years from now.

As a matter of fact, that attitude that maybe petrochemicals aren't the hope of the future came through rather well in the Premier's year-end interview, which was carried in the *Edmonton Journal*. The Premier said that really he doesn't expect the petrochemical industry to go through all the stages. Now

that we've got stage one, perhaps we won't be able to get to stage two, three, or four. And of course we all know the real future, where you get the myriad of jobs in the petrochemical industry, is not stage one. It's in stage three or four. It's as you move out from the basic plants that you really create the dream of employment that comes from a world-scale petrochemical industry. So that part of the industrial dream is, if not in tatters, at least showing a little wear.

What about oil sands development? I remember in 1973 the optimism of this government over oil sands development. We even had the hon. Minister of Housing, who was then minister of energy I think, talking at one time about a number of plants in the Fort McMurray region. That's when everyone was buoyant and optimistic, and some people were talking about 20 plants by the year 2000. We had them move in rapidly so we'd get ahead of the Americans, who were going to develop the oil shales overnight.

Well, Mr. Speaker, at that time we were told that it wasn't too long before we were going to get a major policy statement on oil sands development. But the policy statement never came. It was delayed and delayed, and now we have an oil sands policy of playing it by ear. I gather there's a bit of a division in the ranks across the way over whether we should invest more money in an expanded oil sands venture, the Syncrude venture, or emphasize shoring up our petrochemical industry instead. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the sense of purpose, the confidence, and the emphatic sense of direction that one saw three or four years ago no longer exist.

What about agriculture, the other part of the industrial dream? Let me say here, because I want it made abundantly clear, that I fully support the joint submission on agricultural tariffs and trade made by the three prairie provinces to the GATT negotiators. Let me also say that I applaud the opportunity to debate the Alberta proposals before GATT in this Legislative Assembly. No question about the importance of the GATT negotiations to all of us. I fully support the discussions within the Alberta Legislature on that subject.

However, on the question of international trade there are several important "buts". They relate to the future of the agricultural and industrial development of this province. I think the first "however" is that we should learn the lessons from the Alberta Export Agency. My heavens, we should learn the lessons.

I remember in 1972 the government in the first Speech from the Throne underlined international marketing. That was one of the things. Credit, credit to the farmers, more money to the farmers — and market initiatives. Well we've found in the Alberta Export Agency example that it didn't quite work out the way we hoped. One of the strong arguments the National Farmers Union is proposing for an inquiry is not because there's any sense of wrongdoing, but because we've got to find out what went wrong with the Export Agency if we are not to repeat those same errors in developing our new international marketing thrust.

Mr. Speaker, while I support joint prairie initiatives on lowering rural tariffs and even certain bilateral tariffs with the United States, and I agree that we should be debating this matter in the Legislature, I

want to stand in my place and clearly oppose certain aspects of international trade matters in the last three or four months. One was the proposal outlined on October 19 by the hon. Premier. In response to a question he said, and he's talking about petrochemical industries:

They have a gap period in terms of their natural gas needs, and we felt that with . . . new supplies being discovered in Alberta today it might be possible to trade off in terms of jobs to provide better assurance of natural gas supply in north-western United States and in northern California, on the basis that they would strengthen and improve our position of jobs in Alberta by reducing on a bilateral basis petrochemical tariffs into the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier was saying that we should be working out, if you like, a *quid pro quo* with the Americans: more natural gas in return for lower petrochemical tariffs. Mr. Speaker, I thought that battle had been won in Canada. I thought Canadians had come to the conclusion that we should gradually, not turn off the taps of export — honor our existing agreements — but at least not get into any more long-term export contracts, that these very limited supplies of natural resources . . .

As a matter of fact, I have a speech here from the Premier where he talked about 10 years in which Alberta can diversify its economy because that's how much non-renewable resources we have. One can argue how many there are. One can argue what the rate of development is. But it's obvious that there is a very severe limitation. I would say that any further export at this time, particularly to get some sort of deal on petrochemical tariffs, is really unwise. Why do it? Because, you know, the more gas we export, the sooner we run out of natural gas. And the sooner we run out of natural gas, the sooner we no longer have any feedstock for our petrochemical industry, or we have to turn to an extremely expensive feedstock such as the gasification of coal that the Member for Drumheller raised in the question period today. An engineering possibility, but at this stage one which would be so expensive economically that it's doubtful we'd be able to compete in the markets of the northwestern United States.

There's one other point about the Premier's answers on October 19, 1976 that concerned me perhaps even more. It was in response to Mr. Clark. I remember the day very clearly because all the back-benchers became extremely enthused and pounded their desks with great vigor, as a matter of fact more vigor than I normally see from my honorable friends in the House. In any event, the Premier said:

The approach we should make is to see wherever we possibly can to get support to change a fundamental position by the Government of Canada, which is to tie everything into the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. As far as I am concerned . . .

and this is the operative statement

I intend to talk to the United States Ambassador to Canada, to the Canadian Ambassador to the United States, to governors, to congressmen, to senators, to members of parliament, to leaders of the opposition, to other premiers. I intend to use everything I can to make a basic change of policy.

Well, that won the applause of the House, but I

wonder how many people considered what it meant to talk to the United States Ambassador to Canada, to governors, to congressmen, to senators, to try to change the domestic policy of Canada. I have no objection if the Premier wants to talk to leaders of the opposition in this country. I have no objection if he wants to camp out, set up a tent like the NFU did in front of Margaret's swimming pool, and bring his attention to the Prime Minister that way.

I have no intention of criticizing any effort to fundamentally change tariff policy within this country. But I do object, Mr. Speaker, to the suggestion that we would be going abroad to encourage people in other countries to bring pressure on the government of Canada to change its policy. We as Canadians must fight our battles in Canada. That's why I support the joint submission of the prairie provinces on the GATT talks. That's perfectly correct. It's a totally different thing to try to encourage politicians in other countries to lobby the government of Canada. That would be just as true if it were Mr. Lougheed in Alberta, Mr. Blakeney in Saskatchewan, Mr. Schreyer in Manitoba, or Mr. Levesque in Quebec.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's just move from that question to examine the issue of agriculture in Alberta. We hear so much about agriculture, but one always gets the impression the rhetoric is a little stronger than the action. For example, we've had no significant new agricultural research program announced provincially, but in the last two years we have committed, first, \$100 million and then, with the heritage fund in the fall, another \$40 million to oil sands research, and now in this Speech from the Throne another \$100 million to conventional energy research, the bulk of which we funnelled into the oil industry. That's almost \$240 million, Mr. Speaker, excluding a little bit that will be spent on coal, and maybe \$1,000 here or there on a windmill. But the bulk of it is going to be spent — and the minister knows, he's laughing — on research by the energy industry.

I can only assume the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources has more clout in the cabinet, because he's getting the money for his department and the hon. Minister of Agriculture is getting the good words. But you know, I think the farmers would be more interested in the money and letting the oil companies have the good words.

In looking at the question of agricultural development in Alberta, it seems to me that the Speech from the Throne really doesn't deal effectively with three rather important questions: number one, we're side-stepping the question of land transfer. We've had the report of the Land Use Forum, but there is still no commitment in this session to proceed with action to make sure that only Canadian citizens or landed immigrants will own land in this province.

I might just point out, Mr. Speaker, that there is no longer any excuse for not legislating. The changes in the Canadian Citizenship Act, proclaimed a few days ago, now make it perfectly proper and legal for the province to move in this area. Heaven knows, we can't say we need to study it any more, Mr. Speaker. We had the Select Committee on Foreign Ownership studying this matter for a year. Then the Land Use Forum had roving hearings all over the province to discuss this matter. It has been discussed, and it has been reviewed, and it has been studied; the question

now is whether we're going to see any action.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if we're serious about land transfer, making it possible for young Albertans to get into the business of farming, then we have to deal with this question of foreign ownership of land. There is no doubt in my mind as I travel around the province that the purchases of land by foreign concerns are not the only factor, but are a contributing factor to land prices increasing beyond the productive capacity of that land. That may be all right for the farmer who is selling out, but for young people getting into agriculture it's just not possible to pay \$700 or \$800 an acre for land — prices I've seen quoted in parts of this province — and ever, ever hope to make ends meet.

But the other question that isn't dealt with on this issue, Mr. Speaker, is the rather more important question we touched upon in 1974 when we had the debate over the repeal of The Coarse Grain Marketing Control Act, the debate which allowed Wheat Board control over intraprovincial — that is, sold within the boundaries of a province — as opposed to interprovincial traffic in grains. At that time I raised some concerns I intend to raise again. There's no doubt this government is really theoretically claiming to be neutral, but I really wonder what their commitment is to orderly marketing. If it is a commitment to orderly marketing, the Minister of Agriculture has repeatedly made it clear he doesn't believe in quota systems. We've heard that over and over again.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think one of the crucial issues in Canadian agriculture that will be settled in the next two or three years will be who's going to control the marketing of our grain products. Are we going to extend the principle of orderly marketing, as has been fought for by organized agriculture and supported by both major farm organizations in the province for many years, or are we going to slowly erode the authority and jurisdiction of The Canadian Wheat Board so that other forces can move in?

I just want to take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to say that the large international grain companies, the Dreyfuses, the Continentals, the Cargills, are not as well known as the big oil companies but, considering the importance of agriculture to the future of this province, it may well be they are more important to us in the long run than the major oil concerns. Let me say this: there are many people working for Cargill who are honest dedicated Albertans doing a great job as elevator agents.

But I don't think we should ignore what some of these companies have been up to elsewhere in the world. We shouldn't ignore what happened with the U.S. grain deal in 1972 where inside information was given to the international grain companies. The bonanza from that deal didn't go back to the farmers of the U.S. It went to the grain companies. We shouldn't ignore that the government of India at this point is suing the five major grain companies for a total of \$346 million and is alleging that the companies in question embezzled or took by fraud with intent to convert to their own use grain bought by India, or that a system of organized cheating based on short-weighting was also operated by these companies.

Mr. Speaker, over the years we have developed a system of orderly marketing, and we have seen the growth of the prairie pools. I think it would be

unfortunate at this time, when we should be battling to preserve orderly marketing, if we in any way appeared to open the door to large international concerns which base their operation on the world-wide interests of a multi-national operation in precisely the same way Standard Oil does. We've a lot of investment both in time and effort among our own rural people in building the principle of orderly marketing and in developing the pools. In my judgment any effort to undercut that work would be a serious mistake.

Another point I want to make deals with agricultural processing. Quite frankly, we've had a number of examples where agricultural processing plants have got themselves into some trouble. I think the major problem is freight rates. That's one of the reasons why I have said all along it would be far better for us in the west — I said this in 1973 and I've said it subsequently — to try to work out a *quid pro quo* on the question of freight rates in order to bring down freight rates on those renewable products we're going to have forever in return for a cushioning of prices on the non-renewable products which will someday run out.

Mr. Speaker, I see you have kindly advised me that I'm now to be paid time and a half and while I certainly welcome the opportunity, I will conclude my remarks by saying to the members of the Assembly that what one sees in reviewing the Speech from the Throne in 1977 is not that sense of confidence of a government that has clearly designated objectives and knows where it's going. Rather, we see a strategy which is tattered and torn and showing some very serious weaknesses.

Thank you.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, it is usual for all of us when we rise to take part in the reply to the Speech from the Throne to say how pleased we are to have this privilege within the House. I suppose it sometimes gets to be almost a monotonous cliché when we hear this repeated over and over again. But I do not think there is anything but a sense of pride and responsibility that we as members of this Assembly all have in the distinct honor given us to be chosen one of 75 people within this House to participate in the debates and the discussions from day to day, and to have a part in shaping the destiny of this province. It is with that sort of feeling, Mr. Speaker, that I rise once more to participate in this debate.

It is interesting to me, Mr. Speaker, to note that both the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview have made mention of the fact that the subject of national unity was relegated to page 20 of the Speech from the Throne. I wonder if they are indicating by these remarks that the format of the throne speech should be changed somewhat. Perhaps they expect us to have a prefix in there which says, all items within this speech are not necessarily in order of importance. Because there is no way you can distinguish in the manner of importance the many items which have to be included in the Speech from the Throne.

The Leader of the Opposition is not with us at the moment, but he made a complaint about the length of the speech and said something about quantity rather than quality. I have to ponder that, Mr. Speaker, because people who have read or listened to this

speech have spoken to me about what was in it since the day it was delivered and have said, "It didn't tell us enough. What is going to happen regarding libraries? What is going to happen regarding community resource centres?" I have to explain, of course, that these items will be coming up under legislation and the budget discussion, Mr. Speaker, but I have not heard anybody else complaining about the length of the speech.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Lieutenant-Governor of this province is to be commended and congratulated for many things, certainly the impression, the distinction he gave to this Assembly when he read this speech. When he entered the Assembly, dressed in his ancestral costume, it was a moment that will never be forgotten in the history of this province, commemorating as he did the sixth and seventh treaties signed 100 years ago. The way he communicated the speech under the trying conditions with which he had to cope at that time is also to be commended.

I think any criticisms we've had of this speech are totally unjustified, Mr. Speaker, because to me it indicates very, very clearly and very, very definitely the policies and plans this government intends to undertake. It also indicates a steadfastness of purpose in the directions this government intends to move.

When we look at certain parts of this speech — just to quote a couple of them, when we speak about education on page 4, agriculture on page 5, or other things in the speech — it indicates to me that as well, this government has the ability to introduce necessary flexibility into the planning for the future of this province. Because what is looked upon as proper, and the method, and the reasonable direction to go at one time may require changes six years later. I think that is indicated in the speech too.

All through the speech the theme is still the same, Mr. Speaker. The goals and objectives of this Progressive Conservative government remain first and foremost in the mind of this government. These goals and objectives, Mr. Speaker, as I see them, are to build and maintain a level of existence within this province, a quality of services within this province, and a quality of life within this province not just for today, not just for tomorrow, but for many generations and for many decades still to come.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend you on the conduct of your office. The continuous dedication you have shown to this Assembly and the many changes you have assisted in inaugurating or implementing in the conduct of the Assembly have raised the stature of this Legislature of Alberta to a foremost place within the nation. It is well known not only in the other legislatures of this country but also beyond the bounds of our nation. All this change in efficiency of operation, service to members and those sorts of things has been done while still keeping the traditions in this Legislature well within the parliamentary traditions of the Commonwealth. I think you are to be congratulated for that, Mr. Speaker.

I would also like to pay a tribute to the weekly newspapers of this province. In the Athabasca constituency which I represent I have found, and I'm sure many hon. members have also found, the weekly newspapers are very willing and anxious at all times to print factual information that government members or other members of this Legislature supply them

with. They are anxious that the people of this province should know what the proceedings of this House are, what is being done and what the expectations are. I think it is perhaps unfortunate in this capital city that we have a monopoly situation in the daily newspaper sphere, because I think it was very, very unfortunate that the excellent speeches given by the mover of the address and reply to the Speech from the Throne and the seconder just did not receive comprehensive coverage in the daily press. I think they really deserved it. There have been many good speeches in this throne debate, Mr. Speaker.

I have to wonder just what the Leader of the Opposition was referring to when he spoke to us about the characters from *The Wizard of Oz* and said this government doesn't indicate it has a heart. My idea of feelings of the heart — I suppose we all have different ones — is that you are concerned with people. When we look at the specific objectives outlined on page 3, we see they deal with such things as housing, shelter, health, and land resources, all concerning the people of Alberta. Certainly if we didn't have those sorts of feelings within our hearts, we wouldn't be concerned with what is happening in that respect. I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, that we are reassessing in this Legislature and this session some of the goals and objectives of our education system. I would have to emphasize and re-emphasize — and this has been done on other occasions by other members of this House — that money doesn't always solve everything. I feel maybe there should be some rearranging of our priorities in the field of education. Maybe there should be some reassessments. In the last few years we have introduced some programs dealing with learning disabilities. We have upgraded the programs dealing with special education. I feel these were excellent directions in which this government has moved.

These were very, very valuable programs. They brought very valuable assistance to many students in overcoming learning disabilities. It's unfortunate that 10 to 15 per cent of the students within this province — and students everywhere I guess — have some sort of learning disability, but it has been shown that by the proper implementation of remedial training and remedial action many of these can be overcome. Certainly many of these students have been brought back into the mainstream of education in the province through the types of programs we have introduced in the past. I think those types of programs have been very, very useful.

We will be discussing this topic, I know, at much greater length. We'll have opportunities, Mr. Speaker, as the session develops to talk about it further. I look forward with great anticipation to participating in such discussions.

I read with interest indications of where we are heading in the matter of hospital care. I couldn't help but notice in the question period today what a problem this becomes as the years go on. This problem exists not only in hospitals and medical care but in every department of government, because escalating costs are something we cannot anticipate. Therefore it does require some adjustment as time goes on. But this is an ongoing program. I know the hon. minister has indicated on other occasions that these programs have long-range planning behind them. This of course is essential. I think it's very essential in the

area of extended care because, Mr. Speaker, we have continued facilities for senior citizens and better medical care of all kinds. In this way we're getting more longevity, and so we have greater need for extended care facilities in many parts of the province — not only in my constituency where they're pretty acute, but in other places as well.

Of course I was very, very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to see that under energy and natural resources we are going to be able to move in the direction of starting a new inventory on our forest resources in this province. This is long overdue, Mr. Speaker. In fact it has never existed in the proper sense. Some inventory has been made. It has been a sort of patchwork effort.

When the forest management policies came into effect in 1976, the government was not properly prepared to allocate timber on a basis of what they knew actually existed. There have been attempts to upgrade the inventory from that time on. But it is a key at this time, Mr. Speaker. If the projections are correct for forest resources and timber in this nation, we'll be moving into a period in the 1980s when the regeneration of timber will not be keeping up with the demand. So I think it's vital that we find out what we have in the way of timber and that we upgrade our management policies and our regeneration, harvesting, and reforestation procedures. I expect we'll be talking about that as well later on in the session, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to touch on one other area within the speech itself, Mr. Speaker, the matter of transportation. Here again, as in hospitals and medical care, we have the same problem of escalating road costs and construction costs. No matter how much money we seem to be able to put into the budgets, I'm sure the hon. Minister for Transportation and Deputy Premier will agree it's never enough, Mr. Speaker. We find this particularly so in the northern regions of the province where road construction costs are very, very high.

Over the past four or five years there has been a remarkable increase in the construction of primary highways, secondary highways, assistance to counties, M.D.s, improvement districts, and so on in district roads within the province. It's been absolutely astounding, but there's still a great deal to be done. I am sure we all feel that we have to be patient because it can't all be done at once. I always try to tell my people, Mr. Speaker, once we construct, build, and pave a mile of road, that's one more we have under our belt. And we don't have to do it again if it's done properly the first time, and that's very important.

The airport program has already had a substantial impact on this province, Mr. Speaker. A definite awareness is starting to develop of its importance in the future transportation in the province. I think that program is going to be looked upon in the future as a tremendous milestone in the development of Alberta in many respects.

Because it was placed at the end of the speech on page 20, Mr. Speaker, I would now like to make some references to national unity. This was brought out in the discussion by both the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview. In fact, Mr. Speaker, in his speech the Leader of the Opposition came out with the phrase "my fellow Canadians", and it was not like the John Diefenbaker tradition at

all.

But I think there has been some attempt in both speeches I have mentioned to try to create the impression and to try to spread the sort of feeling, if possible in this province, that there is a wedge between this province and Quebec. When the Leader of the Opposition says in his remarks, "... Alberta has reached a new plateau in the opportunities available to the people of this province within Canada", I'm sure we can't help but agree with that. But when he says, "For I don't believe, Mr. Speaker, that the majority of Albertans want Quebec out of Confederation", I'm not sure what the connotation has to be. Why is this introduced into his discussion at all? Where did he ever get the idea that anybody in Alberta wants 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." I wonder where he could find a member of this Assembly or anyone else who would argue with that point of view. I cannot see why he has to introduce it in his speech or suggest that it was not included in the Speech from the Throne.

Why do we have to reaffirm this sort of thing? That is something basic to all of us as Canadians. We are all part of this country and I'm sure we hope we will remain part of this country, Mr. Speaker. I don't think there's a member of this House who would want to say, I don't want Quebec in Confederation. I'm sure there isn't. So I really can't see why he has to introduce that into the debate at all.

Now adding a little fuel to the fire, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview has suggested, Mr. Speaker, that when the Premier was interviewed by the press about the loan this province made to Newfoundland, and asked, would you make a similar loan to Quebec, the Premier, according to the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, replied, "only if I was assured they would remain in Confederation." The Member for Spirit River-Fairview tries to use that, I suppose in some derogatory sense, as a remark that should not have been made. That indicates he is not fully aware of the terms of The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act which says that we can make investments under the Canadian section to provinces in Canada or to Canada, but we can't make investments outside Canada. So unless we were assured Quebec was going to remain within Confederation, there would be no way such a loan could be made under the present statutes. And that's only a logical answer to have to give.

I think there was some suggestion by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview that we were trying to assist in some way in quarantining Quebec. I don't know where this arrived. I think there was some suggestion in both those speeches, Mr. Speaker, that we should have come out and trumpeted the fact that we are very concerned about what is going on in Quebec, and that we definitely want Quebec in Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, I have to think about the night, after the Prime Minister made his speech to the Congress and members of the Senate of the United States, he was interviewed by newspaper reporters. Reporter after reporter talked to him about this, and he indicated that he had some concern, and naturally as the

federal leader he had to do this. But then they turned to members of the Senate, and they tried to get them to comment on what they thought about it. They said they wouldn't like to see it, but it was something they didn't want to get involved in. I'm sure none of us want to see it, definitely we don't want to see it, but I don't think it is a topic that should be included in the Speech from the Throne in this or any other province.

So because this was mentioned on page 20 of the Speech from the Throne . . . You know, the Leader of the Opposition isn't with us now, but he was quite a ballplayer in his younger days. In fact I suppose he's in pretty good physical shape right now, Mr. Speaker. He could maybe do pretty well at it still. I'm sure he must remember times when he was involved in baseball games when perhaps one or both of the pitchers had had a very exciting game, and they came down inning after inning, inning after inning, scoreless, doing a tremendous job. Then in the final inning somebody knocked a home run out of the park and won the ball game, right at the end of the game. Now that's the one who would get the publicity, isn't it, the fellow who hit the home run.

So if we put this right at the end of the speech, that's where it's going to make its impact, Mr. Speaker. We look at page 20. What it says is pretty important. We all know it so well: "My government reaffirms its commitment on behalf of our citizens to national unity." What could be plainer than that? "The next few years will obviously be important ones for the future of Canada and the preservation of its federal system." That's what we're stating we believe, Mr. Speaker. "Confederation has proven to be remarkably flexible in the past, and my government has every confidence in the future of the country." That's pretty plain too. And finally, "My government believes that the future depends on the continuation of strong provinces and recognition of the diversity which has enriched our country." This of course will go back to the Premier's Motion No. 3 which we debated last November, which reaffirmed our stand within Confederation and the equality of the provinces.

But that wasn't really the only reference as far as national unity is concerned within the speech. There are a couple of other things there which indicated we were thinking about it too. On page 3 you can find something which says, Mr. Speaker, "Alberta has been a firm supporter of the national effort to reduce inflation." That's a support for a national policy, too. That restraint which we have had in Alberta, Mr. Speaker and members of this Assembly, I would say has been much more difficult than in any other province in Canada because [of] the state of our finances within this province compared to many of the other provinces. But we have gone along with that program because it was in the national interest.

When we refer too, on page 9, to "Alberta's significant submissions to Canada's tariff and trade negotiators" — these are going to be presented to the Legislature — it's not beyond and outside the bounds of the national interest, it's in the interest of everyone in this country that we should publicize what we have here in the way of production. We are not going out to make trades and deals outside of the federal scene. But we're going to let people know what we have here so that they can come shopping to our country and make their own arrangements as far as that's

concerned.

I think one of the more significant things — and we have mentioned this already — was the Premier's announcement the other day regarding the 21-year loan to Newfoundland which over a period of time will bring us back hundreds of millions of dollars in interest if you compound it. But as he made that announcement within the House, Mr. Speaker, he said it's a reaffirmation of the confidence Albertans have in the future of this nation.

What more? Where do the Leader of the Opposition and the member from Spirit River-Fairview have the audacity to stand up in this House and try to indicate that the members of this government are not concerned with national unity? I just can't believe it. I just can't. But they are. There are those kinds of people who will suggest that our Premier and our government would take a selfish view, an isolationist view, in our attitude and our participation in Confederation.

I don't know what it takes, Mr. Speaker, to convince those who would try to promote such a view that it's entirely false, that it's entirely misleading, that it's just completely non-factual.

Well, what else can you say? You know, you don't want to use those very vicious words. But it just isn't true. Because our Premier, our Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, and other members of the Executive Council have gone to conferences throughout the nation, time and time again, and reaffirmed this government's belief in Confederation and national unity, at the same time emphasizing equality for each province. No matter what your geographic location, no matter what your population, and no matter what other aspects there are, every province should have equal rights. Mr. Speaker, I want to leave my remarks with that very, very clearly in mind. I believe as a member of this government, and I am sure my colleagues share with me, that we have a true, complete, and ongoing faith in the unity of this nation, and that no one in this province has the right to stand in this House and try to say that we do not.

.....

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that I may have made an error in responding to one of the questions by the hon. Member for Drumheller this afternoon. I indicated, I believe, that the heating value of the gas produced in the gasification process was 100 BTU/cubic foot of coal. It should have read that the heating value of the gas produced in the gasification process is 100 BTU/cubic foot.

Thank you.

MR. APPLEBY: Point of order. I believe perhaps in my remarks I may have said that prior to 1976 the province did not have a proper inventory of forest resources. I should have said 1966.

Thank you.

.....

MR. KIDD: Mr. Speaker, it's a privilege for me today to participate in this throne speech debate. I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the throne speech, the hon. Member for Lloydminster,



and the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff, respectively. In my view they have set a standard for debate which adds prestige and distinction to the Alberta Legislature. However, I'm afraid the only major similarity between their distinguished addresses and my own is that we'll both receive equal time from the press.

Mr. Speaker, to me the opening of the Legislature was a very emotional experience. How appropriate it was to have that distinguished gentleman, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Alberta, attired in full-dress Indian regalia, and on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of the signing of treaties nos. 6 and 7. Perhaps this occasion had special significance for me since my father was an honorary chief of the Stoneys, the first to my knowledge. Further, I have in my possession a peace pipe, which I believe was carried by one of the chiefs at that historic treaty signing ceremony.

Mr. Speaker, these are truly uneasy times in Canada, in North America, and in the world. We are uneasy in Canada about our national unity, about our economic health, and perhaps more than anything else about the lack of clear guidelines for our future. This winter as never before, our great neighbors to the south have been brought to the realization of their vulnerability regarding supplies of oil and gas. That very bad winter in the eastern states that we heard so much about in the press really brought home to many citizens of the United States for the very first time that they were short of oil and gas.

In the world, Mr. Speaker, all civilized peoples are concerned and uneasy about the evidence of brutality and savagery in a certain African state, about the uncertain future for underdeveloped nations, and certainly about the decline of nations that were once great.

However, Mr. Speaker, as individual Albertans and as members of the Legislature in Alberta, I believe our best response to these concerns is to act responsibly, both collectively and as individuals. In my view the Speech from the Throne implicitly demonstrates the responsible nature of this government, and surely indicates that we have clear plans for the future of this province. What could be more important to the people of this province than the priorities outlined in the Speech from the Throne: education, housing, health, land resources, and markets for our produce. Surely the frank and honest statement that our economy relies far too much on income from our petroleum resources, and that we must diversify, constitutes exemplary responsibility.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the government of this province is setting an example, and in my view providing a model of good government for all Canada. Our Premier is surely providing the leadership to make that possible.

Mr. Speaker, being of a very sympathetic nature, it's with a certain degree of sorrow that I observe the antics of the hon. Leader of the Opposition as he attempts to keep up with our Premier. The Premier, being so far ahead at most times, is lost to the hon. opposition leader's view by the very curvature of the earth.

Mr. Speaker, as stated, I welcome the emphasis being placed on education as expressed in the throne speech. I do believe, however, that we must never forget one of the great strengths of our educational

system, something we could overlook in the heat of debate; that is, the knowledge, expertise, and dedication of the teachers in this province to their profession.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works on the efficient and vigorous manner in which he has administered the activities within his portfolio. A glance at housing starts across Canada indicates the leadership of Alberta in the housing field. If you want visual proof, visit Airdrie, Canmore, and Cochrane, which happen to be in my constituency. I'm sure it's the same in many other towns in other members' constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, a word about Hospitals and Medical Care. I continue to be amazed at the lack of publicity and public excitement about such things as the starts we're making on projects such as the Alberta Health Sciences Centre and the Alberta Children's Hospital in Calgary. What we're looking at in the Alberta health sciences centre is a health centre that will equal and better Mayo in Rochester. We're looking at something that, a few years down the road, I'm sure we'll have people visiting from all over Canada, if not all over the world. When I heard today in the question period some quibbling questions to the hon. Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care about normal budgetary control measures, it made me think of that old statement, "Unto him who hath done some work, unto him shall the works be given".

Mr. Speaker, in Agriculture I welcome the revised beginner farmer program and the new father/son lending program. I think they constitute a very important step forward to combat the difficulties of our young farmers in getting started.

We talked about agricultural research today. The hon. member from Fairview — that's where he comes from, I think — said we weren't doing enough. Well, we're just about completing a lab in Airdrie; I look forward to its completion.

Mr. Speaker, concerning Energy and Natural Resources, the other day the Premier was very modest, in my view, in regard to the gas reserves that have been found through our exploration incentive program. I believe the reserves that have been found, particularly in the foothills, can justly be termed substantial.

In the comments under Energy and Natural Resources, I'd like to discuss the Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority in two aspects. I think the comments are correct. I would add two things. I think one of the things that has happened through the funds in that authority is to initiate and put to work a lot of brain-power that's in the universities. I think our university research program is very significant. We've got a lot of brain-power going to work there.

The other thing is that as far as the deep-seated recovery of oil is concerned, I'm very encouraged. I wouldn't for one minute let anyone here think there is a short-term program. But I believe, looking down the road 10 or 15 years, that we've made starts that are going to recover tremendous quantities of oil in that program. I believe one other thing is part of what we were asked to do; that is, to spend money on some surface mining techniques, and we have, in the sense that there can be a great breakthrough in surface mining techniques. Indeed, rather than sho-

veiling up the tar sands and moving them on a belt back to a big plant and then getting your bitumen, if you can produce bitumen right at the very face, I think that, as it develops, will constitute one of the biggest breakthroughs in our tar sands development.

Mr. Speaker, we talked about national unity. I think it has been overlooked that one of the greatest contributions we're making to national unity is to spend the money we're spending in the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority — \$100 million plus. It will be more than that when we're through. But on a comparative basis, based on our population, the federal government should be spending \$1.5 billion. Further on that point, you might say, oh, that's just a selfish thing we're doing, we need the oil. That isn't true. We can produce all the oil we need simply from surface mining.

Mr. Speaker, concerning Public Lands, I think this is a very significant statement: "Land-use zoning in the eastern slopes is now almost completed." Then further, "A comprehensive policy statement on the management and administration of public lands will be developed during the year". That is a very, very significant sentence for my constituency and for many other rural constituencies. I'm certain the associate minister, in his consideration of these matters, will weigh carefully the effect changes may have on small ranchers who depend on grazing in the forest reserves for their very livelihood.

I have to say something about Municipal Affairs because my constituency — you know it covers everything in the world, it's a little bit of Alberta. I've got lots of small landholders. You name it, I've got it.

One of the things I must say here is that I'm looking forward, on their behalf, to the determinations of the Provincial-Municipal Finance Council. The method of assessment of lands needs revision and has for many years. As it is, it's not uniform and it's not just. I will say this: for my part, I favor the taxation of farm residences and one or two acres around them at or near market value, and the remainder of the land at low agricultural value. It's a simple process, but I think it makes a lot of sense.

Mr. Speaker, under Environment I think one thing suggested here is extremely important. It's a small thing; the reclamation of lands, particularly abandoned gravel pits — they're all over the place. I think an extremely important comment is made here.

Transportation: I'm sorry the minister isn't here, because every year I make it a point of telling him about that narrow, dangerous, winding road between Exshaw and Canmore. I'm sure he will be very unhappy to have missed my comments this year. But the road is still there that same way.

Mr. Speaker, I spent some time in Phoenix this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: Good for you.

MR. KIDD: I drove down to Phoenix . . .

DR. BUCK: The gas is cheaper.

MR. KIDD: . . . and the gas is a little cheaper — but not much, just in some places. But the speed limit was 55 mph. This is an old chestnut, but I drove and I compared — I broke the speed limit on those large, long stretches of road. I did it so I could compare my

gas consumption. Between 55 and 65 the gas consumption increased between 15 and 20 per cent on my car.

Now, I think there are two aspects here. Here we have a vast country below us, our big neighbor to the south, that big giant which has a 55 mph speed limit. They are concerned about their energy. How long can we be an anomaly in this country, in Alberta, and say oh, to heck with you guys, we'll drive at 70. It's got to change. I think it's coming, and we'd better look forward to it. I may have a lot of trouble with all my constituents on that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Drive a smaller car.

MR. KIDD: Under Recreation, Parks and Wildlife: I'd like to go on record that my constituents in Canmore are one hundred per cent behind a development up the Spray, sometimes called the Assiniboia project. They're behind it. So if the minister were in place there, I would say let's get going fellas, we want you to get that thing done.

Culture. We talked about national unity. I think we're seeing in Alberta a contribution toward national unity at the grass-roots level in what we're doing in the Department of Culture. I would certainly commend the minister for the good work he's done in making ethnic groups retain their own ways but still be proud to be Canadians and welcome to Canada as Albertans. I think that is the real grass-roots part of national unity that somehow down the road, over the years, we failed to do in Quebec.

Utilities and Telephones: I didn't want to miss the hon. minister on this one, because he's getting a lot of flak on it. But I just want to say there is one gas co-op, called the Cochrane Lake Gas Co-op, and they've been managed, well-managed, in an efficient way. They have not exceeded their \$3,000 per member cost.

DR. BUCK: They are unique.

MR. KIDD: There are a lot of good people down there, Walter. And the price they're selling their gas at is \$1 per MCF, a darn sight better price than they're paying in Edmonton and Calgary right today, and a heck of a lot better than the \$2.38 they would have to pay if they were using propane. I think our people are very happy they've got natural gas at that price, and there should be a lot of other people happy in Alberta since we're the only province — the only province — that has natural gas throughout our rural areas.

DR. BUCK: Did you get any other letters, Fred?

MR. KIDD: I've got lots of letters, good ones. You know, I welcome these little flies so they can be embedded in the fluid amber of my prose. [laughter]

AN HON. MEMBER: Say it again.

MR. KIDD: Say it again? Do you really want to hear it? I'll say it some other time.

Mr. Speaker, I've enjoyed this discussion. [laughter]

Oh, just one little thing. This is kind of serious. It brings out the engineer in me. I read in Government Services and Public Works, "There will be greater

emphasis on the use of automatic devices to reduce energy consumption." I hope they're using thermography. I suggest you look at the January issue of *Engineering Digest*. It's a beautiful method. Infra-red sensing is used, and you take photographs. They've been doing it in Europe for years. Are we doing it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yeah.

MR. KIDD: Okay.

Mr. Speaker, I've really enjoyed this discussion. I appreciate the privilege of being able to stand up here. I certainly enjoyed the heckling by some of the fellows. They're not too competent at it, but I enjoyed it. Thank you very much.

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a real pleasure to participate in the throne speech [debate]. At the outset, I would also like to commend the mover of the motion to accept the Lieutenant-Governor's speech, the hon. Member for Lloydminster, who so eloquently presented his address.

Since the text of this throne speech is somewhat different than it has been over the past years, I think my brief address will also be somewhat different. Every year I seem to have some things to say about the Vegreville constituency. Yet every year it is something different. I never repeat anything, and I find it very hard to finish.

The Vegreville constituency has several areas of real importance and information. It is truly a constituency which is unique. Vegreville was incorporated into a village in May 1906. It was incorporated into a town in August 1906. Also, it was considered as a place for the capital city and the Legislature Building.

I have learned this recently, and I'm going to take the privilege, Mr. Speaker, to read a little portion of this. I am sure it is going to be very informative to many.

Edmonton is the capital of Alberta, but let us not be complacent. A smidgen of wary vigilance will always be in order. Edmonton still is only a provisional capital. A determined government could move it somewhere else. It would take an extremely determined government, of course, but that's how the statute reads. Alberta was erected — that's the word — in 1905 by a parliamentary device called the Alberta Act. Saskatchewan was erected simultaneously by a device called the Saskatchewan Act. Now since Regina has been capital of the Northwest Territories and since Queen Victoria herself had named it so, there was no argument about Regina's continuing as capital of the province. But there was plenty of argument in Alberta, which had no tradition in the matter. The arguments were so plentiful and so heated that Parliament shied away from making a firm decision. The Alberta Act made Edmonton temporary capital only, and said in effect, as they say in Madison Square Gardens, may the better contestant emerge victorious. In the view of Calgary, Banff, Vegreville, Cochrane, Lacombe, Red Deer, Wetaskiwin, and Athabasca they were better contestants than Edmonton. Claimants to the title of capital bombarded members of the federal Parliament with letters, delegations, and editorials.

And here it comes. Vegreville, with a population of 78, was a vigorous contender, with several arresting arguments based on the climate. It was very healthy.

Vegreville air was the best, having more ozone than air in other towns. There was so much ozone that people suffering from tuberculosis, asthma, rheumatism, and malaria had been greatly improved if not downright cured by residence there. Vegreville had an open air rink, and three masquerade balls had been held out in the open there the previous winter. In fact the winter climate was the clincher in Vegreville's claim. The town was farther from the mountains and therefore beyond the range of chinooks. Horsedrawn sleighs would bog down when chinooks turned the snow to slush. Vegreville was not vulnerable to attacks from chinooks and was therefore the logical site for the capital. Attacks were [part of] Banff's aspirations. Banff could be fortified best in time of war. The capital would necessarily be the centre of the university education, and the mountains of Banff would be very educational.

It seemed that the contentious area in the decision was that the legislative building and the capital had to be close to the North Saskatchewan River, and that's where Vegreville lost out. [laughter] However, with modern technology, if this was taking place today, I'm sure it wouldn't be too hard to either move the North Saskatchewan River by Vegreville or move Vegreville by the river.

This year Vegreville will be celebrating the seventieth anniversary of their Chamber of Commerce. One year after their incorporation, they formed a chamber of commerce, which I feel is one of the strongest in this province today. Last year, when the Alberta Chamber of Commerce presented its brief to the cabinet with some statements that may have been irrelevant, the Vegreville Chamber of Commerce immediately notified the Alberta chamber that they were resentful of some of those statements, and that they were no part of it. I may say that just because of the chamber, the way it is, it is doing one of the better works of any community.

The Vermilion River has been quite an issue over the last few years. To those of you who have known or seen it, back in 1974 in the spring the Vermilion River flooded its banks, and many millions of dollars of damage was created. The hospitals, the nursing home, the auxiliary hospital, and many homes had to be vacated. It was a terrible scene. The Premier, the Minister of the Environment of the day, and the Minister of Lands and Forests of that time came out. The Premier made a commitment, even though it was known that the river flooded its banks over the past 70 years, that something will be done. This year there has been a commitment from the Department of the Environment by the hon. minister that the final phase is going to be done. I'm sure that many people will be resting much easier.

Another area of concern that took place in the constituency was the proposed Calgary Power plant at Dodds and Ryley. Because that area is represented to some extent by me, the villages of Ryley and Holden were looking forward to this plant to go ahead. They saw that there would have been an increased population, recreation would have been extended, and they were sort of assured of a good water supply because water would have had to be brought in from the North Saskatchewan River. However, there had been quite a few farmers who opposed this. Regardless of what decision was made, because I was in a position where I serve all the

people, I almost had to take a neutral position.

However, I would like at this time just for the record to say how I appreciate the people of the Shaw community. I think 37 of them wrote a letter to me. They wrote a letter to the ministers, to the Premier, that they would not like to see this plant go ahead if at all possible. But if necessary, they would not oppose it. They would want to be compensated fairly. [so] if they had to move they would be able to get similar land for the price they would be paid. Also they asked that the land, once it had been used, would be reclaimed to its original status or better if at all possible. I must say that it is people such as this, who see the positive side of things, who have helped to make a province such as we have. Already a couple that were much opposed to this project said they thought their opposition would not stop it, but they only thought that maybe they would derive more money from it.

So as I say, this is the situation as it is. Unless the people of Alberta are going to start restraining the use of electrical energy, I am sure that plant will have to go in, not too long in the future.

Another area I would like to mention — and it has been brought [out] in this House on numerous occasions by the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview — is accountability, and particularly stressed on the Minister of Government Services and culture. I would like to say that the Premier of this province can stand up today and very favorably say that none of his members have ever been ousted with a conflict of interest. And I [wish] the hon. Leader of the Opposition was in his place today, to see whether he could make a statement of the party he is the leader of today.

I must say that the Minister of Government Services and culture, with a number of programs, thousands of them throughout the province, had never made a blunder. The only time this issue came up was when an individual made a false application for a grant. Somehow or other I feel very sorry that action and charges weren't laid against this individual, just like when others make false application on income tax or anything else. The reason for this is that many of our organizations in this province are suffering a real disservice because of this one individual. Grants for various programs are scrutinized [so] that it takes two or three months longer than it normally would. So as I say, all the people of the province are being hurt by one individual.

I would like to say that the Minister of Government Services and culture can walk on any street in my constituency and anybody will bow to him for the many programs he has made available. One program in particular was the cemetery improvement assistance grant. Even though I sort of feel sorry that there was only a limited amount of money for it, great advantage was taken of it. The cemetery where my parents are resting, one of the oldest in the province, was grown over. You could not see some of the markers. But this grant they received of only \$1,000 gave them an incentive. The parish and the community put another \$6,000 to it, and this is one of the finest cemeteries you could find anyplace. It may not be better than anyone else, but one of the finest. I am getting letters from time to time from other areas, parishes that are jealous they did not have that chance to participate because it was on a first-come

basis. So I would strongly urge the minister, if at any time in the near future it would be possible to bring back that program, I'm sure it would be well appreciated and made use of.

One more area which concerns me is the proposed loan of \$50 million to Newfoundland. While the Premier read his statement I noticed that both the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview were mildly applauding. But right after that it was a different story to the press already: it was so wrong, it's throwing \$50 million away for political reasons. I was just wondering, particularly with the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, whether his caucus changed its decision.

Mr. Speaker, insofar as the Speech from the Throne, there are a number of areas I would like to speak on; some favorably, some maybe less. On the first page, the objective to reassess the goals of education, I would like to say I know for a fact our education system in this province is one of the best, maybe throughout the world. Just last year when the deputy minister of education from southern Arabia came to Alberta to view the educational system here, he was asked how Alberta was chosen. And his statements was that in inquiring, Alberta was the best place to go. So as I say, I'm quite satisfied that the educational system in our province is one of the highest.

However, I think, and I think somebody else has mentioned it slightly sooner, it is not only the teachers that could be at fault if anything goes wrong, but we in our communities are all liable for education. The first teachers the children have are the parents. It's up to the parents to teach these children to love, to obey, to respect through the first six years of their lives. Then comes the next teacher, the academic teacher, who must teach the child to read and write and everything else. Along with that is another teacher, the clergyman or minister.

If the parents fail, in the six years, to teach the child the basic requirements, [there is] very little chance that child is going to grow up to amount to anything. I would like to say that if anybody went and spent a whole day at court and listened to the charges and convictions, I am sure that 99 per cent of the time you would not be able to pin [it on] the teaching staff; that they didn't do a good job and that's why that person was in court or convicted. It would have been the teachers, one or the other. So as I say, I am really of the opinion that we ourselves must get involved in the community and so forth.

I'm also very glad that the minister took a real view to provide Canadian context in our educational system. In the past, I'm sure if you asked any high school student how many wives Henry VIII had, they'd all know it was six. But if you'd asked them who John A. Macdonald was, they'd probably say he's the manufacturer of Export cigarettes.

On housing, I would like to give credit to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. Last year he approved all applications in rural Alberta for senior citizens' lodges, and particularly, it seems, they're well appreciated and well used. Also, the \$1,000 home improvement grant was made available. I'm sure all senior citizens cannot get into these lodges; the accommodation isn't there. I still think the best place for senior citizens is in their home if they can look after themselves.

It's also been mentioned from time to time that the senior citizen on a fixed income is experiencing difficulties. I think we may have to look at some of those making a livelihood on the lower income. The senior citizens in my constituency are the happiest people. I have not yet heard from one complaining that they do not have enough.

Insofar as health services, I think that in the constituency we have enough academic hospitals, but there is a real shortage of nursing home accommodation. The waiting lists are long, and I notice that many people who should be in a nursing home are in the active hospital, where it costs \$75 to \$100 per day when they could be accommodated for \$12 to \$14 in the nursing home. So I hope the minister would look into this area.

I would like to spend a little time on libraries. Over the past little while, I had received many letters from library associations, from individuals who would like financial support for library systems in our province, and I am also very glad it's in the Speech from the Throne. However, just for the first time today, I glanced through a paper I've never seen before. It's the *Prairie Star*, Edmonton's alternate newspaper. Now when you think of alternative, alternative to what; to a good newspaper? That means a bad newspaper to a good newspaper, that's the only way. But on the page here it has, Library Disgrace, and the picture of the hon. minister on it. It says,

Public Library Grants Per Capita  
(For 1975 unless otherwise noted)

British Columbia	\$1.07
Alberta	

Well, we will leave Alberta out.

Saskatchewan	\$2.63
Manitoba	2.00
Ontario	2.36
Quebec	0.62
New Brunswick	2.99
Nova Scotia	1.92
Newfoundland	3.97

But Alberta's figure for 1976-77: \$0.26. Now when the editor of this paper was able to find out the grants in every province, he couldn't find out the 1975 grant in Alberta. Why? In 1975 there was a special grant of \$15 per student throughout the province. Now you take the 400,000 students and multiply by \$15, and add all the other ordinary grants for libraries, [and it] would amount more than all than the provinces in Canada. And it's right here.

I don't have to spend much time wondering where this paper comes from, but I see there is a socialist crossword on one of the pages. Or maybe, Mr. Speaker, the literacy in Alberta is so much higher than elsewhere, maybe less is required in Alberta. You know, this also makes me think that occasionally you see cars going past the Legislature grounds with little stickers on the bumper, "NDP the alternative", which is very, very true. Alternative to what, good government? It's even been proved in 38 months in British Columbia.

My time is going quickly, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to just say a few words about Social Services and Community Health. I would like to commend the

minister even though she is not in her seat. I am very glad she did not take the recommendations of the provincial Ombudsman, Dr. Ivany, to have civil marriages a must, church marriages an option. More than ever, I was surprised that the Ombudsman would be making that statement; a person who was the Dean of All Saints' Cathedral in Edmonton. Yet we're taught right from a young age that what God has joined, let no man put asunder. All my time, I've always heard ministers claim that marriage should be taken in church. I would have really supported him had he made the recommendation that a marriage must be taken in church, otherwise maybe he shouldn't take it at all. He could have the church of his choice, and if there is any person that can't find a church of his choice, as I said they're not prepared for marriage.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I have three children who are married. When each one married, I thought — and I'm sure many other parents have, realizing that 44 per cent of the marriages in Alberta break up — are the marriages going to last? But all my children, before they took marriage, had to go for a two-week instructional course and write an examination. If their marriages prove successful, the credit is due there. So as I say, I can really praise the minister for not taking the advice of the Ombudsman.

Once again, as far as agriculture is concerned, over the last six years of our government in office, I think there have been more agricultural programs in this province than ever before. It is very encouraging to see many homes where the windows were barred and so forth being used again. True enough, maybe some of those coming back to the farm are not the best of farmers. But they sure make good neighbours, and it is a real pleasure for me to represent them.

Transportation — I don't want to dwell on this too long.

AN HON. MEMBER: The minister's in his chair.

MR. BATIUK: I would like to say that particularly the towns and villages in the constituency got a real boost from the street improvement program. From the smallest village to the largest town, when I drive through them it is a real pleasure to see the cleanliness and so forth. There have been numerous roads upgraded in the constituency. I am not satisfied that it is as fast as I would like, and I hope the minister is going to consider giving a little more priority in the Vegreville constituency.

Mr. Speaker, once I go on with this maybe I won't be as popular in our caucus, but . . . Native affairs: even though I want to commend the Minister of Housing and Public Works that he has gone a far way in providing housing for the natives and the Metis, I somehow or other am perturbed that for such a small segment of our provincial population, such a big amount of money is being spent and doesn't seem to be reaching its goal.

I mentioned the heritage trust fund. I was very glad when \$10 million was set for cancer research. I wish they would have set another million or two to maybe discover some inoculation that could be injected into a person and make him raring to go.

I would like to dwell on the Department of Utilities and Telephones. I have been receiving many letters

about the increase from natural gas consumers. I replied to all the letters within the constituency. Last weekend I put in six papers, to cover the constituency, that I cannot oppose an increase in the natural gas rates. When we consider that if there would be no increase whatever to the natural gas co-op consumers, I would guess they would save approximately \$1 million. But how much would the province of Alberta lose — \$100, \$125, \$150 million? It is because of these increases in oil and gas that we are provided with many of these programs, such as the recent \$40 million for cow/calf assistance. That's where it comes from, the extra money derived. So I cannot oppose an increase in the price of gas. But I would strongly urge the minister to maybe consider a bigger rebate or assistance in some other form.

I was really glad [to be one] of the three MLAs appointed to an REA committee, even though we spent many 7 o'clock mornings meeting with 15 groups. [interjections] Mr. Speaker, I'd rather pay my time and a half; I'll continue. [interjections] Our recommendation was listened to. Our recommendation came about only a month ago and it's in here already that the government will accelerate its efforts to assist in providing arrangements for rebuilding these lines.

So here again it was very obvious when the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview moves a bill, The Rural Electrification Association Act as soon as he knew of our appointment to this committee. Well it just didn't work this way. I think we are going to get the credit for it this time.

Mr. Speaker, our power is subsidized and I know it's costing quite a bit. When I was taking the power

back in 1950, I had no assistance whatever. Today it's sheltered. No person will pay more than \$2,500 for a line. In 1950 I had to sell seven steers, 13 pigs, and 200 bushels of wheat to pay to get a line. Today anybody with similar steers could sell the seven steers and have the 13 pigs and 200 bushels to wire his house or whatever he wanted to do.

Mr. Speaker, there are a few other areas, but I'll just have to leave it for another time. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that every morning when I get up I thank the good Lord that I live in Alberta, a province where opportunities abound and relatively few suffer.

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

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the recommendation by the hon. Deputy Premier, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

[The House adjourned at 5:24 p.m.]