

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Friday, March 4, 1977 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members are no doubt aware that this morning marks the opening of the World Day of Prayer which is being observed in many communities in Canada and across the world.

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 206****The Alberta Farm Ownership Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 206, The Alberta Farm Ownership Act. The purpose of this act is to ensure that the ownership of farmland in the province of Alberta will be in the hands of Canadian citizens or landed immigrants. This kind of legislation is now made possible as a result of the recent proclamation of changes in the Canadian Citizenship Act, which now make it possible for provinces to legislate in this important area.

[Leave granted; Bill 206 read a first time]

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, this morning I wish to introduce a class of students from the constituency of Edmonton Beverly. They are some 60 students from the Belevedere Elementary School. They are accompanied by teachers Mrs. Lumsden and Mr. Salzyn. They are seated in the members gallery, and I would ask the members of the Assembly to give them the usual welcome. Would they please rise.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, students from Westfield school located in the constituency of Edmonton Kingsway. Mr. Speaker, the students are accompanied by their teacher Lois Smerdon. I'd like to congratulate them for taking an interest in the legislative process. They are located in the members gallery. I would ask them to rise and receive the usual applause from the members.

MR. JAMISON: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure this morning to introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, 60 grade 5 students from the Sir Alexander MacKenzie school in the city of St. Albert. Like the Minister of Housing and Public Works, they too have abbreviated the name of the school and they call it SAM. They are seated in the

public gallery, and I'd ask that they stand and be recognized by the Assembly.

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table five annual reports. The first is the report of Treasury, and the remainder are reports of the pension administration dealing with The Local Authorities Pension Act, The Public Service Management Pension Act, The M.L.A. Pension Act, and The Public Service Pension Act.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the answer to Motion for a Return No. 212.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a progress report on the Pilot Alberta Restitution Centre, September 1975 to November 30, 1976. This is a joint project of the Solicitor General for Alberta and the Solicitor General for Canada, actually performed by the University of Calgary.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Municipalities — Revenue Sharing**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the first question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. The question arises from the proposal of the Alberta municipal finance council for property tax growth sharing. When does the government plan to implement province-wide sharing among municipalities of 50 per cent of the growth in commercial and industrial assessment?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we haven't come to any conclusion with respect to a time frame on that report. It was put out to municipalities for input and reaction. The hon. Leader of the Opposition will note it's on the Order Paper for discussion and resolution. I look forward to his contribution at that time.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is it the intention of the government to move in the direction of these recommendations prior to the completion of the Syncrude plant or the Alberta Gas ethylene plant? In keeping with the recommendations, once the project is finished it would not become part of the revenue sharing pot among municipalities.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the amendments which the Social Credit party brought in with respect to industrial development and when it comes on stream. But I would appreciate the reaction not only of this Assembly but of the various municipalities before we can decide on our direction.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then in light of any action by the government, could the minister indicate what kind of time frame he is looking at. Are we looking at one year, or five years down the road for dealing with the recommendations here? Yes or no.

MR. JOHNSTON: Yes we are.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, that's the first positive thing the minister has said this session.

DR. BUCK: Since he became minister.

MR. NOTLEY: Fairly decisive — between one and five years.

MR. CLARK: Yes, as the member says, "between one and five years." Like the Planning Act.

Mr. Speaker, to get back to the matter at hand. On the question of revenue sharing, is it the intention of the minister, or has the minister asked the municipal finance council in fact to study the concept of income tax revenue sharing, and will the council be making a report similar to this one?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we have made a study on the question of revenue sharing. I think we made our position very clear on October 13, 1976, in this House.

MR. CLARK: Has the minister instructed the municipal finance council that in fact they are not to become involved in the area of municipal revenue sharing at all? Have they been told they can't do any work in that area; has it been ruled out?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, in line with the direction we have taken with respect to revenue sharing, we are looking at some of the possibilities. I would point out that our thrust in the area of revenue sharing is one of examining conditional and unconditional grants, looking at other areas which may not be included in the income tax sharing or the resource sharing areas. But we are looking at other areas which the municipalities have been asked to report on and are examining those through the provincial municipal finance council.

Calgary Remand Centre

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, after that exercise in frustration I'd like to direct the second question to the Solicitor General and ask what effects have been made to improve the problems of overcrowding in the drunk tank at the Calgary Remand Centre.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, considerable improvements have been made as a result of the Ombudsman's report. They're so lengthy that I think I could probably do greater justice to the question if the hon. leader would put it as a motion on the Order Paper.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the minister's desire to use that approach, but can I ask the minister specifically what changes have been made? Certainly he can list one, two, or three changes that have taken place there.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, we have installed the vandal-proof water fountains that were recommended by the Ombudsman. We have an ongoing study with AADAC to look at possible alternatives for chronic alcoholics who are regular overnight customers of the drunk tank. We are seeking more space in the

balance of the detention centre and so on. I will give you a full report if you put it on a motion.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister: has the department pursued the suggestion made by the Ombudsman with regard to psychological testing of correctional officers prior to their being taken on staff?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, the Ombudsman has asked for more time to amplify these suggestions. I understand he has been carrying out some inquiries on his own account in eastern Canada so that he can make it quite clear to us what he means in terms of psychological testing. We have also circulated other provinces to find if any such practices are carried out by them. We discovered that two provinces have an elementary question and answer test for recruits, which doesn't seem to perform all that useful a purpose.

We have to determine exactly what the Ombudsman means and what is feasible: whether he is talking about word association tests or questioning under a truth drug like Pentothal, whether he intends to put recruits under some condition of stress and observe how they react. Psychological testing, just as a broad statement, covers such a broad waterfront that we are unable to handle that recommendation in a meaningful way until the Ombudsman reports. He has promised to report in a month or two.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. When does the minister expect the recommendations from the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, as soon as they are completed.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, hopefully the minister will be a bit more serious in the next area. What steps have been taken at the Remand Centre to ensure that drugs are handled only by qualified personnel?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, that is standard procedure. We went into this at some length a couple of days ago in regard to Peace River. All drugs — or medicines, I prefer to call them; in case there is some mix-up in peoples' minds as to the connotation, we are talking about medicine. Medicine is prescribed by a doctor, dispensed by a trained nurse if it is not received from a drugstore in prescription form, and merely distributed by the correctional officers. The correctional officers are performing the same function a taxicab would when it delivers a prescription from a local druggist.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, supplementary question. Is it the position of the government that adequate safeguards are now in effect at the Calgary Remand Centre for the handling of drugs?

MR. FARRAN: Yes it is, Mr. Speaker. We have had some trouble hiring trained nurses to fill the vacancies on the establishment, trained nurses who are willing to work in a prison environment. But at the moment the vacancies are filled except for two in

Peace River, which we expect to fill within the next week.

MR. CLARK: How about the Remand Centre?

MR. FARRAN: The Remand Centre ones are filled.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, has the minister had discussions with The Alberta Crimes Compensation Board as to whether or not the female inmate referred to in incident two I believe in the Ombudsman's report will receive compensation?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I've had correspondence but not discussions with the chairman of The Crimes Compensation Board, who informs me that an incident such as this would be under his jurisdiction. The citizen referred to in the Ombudsman's report has been so advised. Incidentally, the citizen didn't spark the complaint in the Ombudsman's report; the Ombudsman investigated this particular incident of his own motion.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary to the hon. minister for clarification. I wonder if the Solicitor General would indicate to the House whether the distribution of those drugs by people who are not necessarily nurses or pharmacists would include drugs that are narcotics and non-narcotics. Is this within the law?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the hon. member knows more about that aspect of the law than I do. I can only say they are all lawfully prescribed drugs. Whether they are narcotics or not is not my concern.

Parkland County Police

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, this is a question to the Solicitor General. It is a follow-up to a meeting which was held a couple of weeks ago with the assistant commissioner and inspector for the RCMP, the county of Parkland police officials, members of the county of Parkland, and the minister and his staff. At that meeting the minister proposed that the two police forces work together. Has the minister had any response from the commissioner of the RCMP in this regard?

MR. FARRAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I proposed a possible alternative to this long-standing problem in the county of Parkland whereby the local county police will come under the direct control of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, thus avoiding all the undesirable aspects of dual policing. However, the Mounted Police have a clause in their contract with all provinces which entitles them to refuse to accept control of any other police force. They have exercised this legal option in their contract and declined to take over control of the county police in Parkland.

MR. PURDY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister make representation to the federal minister responsible for the RCMP to see just how binding that particular clause is in that contract?

MR. FARRAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's binding all right, but I'm quite prepared to write a letter explaining all

the circumstances to Commissioner Nadon if the hon. member thinks it desirable.

Alberta Hospital Procedures Review

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health is with regard to the ministerial statement yesterday in the House. The question is also related to an answer by the minister to a question on February 25, when she indicated that "no action is taken by the officials in the department without recommendation from the board of review". My question is: was it the board of review that had asked for the complete re-evaluation and reassessment announced yesterday in this Assembly?

MISS HUNLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, it was not. We consulted with Justice Lieberman and with officials from Alberta Hospital, Edmonton, to get their opinion on the incidents that had occurred and the operation and the recommendations they make to the officials at the hospital. As a result of that consultation, we decided the ministerial statement was an acceptable route to follow and would be a very useful exercise, and announced it to the House.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, to the minister, for further information on the review. Could the minister indicate who will be conducting the announced review?

MISS HUNLEY: I'll confine my remarks to the review for which I'm responsible, Mr. Speaker, because I'm sure the hon. member is aware that two assessments are being done. So my comments will relate entirely to the forensic section of the Alberta Hospital, and what occurs there. We consulted Dr. Blair and he has recommended a Dr. Jim Earp, the associate professor of psychiatry at the University of Alberta. Dr. Earp has agreed to accept this assignment, and we will be proceeding forthwith.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Have the terms of reference for Dr. Earp been established and, if so, could they be tabled in this Legislature?

MISS HUNLEY: The terms of reference will relate very largely to what was said yesterday in the ministerial statement. They have not been itemized. They will be discussed with Dr. Earp. I think the hon. member can be assured they will relate very closely to the statement made yesterday and, as such, I would certainly have no objection to tabling [them] for the information of hon. members.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the minister. Has the minister established a time line or date when the review will be completed and recommendations back to the minister?

MISS HUNLEY: Well, we also said that yesterday, if the hon. member was listening, Mr. Speaker. We indicated three months. I feel sure it can be done in less time, according to the information I have at the present time.

Two-tier Fee Structure

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. Has the minister had an opportunity to review the assessment of the University of Alberta board of governors on the question of the income from the two-tier system, which suggests that even under the most optimistic circumstances fully one-third of the revenue raised from the two-tier system would have to be used to administer it in its first year?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I have that as information from the University of Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question on the two-tier system to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise the Assembly what the government proposes when it talks in the Speech from the Throne about expanding the governing bodies of universities and colleges? Will the minister assure the Legislature that this will not be a method to bludgeon the University of Alberta into accepting the two-tier system?

DR. BUCK: Take their money away, Bert.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, the legislation is scheduled for introduction in the House. That matter and several others are included in the amendments and will come before the House when the bills are introduced.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Will the minister assure the Legislature that potential candidates for new public representation on colleges and universities will not be screened for their attitudes on the so-called two-tier system?

DR. WARRACK: Is that one from each eye?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I recall a poet who spoke of beauty being in the eye of the beholder. I think the hon. member from Spirit River is suffering from that kind of analogy, though not with respect to beauty.

DR. WARRACK: Well said. One tear from each eye, Grant.

DR. HOHOL: I have to take pretty real exception to that kind of imputation, Mr. Speaker. I don't think it's seemly for the House to perform in that way, but each of us has his choices.

In extending the membership on boards of governors, I am responding directly to the requests of the boards of governors to increase its numbers because of the heavy workload of the people. Screening with respect to a specific item would be just the poorest form of assessment of people to do the work of the university. So the two in no way relate, except in the member's mind, and I regret even that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm encouraged to learn there is absolutely no connection between the two.

Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the question of the two-tier system been discussed with other jurisdictions in the

country, in view of the impact that a decision by one or two provinces will have on other provinces?

DR. HOHOL: Certainly it was discussed very briefly. But education being a provincial matter under the British North America Act, Section 93, the matter was left to the judgment of each provincial government, as it ought to be.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. The question I would like the minister to answer really relates to the issue of the impact of a two-tier system on the foreign students who go to other institutions in the country. This can't be done in isolation. My question is: was there formal discussion at meetings of provincial ministers on this question?

DR. HOHOL: Yes, there was discussion with respect to the possible effect of movement of university applicants throughout the nation, but at this point it did not appear to be significant. I think the major decision a foreign student makes is to leave the country and come to what for him would be a foreign country for a particular kind of education. I think that's the overwhelming motivation for a student personally. Certainly the level of fees relates to that in another way.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to follow up. When the minister indicates that the movement would not be significant, can he advise the House whether that is a subjective analysis, or have there been any studies from other countries, for example, that would indicate that this might in fact be the case?

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, all we can do is look at trends to this point. In Canada there are no precedents. In other countries there aren't. I should like to say this: the move as we contemplate it is certainly not one that, on the record of other countries, is going to keep a single student from a foreign nation [from] coming to the university of his choice in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, the questions beg the point of why we're doing it, and I think it's important to respond in that way. It's to provide financial benefit to Canadian and Alberta students by subsidizing them more than foreign students. Even so, both international and domestic students will continue to be heavily subsidized by the government — by the people of Canada, and the people of Alberta.

It's important to note, Mr. Speaker, that the institutions we have in place in Alberta today — which per thousand are more spaces than any other province in Canada and by dollar more per student than any other province in Canada — are there because of the value our people over the years placed on higher education, else this argument would not be before us.

MR. SPEAKER: Could we have a final supplementary from the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway, then if there is time we can get back to this topic. We have covered it at great length, and there is a considerable number of members who are waiting to ask their first questions.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether he has information to indicate overwhelming general citizen support for the two-tier system? [interjections] Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would respond to that.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I haven't the slightest doubt that the generality of the people of Alberta support the position I've taken with respect to additional fees for international students. There's no question about that.

Annexation Applications — Calgary

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the tenor of this morning, I too would like to pin down the somewhat elusive Minister of Municipal Affairs and ask whether he has received the report of the Local Authorities Board, relative to annexation applications in the city of Calgary.

MR. JOHNSTON: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GHITTER: Could the minister advise us when he will be in receipt of that?

DR. BUCK: Five years or so.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the process of hearing the applications in the city of Calgary is one which the hon. member knows is very weighty and complex. They proceed in their best time. I really haven't got much control over their proceedings.

MR. GHITTER: Again, Mr. Speaker, the elusiveness evades me. Do you have a time frame as to when we might anticipate receiving the report, Mr. Minister?

DR. BUCK: Five years, I told you.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows that there are several applications, six in total I think. I don't know which one specifically will be coming at which time. Obviously it is difficult to give information on what proceedings will take place because so many are involved.

MR. GHITTER: Mr. Speaker, maybe I can have better success with my own MLA and ask the Minister of the Environment whether he has concluded when we might anticipate the removal of the restricted development area around the city of Calgary.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, there are two parts to that answer. When the restricted development area was announced, we made it very clear that at such time when parts of it may become part of the city of Calgary, those areas would be removed. Insofar as the remainder, no deadline has been set.

I am pleased to see that we are gaining support for the concept. The Calgary Chamber of Commerce was the last to support the concept of that important planning measure. No time limit has been placed on it.

MR. GHITTER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works. I'm wondering if the minister could advise the House whether in his assessment there is presently sufficient land in the city of Calgary to meet our future housing needs.

MR. SPEAKER: The honorable and learned member will undoubtedly recognize that that's a matter of opinion. Perhaps he would like to elicit something dealing with facts.

MR. GHITTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase the question. Would the hon. minister advise the House whether he has any reports or studies at his disposal which would indicate if there is adequate land around the city of Calgary for future housing needs?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, we have done in-house studies on that matter and are constantly updating these studies with respect to the availability of land for different types of housing in the city of Calgary. However, the matter is related in a large degree to opinion, and the opinion can be as broad and as long as you wish to make it.

However, I should also add that the department is constantly assessing the need for additional land and has addressed itself [to] and studied the various annexation proposals which have been submitted to both the local authorities and the LAB. The department is constantly making recommendations to me in this regard.

Restricted Development Areas

MR. JAMISON: Supplementary question to the Minister of the Environment, Mr. Speaker. Can the minister assure the people of the city of St. Albert that the RDA separating Edmonton from St. Albert will remain in place?

MR. RUSSELL: I don't know if anybody can guarantee that something will remain in place forever. But insofar as the objectives of that RDA are concerned, it is certainly our intention to leave it there and direct into it the kind of development that was proposed at the time it was announced. The government has made substantial financial commitments to maintaining the integrity of the RDA. I would hope it would remain in place.

MR. JAMISON: On behalf of the people of St. Albert I would like to thank the minister.

MR. MUSGREAVE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of the Environment if the endorsement he speaks about for the RDA in the city of Calgary has received the formal approval of the Calgary city council.

MR. CLARK: Hardly enthusiastic.

MR. RUSSELL: We've had excellent co-operation at the official working level with the officials of Calgary. [laughter] Seriously, I'm very pleased with the response to this. Certainly the concept of the element of the transportation/utility corridor has been

strongly endorsed, and all planning jurisdictions are working towards maintaining and developing that.

As for the areas that are affected by annexation, I think our position is clear. If they do become, in all or in part, part of the city of Calgary, they'll become their responsibility. Insofar as the rest of the RDA is concerned, I haven't had any official response from the city. I have to assume that no news is good news, Mr. Speaker.

Oil Sands Development

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Is the government accepting applications for a third plant to develop our oil sands?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, an application for a third oil sands plant would necessarily be made to the Energy Resources Conservation Board, and none is before it right now. The board has dealt with three applications in the past, has approved them, and passed them all on to the Executive Council. However, all three groups involved in those applications have, for the time being, asked the government not to deal with them while they reconsider the economics and markets for the oil and wait for the results of discussions between the federal government and the provincial government regarding potential commercial terms for a third oil sands plant.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Do any of the three involve atomic blasts?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, because we're on the subject of a third oil sands plant, I'd like to reply to a question from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview when he asked, "Is the minister in a position to confirm that either Syncrude or Canadian Bechtel has on order a hydrogen furnace for use in a third-stream refining plant . . .?" And I replied, "if they have, I'm not aware of it".

Mr. Speaker, neither Syncrude Canada nor Canadian Bechtel Limited have on order a hydrogen furnace other than the two presently under construction at Syncrude's Mildred Lake site.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the information the minister has, can he indicate to the Legislature if the proposed third plant would be an *in situ* plant or an open-pit mining plant?

MR. GETTY: That would be speculation, Mr. Speaker. My judgment is that the surface mining process is ahead of the *in situ* process, and therefore it would probably be a third surface mining plant. However, there are corporations which are very actively pursuing the potential of *in situ* mining, not just in the Fort McMurray type of oil sands but, for instance, in the Cold Lake type of oil sands.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Has the minister been given any information on the engineering timetable that would be necessary if the present Syncrude project were to be substantially

increased, or is it possible that the project could be completed and then expanded? Or must the decision on expanding or not be made at some point to efficiently utilize the capital involved?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the plant could be completed and then expanded.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary to the minister. In light of the information that I assume the minister has in his possession, if this third plant is to go ahead has the timing been set up and the lead timing available so the equipment and expertise on the Syncrude site could be used in this third site?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure decisions would be made in time to allow an easily planned flow of either the labor or equipment from the present Syncrude plant to a third plant. It may be that that could happen should all the various factors come together in a positive decision fairly early. On the other hand, if any time lags are involved in that decision there may well be a gap between the conclusion of the Syncrude construction and the commencing of any third plant.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy. Has the minister received any data or information concerning this question of time lag as it relates to the expansion as far as workers are concerned, or keeping workers in the area? Would that create a time lag or, were the expansion announced toward the end of this plant's completion, would there necessarily have to be a time lag? Or could the thing maintain the steady flow of jobs in the construction trades that presently exist?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I don't think the expansion of the Syncrude plant, if it proceeded, would pick up the work force the hon. member is referring to.

Pheasant Rearing

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would direct my question to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. It's regarding the pheasant hatchery to be built in Brooks this year. Is this to be just a hatchery, or is it to be a facility that raises the birds to maturity? What is the capacity of this plant?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, to start with, the expansion and relocation of the hatchery are taking place. The contracts for phase one were just recently awarded, as a matter of fact. It will be a hatchery in which we will be raising birds to maturity, and they will in fact, using the normal process, be providing eggs to us to get the young chicks from.

I think one of the areas of concern was the fact that the old facility was providing us with 6,000 to 8,000 chicks or young birds. The demand was much higher than that. Hopefully we're very, very close to being on schedule, Mr. Speaker, and we should be able to produce between 15,000 and 25,000 birds in the spring of 1978. That's what we're aiming at right now.

MR. MILLER: A supplementary if I may, Mr. Speaker. Is any consideration being given to establishing 4-H

clubs throughout Alberta, possibly working with fish and game associations, so the clubs could get some of these birds, and farm children could then raise them and release them in that area?

MR. ADAIR: If I may comment, we're actually a step and a half ahead of you because we have the 4-H pheasant program in the manual of the 4-H group right now, and we are working toward that with the 4-H people who, I might add, are very, very interested. Down the road it's certainly going to provide us with a much better opportunity to develop a better interaction between the farmer and the hunter, because the young people in the 4-H program who will be raising them will understand the pheasant much better than they do now. Hopefully the interaction in four or five years, 10 years, will be a much better relationship.

MR. APPLEBY: One final supplementary to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker. With regard to the mature birds he mentioned, which will be kept for the purpose of raising eggs for hatching, will any of these birds be provided for release for hunting purposes?

MR. ADAIR: Yes. Again carrying on with the normal program for put-and-take, if I can use the term, where we in fact place birds in an area for hunters to take them, we're going to be expanding that program once we get the facility producing enough eggs so we can raise enough to get more into the area. Right now we have a limited number of adult pheasants going into the put-and-take program and that will be increased quite substantially, I think much to the appreciation of many hunters in the province of Alberta.

Native and Metis Programs

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the minister responsible for native affairs. I would like to know if his department is continuing its work on the commenced program to provide self-help, employment, and business opportunities for the province's Indian and Metis population.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would be more specific, I will attempt to answer his question.

MR. SPEAKER: This would appear to involve a whole area of policy. If the hon. member would like to elicit an answer which could be given within the confines of the question period, perhaps he could rephrase what he is asking.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, it's a program the government initiated last year, so that's fairly specific. I would like to know if that program is going to continue and be accelerated — the self-help, employment, and business opportunities program as outlined by the government last year.

MR. CLARK: Like the housing program, Bob.

MR. BOGLE: Oh, Mr. Speaker, if he is referring to the housing program which was initiated last year by the Native Secretariat in isolated communities, I would be very pleased to expand upon that. Through the assis-

tance of the staff of the Native Secretariat, three homes were built, two in Sandy Lake and one in Loon Lake. These homes were designed and built by native individuals with some assistance from us in the form of grants. We provided grants to cover materials which could not be obtained in the areas by the native citizens, materials such as windows, doors, and roofing. The maximum amount per household was \$3,500. We have had excellent reports. If any hon. members would like to see pictures of the homes, or have further information, I will gladly provide that for them.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'm still not sure if the minister has a program, or if he is going to continue with the self-help, employment, and business opportunities program.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could rephrase the question. Can the minister advise the Assembly what happened to the equity fund which was, I understand, on the drawing board to be set up so that native people could borrow small amounts of money, \$2,000 or \$3,000, for business enterprises of one kind or another?

MR. BOGLE: Just to clarify, Mr. Speaker, an equity fund was never announced in this Assembly.

MR. CLARK: Nothing happened to it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I am well aware it was never announced in this Assembly. The question is: what happened to the equity fund which was on the drawing board and was discussed with the Alberta government by a number of native groups and organizations?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is asking what this government is doing to assist its native citizens in the area of business development, that's . . . Well it's too bad the hon. Member for Clover Bar didn't ask that to begin with.

Through the existing agencies established by this government, such as the Alberta Opportunity Company and the Agricultural Development Corporation, we are encouraging native Albertans to follow the same process used by all other Albertans.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary to the minister. Could the minister give us two examples of businesses that have been initiated through the Alberta Opportunity Company related to Metis businessmen?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to give examples of companies which have received assistance. The first which comes to mind is New Dawn Housing at Lac La Biche, which has been helped substantially by the Alberta Opportunity Company. New Dawn Housing is a company which was set up by Metis residents in the Lac La Biche region to produce housing. It is a log house concept. If any ministers are interested they can stop into my office and see some of the logs which I have there. The homes are built. A number have been obtained through contracts with the Alberta Housing Corporation, through the rural and native housing program, and other individuals purchase the homes. Some are

purchased by non-native people. In fact, I have seen one in the Caroline region of the province. That is one example, Mr. Speaker, of a business which has been assisted.

Another currently looking for assistance is the store at Fort Chipewyan which is a joint venture of the Cree Indians, the Chipewyan Indians, and the Metis residents in that community, a very successful venture headed by well-known Albertan Noel McKay.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the concern I've had expressed by some people in the various native organizations in the province that the existing mechanisms the minister mentioned — the AOC, the Agricultural Development Corporation — have set out regulations which are not realistic to meet the objective of small loans for native enterprises, can the minister advise why the government decided to choose the course of existing programs rather than the concept of a special equity fund, which I understand was discussed among the Native Secretariat?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to say we have worked through Native Affairs, through the northern development group from Business Development and Tourism, with some of the more successful native leaders in this province in the area of business development. We've worked on various schemes to help native people become more fully involved in the mainstream of Alberta life, if I may use the words of some native leaders. That process will continue.

A meeting is currently being arranged between some of our own officials and the board of the Alberta Opportunity Company and its executive director to attempt to have a better understanding of the channels that are now open for native people. If the hon. member has a program he would like to bring forward, I would like to see him present it to this Assembly.

Hitch-hiking

DR. PAPROSKI: A question to the Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker, regarding hitch-hiking, or thumbing, which I raised last year. In view of the statistics which show a significantly higher incidence of crime, namely robbery, beatings, rapes, and other serious crime related to hitch-hiking, is the minister now considering thumbs down legislation on thumbers?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, while I would like to advise the public that the picking up of strangers or the soliciting of rides from strangers is an undesirable practice, I don't think at the present time it's appropriate for a legal sanction against it.

It's very difficult in our climate, which often — or in the past — has included severe winters, to fetch in a law which would prohibit a good Samaritan act of conveying somebody to shelter when their vehicle had broken down. It is true that there are by-laws which prohibit hitch-hiking in both Calgary and Edmonton. I don't know how effective they have been, but I have the impression that hitch-hiking is less common in Calgary than it was two years ago.

I think the greatest hope in this regard is education of the public to the awareness of the dangers of accepting rides from or picking up strangers; also, I

should say, to remember that part of our heritage and ethical base in this province is respect for women.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, would the minister then consider as an alternative registering drivers who wish to pick up those who require rides?

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that sounds practical. But if the hon. member would give it to me in writing, I'll give it some consideration.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to revert to Introduction of Visitors?

MR. SPEAKER: I was going to come to that as soon as we got to Orders of the Day. The time for the question period has run out. I apologize to those members who were not reached for their first questions. It may be that we may have to limit the number of supplementaries and perhaps the length of some of the answers or of some of the questions.

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS (reversion)

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, a young gentleman from my constituency, from the city of Medicine Hat, who is now a student at the University of Alberta, where he serves as a vice-president of the students' council and is one of two young Albertans recently named as Rhodes scholars. He is going to the university at Oxford, I understand, where he will pursue the noble profession of law . . .

MR. KING: And never catch it.

MR. HORSMAN: His name is Ken McFarlane. He is accompanied by Johane Gagne, an exchange student studying at the University of Alberta from Bishop's University in Lennoxville, Quebec. I would like to welcome these two fine young Canadians to our Assembly today and ask them to rise and be recognized.

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. Young]

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it's an honor for me today to participate in the address of Her Majesty to this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commence with a few words directed to you. I appreciate that the meadowlark did not succeed in the contest with the owl. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to convey my appreciation, and I'm sure the appreciation of all members, that in you we have the wisdom of what will be our provincial bird, combined with the humor and the pleasant nature of the meadowlark.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll endeavor not to lay too many eggs.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I should like to express my keen appreciation to the hon. Member for Lloydminster who led off this debate. His contribution to this debate reflected the qualities of that gentleman, which I learned to appreciate some 10 or 11 years ago at my first meeting with him. The Legislature might be interested that at that time we had a mutual problem which involved quite a number of people, and Mr. Miller was recommended to me as a person whose capacity for bringing a consensus from widely divergent views was unexcelled. I am very pleased to report to all members of the Assembly that the hon. member on that occasion rose very much to the task and resolved the particular dispute in a matter of a week. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to deliver my commendations to him and to suggest to him that that speech might well be one that he preserve a copy of *Hansard* to deliver to the grandson who he related to us was born that day.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment that the occasion of the speech provided us with an excellent illustration of the potential available to us as citizens of this province and this country of Canada.

The Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Steinhauer, on that occasion demonstrated to us better than could ever be described in words what could be achieved by a citizen — an honest, dedicated, hard-working citizen — regardless of background. The Lieutenant-Governor has surely demonstrated how much our heritage can mean and how much potential there is for each and every one of us. Mr. Speaker, that unique contribution — and it's a contribution which only Mr. Steinhauer could have made to us and to Canada — is in quite stark, sharp contrast, I regret to say, with some of the statements which have been made by a very few Albertans in the last few months.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to dissociate myself from some of the radical, ill-tempered, and ill-considered remarks made by a few persons in this province who, it would seem, choose to weaken the fabric of our democracy and of our country. Mr. Speaker, I refer to those persons who seem to reflect a very small point of view: if they cannot achieve the goals and objectives, primarily I think [in] economic terms, which they wish to achieve, they threaten that they should have a separatist party in this province. Mr. Speaker, I regret this development very much and wish to express that regret in the strongest manner I can.

Mr. Speaker, our country is made strong by those who work in a positive manner, by those — if they have a different point of view, short-term goals, narrow economic goals, [or] feel their point of view is overlooked in our federal system — who work posi-

tively, who try to get across their point of view and to make us a stronger nation in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, as I watch children play from time to time, I am reminded of the incidents we witness lately. Often we hear children threaten, if you don't do it my way I'm going to take my marbles and go home, if they're playing marbles. And to me, Mr. Speaker, some of these people convey that same mentality and degree of immaturity.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say too that that is quite in contrast with what I perceive to be our provincial government's initiatives. I speak to the Speech from the Throne on page 2, item 5, wherein we talk of new initiatives in terms of international tariff and trade. I perceive these initiatives to be reflecting a concern for a proper consideration of our natural resources, primarily our agricultural industry. I think we have in this province a tremendous industry, an industry which can be overlooked in terms of international discussion. Surely it is our responsibility as a government to promote the interests of this industry and of our petroleum industry by briefing our federal negotiators, by exploring directly for potential, alternate, and new markets. Surely that helps to make a stronger business climate and a stronger nation. I think that is a responsibility of our government. I welcome the initiative.

For those who are concerned that we go too far, Mr. Speaker, I wish to be on record as saying that at the first suggestion our province should by-pass federal authority in terms of signing international agreements, I would speak out as strongly as I have spoken out in dissociating myself [from] some of the other unfortunate developments that seem to be occurring.

In the same vein, Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for a moment of the situation in the province of Quebec. We have had a suggestion from the hon. Leader of the Opposition that our Premier should go to the province of Quebec and make a speech. I am not sure what he would put in that speech, and he did not indicate. I felt he was indicating we are not doing our bit to make Canada strong. A personal opinion is that Quebec at this moment is in a state of internal turmoil. I am sure that if one were to examine the conscience of Quebecers, Quebecers who have a birthright extending in many instances in our Canada beyond those of us in this province — their roots go down further — we would find a considerable diversity of opinion.

As I see what has happened, Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult to believe that the advent of an avowed separatist government was not brought about by an effort of citizens to improve the form of government. I wasn't there, Mr. Speaker, and I can't speak for all Quebecers, but the election as I understood it was fought primarily for better government.

Mr. Speaker, I think that in Quebec we have a tremendous majority of people who have seen shattered the traditional means by which they can make Quebec strong and remain in Quebec. I say "shattered" because I think it would be fair to say that Quebecers have had a strong affiliation with the Liberal party, and undoubtedly when that party goes down to defeat, one of the traditions and methods by which they can express themselves has to be rebuilt or an alternate put in its place.

Mr. Speaker, other traditions have also been

threatened, and I think we should do a great favor and make a positive step to Canada and to Quebec by stepping aside for awhile and letting Quebecers sort themselves out. I am convinced and confident that in the months to come we will see a tremendous regrouping of those forces favorable to Confederation. And I have no doubt as to the outcome.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I think it well for those of us in the distance to avoid 'sloganeering' and interfering, but continue to hope silently for the most positive outcome. I do not think we should lecture from afar as to the benefits of Confederation.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things the throne speech provides is a tremendous overview of our responsibilities in this Assembly. It's a weighty speech and I say that in two respects. It's a long speech, and it covers many aspects of government, which should show anyone reading it how complex and complicated government is.

Mr. Speaker, this is the occasion when members have a chance to speak about their constituencies in a general way. I'd like to say that in a general way all is well in my constituency of Edmonton Jasper Place. It's not perfect, but it's well. Surely it must be, Mr. Speaker, in a province which in two years' time can attract net migration of 70,000-plus persons. Seventy thousand people who weren't here two years ago choose to live in this province. Surely that indicates a tremendous attraction and that all should be fairly well.

There are sources of uneasiness, Mr. Speaker. Unquestionably, some of my constituents are concerned about housing and rents. We've made great strides there, and there will be opportunity to debate. But I think a major initiative toward solving that particular area of our problems has been accomplished.

Some are concerned about increasing utility costs. Again, Mr. Speaker, I think very few have the information to realize that in the \$70 million plus of subsidy last year toward the natural gas program — if they stop to think about it, that works out to approximately \$30 per person and, in the case of my family, to the equivalent of what I pay in about four months of gas bills during the winter.

Mr. Speaker, some are concerned about inflation. I'm sure that makes all of us uneasy. We're involved in a debate, and all members of this Assembly have been lobbied in the last while about removal of inflation controls. I'm sure I speak for my constituents when I say that if those controls are to be removed, we must all accept personal responsibility and conduct ourselves in a way which will avoid a future imposition of controls.

Mr. Speaker, in a general way again, I'd like to commend the Speech from the Throne for its recognition on page 2 that there is a developing consensus by Albertans that they are asking too much of government, that they must reduce their expectations, and that "desirable but non-essential activities must be the personal responsibility of the citizen, the parent, the family, and the community". I think that recognition is growing, Mr. Speaker. I think it is much more widespread than it was five years ago. I think it is a desirable development.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to refer to one other problem or concern before I close. I refer to a controversial incident that occurred in the last few months. Some of my constituents have spoken to me of their

perception that a situation seems to have been created — arising out of the oil sands, or in that vicinity — which indicates that one or more power groups have been able to extract unusual amounts from our society. In other words, they perceive something not normal has occurred in the world of commerce and trade, and they are uneasy.

Some have requested that the government should interfere directly with the Alberta Energy Company. I do not share that point of view. A very important principle is involved: the management of the company should be at arm's length. I agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition when he stated in the debate on that company on December 7, 1973, in *Hansard* on page 78-4251: "... we believe it to be essential that the directorship and management of the Alberta Energy Company be more than at arm's length from the government." That position has apparently changed on the part of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, according to his debate.

I think it's essential that the direct daily management of that company be separate and removed from government intervention. In saying that, however, I cannot pass lightly over the problem that has arisen. It is very difficult for us in Canada to maintain the degree of competition in commerce and industry that we would like. For one thing, we have a thin population. There isn't the opportunity to sustain healthy competitive companies in all facets of industry and commerce in this country. There just isn't the demand. That poses an unusual problem for us.

That is aggravated, of course, when we get into major developments, whether it's James Bay, the tar sands, or wherever it is. These are developments which require the aggregation of all kinds of services in large quantities. If it is open to them of course, some sectors of our society may choose to take advantage of that.

It is illustrated in another facet of our trade and commerce whereby a small group of persons in this day and age can become crucial, absolutely crucial, to the functioning of a very large venture, whether it is a company manufacturing a unique component of one of the nuclear stations or a group of workers in the Vancouver port facility responsible for loading wheat. To me it is immaterial which it is, but if either of these groups chooses to take unfair and irresponsible advantage of our society, in some sense it is able to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to leave the topic without having advanced any solution, except to say that I think it behooves each and every citizen of this province to look at their individual responsibility. In the case of the infamous or famous pipeline, I say to Imperial Oil, Shell Oil: look at your own consciences in the situation. I say that to the unions. And I say that to all participants in that venture, and in other ventures which will surely come.

It is not uniquely a government responsibility. It is a responsibility for all of us for the proper running of commerce. Surely if those who are involved in trade and industry and in unionism do not want government interference of a major nature, they must accept that responsibility, which, according to the perception of my constituents, they have not totally done in some instances.

Mr. Speaker, in summing up I would just like to say in respect of this particular problem that my ideal in

terms of an economic system — and I believe it's that of my constituents — is that it should be competitive. As I see it, the force, the vitality, the thrust for efficiency and innovation is the challenge of competition, the opportunity to do something different, the opportunity to do a full and a good day's work. Mr. Speaker, that is a challenge which I admit to suggesting is naive. Nevertheless, it's a good guide for the conscience.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the throne speech, the Member for Lloydminster and the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff. I appreciated their remarks.

Secondly, I would like to give my thanks to you, Mr. Speaker, for your understanding and guidance in this Assembly. We certainly appreciate the attentiveness you have given to the rules and our relative positions in the Assembly.

I would also like to indicate my admiration, respect, and appreciation for our Lieutenant-Governor, Mr. Steinhauer. He has certainly taken on his role with great responsibility, and has shown himself again as a leader in our province of Alberta.

The remarks I wish to make this afternoon on the Speech from the Throne will be in three areas: first of all, areas I can support; secondly, areas I feel are serious omissions; and thirdly, errors that I feel are in the Speech from the Throne.

First of all, the areas that I can support, and I'd like to relate my comments to the priorities that have been established by the government. I'd like to say I'm able to support four of those five priorities: the priorities with regard to education, housing, health, and land-use planning. The fifth priority I have some concern [about], and I'd like to comment on that in a few moments.

Why do I say I support these particular priorities? I feel that in the performance of this government in the last few years there has been a great magnificent obsession with economic development, an obsession that has fallen short of being concerned about some of the social problems and having a real strategy with regard to social concern in this province. We can say, maybe it's excusable, maybe it's quite a natural thing. If we recognize the fact that a strong economy is certainly the basis upon which human resource development occurs, I think we can all agree on that point. We also must recognize that Albertans as individuals must be as self-sufficient as possible in order to withstand any economic changes or forces, and in turn look after their social needs. We can recognize that if the provincial economy were to drop or to change, the responsibility would drop back to the individual Albertan. The federal government certainly wouldn't be able to pick up the loose ends, because they in turn would be in a much more difficult position than we are in the province.

But we should ask the question: why are we in Alberta developing our natural resources so feverishly and so actively? The author of the book *The Wealth of Nations* makes a comment about this in his writings. He says: "For what purpose is all this toil and hustle? What is the end of this avarice and ambition, of the pursuit of wealth, power, and pre-eminence?" Mr. Speaker, that certainly is the question. But the

very key question related to that is not with regard to how much wealth is produced, but what we do with that wealth in the province. What do we do with it with regard to human development? What do we do with it with regard to the bureaucratic system in the province of Alberta? What do we do with regard to the various ventures, whether productive or non-productive? That's the real key question.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this year and in the coming years the Conservative government will be judged on that very aspect. Because that's what the people of Alberta are asking at the present time. There's a lot of money, there's wealth in Alberta. There's a lot of it. We have never been so wealthy. We have never had the ability to do what we wanted to do. We have that financial capability. Individuals in Alberta have never had the capability before. Farmers in the last two or three years have been able to do things that were just impossible 10 years ago: build new homes for themselves, upgrade their standard of living. Urban people have been able to purchase homes. But some of that is changing.

The way this wealth is handled by the government will certainly be the way we judge this government in the coming years. As I say, people are starting to raise that particular question. This government will fall or stand in the next election, or the election after that, on how it administers and establishes its priorities in spending relative to the individuals of Alberta. That's the first area.

One of the areas I support is with regard to the educational goals and objectives. In the Speech from the Throne, we as members of the Legislature are requested to make recommendations with regard to the goals and objectives of our educational system. I feel that is a good idea, but I'd like to comment on that at a later date and focus my attention today on something a little different. I feel it is time when we evaluate educational goals, that we should attempt to break the monopoly of the state over the educational process. We find today most of our educational objectives, our thrusts, are pushed by the state: how should it be broken? I feel that we should encourage and enable other sectors of Alberta to assume a greater role in the performance of all these important functions.

I feel that two areas should play a greater role at this time. Number one is the home, and number two is the industrial sector. I feel they could add a lot to our educational process and our educational programs. Let's refer to the home first of all. I feel the home could play a more meaningful role with respect to teaching of values, cultural skills, and so on. The industrial sector of our province could play a more meaningful role with respect to the provision of practical training on the jobs. Certainly we have some of this going on, but it is not a program with emphasis or thrust, [nor] a priority at the present time. It takes a priority position far down the line in the province of Alberta. I think that along with this type of thrust in determining educational goals and objectives we could, as a province, have a greater amount of concern not only about provincial tax legislation but also federal taxation at the present time.

If we want parents to become more involved in the educational process of their own children and take a more direct responsibility, why isn't it possible and why isn't the government — do we not make repre-

sentation to the federal government — making it possible to treat expenses for such things as religious instruction, language instruction, music lessons, swimming lessons, and other forms of activities as deductible expenses for income tax purposes? Why can't we have an incentive tax program such as that? We don't at the present time. I think that that would certainly assist us a lot in our educational thrust in the province.

Secondly, what about the matter with regard to businesses. Couldn't we provide a greater and more clear-cut incentive program for businesses and industries to own and operate vocational training centres in their offices and factories, on job sites, and so on. To me, Mr. Speaker, this would add a greater thrust and responsibility in those areas, and I feel that in a society where we believe in limited government, less government, we have to give incentive to those people we feel should and would take that particular responsibility. Mr. Speaker, I hope the government in their presentations to Ottawa and their own tax policy would certainly consider those two suggestions. When I speak of the expanded role for industry and business in this state-dominated field of education, at the same time I am supporting some of the items in the Speech from the Throne. I'd like to commend the government for its reference in the speech to successful involvement of the private sector in the printing services of the Queen's Printer. There's another quote there that indicates, and I quote, "[the] possible expansion of this concept to other areas". Mr. Speaker, I'd like to suggest to the government, and certainly to the Deputy Premier, that this type of concept be extended into the field of education and many other areas of the government. I think that would be a good strategy and a good thrust for the Conservative government and certainly in line with the Conservative philosophy as I understand it.

DR. BUCK: That's their problem.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Yes, I understand that too. That'll be their downfall. Now, Mr. Speaker, those are some of the areas I could support and certainly I feel I can give some positive suggestions to the government at this time.

The second area I'd like to cover is with regard to what I feel is a serious omission in the speech. That is with regard to the question of national unity. In the speech there are some quotes, and I'd like to just paraphrase them. We say in there, to observe that the next few years will be important for Canada, a rather trite statement. Also it said very simply that Canada needs strong provinces and greater recognition of diversity. Mr. Speaker, that has been declared many times, but they've just been words. As a government and certainly as members of the Legislature, to be committed to national unity is a good thing.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, we have to have some actions, and one of the concerns I have with this government is that at the present time there is no strategy made public that the government is using to maintain national unity in Canada. I feel that in that statement in the Speech from the Throne there just isn't anything. The speech is completely silent. I think it was an opportunity for this government, because the issue is on everybody's mind, not only in

Alberta but all across Canada. It was an opportunity for the government to show some leadership in how they would contribute to this national unity plan that we all want in Canada at the present time.

What could they have done? Possibly even land purchases in Quebec, to show they really have confidence in Quebec. Possibly even consideration of the loan that was made to Newfoundland. What about Quebec? The Premier says, no, not Quebec.

We find that this kind of omission in the Speech from the Throne really doesn't do anything to deal with that question of national unity. I feel that as long as we continue to just talk about provincial interests, and can't look at this broader perspective or address ourselves to this whole national issue from a western point of view, the problem will certainly continue, and as Albertans we will not contribute to the problem of national unity.

Okay, what about some errors that I feel are in this Speech from the Throne? There are three of them: one, an error in judgment; two, an error in philosophy; and three, an error in emphasis.

Let me deal with the first one with regard to judgment. I'd like to refer to the Speech from the Throne, priority number five. This is with regard to international tariff and trade matters. It indicated that the government will:

... take [selective] initiatives in international tariff and trade matters as may be required to improve access to essential new markets for our agricultural and other products [in Alberta].

Now, Mr. Speaker, it's not really my intention to debate whether those initiatives are right or wrong — because certainly they may have a good effect for Alberta in the market place — or whether in practice they will actually contribute anything to the trading process. That's not really what I'm concerned about. What I'm concerned about is this error in judgment at this time. By making that statement and taking that position so publicly, we are again challenging the federal government in their responsibilities in this particular area. We don't talk about co-operation with the federal government, co-operating, trying to work it out, making presentations. We're saying we are going to take these tariff and trade initiatives. We are at the present time creating and continuing to create a tension in Canada between Alberta and the federal government which really isn't necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that is certainly an error in judgment at this particular time. Four or five years ago the situation would not have been the same. Today it is different. We must be very concerned about that relationship between the Alberta government and the federal government, and be concerned that these types of things don't create wrong attitudes and tensions that can certainly be harmful to the unity of Canada.

The second thing, the error. I feel there is an error in philosophy. I refer the hon. members to page 2 of the Speech from the Throne, the top paragraph. I would like to quote the one sentence I'm concerned about:

My government recognizes that there is a developing consensus by Albertans that they may be asking too much of the government, that expectations must be reduced, and that desirable but non-essential activities must be the personal responsibility of the citizen, the parent, the fami-

ly, and the community.

Mr. Speaker, I become quite concerned when I read that statement. It talks about a division of responsibility between the state and the individual. I get very concerned when I examine the word "non-essential". What does it really say? It says that the non-essential activities are those that should be left for the parent, the family, and the community. Mr. Speaker, I think that is a very alarming statement.

A few moments ago I talked about the state in education: we should reduce that role. Hopefully the Conservative Party doesn't believe in that. We talk about individuals in Alberta, individual incentive, incentive for industry. But here we have a statement in the throne speech as an objective of this government that the people, the parents, the family, and the community should have the non-essential activities. Who else gets the other? Who takes the responsibility for some of these important things? The state then is left with the essential responsibilities of us as individuals.

I think that's a very serious statement in this throne speech, a very serious thrust by this government. I question, is that really what it means? If it is, I think that not only should we be concerned on this side of the House but the backbenchers on that side of the House should be thumping a few ministers on the head, if that is the direction we are going at the present time. I hope it isn't.

[Mr. Diachuk in the Chair]

Now if it's the case that the "non" in front of "essential" was not supposed to bethere, [if] it was an error in printing, I certainly stand to be corrected. But as it stands in the throne speech, to me it indicates that the non-essential activities are those of the parent, the family, and the community, and anything that is important and essential is the responsibility of the state. They make the decisions in that particular area. Maybe that is the new interventionist approach of this government. If it is, well maybe we should hear it in public.

The third error I would like to refer to is an error in emphasis. As I have viewed throne speeches over the years since 1964, I have always felt that the importance of the throne speech was to have an outline of the government's legislative program, or some of the objectives they see they can fulfil in this or future sessions of the Legislature. But as I go through this document and examine it very closely, Mr. Speaker, I become very alarmed at what I see.

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

As I read through page 1, there aren't any legislative initiatives. On page 2 there are none. Page 4 has one, The Universities Act and The Colleges Act. Page 5 hasn't any legislative initiatives. Page 6 and page 7 haven't any. Page 8 has one, The Nursing Assistant Act. Page 9 and page 10 haven't any. Page 11 has two, page 12 has one, page 13 has one. As we go to 14, there is one; I don't know what its significance is. Page 15 and page 16 haven't any legislative initiatives. Page 17 has three acts by the culture department; that's good, I guess. Page 18 has three, page 19 has two, page 20 refers to three acts, and page 21 hasn't any.

DR. BUCK: Nice paper, though.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Terrific paper. The longest throne speech I can ever recall in this Legislature. But the purpose of this throne speech was to indicate the legislative initiatives of the government. Out of 24 bills mentioned in this document, I consider only four of any significance. The rest of them, I feel, have been initiated by civil service memoranda, sort of up through the civil service, cleaning up legislation, but nothing of new directives or new initiatives.

The only ones I feel are of any real consequence are: the new planning act, the Alberta heritage savings trust fund special appropriation bill, 1977, the new bill reflecting recommendations of the task force on provincial public service labor relations, and four, the legislation to follow up the report of the select committee studying The Ombudsman Act. I feel those are significant.

But the rest of the legislative initiatives, to me, are just from old press releases, departmental memos; they are just cleaning up things. That's where they've all come from. After I was around government for awhile, I found that a lot of things come up through the civil service. That's one of the binds this government is getting into. That's where their initiatives are coming up.

Now maybe that's one of the answers as to why we have this "non-essential" quote in the speech at the present time. But after these four pieces of legislation were listed in the throne speech, Mr. Speaker, we should have had better information and follow-up on them as to what kinds of thrusts — and that's the Conservative word, not my word — would be taken on them to show Albertans there really is a strategy and there are some directions to this government. But that's not it. Instead, we had 21 pages of old repeats from press clippings. As MLAs we just get piles of those every day. I'm sure the civil service wrote a lot of these as memos to ministers, and they're added in here. There's a bunch of backslapping, the self-compliments, but no real feelings of thrust.

I would like to say that when the first Conservative throne speech came in in 1972, I was really pleased. I didn't admit it that much, but I would like to say at this point in time that I was really pleased to see that throne speech. It was one of the best this government has ever put together. They came into government and said, we've got some objectives, and we're going to move ahead. We're going to get some things done. [interjections]. They're going to get some things done. But man I'll tell you, back here five years, here we have a bunch of just odds and ends of everything. Man, we're great guys. We did this, we did that, we're doing this, we're going here, we're going there.

DR. BUCK: Horner ran out of money, that's what happened.

MR. R. SPEAKER: That's what we get, 21 pages of it: lots of bulk, but no content. That's the kind of thing that happened.

I think what this government should do is wake up again. Maybe they need to lose an election. Then they would wake up, and we'd come back maybe in the early 1980s and have a great throne speech again. Somewhere along the line that shock will

come, because [of] this complacency, this feeling that we have all the answers, we don't have to listen to anybody else. We don't have to accept some rules that may assist members to equip themselves better in the House. They don't have to do that anymore. Just carry on.

The backbenchers, if you watch, you be careful. As this government goes along and as these ministers get entrenched a little more and keep in good stead with the boss, your role is just going to be eroded. Oh, there will be little things tossed to you, and pretty soon you won't play much of a role.

MR. JAMISON: Talking from experience, Ray.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Yeah, sure there's lot's of experience, 14 years of it. I understand part of that concept.

Just by organizational default, that's the kind of thing that happens. Part of this Speech from the Throne is certainly exemplary of the fact the government has lost direction and really isn't feeling where it's going at the present time. I think it's time the Conservative caucus maybe quit talking about the little things, but again re-evaluate and refocus its goals and direction. Because at the present time I sure don't understand them, and if it isn't done by 1978 or '79 the people of Alberta won't understand it. Then we'll have a Social Credit government again and we'll have a good throne speech in this Assembly. Excellent. That's what's going to happen.

MR. DIACHUK: Then all initiative will be lost.

MR. R. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly indicates all initiative will be lost. All initiative of government will be lost, but the initiative of people will be restored. That's what will happen. That's the thing.

I think, Mr. Speaker, we've got to be aware of that. Certainly the people of Alberta are becoming more aware. Every day we get more phone calls, we have more people in Alberta telling us the shortcomings of this government, how they don't even know what any of the ministers look like. Because they're even starting to take them out of some of the propaganda, the magazines they're sending out, because they say, everybody knows this, we don't have to put it in the magazine any more. I think maybe we should reinstate that policy so that people of Alberta at least know what your picture looks like, Mr. Minister.

DR. BUCK: In the *Heritage* magazine, here.

MR. CLARK: *Heritage* magazine here. The back page.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I've sort of got away from the air that I was stressing. Certainly the air of this government needs to be expressed with even greater emphasis maybe than the air I was talking about anyway.

As my closing comment, Mr. Speaker, I took the time to condense the Speech from the Throne. I thought all that filler and all that stuff was quite a bit of nonsense so I took the time to summarize it. And I felt my summary was accurate. I quoted from the Speech from the Throne. I didn't leave out anything I figured was significant. All of it, Mr. Speaker, fits on

one page. If I was able to take the protocol from the top — which we all recognize is in the speech — and the protocol at the end of the speech, I could have got it on an eight and a half by eleven sheet of paper. You know, Mr. Speaker, that was all that was really there. In about 5 to 10 minutes the opening day could have been finished and everybody would have been wiser. We'd have got it done before the power went off because I know that was most likely a Conservative ploy to kind of shut things off before . . .

MR. CLARK: People found out how it affected them.

MR. R. SPEAKER: . . . the people really found out what kind of nonsense was in that speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sacred sabotage.

MR. R. SPEAKER: So, Mr. Speaker, if any member would like to read this to verify the content, I'm certainly willing to make it available. I do appreciate the time to make these comments. But I think the government has a lot of cleaning up to do as to what they're doing with regard to the unity of Canada and certainly what they feel are real objectives for Albertans.

MR. ZANDER: It certainly is a privilege for any hon. member of this House to speak to this throne speech delivered by the Lieutenant-Governor and also so ably moved and seconded by the hon. members for Lloydminster and Medicine Hat-Redcliff.

I wish at this time to thank the Speaker for the number of years he has been in his Chair. He has over the past few years ably handled the position of Speaker of this House.

I would only make two comments in this regard and I hope the Speaker will take note of them. I know that he in his very able manner will be able to handle them. There are two problems in the House, as I see them. In the question period some of us who have had questions were not able to ask them because some hon. members of this House, after saying that this was the final supplementary, also came about with three more supplementaries. If the decorum of the House is supposed to exist as formerly, I think we will have to revert to as few supplementaries as possible.

The other one: although most of us have over the past years enjoyed *Hansard*, I find it hard to understand, Mr. Speaker, that some years ago when I sat in the members gallery or the public gallery and watched the operations of the House before there was a *Hansard*, I used to look up and I could see there were about 10 or 15 members of the news media over there. It's quite strange now, Mr. Speaker, that after the question period they seem like pigeons; they fly out and perhaps read it in *Hansard* that evening or the next day. I wish to thank the member of the media who is there now. Because certainly I think if they are part and parcel of democracy as we like to see them, I would rather see them in than out of the House.

Probably in connection with this, Mr. Speaker: all hon. members of this House are advised, and correctly so, that they come in with proper garb and attire so they're properly dressed. I notice a number of our newsmen follow that very properly, but some don't. I

hope the hon. Speaker will also look into this matter because maybe we can continue in the manner we have some years ago.

DR. PAPROSKI: Are turtle-neck sweaters okay?

MR. ZANDER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just a few comments on the national situation as it appears in Canada today. You know, there is a problem in Quebec. It's been brought about by a government that has been elected. As the hon. Member from west Jasper Place has said, it was elected to govern and not to separate Quebec from Canada. But one thing we fear more in western Canada, and as a matter of fact also in eastern Canada, is that the issue of Quebec separation is going to cloud central Canada so much that all other issues in Canada are going to be forgotten. They're not going to be dealt with. I certainly hope that will not be the case.

AN HON. MEMBER: Never.

MR. ZANDER: Many people have made the comment and have switched their television sets off because of the continual Quebec problem on the television screen. I think we're driving it to the extent where the people are going to be fed up with it and are going to make a move.

I just have to reminisce a moment [about] what the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff said in his speech and I quote from February 25 *Hansard* on page 21. I cannot quite agree with him because he made this statement:

One of the [many] features of throne speech debates in the past has been that members would rise and tell [the] Legislature about their constituency. More particularly, I think back-bench members were trying to tell [the] cabinet what their constituencies were all about because the cabinet never visited [the] constituencies. That of course has been changed under this administration. I need hardly tell the members of the Executive Council about Medicine Hat and Redcliff, because they [all have] been there so often that I'm sure they feel it is their second home.

I wonder if the hon. member would give me that formula sometime, if it's still in existence.

Talking about my constituency, Mr. Speaker, I think many people in this Chamber today, and some of those who aren't here, do not realize or probably haven't got any idea what the Drayton Valley constituency comprises and what it contributes to the Provincial Treasurer. But maybe just for the record, going back to 1954, the first oil sale after the discovery of oil in the Pembina field netted the province some \$34 million. That was 1954 when the dollar still meant something. If you equate it to today's value, you'd probably get up to about the \$3 billion mark. Mr. Speaker, at one time we had some 71 rigs drilling in there and they're not out of there yet. There are still many in there today. They're going into the deeper zones. The field has been in production over 20 years. It has produced from an average of 200,000 barrels a day to almost 400,000 barrels a day. It is now on a reduced scale, and I believe it's still producing somewhere around 200,000 barrels.

So, Mr. Speaker, we look at the totals I got from the former minister of energy and resources, Mr. Dickie. Up to 1972 the provincial government received in excess of \$411 million in bonuses only, not royalties, from that field. That was up to 1972. I'll quote from *Oil Week* of [February] 28 on page 39: "The top lease bonus was paid by Chevron Standard amounting to \$185,221" or \$144.70 an acre on 1,280 acres in the northwest corner of the Pembina field, immediately east of the Nairb discovery of oil on 11-22-49-12 W.5. The total price of two sections brought \$1,015, 80 per acre, or a total of \$1.3 million. Following that sale, Mr. Speaker, in the very same area an additional three point some odd million dollars was brought in to the Provincial Treasurer by way of bonus bids by AMOCO and their partners. So we could gather that — and I'm taking the figures that we're only recovering 32 per cent of the oil in place, the secondary recovery from that field — we have taken over 1 billion barrels of oil from the Pembina field in the past 20 years.

Now what the total value of this in government returns would be, I do not know. But I know this much: before this government was elected in 1971, that was the forgotten area of the province. Thanks only to the hon. Member for Drumheller, the former Minister of Highways, who constructed two highways in that area, Highway 39 and Highway 57. Although I wish the hon. Member for Drumheller had widened Highway 57 at that time rather than have to do it at the price we're doing it today. I know that money was scarce, but with that kind of money flowing out of an area, there has to be a responsibility.

I notice the hon. Leader of the Opposition is not in his place. I recall some of the trials education went through when he was Minister of Education. I think he should probably read it in *Hansard*. Here was a quiet hamlet of some 74 people with a school population of about 94, which in three years mushroomed to over 1,000 pupils. And the local taxpayer — all except \$64,000 was given by the Department of Education to alleviate the hardships of the children and the influx of people going to school there.

I visualize the number of dollars going into education today, and I go back those 20 years . . . Mr. Speaker, I see the former Minister of Education, the Leader of the Opposition, sitting there and saying we're not putting enough into education, and I wonder what he thought of at that time when this tremendous influx of children was brought about. The government at that time derived all the benefits, but the local taxpayer had to bear all the costs. It's strange that he should now be saying we should put more money into education when the educational budget in the last four years has almost tripled.

Mr. Speaker, we have another industry in that area, and that is agriculture. We pride ourselves on the many cattle in there that are fed and marketed. But I wonder, Mr. Speaker, when we as a government are going to dispose of the archaic marketing of our livestock in this province, and when Canada is going to wake up to the fact that we're marketing cattle and hogs and sheep in the manner we are. I have not yet read the Hu Harries report. But from what I as a former farmer know of agriculture, the marketing of livestock is back maybe 4,000 years, because we haven't changed. I wonder when we're going to get the courage to change the total marketing system of

our livestock in Canada, and particularly in Alberta. There's no way an ordinary farmer today, unless he has about a week, maybe two weeks beforehand, [can] get his cattle slaughtered, if he wants to get them slaughtered in a processing plant in the city of Edmonton. It isn't a week that goes past, Mr. Speaker, that our rural MLAs, at least myself, are not confronted by people who have not been able to take their cattle directly to the plants for slaughter.

This brings me to another point. If we take a look at the federal subsidy plan, they say you must have proof of an animal being slaughtered. How can you have proof other than the carcass grading of the animal? It seems to me that this is what they demand. But we can't get our animals into the slaughter house to get them slaughtered. We have to deliver them either to the local auction mart or to the yards in the city of Edmonton. And there's no way a farmer can get the federal subsidy on those cattle. Many farmers have the federal application forms in their hands today, but many, many will not qualify because they have no proof that their animals were slaughtered.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal part and parcel with the health delivery system in our province. You know, it takes me back a number of years — and the hon. members across the way, to my left there, will know — we were building active treatment hospitals on a fifty-fifty cost-sharing agreement with the federal government. We built smaller hospitals — 20-bed, 30-bed, 40-bed — all over the province. We built them in centres within 12 to 15 miles of larger hospitals. We built hospitals 20 and 30 miles away from other hospitals. So we finally wound up with more active treatment beds in this province than in any province in Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: We still do.

MR. ZANDER: And probably are still at the same place. What we had neglected was the looking after of our senior citizens. Consequently this government embarked on a crash program to bring in senior citizen housing, and that was the lodges in 1972-73. I'm very thankful I got a certain amount. I probably got more than I should have, because there weren't any in the constituency in 1971.

But what is wrong now, Mr. Speaker — and it doesn't take a mathematician, it doesn't take a doctor; it takes only good common sense for an MLA to go into his constituency — is we haven't got any place to put our senior citizens who can no longer get into these senior citizen lodges but have to get into an auxiliary hospital or nursing home, and there are no beds available. There is a waiting list in the hospitals, and active treatment hospitals right now are congested with these chronic illnesses or these senior citizens. Many hospitals have set aside certain beds or a wing to take these people.

What really surprised me, Mr. Speaker, when I returned, not willingly, to the Misericordia Hospital this past January was that there was a man in that hospital who had been in a year already. He was 96 years old. It was costing this government \$36,000 a year to keep him in an active treatment hospital. Our health delivery system has to be revamped completely, or the costs are going to get so high that we will not be able to cope with them.

I would say that wherever possible we should either create auxiliary wings in existing hospitals or construct some auxiliary hospitals or nursing homes, so we no longer have to keep senior citizens who need auxiliary hospital treatment in an active treatment hospital. I think the sooner we commit dollars to that, the more money we will save.

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to the other point, transportation in my constituency. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that we have been blessed by two cabinet ministers who so ably filled that position; I'm referring to the former Minister of Highways and Transport and today's Minister of Transportation. In my case, an area that had been so neglected you wouldn't believe this if I told you — but I think I have pictures to prove it — after a day's rain, children in my constituency cannot go to school because the school bus can't get there. We are 90 miles away from the city of Edmonton, as the crow flies, and everything comes to a standstill the minute a rainstorm comes. The roads that were built in that area were built primarily by the oil industry 20 years ago.

We talk about assessment, and we talk about taxes. I see a motion on the agenda that is going to deal with the 50 per cent division of industrial assessment. In one county there is one division that has land and industrial assessment of over \$20 million. Yet when it rains in that area the bus can't come to pick up the students because there is no gravel on the road. The road hasn't been reconstructed to make it suitable for school buses.

I wonder just what must be done. A petition came to the government from my area some five years ago. It was signed by over 1,400 rural people who wanted a change in direction. It's five years, and I'm told we're going to get a decision. Mr. Speaker, in all honesty and sincerity I can say that I will not be in this House unless a decision is made so that these people at least have the chance to look after their own local problems. There is no reason why an oil industry has to come to my house and say, What is happening? We're paying all these royalties and all these taxes and we can't move because somebody else won't move. I think it's time, Mr. Speaker, that we have a hard look at the situation out there.

The Minister of Transportation has done his best — the former one and this one have done their best — but he can only do so much. Then of course it has to be other action. I am almost ashamed to say that it takes five or six years to make a decision on something.

I hate to leave the subject of transportation because it is so urgently needed in my constituency, but I will deal with education at this time. Only eight or nine years ago, the cost of educating a child was about \$345. Now the cost of educating a child out there is on the average of \$1,400. So the cost of delivering education to a child in that area has risen by 400 per cent. After checking and rechecking the financial statements, I am really surprised it isn't, as we are told many times, that the salaries and transportation are 90 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see handed to each taxpayer in the area the financial statement of both the educational and the municipal portion of a county — and I don't mean the abbreviated part of it, I mean the total financial statement as it is delivered to the county. The abbreviated form does not give you eve-

rything the ratepayer wants to see, because he wants to see some other things. I think we have to see whether we can't get that financial statement into the hands of the taxpayer.

The capital costs of school buildings has gone up, there is no question. As all other things, I think it is going to continue to rise. But I believe we can cut corners. We can use some of the classrooms now standing empty. We should be bringing the teacher to the classroom, not the children to the teacher. I know that in parts of my constituency and elsewhere in this province schools are standing empty, that have been overbuilt, whose debentures still have 10 or maybe 15 years to go. Then the children are picked up and transported elsewhere. This is one way we can bring back some input from the local people.

I was sort of surprised also — the hon. member speaking just before me mentioned that the throne speech could be condensed, I think he said, on an 8 by 11. Well I don't know what he took out of it, but certainly he's getting a lot out of it as far as his constituency is concerned. I think he's getting more out of the provincial government now than he got while he was a cabinet minister.

It makes me sick when I hear people across the way asking for things, and demanding things and saying, well we did it that much better. But if you actually stopped and took an assessment of your constituencies, all hon. members, you're getting 10 times more than you got when you were cabinet ministers.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's performance.

MR. ZANDER: It is strange that all the comments that came across here — you know, you always say the chickens come home to roost. I wonder if the hon. member who spoke just before me doesn't really remember "Land for Living". I wonder if he can ever recall that. You can call it what you want to, but it was a piece of propaganda that came out just as a chicken would lay eggs, out every day. Any time you want to, just look at "Land for Living", you've got it. He just complained because no more cabinet ministers appeared on government publications. To tell you the truth, the cabinet ministers have been out in the constituencies and have seen the problems. Therefore there is no longer any need to put them on the front page — save the space for additional information.

In closing — you know, the Speaker always has these things going around. It's something like Jack Benny would say, I see you too often. But, Mr. Speaker, it's been a wonderful time. I enjoyed the first term in office. I also enjoyed the second term of office.

DR. PAPROSKI: We enjoyed having you too.

MR. ZANDER: But sometimes it comes that a person has got to look at the constituency and the people he represents and the ideals, what he stands for. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker and hon. members, that I am going to represent my constituency and the rest of this province in the Dominion of Canada as long as I'm able to.

Thank you very much.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure for me to get into the throne speech debate this morning. First, I'd like to offer my congratulations to the mover of the speech, the hon. Member for Lloydminster, also to the seconder, the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff. I'd also join them in their congratulations and remarks on the fine way in which you and the Speaker perform the duties of your office; the fairness and dignity with which the office is performed is exemplary throughout Canada.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the throne speech in detail, I would say initially that I think it is a fine speech. It's a reflection of the strength of Alberta, of the determination of the people of Alberta, a reflection of the past several years of our government and the position Alberta is in today.

But before I get into that in any detail, I would like to offer a few comments on some of the criticisms by the members opposite. I would say I am a little disappointed in them. I understand from their remarks that they perceive the role of an opposition as simply to criticize, to be negative. Frankly, I would have thought part of their function was to pick some spots to criticize; I am sure there is always room in anything for some criticism. But surely they should be doing something positive in developing a platform so sometime, someplace, they can offer an alternative to the people.

If they're not prepared to do that and they're satisfied just to sit there and be negative, so be it. But I think it is unfortunate, not only for the House but for the people of Alberta in general. I thought, Mr. Speaker, one of the speakers this morning, the hon. Member for Little Bow, was going to change that philosophy or pattern of the members opposite when he said, I agree with certain parts of the throne speech. I think he was probably the first of the official opposition to get up and do that. For a moment I thought he was going to come out with something creditable. But in just a matter of a few sentences he was back to what he called three errors. I don't think they were errors. Let me start with his third one first. He criticized the speech because there was little . . .

Might I say I'm happy to see the hon. Member for Clover Bar back. I was concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is he back again?

DR. BUCK: Nice to be back.

MR. McCRAE: Frankly I didn't think he listened very often, but I thought he was listening yesterday when the member to my right talked about the British parliamentary tradition that they didn't have seats. They only had benches, and people only came when they had a contribution to make. [interjections] I thought his perception of what that meant was you only came when you had a question to ask or a speech to make, and that was the contribution. It's been my impression that he is here only when he has a question or a speech to make. There are other contributions as well.

DR. BUCK: They're not getting much out of you for their \$35,000, Stu.

MR. McCRAE: Anyway, the third criticism by the hon. Member for Little Bow: that the throne speech did not

contain our legislative program. Mr. Speaker, I think he totally misunderstands the function of a throne speech.

Now I have been here but a fraction of the time he has, but surely the sessions of this House are broken into at least three main categories. One is the throne speech, which gives an overall direction of government policy with some legislative indications, but by all means not all of them. Secondly, you have the budget speech and the discussions and debate that follow that and, thirdly, you have the legislative program that develops from the session of the House.

Also the member made some rather uncharitable comments about the way our caucus operates and what contribution the non-cabinet ministers may make. I thought they were grossly unfair. I know our caucuses are efficient in spite of the fact we have 69 members. Because of the leadership and the chairmanship, the deliberations of caucus go on with punctuality, with responsibility, with brevity. I guess the hon. Member for Clover Bar . . .

DR. BUCK: Especially brevity.

MR. McCRAE: . . . gave us a pretty good indication in his rambling, unco-ordinated remarks yesterday as to why their caucus had not worked. The fact that there was no discipline, little direction, little preparation — I suggest to you, sir, that our caucus does work because of the determination of our people to make it work.

DR. BUCK: Talk to me if you stick around for 35 years, Stu.

MR. McCRAE: The second concern I had with the remarks of the hon. Member for Little Bow — and this is a very delicate subject — was the question of national unity. He got into it by his remarks on our statement about international trade, tariffs, and our determination to do something in that area. He suggested that because of the tensions across Canada at this time, it somehow would have a negative effect on national unity for us to pursue our ambitions, our necessary goals at this time. He suggested there would be another time. I don't know when the other time would be.

The members opposite were in government for something like 35 years, and they did nothing about it. We are doing something about it. We have been for the five years we have been in office, and are continuing to do it. Surely the pursuit of our necessary, credible, and worth-while goals is not to the prejudice of national unity. In fact if they hear us on the other end, it will be something that will solidify Canada, cement the relationship. We're talking about strong regions, jobs, taxes, opportunities for Albertans and, as I say, the reasonable pursuit of those directions is not something that is going to create disunity in Canada.

So I suggest he reflect on that kind of thinking. I am sure there are those who would like all of us to feel that way, to sit down and play dead and do nothing, and so on. Sure. We'll wind up 10 years from now when the oil and gas revenues have run dry or the wells have run dry or are running dry and the revenues have reduced. We'll wind up like we were back in 1935, or perhaps like we were from

about 1971 to 1973 when oil exploration had dropped off because of pricing and other factors.

In Calgary there was a tremendously pessimistic attitude. People were concerned about jobs, not just in the oil industry but in every facet of life, from the realtors right through to the cab drivers, all sorts of business people. There had been no direction, no efforts had been made to ensure a fair return.

So I say it isn't against national unity to pursue those objectives at this time. As a matter of fact, while sitting back and doing nothing, waiting for the opportunity to co-operate, what did we have? We had Petrosar get the jump on us. That is why it is so difficult, or may be difficult, for our petrochemical industry to establish itself as firmly as we would like at this time. Because you people sat and did nothing. If that is co-operation, I fail to understand that kind of co-operation.

The third criticism or concern expressed by the hon. Member for Little Bow were the remarks on page 2 of the throne speech, which I very firmly support, about the role of the volunteer and the fact that people are realizing they had perhaps expected too much from government and it was time to reassess things. I think that was one of the finest statements in this throne speech. And the necessity of it was never [better] exemplified than yesterday when we had the Member for Clover Bar jumping up and in one form or another suggesting and imploring the government that it should buy the Alberta Game Farm.

The volunteer, the individual citizen out there, what is he for? What is he doing? Well, I'd like to take a copy of *The Calgary Herald*, dated Thursday, February 24 — and some of the things that are happening down there by the community, not by the government, and the people are not asking the government to do it. One headline: "Major facelift for the Calgary Zoo". That's a multimillion dollar fund raising campaign of the private sector to rebuild certain facets of the zoo. They're not standing here saying, government do this, government do that. The members and the community people are getting involved and showing leadership and doing something.

Another example from that same paper, and I just show you this to indicate the many, many things that are happening down there by the volunteer sector: "Stampede Needs Agricultural Complex". The Stampede has been a source of pride to Calgarians for 50 years. By and large they have done things themselves, through volunteers, 2,500 volunteers working throughout the year.

Another headline: "Facelift under way for Heritage Park". That's the kind of thing volunteers have been doing for 50 years, and should continue to do. If the hon. Member for Clover Bar reflected on that, I think he would recognize the importance of this statement in the throne speech . . .

DR. BUCK: You could buy the Game Farm from the cream you take from PWA.

MR. McCRAE: If we bought the Game Farm, as the hon. member opposite suggests, we could have 300 more public servants to operate the Game Farm. And he stands there in his place [interjections] constantly deriding the government for the number of civil servants we have.

The Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff said yester-

day that he was going to keep an itemization of the number of contradictory statements the members opposite make, where they're chiding us, deriding us for the number of public servants, and at the same time asking for programs that would necessitate, without good reason, the addition of a whole lot more civil servants.

I suggest to you that you take a look at what the volunteer community does, and is doing up here. My comments were not to suggest that it doesn't happen up here. It does. But if you people would get on the wagon and help a bit, it would work a lot better.

Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to make a comment about the comments of the member who is so often absent, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

DR. BUCK: He's shadowing the Premier.

MR. McCRAE: I guess he is out contributing somewhere else right now. Anyway, he was condemning us a couple of days back, in his great contribution to the throne speech debate, for not having developed a fixed policy on the oil sands. Now some three or four years back, when the oil sands appeared to be the answer to the energy problems of Canada, there was a suggestion that we would develop a policy. Granted, at that time we thought it could be a fixed policy. But one of the cornerstones of this government is that we don't get tied up in dogma, that we don't get tied up in manifestoes, that we don't get tied into fixed policies from which you can't depart. Things changed in the oil sands. We had inflation. We had the cost of the plant going from a few hundred million dollars to in excess of \$2 billion. What did we do? We developed a flexible policy. We reacted to the need of Alberta — the need of Canada, I should say — to assure that that plant and that program would continue, and it did. Now that was a policy.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Additionally, appreciating the problems in the oil sands, cost being only one of them, the environmental problems of overburden and ground water, and other problem areas, we decided it is perhaps unlikely that plants of the number and magnitude that had earlier been predicted will in fact proceed.

So what have we done? We have responded with positive programs, one being AOSTRA, adverted to this morning by the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, a program to work with the private sector in developing a number of areas of experimentation, research, pilot projects on the ground, which may someday result in the development of this tremendous asset. It is a tremendous asset, but it is not apparently very economic at this time. So we did respond with a flexible program that meets the needs of the time. I think it's significant to relate the remarks of the president of Shell Oil, speaking in Saskatchewan a couple of days back, when he said that to make an oil sands plant economic at this time the minimum price per barrel for oil was \$12, and that was before royalties. So if that projection is correct, you can imagine the cost a barrel of oil would have to reach before another plant might become economic.

So we didn't get locked into a fixed policy. We

developed as a now government, a reaction to a now situation. We're pursuing it through the research AOSTRA will do.

Another area we responded to in the oil and gas sector was the statement a few weeks back that royalty on secondary or tertiary recovery projects could and would be reduced in order to secure additional production that would otherwise be left in the ground. That is a very positive type of reaction. That is a program. That is a policy. Not a fixed policy, such as the Member for Spirit River-Fairview might develop, but something that is positive and current.

Another area the members opposite seem to be criticizing us on is the restraint program. We heard it yesterday. We hear them out there in the street condemning us for government expenditures, the alleged growth. We have responded to government growth, government expenditures, with the restraint program of last year which, I might say, was very successful, and again this year with another 10 per cent limitation.

But I was concerned. We hear that the members opposite are against government growth, against excessive government spending. But what did we hear yesterday? The leader of the official opposition, through his questioning, was criticizing the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, who has done such a good job in the way of trying to curb hospital expense growth, for attempting to control the cost of the construction of hospitals at Red Deer, Fort McMurray, and Grande Prairie. Surely that's a total inconsistency.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame.

MR. McCRAE: And surely that will be noted by the population . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Well noted.

MR. McCRAE: . . . of Alberta. Another rather strange situation we had was a debate the other day on a motion by one of the members, asking for an inquiry into the letting of Syncrude pipeline contracts.

The explanations given by people on this side were entirely credible, entirely responsible, entirely consistent with the direction of this Legislature, when we set up, say, the Alberta Energy Company, or made our contribution to Syncrude, that we should do it with the purpose and avowed intention of letting management manage. That was the determination we made and the stricture we had from the members on all sides of this House.

So here we have a motion the other day asking for an inquiry. I say the debate on this side handled it well. But the thing that shocked me was the expression of shock, I believe it was yesterday, from the Member for Clover Bar. He said he was appalled or shocked by the results of the vote. Apparently he was so appalled and so shocked that as I recall he didn't even get into the debate. So if it was a serious matter, where was he?

AN HON. MEMBER: He was in Fort Saskatchewan.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of good things in the 21 or 22 pages of the throne speech. I'll just mention a couple of them: the announcement of

increased support for libraries is something that's got to be heralded and applauded by all members of this . . .

DR. BUCK: Did you say "prodded"?

MR. McCRAE: . . . applauded by all members of this House. And again that was a situation where we're coming from 35 years of neglect, little spending. But hearing the people, hearing of their need, we responded. And so it should be. That is one of the many, many examples of how the people on this side listen. The cabinet tours is another. The cabinet is out there, touring around, doing things, listening to people and responding to them.

The Leader of the Opposition is constantly talking about revenue sharing — the lack of it now — local autonomy, that sort of thing. I want to ask you who withdrew revenue sharing from the municipalities?

AN HON. MEMBER: Who withdrew it?

MR. McCRAE: The members opposite. Our Member for Clover Bar often says that two wrongs don't make a right. I could give him the reverse of that and say two rights don't make a wrong. That was one of the decisions you people made that was proper, for the valid reasons expressed by our Provincial Treasurer and others. We support it. Through the Minister of Municipal Affairs, we've talked about extending the unconditional grants or taking some of the strings off the grants. That's fine. But to get down to total revenue sharing would not only be unwise but unfair to the municipalities. So again I ask you, when you're marching around the province complaining and trumpeting the cause of local autonomy, why don't you reflect on where the initiative came from? You really didn't have that many initiatives. But it's one that was good, and I think you should stick with it, take some credit for it.

One of the problems facing Calgarians in the months ahead, Mr. Speaker, will be the question of annexation. As all members know, we passed legislation some months back providing that the final determination of an annexation recommendation by the Local Authorities Board should be made by the cabinet. There are about six current applications in Calgary, and it's something cabinet will have to deal with. It's a question that is concerning all Calgarians, the question of quality of life, whether growth should be inward and upward or, by virtue of annexation, whether it should be outward. A lot of facets to that question — transportation, impact on inner community. I'm sure we will all be eagerly awaiting the report of the Local Authorities Board and the determination by the people of Calgary through their elected representatives down there as to the type of growth they want. So the cabinet, by listening, can respond to the wishes of the people consistent with provincial government policies.

Another area I want to get into, and it's referred to in the Speech from the Throne, was the major recreational grants program; that is, the matching dollar program where the province has set \$10 per annum aside for each person in each municipality, to be used for recreational and cultural purposes. My references to the things happening in Calgary — the Calgary Zoo, the Calgary Stampede, and so on — are, along with

countless other community opportunities, evidence of how that program is working and how it can work in other parts of the province if people will take hold of it and make it work.

In my own community of Triwood, in my constituency of Calgary Foothills, we have a sportsplex. We have a new sportsplex in Brentwood, a new community hall in Varsity Acres, new playground facilities in University Heights. We have countless examples of how the community volunteer has gone and said, here is a worth-while project. Let's get a group of citizens, do some fund raising and, after we've developed our strategies and our fund raising and gotten our volunteers together, we will come to the provincial government, through the municipalities, respecting local autonomy and giving the city, for instance in Calgary's case, the opportunity of determining where these projects will in fact be. There's the opportunity for the volunteer to develop community facilities, be they recreational or cultural. One of the many, many examples where this government has developed a program and at the same time respected local autonomy.

Other areas of the Speech from the Throne that I would briefly comment on are the five goals; surely we can all support them. A member opposite had some difficulty with one of them, but in my estimation they are fine goals for any government.

On page 3 there's a reference to the strength of the Canadian petroleum industry and the fact that it anticipates another record year of activity. That's important to all of Canada, to national unity, to the balance of payments, to our energy supply, to assure — and this is the responsibility of Albertans, and part of their contribution to the national scene — that we have a healthy industry with the wherewithal to go out and explore and develop new reserves.

I don't want to harp on this too long, but members opposite will recall the development in late 1974 of the Alberta petroleum exploration incentive program, which was a reaction to some of the goings on between the levels of government, perhaps in the co-operative atmosphere the member opposite was talking about where the impositions on the industry were so heavy that it looked for a while as if the industry might go under. We, in a conscientious national effort and attitude, developed an incentive program that has the industry back functioning well, working hard, creating jobs, finding new oil and gas, meeting a national demand.

I was also happy to note in the Speech from the Throne the reference to the Alberta Children's Hospital in Calgary, the moneys that will be expended there in developing it as a major provincial referral centre that will specialize in a priority for this government: health care for our younger generation.

Mr. Speaker, another area in the energy scene which had some reference here has been our participation in coal gasification research schemes, another indication of our contribution to the Canadian scene. Surely coal gasification cannot be of such importance to Albertans that we do it only on our own behalf. It is done in the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne that I have the honor to address myself to today is something we all can be proud of. It is an indication of the resourcefulness of the people of Alberta, the strength of Alberta, the opportunities here, the buoyancy of

our economy, the ability of this government to respond to situations and needs as they develop. All in all it is a document I am proud to be associated with and proud to speak to.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BACKUS: Mr. Speaker, it's an honor and a pleasure to participate in this throne speech debate, which was so ably introduced and seconded by the members for Lloydminster and Medicine Hat-Redcliff. I also must say I enjoyed this year's sermon on heart and courage. Although maybe he didn't intend to, I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition chose a very good text for this sermon. As I recall, and it's a while since I saw it, the end of the story about the land over the rainbow ended up with the Tin Man and the Lion discovering that they in fact had the courage and the heart without needing any magic from the Wizard of Oz.

AN HON. MEMBER: The wizard of who?

DR. BACKUS: I was a little surprised today that the Member for Little Bow felt the government was so busy with an obsession on economic development, and suggested that because of this we did not show adequate concern for social development and help for the individual. Of course I do believe his view is shared by the Leader of the Opposition and, probably appropriately, it seems it was also shared by a party executive from the NDP who was visiting with our Member for Spirit River-Fairview recently in Grande Prairie, when he stated the Alberta government was so busy helping the big multinationals that it was not helping the individuals in Alberta.

Unfortunately, I was reading this with a senior citizen at our beautiful new Heritage Lodge in Grande Prairie which is right next door to Aurora Court, our senior citizen self-contained units, and we were just across the street from the sheltered workshop for the mentally handicapped. The senior citizen made a few remarks about this statement which were not very parliamentary when he got into his cab to go to the Senior Citizen Recreation Centre. I left for a swim at our new 'recplex' before going to a concert at our new auditorium. My wife wasn't with me, because she was at the government-assisted art gallery in Grande Prairie attending a very fine exhibition by The Alberta Art Foundation. AN HON. MEMBER: What about the children?

DR. BACKUS: I could go on about the education tax savings and the gas rebate plan and various other things, but I think this isn't a bad record of help for the individual in just five and a half years.

I hadn't intended mentioning the Grande Prairie hospital. But since the hon. Leader of the Opposition brought the matter up, I think perhaps it is worthy of mention, particularly as he also brought up at a later date in the question period the fact that the government seemed to be cutting down the plans by 20 per cent. He may know something I don't, but as far as I know we haven't even got to the stage of planning where the government is in a position to start cutting it down. It's certainly true, with regard to this hospital, that expectations ran away ahead of construction. I think it's also true that the planning phase may have taken a little longer than we anticipated. But the

hospital board has now put the conceptual plan in the hands of the planning architect, and we anticipate detailed planning will be coming forward very rapidly.

I would rather have a little longer planning period for something like this than spend the next 20 years, as I have the last 20 years, in the hospital given to us by the previous administration, where for reasons of economy 30 feet were chopped off the original plan without any consultation and all the wards were shortened appropriately. For the last 20 years we have had to move all the furniture out of these wards — including the patient in the other bed — in order to get in a stretcher to take a patient to the operating room or return him from it.

I was also very interested in why a number of speakers felt it was a relegation to put something on page 20 of the throne speech; I think it has been mentioned by others. To me the matter of importance about our federal relationships comes under the Department of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, which was dealt with on page 20. On the other hand, by virtue of their argument, I notice that Grande Prairie is mentioned on page 6, Edmonton on page 11, and Fort Saskatchewan on page 14 which, if their argument is true, may show the relative importance of some of these areas.

I thought the Member for Spirit River-Fairview indicated his centralist point of view and stressed that Alberta should not lobby outside of Canada in our attempt to improve the trading position of this land-locked province. I hope the media will stress this important point of view, because Albertans are wise enough to recognize what an NDP government, under direction from Toronto, would mean to this province.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak of my constituency, although my remarks earlier will have indicated that much has been done for the people in this exciting and growing and developing part of the province. I think it would be fair to say that the many problems I've had to face have been the frustrations of people in the area because of time. So much has been achieved in such a short time that people expect all the many things we feel need doing will be done immediately. People are frustrated because they do not see the new hospital opening tomorrow or the highway south being started last year or the development of an inland terminal being planned today. But they were also impatient about the 'recplex', the auditorium, and the college.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned expectations as being a problem, and I agree with him very much. But how do you balance expectations with actual progress? I think if nobody expected anything, they would probably never get anything. I think that maybe last year's sermon on accountability should be applied to all members of the Assembly. We should each be accountable to our constituents, to interpret to the whole province the problems and responsibilities of this Legislature. At the same time, we should each be accountable to the Legislature and government for the needs and ambitions of our constituents.

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

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, as to next week, the Assembly will not be sitting on Monday night. We will continue on Monday with the debate in reply to the throne speech. I move we call it 1 o'clock.

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

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

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