

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Monday, March 7, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 7****The Trade Schools Regulation
Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. DONNELLY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 7, The Trade Schools Regulation Amendment Act, 1977. The purpose of this bill is to increase public participation by adding two members to the trade schools advisory board. This will bring the board to a total of five members.

[Leave granted; Bill 7 read a first time]

Bill 13**The Forests Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Forests Amendment Act, 1977. The purpose of this act is to clarify areas in the present act dealing with administration of crown timber and forest land use. The act also deletes certain authorities in respect to forestry roads and airstrips which have been transferred to the Minister of Transportation.

[Leave granted; Bill 13 read a first time]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the following bills be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders: Bill No. 7, The Trade Schools Regulation Amendment Act, 1977, and Bill No. 13, The Forests Amendment Act, 1977.

[Motion carried]

head: INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, today it is my pleasure to introduce to you a distinguished visitor from overseas. He is in your gallery. I'd like to introduce to you, and to the Assembly, the High Commissioner for Zambia in Canada, His Excellency Wilson Chakulya. He is particularly interested in matters relating to education and international aid. He is accompanied by the Second Secretary, Mr. Simfukwe. I'd ask that both of them stand at this time and be recognized by the Assembly.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I should like to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assem-

bly, a school in which I feel adopted. From the McLeod Elementary School in my constituency of Edmonton Belmont, we have with us this afternoon 85 students and three teachers, headed by teacher Mrs. E. McKeen. About 60 are in the members gallery, 25 in the public gallery. Mr. Speaker, I would ask them now to rise from their seats and be recognized by the Assembly.

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to file with the House two copies of the annual report of the Alberta Health Care Insurance Commission for the year ended June 30, 1976.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table the fifty-second annual report of the Alberta Liquor Control Board.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Oil Pricing**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to either the Premier or the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. It flows from the Ottawa announcement that the federal budget will come down on March 31. It's of direct interest to the Assembly because of the oil pricing negotiations between Alberta and the federal government. Mr. Speaker, the first question is: what is the position of the government of Alberta with regard to anticipated price increases, looking toward the end of June this year? At what stage are the negotiations now?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the matter of oil pricing policy has been agreed upon between the governments of Alberta and Canada. We're pleased the government of Canada has agreed that prices for Canadian oil should rise toward international prices. We are now in a position of determining how the rises occur or how much each year over a period of years. It seems this happens every year.

We are presently talking to the federal government about the increase which will occur after July 1 in the coming year. In the next 10 days there will be a meeting of officials to discuss the matter. The ministers of energy are also meeting on April 6 to discuss the matter. I hope we will be able to reach some general agreement at that time on crude oil pricing, keeping in mind, however, that we feel that is a responsibility of the province of Alberta.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Is the minister in a position to assure the Assembly that the federal government will not be announcing a new price for crude oil in the budget which comes down March 31?

MR. GETTY: As possible as it is for me to predict what the federal government is going to do, I would say I would be very surprised if they could announce a price for Alberta's crude oil in their budget, and very unwise of them.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then a supplementary question along the same line to the minister. Have negotiations between Alberta and the federal government got to a point now that the federal government could follow the same practice it did last year, I believe, when the federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources announced from Ottawa the result of the negotiations between Alberta and the federal government? I relate once again to March 31, when the federal budget comes down.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure of the procedure last year that the hon. Leader of the Opposition refers to. The only reason oil is at the price it is now is that that's the price the Alberta government has agreed to sell it at. To the best of my knowledge, no legislation is presently in existence which controls the price of oil in Canada, except the Alberta government's Alberta Petroleum Marketing Commission. So when the federal minister announces a certain price, it's a price agreed on between the government of Alberta and the government of Canada.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, going back to the minister once again, just so there's no misunderstanding. Have the discussions between the minister or the Premier and the federal government gone far enough that the federal government can make this announcement on March 31? We really want to be assured that it can't.

MR. NOTLEY: Are we at the bottom line?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I advised the hon. member, if he was listening to my earlier answer, that the energy ministers are meeting on April 6 to discuss pricing of oil and gas for Canada. Obviously then, the federal government would not be announcing a price on March 31. I don't know when the federal budget will come out. Perhaps my hon. colleague the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has a better idea on the timing, but I doubt very much whether there will be any comments regarding price of oil when we are having an energy ministers' meeting on April 6.

MR. CLARK: Just one last question to the minister. In the last series of negotiations the minister indicated the minimum increase Alberta would accept would be \$2 per barrel. What is Alberta's target on this round of negotiations? Perhaps I should say, the minister's target was \$2.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, last year about this time the negotiations were under way and as I recall Ontario said not one cent, the Alberta government through me said \$2, and we ended up with \$1.75. This year we are in the midst of negotiations, and I'd prefer not to enter into any open discussion as to how those negotiations are being carried on.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary to the hon. minister. Once the sale price of oil is agreed upon, is that binding on the government of Alberta within Alberta?

MR. GETTY: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's binding inasmuch as the government lives up to its word.

Natural Gas Sales

MR. CLARK: I would like to direct a second question to the same minister. It's as a result of the problem a number of small gas exploration companies are facing in not being able in fact to sell their produce. The question is: at what stage are negotiations? Is the province of Alberta involved in negotiations that would extend the pipeline in the Worsley area so some 275,000 cubic feet of Alberta natural gas could be got into the Westcoast Transmission line and, I think, go some distance toward helping a number of small companies?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, a matter that concerns some of the smaller gas producers, and I suppose larger ones in our province, is that we currently have a surplus of natural gas. It's kind of a nice problem to have, far better to have some surplus than to be running right on a supply/demand curve with very little flexibility.

Nevertheless some producers wish to find additional markets. The government of Alberta is not actually involved in negotiating for markets, but producing companies and transmission companies are, to the best of my knowledge, following a variety of solutions.

One is to shorten the term of export permits to the United States so additional gas reserves won't be committed, but the amount that is committed can be sent in a shorter period of time. Therefore, they could produce more gas now and take up some of the surplus.

Another avenue being explored is the potential to swap additional natural gas now for gas guaranteed in the future.

A third is the one the hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned, that is the potential to use that portion of the Westcoast Transmission export permit from British Columbia that is not now being satisfied. They have not been able to supply to consumers in northern and western United States some 300 million cubic feet a day. Some of the Alberta producers and transmission companies are looking to export gas under that export permit.

The government of Alberta has given its approval to a connection at Worsley in order for the additional gas to flow. However, there are contract terms that have to be negotiated, because if the natural gas is going to be sold to the United States we will want Alberta producers to receive the full benefit of the export price.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. Premier with reference to answers by the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. With regard to the answer of compression of time for export of gas, has the Premier received requests from Governor Judge of the state of Montana to allow Alberta to compress the time period of the export of gas to the state of Montana?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, although I was involved in discussions with Governor Judge in regard to that matter in June, in his case we were dealing with a different matter than the matter the hon. member raises, because with the state of Montana it's a matter of renewal of export permits. They

of course have a relatively different case from others because first of all they were encouraged to come here to develop and explore, did so and were successful. People from Montana through Montana Power and others discovered the reserves in Canada and in fact are producing them. We've felt that they should be looked at in a different way perhaps than other export permits, and have accordingly advised the federal government on a number of occasions to consider that the position of the state of Montana and its requests for additional gas supply differs somewhat from other regions receiving Alberta natural gas. But perhaps the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources may wish to elaborate on the answer.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the only elaboration I could add would be that an application would have to be made to the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board, in this case I imagine it would be by Canadian Montana. Assuming approval were given, it would also have to be approved by the National Energy Board. I'm not aware of that application having been received.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary with respect to the possible hookup with Westcoast Transmission. Could the minister advise whether such a move would have to go before the ERCB?

MR. GETTY: Well, it has already, Mr. Speaker. In this case, Pan-Alberta has applied for — it's actually a small application, but it has fairly major ramifications. They've applied for a pipeline interconnection between Alberta and British Columbia to feed into the Westcoast line. The Alberta government had received a positive recommendation from the Energy Resources Conservation Board, and has approved the permit for Pan-Alberta to go ahead and make that connection. Pan-Alberta has also lined up a supply of gas which it could sell to Westcoast Transmission.

Heavy Crude Oil Upgrading

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I also have a question that I would like to direct to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. If I may be permitted a short preamble, I would say that the people of my constituency were delighted to read in the *Edmonton Journal* that 19 Alberta heavy oil producers are studying the feasibility of building a 1,000 barrel a day heavy oil upgrading plant in eastern Alberta. I understand this consortium has met with the federal government and is planning to meet with the Alberta government. Will the minister be part of the representation that meets with these people?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether I've actually received a request to meet with the group which is attempting to develop the heavy oil upgrading plant in the Lloydminster area. However it would be my intention to meet with them, should they request.

I might also say, Mr. Speaker, that we are encouraging anybody who has a potential project to upgrade the heavy oil which we have in our province. Right now the product tends to be difficult to market, but if it's upgraded economically it will be a very sought-after product and, of course, we'll be able to

find markets readily.

I might say that as well as the group the hon. Member for Lloydminster has mentioned, Husky Oil has been talking about such a possible project and, I believe, Petro-Canada is also involved in looking at some type of project in the area.

MR. CLARK: Supplementary question to the minister, on the question of heavy oil. What representation has Alberta made to the federal government with regard to the recent announcement by the National Energy Board that it would exempt heavy crude on export to the United States? I raise the question because it's my understanding that unless there's some sort of longer term commitment by the National Energy Board, refiners in the States are not likely to make the necessary adjustments to their refineries.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I think I mentioned in the fall session last year that probably the single most effective presentation made before the National Energy Board hearings regarding heavy oil was passed from my colleague the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to the National Energy Board of the government of Canada representing the views of the Alberta Energy Resources Conservation Board. The information from the Alberta board, I think, weighed very heavily in the minds of the NEB in allowing additional heavy oil exports to go to the United States. We did at that time point out as well that there was need for fairly long-term commitment of this heavy oil production because, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned, facilities and refineries have to be geared up to handle that heavy oil.

There is though the alternative which has been mentioned by the hon. Member for Lloydminster, that is, rather than having heavy oil, which is difficult to find a market for, have it upgraded within the province and have it then become a much sought-after product, and also have upgrading within the province.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. minister. Mr. Minister, do you have any information as to what form the heavy crude in the Cold Lake area is being produced in? Will it be upgraded, or will it be similar to the heavy crude in the Lloydminster area?

MR. GETTY: As of right now, Mr. Speaker, a very small amount of heavy oil is being produced from an experimental project, or projects, in the Cold Lake area. That heavy oil is being diluted with condensate and sold as a finer, or higher grade oil. However, in a new project that might be contemplated in the Cold Lake area, I believe any project would contemplate having not only the *in situ* recovery of the heavy oil but also its upgrading.

Highways — Metric Conversion

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Deputy Premier and Minister of Transportation. On a recently-erected sign on Highway 16 out of Edmonton, it states that as of September 1, 1977 this sign shall read 100 kilometres per hour. I was wondering whether it's the minister's intention to reduce the speed once the sign is made, since the present speed of 65 miles per hour does not

coincide with 100 kilometres. Or is it because of someone's metric inaccuracy?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, when we had a debate in the Legislature a year ago or last fall relative to the metric conversions, I think we indicated that we were attempting to make those conversions in round numbers. For better or for worse, that is going to mean a slight reduction in speed limits on certain highways and a slight increase in speed limits on certain other highways, depending on what the mileage is now and relative to its metric conversion.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, that very shortly we'll have available to members of the Legislature, and indeed to the general public, a small brochure identifying those speed limits and the conversion rates we'll be using. Hopefully by September 1 they'll be very conversant with them and won't have any difficulties with my colleague's enforcement program.

Annexation Applications

MR. ZANDER: Mr. Speaker, my question dealing with annexation is addressed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Could the minister give us the information: after a recommendation has been made by the PUB to Executive Council, what is the time frame that elapses between that time and a decision [which] then comes forward and is gazetted in the *Alberta Gazette*?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, that would of course vary with the kinds of annexation which are concerned. The LAB, not the PUB the hon. member referred to, deals with about a hundred applications per annum. Of those, about 90 per cent are done on a routine basis and may be described as expansions of a small urban municipality to adjust for the balanced economic growth and the necessity for more land. But the more complex ones are handled by the various subcommittees of cabinet with full debate.

House Prices

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. In light of the minister's comment in *Hansard* of October 26 that housing prices in some cases had dropped by 18 to 25 per cent and that the market place is working effectively, is the minister in a position to explain to the House the reasons for the rather shocking increase of 34 per cent in MLS listings in 1976, and the dubious distinction now held by Alberta of having the highest home prices in the country?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I think the fact is that houses, particularly at the high end of the price range, have met with a certain amount of buyer resistance — I think that is the market place working — with the result, it is my understanding, that some builders have an unsold inventory on hand. It's rather difficult, of course, to accurately tie down prices because of the fact that list prices do not mean that properties have actually sold at those figures. It's my understanding that the same body produces statistics which show that sales are not as high and in fact [have] decreased.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to confirm that the only substantial reductions in fact have been in higher priced housing, and that there has been no material change in the pricing of medium and lower income homes in this province?

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the hon. member's previous and present questions, he would appear to be translating research efforts to the floor of the Legislature. It would seem that the minister's statistics would be equally available to the hon. member, especially if he wanted to put them as a question on the Order Paper.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could pursue the question in a slightly different way. Is the minister in a position to confirm that in fact there has been no significant reduction in the price of medium and lower cost homes in the province of Alberta?

MR. SPEAKER: We're on the same tack, it seems to me. This could be a matter of opinion or it could be a matter of collecting statistics.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question again, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Can the minister advise the Assembly whether any surveys have been taken by the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs which would specifically assess the workings of the market place as it relates to middle and lower income housing in Alberta?

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, perhaps my colleague the Minister of Housing and Public Works may wish to supply some information in this regard.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering how many minutes I have on this subject.

AN HON. MEMBER: All afternoon.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, a couple of years ago, if you remember correctly, we started out with three objectives: increasing the supply, ameliorating the affordability problem, and undertaking to repair some of the older homes. I should like to suggest that in regard to supply we have had considerable success, and in the area of repair we've also progressed markedly.

The area of price structure is a very complex matter. Perhaps the success in all areas of this price structure hasn't been as evident as it can be, because indeed the statistics themselves are very confusing. The peak of the price structure hit Alberta in the first and second quarters last year. The price structure was probably about the highest in April and May, so the averages by the Canadian real estate market reflect a very high peak in the first six months of last year.

Since the peaks were hit last year many things have happened. There is a considerable difference between the new house market and the resale house market. Indeed my colleague was certainly correct in suggesting that the prices in the new house market, even in the area of medium and lower cost homes, have been on a downward trend during the last four to six months and have come down considerably in

some areas where the supply is fairly substantive.

However, the total price market in regard to a composite of both the resale market and the new price market doesn't necessarily show the same degree of drop, particularly if you only relate to the market of resale which is what the multiple listing caters to. That really is on about a one-to-one basis with new house prices; then the suggestion is that the actual market price hasn't dropped as much as was anticipated. I think the actual average price was considerably higher last spring than what is now indicated.

However, I do want to indicate that the provincial government has embarked on bringing into the market a substantive number of homes catering to the low- and middle-income brackets and has maintained the price structure and a downward pressure on the price structure. Indeed many of the large builders are now, if you wish, seeking money from provincial government programs to build housing in the lower priced market for lower priced wage earners.

Nevertheless, I do anticipate that the price structure will continue to lower in Alberta. This can be helped by buyer resistance. If I had any suggestions to make to the public of Alberta — and I'm almost finished, Mr. Speaker — it would be to be wary, to demand value at every turn, and indeed to question seriously whether or not they should pay much over \$45 per square foot for a new house. Unless they are getting considerable value, I would suggest that as a 'guidestone' for any purchasing resistance from here on for the Alberta public.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Under the circumstances, perhaps this might be the last supplementary.

MR. NOTLEY: Yes. Could I direct a supplementary question to either the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs or the hon. Minister of Housing and Public Works on the issue of making the market place work. Has the government investigated the impact of the merger of Abbey Glen and Genstar as it relates to possible monopoly or at least undue concentration of ownership of developable land around our major cities in the province of Alberta?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Housing and Public Works has compiled figures in regard to the land holdings of the various companies in both the Calgary and Edmonton areas, and indeed has reflected upon the extent of these holdings by the companies involved. At this time there's nothing to suggest that the action of the companies involved would cause the type of concern necessary to take any form of precipitous action.

Again, the amount of land available for housing is being watched closely all across the province and does tie in very closely to the amount or the extent of the annexation proposals throughout the various towns and urban centres in the province.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly we might come back to this topic. I'm concerned about reaching the hon. members who have yet to ask their first question.

TV Programming

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Attorney General. I wonder if the Attorney General would indicate to the House whether he is taking action to prevent further showing of nude and topless dancers on television. Mr. Speaker, this is in reference to an allegation regarding a showing of such nude and topless dancers during an interview at approximately 7:15 p.m. on March 4, 1977, by CBC affiliate CBXT. This is a repetition of a similar event or showing in 1974.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I don't often get the opportunity to speak directly to the CBC on an issue of such considerable interest to the news media, I'm sure.

Let me say the case that has been cited was brought to the attention of my office last week by a single male telephone caller, unidentified. The suggestion was that, if appropriate, it might be reported to the chief Crown prosecutor in Edmonton, Mr. Abbott, and it was. Mr. Abbott requested the co-operation of the CBC and the Edmonton city police department in reviewing the film clip in question. [They] did so and have come to the conclusion that the demonstration or the dancing did not offend the provision of the Criminal Code as it relates to obscenity. I don't see any cause, Mr. Speaker, for disturbing the finding of the chief Crown prosecutor and his advice in the matter.

I might point out that the matter of obscenity and the proving of obscenity in the courts is extremely difficult and complex. We're looking for a publication, the dominant characteristic of which is the undue exploitation of sex. That test must be met. The test is not easily met, but I don't want to imply that the Crown is unwilling to pursue these cases when a proper case is made. That is not the situation. I think the situation here has been reviewed by law officers of the Crown, and in their opinion there is not sufficient evidence to support a charge.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Attorney General would indicate to the House whether he is aware or if it is true that a 4,000-name petition was drafted in 1974 when this interview took place, and that presently a petition is being drafted too. It is expected that the petition will have a similar number of names on it.

MR. SPEAKER: It would be difficult to connect the hon. member's representation with the official duties of the minister.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, then another supplementary if I may. I wonder if the Attorney General would indicate to the House whether he intends to or considers making representation or review with the CRTC to indicate to him and to the department, for the citizens at large, whether these are in fact meeting community standards, and whether he can do anything about it.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, my concern for amendments to the Criminal Code of Canada passed by the Parliament of Canada is a matter which I would discuss directly with my provincial counterparts and

the federal Minister of Justice. I have done so and will be doing so again. I would not anticipate any involvement of my office with the members of the CRTC.

I indicated, I believe, that we are as concerned as anyone with the definition of obscenity in our society and its provision in the Criminal Code. We are obviously involved in considering the possibility of prosecution from time to time and will be discussing with the federal Minister of Justice, as we have in the past, possible amendments to the Criminal Code in this area. But I certainly have no proposal for amendment that I would make at this time.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary to the hon. minister for clarification. What is the difference between undue exploitation of sex and due exploitation of sex?

Power Project — Bow City

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources with regard to the proposed coal-fired power generator plant to be located in Bow City. Can the minister indicate whether there will be any further hearings on the project and when we can expect a recommendation from the ERCB?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, under the Alberta coal development policy there's a requirement for several steps before approval. The earliest step is preliminary disclosure to the government of a plan to develop a coal-fired plant. To the best of my knowledge, we have not received the preliminary disclosure document for a plant at Bow City.

Solar Energy

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism, the chairman of the Research Council. Is the Research Council carrying out any research in regard to using solar energy for the purpose of heating homes?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, the Research Council has been substantially involved in compiling an inventory on solar energy use and research projects being undertaken the world over. This inventory is ongoing. At the moment they do provide technical assistance for any person or organization which wants to become involved in developing their own solar energy source. However, the council is also involved with the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. To a considerable extent it involves the energy resources research fund in an attempt to develop a major undertaking of research in all forms of energy. That is probably now their most involved project regarding solar energy.

MR. TAYLOR: A supplementary to the hon. minister. Are any groups, other than the University of Calgary, carrying out actual experiments in the field at this time?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm unable to answer that question. Perhaps the Minister of Advanced

Education and Manpower would be informed on that subject.

Legal Age Differential

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Attorney General. A short explanation: it's to do with the ages of 16 and 18 for males and females set down by the federal statutes. In Alberta we have this differentiation. A year ago the hon. Attorney General told the Legislature he would expect a position in the near future. Is the Attorney General now prepared to petition the Governor General in Council for readjustment of these ages to guarantee equal treatment for all citizens involved in criminal procedures, regardless of their sex?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I think the last occasion when this arose in the House I indicated we were awaiting the initiatives of the federal government with respect to the proposed legislation entitled *Young Persons in Conflict with the law*. Since that time we have discovered that proposed federal legislation is being redrafted and reconsidered by the federal government. We are awaiting that legislation to determine our response to it.

At the same time we are obviously having to consider a young offenders policy with respect to provincial jurisdiction. We have not moved to change the age differential in Alberta, pending receipt of the advice from the federal government.

I think I have indicated in this House before that we generally favor the same age for both male and female. So there is no confusion, the Crown has recently been appealing certain cases in the provincial courts, not because we want to see the continuation of the distinction between 16 and 18 but because there is some question as to the validity of this law as it affects The Bill of Rights, The Individual's Rights Protection Act, et cetera. In one sense it is really a constitutional question.

So we are awaiting the initiative of the federal government in this area. We had expected that initiative long before now. In the event that initiative is not soon forthcoming, the provincial government may have to consider whether or not this distinction should continue.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister in a position to indicate what age the provincial government is looking at or will recommend?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, that is clearly a policy question. It's not for me to say yet that the age of 16, 17, or 18 — obvious ramifications flow from the determination of that age.

As I've said, I think it's fair to say we agree it should be one age for both male and female. The distinction was more apparent than real in 1952 when the decision was taken to create that differential, which doesn't seem to make too much sense. But I am not in a position to say what the government's final position would be on this as between 16 and 17 or perhaps a higher age. I would suspect at this stage that it will be something under 18.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the hon. minister. Can the minister indicate if the Assembly will have any input as to what that age should be? Will any legislation be brought before the Assembly that there will be full discussion in this House of the recommendation we will be using?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I think that question is also somewhat premature because we have not yet seen the terms of the new federal legislation. Companion legislation might be most appropriate at the provincial level, depending on what the federal government proposes. In any event, it might be a perfectly appropriate motion for the Order Paper to discuss in the Assembly.

Children's Legal Status

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is also to the Attorney General. It is with regard to the [Institute of] Law Research and Reform report of last July which recommended that illegitimate children be given the same legal status as children of married parents. My question to the minister is: is action planned on that recommendation?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, in response to a similar question from the same hon. member last week, I think I indicated that the matter of law as it relates to the rights of children and the family is being reviewed, and the institute's report as it relates thereto is being reviewed by me and my colleague the Minister of Social Services and Community Health.

Not to put out a government position on the matter, personally I have great sympathy with the institute's report and think there is a great deal of merit in what it recommends. At the same time, I think, since we have the responsibility for bringing legislation forward, we want to be sure we have considered every aspect of the question. I would not want my personal comment at this point to be taken as policy.

Lamb Processing Plant

MR. LYSONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. Over the weekend I had some phone calls regarding concern over the sheep processing plant in Innisfail. I wonder if you could give us any indication if there is serious difficulty there, or whether the plant will continue to operate.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, indeed there is a fairly serious situation in that the plant under its present management has suffered considerable monthly operating losses. All I can really tell the hon. member at the moment is that we are having ongoing discussions with the co-op which is operating the plant. I would hope we will be in a position to resolve the matter before too long. It is our intention to try to keep the plant operating if at all possible.

Restitution Program

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Solicitor General. It's a result of the somewhat inconclusive nature of the progress report on the Pilot Alberta Restitution Centre, which the minister tabled on Fri-

day. Does the government plan to expand the restitution program this year, as was indicated in the throne speech?

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, our plans to expand the fine option program generally from Edmonton into the rest of the province — and restitution is one of the components of the overall fine option program. You will recall that last year, Mr. Speaker, I announced in the House that we were starting in Edmonton, last February I think it was, a work-for-fine project to attempt to divert as many fine defaulters as possible from prison. I said at that time that there were three prongs to this particular thrust. One was the work-for-fine, finding work to enable people to pay their fines. The second part was the collection of fines by a simple civil process similar to a collection agency reminding people that the deadline was approaching. The third of course is restitution.

Now the further development of the restitution program beyond the Calgary experience, which has been a modest success in my opinion and certainly encountered some snags, depends on changes in the law. I feel that the federal government must address itself, through amendments to the criminal code, to the making of a restitution order by a judge for summary conviction offences a civil judgment, so in the event of an offender defaulting the victim doesn't have to start from scratch for collection through the civil court. At the present time most of these restitution orders are conditions on a probation order, and if there is a breach the offender can go to prison. But that does nothing to compensate the victim.

The other thing they must address their minds to is the liaison with judges and defense counsel [for] making these tentative restitution agreements privileged documents, which are only revealed to the judge after trial but before sentence. If the judge's restitution order is then made, this would be the triggering mechanism by which the restitution agreement became a contract in law.

These are very sensible common-sense amendments that could easily be made by the federal government to further make practical the whole concept of restitution.

That report, Mr. Speaker, shows that some 30 per cent of potential clients did not take advantage of the restitution procedures. I presume this is because defense counsels were afraid that even a tentative restitution agreement was a tacit admission of guilt.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Has the minister made representation to the appropriate federal minister for the changes in the Criminal Code in the two areas the minister outlined?

MR. FARRAN: Yes I have, Mr. Speaker. The subject was discussed at the meeting of ministers of justice, attorneys general, and solicitors general in Vancouver late last summer. At that time a verbal promise was given by Mr. Basford that some amendments were in the wings. So far as our own provincial statutes are concerned, this matter is also under consideration.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Solicitor General. Will there be an expansion in the restitution program prior to the federal government bringing down its

legislation? As I read the report and from what the minister has said, it appears the program can't be successful, as many of us hoped it would be, unless those changes are made.

MR. FARRAN: We can still go on on the same basis as PARC which still has another two years to run in Calgary, Mr. Speaker. I agree it's hampered by the law, but it still can be considered a two-thirds success.

MR. SPEAKER: Might this be the last final supplementary. We've run over our time, and I've already recognized the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to try to get two supplementaries into one question. Really the nub of the question to the minister is: has the Minister's Advisory Committee on Corrections been asked to review the success or lack of success of the program in Calgary? Would the minister be in a position to table in the Assembly its recommendations and assessment of this program?

MR. FARRAN: No, Mr. Speaker, they haven't been asked to assess that.

MR. CLARK: Why not?

MR. FARRAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, primarily because they're working on other things. They're working on volunteer agencies at the moment, and I just don't want them galloping off in every direction at once.

Sulphur Dioxide Emissions Report

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Is the minister in a position to indicate to the Assembly whether officials of the Department of the Environment have received a report from the Syncrude air atmospheric committee covering SO₂ emissions?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to check and see. If the hon. member would provide me with the official title of the report, I'd be glad to check that for him. A great number of reports are involved with that project, and I'd have to look up to make sure.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, just one quick supplementary — and I can supply. It's my understanding this is the federal-provincial committee that has been doing a two-year study on some of the environmental ramifications of SO₂ emissions and emission control technology. If the hon. minister finds out whether the department has received such a report, is it the intention of the government to make it public?

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: Dr. Horner]

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, it's a real pleasure for me to take part in a throne speech debate again, to extend my congratulations to those who have taken part but more particularly to my colleagues from Lloydminster and Medicine Hat for an excellent start to this debate.

Only one disconcerting note, Mr. Speaker: as I listened to some of the speech from the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, I thought for a moment I was back in Ottawa listening to one of his colleagues in the NDP from central Canada espousing certain policies. The concept he had about transportation, of course, was rather interesting in that he suggested that with regard to transportation problems in Alberta and western Canada, we should buy the Crow rate back again with our natural resources. I found that an intriguing position for the NDP in Alberta to be taking. I hope some of the rural members in his party will straighten him out on it, because it will be unfortunate for him if they don't.

The problems in transportation, Mr. Speaker, are multifold and I suppose one could spend a great deal of time on them in general, and on the specifics. I did want at first to say one or two things generally, though. Certainly the fact is that transportation is the key to really reaching the kind of diversity and development, the kind of jobs we want to see in our province. But I would say again that while it is a major factor, it's not the only factor. I would hope that people wouldn't use it as an excuse for not doing some particular job of economic development that they should be doing in this province. We all know there are numerous other factors such as the marketing capacity, the efficient handling of the product, the effective use of technology, the use of financing, and general management, all really very important components of any economic project.

While transportation is in fact very important, it isn't the only factor. As transportation isn't the only factor, it's difficult to take any particular mode of the four usually talked about, separate it, isolate it, and say, this is the real problem we face relative to transportation problems in our province.

I have some interesting statistics and I'd be quite willing to file with our library a copy of a document on infrastructure costs of the various modes of transportation in Canada, a study done on one of the reports put out by the Canadian Transport Commission. As a sort of initial thing to show my point that we have to be careful how we look at this question of user pay and the question of one mode of transportation carrying a larger or lesser load relative to our problem here — I'm sure the House would be interested in knowing, for example, that in civil aviation infrastructure costs and their proportionate revenues as a return come to something like 31 per cent. Over a 15-year period, this has come up from about 12 or 15 per cent, where the user is now paying 31 per cent of the

aviation infrastructure costs.

If we go to roads, the study details the criteria used. It's an interesting exercise, I think. On the question of roads, they've remained relatively constant, in the area of 65 — the latest year I have is 64 per cent of the costs of roads. The infrastructure relative to highways in fact is paid by users in the form of a variety of taxes we're all familiar with.

Then we move to another interesting area we hear about which really doesn't affect western Canada in a direct way but is surely part of the argument I'm going to be making in a few minutes relative to a total approach to some of these transportation problems; that is that over the last 15 years the amount of revenue recovered relative to marine transportation infrastructure costs in Canada is in the area of 19 to 20 per cent. That's pretty important also.

Then we move to the question of railroads. I want to deal in some detail with rail freight. I think it's important to have these in perspective. The facts are that in the last 15 years, revenues as a percentage of total costs relative to the rail system — by the way, these are capital and operating costs totalled — are anywhere from 72 per cent to 74 per cent for the last year I have, [and] are paid by the users of that particular system. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, the interesting component there is that in the railway statistics, they use the capital and maintenance costs of the rolling stock as well as the capital costs of the roadbed itself.

So it becomes pretty important that we really shouldn't isolate any particular mode in this user-pay situation. As you can see, there is a great deal of difference, and each of these apply to all areas of Canada. Therefore I want to make the second point: a particular freight-rate problem in a region of Canada can't be treated in isolation from the freight-rate problem right across the country, nor can it be treated in isolation from the question of other modes of transport used more particularly in other areas of Canada.

That immediately brings me to comment relative to the St. Lawrence Seaway. All of us are aware of the recent announcement in Ottawa that the federal government intended to write off some \$700 million plus relative to the capital cost of the St. Lawrence Seaway. The argument of course has been ongoing as to who really benefited from the Seaway's construction. Was it really the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, where the capital project was taking place; [it] created innumerable jobs and economic activity in central Canada over a number of years. Was it the iron ore people who then had the advantage of better water rates relative to iron ore? Was it in fact the western Canadian grain producer who was sending his grain through Thunder Bay? If I recall correctly, with the advent of the Seaway there was a decrease in the per bushel charge on the Seaway.

Then it becomes much more complex, Mr. Speaker, because once the Seaway was completed and doing all this traffic, the railways had to give competitive rates to central Canada to compete with the Seaway. Who's going to calculate that cost? What user is going to pay it? Certainly if they're getting a competitive cost because of a major capital undertaking by the government of Canada, paid by all Canadians, and it's going to allow a cheaper freight rate on railways in that same area, then somebody has to pay the cost.

It's very nice to say, user pay. It's very nice to say, this is what we have to do. I think those who

advocate that in its entirety haven't got a real appreciation of what's happened over the years to the rail system in this country. I could spend as much time on each mode. But I do think it is important, because of certain things now ongoing in the rail freight-rate situation, that we discuss them.

I think to understand how we arrived at this situation and to make further the argument that user pay in the Canadian context just has to be altered, and we have to come back to a different identification of what our problem is and how we treat national transportation systems in this country. I think all hon. members are aware of some of the history, but it might be useful just to go over it.

In the latter days of the last century and the early days of this century, we were building railroads all over the place, and in various parts of Canada. Anybody with some imagination, a little bit of nerve, and the ability to get government land grants or cash grants was building a railroad. There wasn't really much common sense to the entire operation. There was duplication. There was overbuilding.

The whole matter became rather irrational until about the 1910 to 1912 era, when somebody said, whoa. They said whoa because a number of these railways were going bankrupt and the federal government and indeed the provincial governments of the day were being called on to honor the bonds they'd guaranteed. Something had to be done.

Out of the numerous railroads we had in those early days of this century we really got two systems, the Canadian National and the Canadian Pacific, the difference being that the Canadian National was burdened with a tremendous debt. If you had to relate its costs relative to its debt structure, no method of rate structuring would in fact have paid it off.

If the government of the day in the early years of this century had in fact done what they've done with the Seaway, it's interesting what a difference it might have made over the years. Because when CN had to have a major rate structure to at least try to get a payment on some of its debt, of course the Canadian Pacific followed right behind and said, me too. Only they didn't have that kind of debt structure, and they then made substantial amounts of profit over the years. My honorable friend suggests we should be buying back the Crow with our natural resources. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we've paid for them a number of times.

We have this complex background, Mr. Speaker. Then we had to move in 1897, because again Canadian Pacific and the at-that-time government of Canada decided they wanted to get into the Crowsnest area of British Columbia. Therefore Canadian Pacific made a very valuable commitment to Canada: they would put a maximum limit on certain rates for commodities being imported into western Canada and for the export of western grain from western Canada, and they would accept that in perpetuity.

If you read the various histories of the CPR — and there are up to a dozen of them; I'd suggest that you read both sides, the one saying they had 100 years of corporate welfare and perhaps some of the others that are a little bit more straightforward — the fact still remains, all historians agree, that when Mr. Van Home accepted that, he was sane, knew what he was doing, and knew that it was in perpetuity. I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, because I'm going to be ref-

erring to the Crow and other things. And if we can do that, I want hon. members to understand what I'm really trying to talk about.

The next stage, and it's important to understand this one, is that in the early '20s, after the Canadian National was formed, they had to do something about the Crowsnest Pass rates which, at that time, only applied to the Canadian Pacific. All hon. members, and particularly those people interested in the western viewpoint, should understand why, in 1925, they became statutory and were changed.

If one wants to go back — and I have done it — and reread 1925 debates in the House of Commons, he will understand that it was a joining together: members from western Canada wanting to enshrine the rates on grain into the export market, interestingly enough, were joined by Members of Parliament from central Canada whose constituencies didn't have communities on the Canadian Pacific Railway and therefore those lesser rates didn't apply to their communities. They joined with the western MPs. It was a strange mixture, Mr. Speaker, that in fact got the rates onto the statute books of Canada. Of course the end result was that all the manufacturing centres in eastern Canada got an equal rate going west, and the west got the Crowsnest Pass rates enshrined in legislation.

The interesting thing we have to understand about that is that the competing water rates meant that the lines coming from east to west were then set up as competitive rates. We ended up with the anomaly that it's always been much cheaper to ship goods from central Canada into western Canada than vice versa. That remains to this day, although I think we are getting somewhere there.

Throughout all this time, in relation to the Crow rates, and in discussions with Mr. Snively, who has recently reported in the Snively Commission on the cost of moving grain — it is his opinion that over a vast majority of the years up until the middle '50s, the Crow rates were always compensatory to the railroads. If you go back through the times when we had good crops and heavy overseas sales, note that the profit picture for the CPR and lessening debt picture for the CNR were in those years.

In the early '50s, at the time of dieselization and the massive capital required by railways to convert, there is no doubt that we went into a period when the Crow rates, in fact, were not compensatory. Once that capitalization and dieselization had taken place though, there is again no doubt that they were compensatory until the mid-60s, when other inflationary factors took over.

So the argument the railways have been placing upon everybody and anybody, that something had to be done about the statutory rates, then came into place. They used a variety of methods to try to convince everybody, including western Canadians, that really the Crow rates were holding them back, that other parts of the country were having to pay additional amounts because of the Crow rates. They didn't say anything about other parts of the country having to pay additional amounts because of the St. Lawrence Seaway, but it's an interesting analogy.

At this time then, we had another of those innumerable royal commissions on railways in Canada, Mr. Speaker. If we don't do something concrete and a little bit bold and imaginative now, we'll have more in

the next few years because we won't really resolve the problem.

Of course one of the approaches by the railways during the time of the MacPherson commission was to say, look, if you're going to insist on those statutory rates then we have to have subsidy or we can't carry on. Of course the CPR again let CN carry the fight because they could show a worse picture because of this massive debt load they were still trying to carry and that made good reading. As a result, massive subsidy payments were made to the railways following the MacPherson commission and the passage of the National Transportation Act.

I don't want to go on at great length, but only to say this: one of our problems is that those subsidies were made as a direct result of an application to abandon a line. In fact, the only way they could get a subsidy was to make an application to abandon. Later we come to our entire story of rail line abandonment, what we can do about it, and what Mr. Justice Hall might recommend.

The unfortunate thing, though, is that there were never any strings placed on that massive amount of subsidy money, and the money then went into the treasuries of CN and CP without reflecting anything in the maintenance and rehabilitation of the branch lines in western Canada. Indeed they didn't pay any attention at all to them, and many lines were in fact were abandoned by disuse.

Now, Mr. Speaker, because I want to relate our problem with freight rates and our problem with the Crow to what's happening in the rest of Canada, you must understand that the year before last — I don't have the last year — the amount of subsidy paid on the branch lines totalled about \$71 million. At the same time, the federal government was paying the railways a subsidy of something like \$137 million relative to passenger traffic, most of that concentrated in the more densely populated area of central Canada. As they were doing that, Mr. Speaker, they were also picking up the tab, under the Maritime Freight Rates Act, of between \$20 and \$30 million per year. This is two or three years old and will be substantially higher now.

So when we hear the story from certain areas that we in western Canada are asking for something different relative to freight rates, it isn't quite true, Mr. Speaker. We're asking for a new look at the freight-rate structure and the railway structure in this country, one based on common sense, competition, and the ability of the people to market their goods with regard to that major problem in the marketing; that is getting their goods to market.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, the original figures I pointed out relative to what each mode returns to the capital and operating investment show that railways in fact have done better than any other area. It shows that federal government and indeed, in certain cases, provincial governments — because if the rail lines are abandoned by disuse or other means, the pressures and the expenditure come back on our governments in the provinces, and we have to ensure there are appropriate road structures, in some cases air structures, to handle the needs of our people. In other words, it goes back.

But, Mr. Speaker, in total, having regard to the Snively commission report that has now come out, Mr. Snively has said the true cost of hauling grain by

rail, using 1974 figures and equated to that, is 2.6 times Crow. That's the factor. It might be interesting to know that the three prairie provinces made the submission to Mr. Snively, and the railways of course refuted it. You would be interested to know we came closer than the railways to his final result by a substantial margin. I mention that because the figure he's come up with as the discrepancy relative to what is now called, in railway jargon, the Crow-Snively gap is about \$232 million in round figures. Interestingly enough this \$232 million is also very close to the figure required to rehabilitate and maintain the branch line system in western Canada.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we put that together with the kind of subsidy we're now paying and will be paying — and I'm sure the \$139 million for passenger subsidy is closer to \$200 million now, particularly with the very major commitment made to the Windsor/Montreal/Quebec corridor, and the vastly increased subsidy the federal government is picking up in the maritimes. Add to that the startling figure of 80 per cent of marine infrastructure on both coasts being paid by the federal tax payer, the tremendous amounts of money that have been allocated to B.C. Rail or are in the negotiating stage. Total direct and indirect subsidies being paid by the federal taxpayers relative to rail transportation in this country are well over \$.5 billion a year.

Surely with that kind of a background, Mr. Speaker, if we just come out with an argument of who is going to pay what to whom, we're not really going to solve our freight-rate problem in this country. What we need, then, is to have a very concentrated look at the idea my colleague for Calgary Currie put forward effectively at WEOC: that we have to get back to some basics, that the time has come for the federal government to take over the roadbed and to ensure that maintenance is done at least on those lines that Mr. Justice Hall recommended remain in a rationalized system for western Canada. We need to have Canada look at it in its total context, not just western Canada but indeed the lines through Ontario, Quebec, and the maritimes.

I need hardly remind most of you, I believe, that Confederation came about largely because of railway interconnections. Nova Scotia wouldn't have joined if the Intercolonial hadn't been mentioned in the BNA Act. British Columbia came in on the direct promise of a rail line, and it came about even though it was five years late. Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island had direct commitments relative to transportation and communications before they would join Confederation.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one of the areas we could look at with some real Canadian background is a proposition that would see the federal government taking over the roadbeds of all the rail lines in this country and devising a mechanism of maintenance and then a new rate structure which could be based very simply on a ton/mile basis with factors for quantity and topography relative to the pulling costs that might be involved.

At the moment any of you who have tried to sift through the various freight rates in effect in this country — I'm sure the ordinary businessman and indeed even the larger companies have to hire specialists to decipher not only the different kinds of rates but the classification of rates within each. It's a

complex study by itself, and there aren't very many people in Canada who understand the thing because it's been built in such a topsy-turvy way.

I'm going to have some recommendations in that regard as an alternative if we can't find the imagination in this country to look in a very solid way at the roadbed maintenance policies I've advocated.

In other areas, Mr. Speaker, I did want to say that following the initiatives at WEOC by my colleague and by our government, relative to some of the anomalies that have been with us for a long time — the question of the long-haul/short-haul rates, the question of the key-weight provisions, the question of the captive shipper, the question of the rate groupings — I'm pleased to be able to report to the House today that, in my view, the bill now before the House of Commons in Ottawa does in fact improve the situation. It removes the long-haul/short-haul anomaly. It goes a long way, hopefully, that we can look after the key-weight provisions by regulation. In fact it eliminates the captive-shipper clause restrictions and allows all our shippers at least to be classified as captive whether or not the old restrictive definition stood.

It's my understanding that we can move ahead on the rate groupings question, which has not yet been resolved, because it can be done under the regulations of the present act and amendments now before the House of Commons. That act gives to the elected government of Canada substantially greater control than in the past and takes away some of that control from the Canadian Transport Commission. I believe that as elected people, if we're going to take the responsibility for the policies in these various areas, we have to take the heat when those policies go wrong. You can't buffer them through some regulatory commission on the side.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reiterate the question of a new approach to trying to resolve our rail problem. I might mention here, Mr. Speaker, that we're not alone in this. As we were building railroads and later having bankrupt railways, so were our friends to the south in the United States. Of course they built many more, being a larger area, but the same pattern has emerged. Indeed until just recently — and this isn't the first one — a number of port authorities have taken into their ports rail extensions that run several hundred miles into the hinterland. But more recently, Senator Kennedy has put a bill before the Senate to do things similar to what we put before the Hall Commission relative to the North West Rail Authority: to take over the railbed and rationalize the whole system in the northeast states because it's costing the industry and the producers there a tremendous amount. In fact they're talking about such things as going out of business unless that particular area can be rationalized.

But as we look around the United States we see some of their railways in fact making money, and that's very interesting. One of the things we're going to be concentrating on is to see what factors allow them to pull that off when every other place, indeed around the world, is having problems. It might be useful to find out how some of these lines carrying similar products to what we do — one of those I've read about got hold of large aluminum grain hopper cars when they came into existence and cut their rates on grain by 60 per cent. That's what I call

private enterprise working effectively. Sometime I'd certainly like to ask the railways in Canada whether they might not think of similar action on occasion.

More important than that, I now want to get back to the question of roadbed ownership and the Crow rates, and how they fit in there. We had a further discussion with Mr. Snively, and we talked to him about his factor of 2.6 being the necessary factor that would allow the railways to have a compensatory rate on the movement of grain. I put the proposition to Mr. Snively that if the railways were relieved of their roadbed, maintenance, and rehabilitation costs, what would happen to his factor? His response to my inquiry was that his factor would disappear. In other words the Crow rates as presently set up would be considered compensatory. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that has an attractiveness for all of us in western Canada to ensure the Crow, to ensure fair play across this country, to take away the discrimination now against processing our product. Because obviously if grain can be carried on the basis of Crow rates at compensatory rates, surely rapeseed oil and meal also can. This seems to me to follow.

So, Mr. Speaker, another advantage of the federal government looking at our proposition of the ownership of the railbed and assuring the maintenance would [be to] allow the federal government to take care of the regions of this country. They could maintain their Maritime Freight Rates Act. In a recent meeting with the federal Minister of Transport, I think the four premiers of the Atlantic provinces told him in no uncertain words that they didn't believe in the user-pay theory either. They quoted the Intercolonial argument to him with a great deal of force. As a matter of fact, my understanding is they had an agenda when they sat down to meet and there were six items; this was the first item on the agenda and they didn't get off it. I think it's just as important a factor in the maritimes as it is in western Canada. The problems we have on both our coasts relative to ports and access for all of our products are all part of the package. Surely if we're going to have the kind of rail passenger system on which we are now spending a tremendous amount of money, it would be a reasonable proposition for central Canada as well.

I don't think I need to go into the reasons we need a rail transportation system. It is the only system that can carry bulk commodities, is the most economical system energy-wise, and it's just absolutely essential. Maybe we have to start looking at rail transportation in this country as a public utility with the roadbeds and the maintenance being ensured by the public. Then perhaps we might even get some competition between our two major railways. That might effect an improvement in service, which is very important indeed.

Mr. Speaker, if I could have the indulgence of the House, I'll only be a few more minutes. I did want to summarize by suggesting some recommendations from our point of view relative to what we've been talking about in rail freight transportation. I would hope all hon. members would keep in mind the user-pay revenue percentages I gave earlier, because I think they're very important.

Our first recommendation is an expansion of that made by our government at WEOC: that the federal government take over the physical roadbed. Whether they take over the rails is not of prime importance to

me; rather it's the ensuring of adequate maintenance on those lines. Whether it is restricted to branch lines and/or main lines is again a negotiable point as far as I'm concerned. I don't believe we should give an inch relative to the Crow rates until we've had some rationalization in this entire rail matter.

One of the other major problems we have in western Canada relative to the entire freight rate structure is that it's all centralized in Ottawa with the CTC. In years past — and maybe we should be doing it now, I'm not sure — some of the provinces kept permanent people in Ottawa to do nothing but deal with the Board of Railway Commissioners. Surely it would only be reasonable to suggest that the decentralization of the Canadian Transport Commission, particularly the railway committee, should happen immediately. We should have a commissioner with at least enough power to hear all the initial hearings situated in western Canada so we could have some effective and efficient representation. It could be done in some period of time that is sensible and reasonable. I think that's an important recommendation we can make to the federal government in that area.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I think that if we can't do what I suggest with regard to roadbeds, we'd better have another look at how to rationalize the statutory rates we have on grain. In any case, one of the ways we should be looking at it is the question of separating the grain pools — and I don't mean the pool elevator limiteds, I mean the pools of the Canadian Wheat Board — so that they're based on the port of export rather than all being lumped into one.

We have previously had in this country the precedent relative to equalization of freight rates on manufactured goods. Interestingly enough, it has always been from east to west. Maybe we need to take that question of equalization of freight rates within the prairie wheat board area, using a different system of pooling, having regard for the price of the product at a particular time, and come up with a solution which will be equitable and useful if and when we can agree on some rationalization of those grain rates in western Canada.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I think the transportation needs of a region have to be treated in total. While I have concentrated on rail, I think there is something to be said to both of our established railway companies: they themselves have to do much more inter-modal work relative to the transfer of goods from one particular mode — I'm thinking primarily of truck and rail, but truck, rail, and sea.

The other recommendation I think is important to us is the immediate removal of the stopover charges that both railways are making, with the consent of the CTC. I don't think anybody has ever done a study. I don't think it helps the railways, and certainly it costs us in the form of processing our goods here. The immediate removal of the stopover charges at inland processing plants and/or terminals would be essential to any rationalization process.

Mr. Speaker, relative to the question of rate groupings and how we can help to diversify our economy and carry forward the direct policies of this government in decentralization, we would like to see a rate grouping for the province of Alberta that would include all our towns and cities as one rate grouping, like the Golden Triangle in eastern Canada. I think this would really help and would be a matter of the

railway companies and the federal government working in concert with a declared public policy of this Alberta government, and would enhance that policy throughout rural Alberta.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, whatever solution is put forward to try to rationalize the freight-rate structure in Canada, surely the responsibility of the federal government is to have the provinces fully and actively involved in that solution. If we are left out again, as we have been in the past — and with due respect, that was partly the fault of the provincial governments of that day not being more active and demanding a say in how the national transportation system would be set up. Surely the final and most important position of our government is that any solution has to have the full and active participation of all provinces, if we are going to have a solution that is going to last longer than a year or two and isn't going to be more than just band-aid surgery on a very serious problem.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor and privilege for me to rise and participate in this throne speech debate today, particularly following the very illuminating remarks of the hon. Deputy Premier with regard to initiatives this province is taking to resolve the historic freight-rate inequities and rail transportation problems we have in this country. I think the hon. Deputy Premier should be commended for the excellent initiative his department is taking. I'm sure his speech today will go down in the records of this House as being a very significant contribution to the future development of this province.

On a lighter note, Mr. Speaker, I should also like to say, being the member representing the Crowsnest Pass in this Assembly, I doubt that I will be able to repeat in my remarks today what I'm sure must be a record: the hon. Deputy Premier's use of the words "Crow" and "Crowsnest Pass" in debate in this Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to add my congratulations to those of other members of this Assembly to both the hon. Member for Lloydminster and the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff for the high-calibre contribution they have made to this debate in moving and seconding the acceptance of the address of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I should like to remark on the significance of the attire His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor wore during the opening of this session. It was quite a privilege to sit in this Assembly and see the Lieutenant-Governor dressed in his native regalia and head-dress to mark the hundredth anniversary of the signing of treaties nos. 6 and 7 with the Cree and Blackfoot nations. It not only made me proud to be an Albertan, but proud of our native heritage and culture and the contribution our native people have made to the development of this great province and nation.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I should like to recognize the significant contribution you are making to this Assembly in the dedicated, dignified, and responsible manner in which you are carrying out the duties of your office. The decorum of this Assembly and the esteem in which it is held throughout this country are due in no small part to your fairness, honesty, and integrity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in turning to the major body of my remarks today, I should first like to comment on

the subject of Canadian unity. Let there be no mistake that this government and this province are committed to a united Canada, a Canada indivisible from sea to sea. We are Canadians, Canadians who believe the strength of this nation lies in a recognition of its diversity, and that the stronger each region of this country is, the stronger a nation we will have.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition stated in his remarks last Monday that we have lost an opportunity to give some major national leadership in the Speech from the Throne on the issue of national unity. Almost in the same breath, he says he reserves judgment on the wisdom of the investment of \$50 million of the heritage savings trust fund, Canadian investment division, in the province of Newfoundland. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that in his announcement of the \$50 million loan to Newfoundland, the Premier showed very major leadership on the question of Canadian unity. The loan reflects this government's confidence in the stability of Canadian Confederation. Surely the major commitment offered through an investment of this nature is a very positive reinforcement of Alberta's faith in the viability and unity of this nation.

The Leader of the Opposition speaks of lost opportunity. The only opportunity lost last Monday was his lost opportunity to show some leadership by his lack of support of this government's positive commitment to Confederation by the loan of \$50 million to Newfoundland.

I should now like to read into the record a few statements by Premier Moores of Newfoundland with regard to the \$50 million loan. These are quotations from the *Edmonton Journal* of last week:

Newfoundland Premier Frank Moores has described a \$50-million loan to his province by Alberta as a tremendous affirmation of faith in Canada.

He goes on to say:

'At a time when a Parti Quebecois election in Quebec has resulted in investors, especially in New York, being reluctant to invest in Canada or its provinces, we see an action by one of Canada's richest provinces which says loudly and clearly that Canadians not only have faith in Canada, but that we also have the resources to make it the great country it will be' . . .

Later on, Mr. Moores describes the loan by saying:

'The loan, drawn from Alberta's Heritage Trust Fund, marks 'a major milestone in the history of Canada' . . .

So, Mr. Speaker, I think there are other Canadians in this country who recognize that Alberta is certainly making a major commitment towards the unity of Canadian Confederation.

In turning to some remarks about my constituency, Mr. Speaker, I should like to remark about the gas well which blew out in my constituency last Monday. A sour gas well being drilled near Waterton Lakes National Park blew out, emitting a very high level of hydrogen sulphide gas. In order to protect the citizens and to be on the side of safety, over 150 residents were evacuated to the area of the town of Pincher Creek in my constituency.

Two years ago in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, I spoke about the values we cherish in our small towns: people feel safer in small towns, know their neighbors, and are concerned with

the quality of life. Small towns have a strong sense of community, of belonging, of identity, of consciousness, and of togetherness. Pincher Creek is such a small town.

I should like to commend the citizens of the town and the M.D. of Pincher Creek for the tremendous community spirit and co-operation they displayed in pulling together last week during that emergency, opening their doors to those who had to be evacuated. Also I should like to commend the citizens, and particularly the M.D. of Pincher Creek, the RCMP, and Shell Resources for the responsible manner [in which] they acted throughout that emergency and in so doing averted any further tragedy. I think it was an excellent example of how small towns get together in situations of that nature.

Also speaking with regard to the emergency, I think it was timely two years ago that a joint government/industry committee was set up to investigate the encroachment of residential development on sour gas fields. I think perhaps it's timely that we go back and review that document to ensure that we're following through on the recommendations that group put forward.

In discussing my constituency, Mr. Speaker, it's too bad the hon. Member for Banff — oh, he's just coming into the Assembly now. I was very interested in his remarks last week. In looking at my own constituency, I was thinking that it represents a microcosm of the province of Alberta. I thought everything that happened in the province of Alberta was reflected in some small way in my constituency until I took a look at the constituency of the hon. Member for Banff. I only have an Indian reserve adjacent to my constituency; the hon. Member for Banff has one in his. I have a national park adjacent to my constituency; the hon. Member for Banff actually represents a national park. In our constituencies we both have: gas exploration, coal mining developments, agricultural endeavors, cattlemen, the problems of the eastern slopes, and recreation proposals being put forward. But the one problem that I feel the hon. Member for Banff has, that he can have in his constituency and I don't really have in mine, is the fact of urban sprawl eventually taking over the greatest percentage of the voting population in his constituency.

MR. KIDD: What are you going to do about it Fred?

MR. BRADLEY: Getting down to my own constituency and the broad provincial initiatives that have taken place there in the last year and a half and some of the future directions we intend to go in, I should like to comment first on the area of transportation. We have just finished a brand-new airstrip in Pincher Creek. This is going to have a very significant impact on my constituency. In fact Time Air of Lethbridge already has filed an application with the Canadian Transport Commission to have a scheduled passenger service out of the town of Pincher Creek to Calgary, and this is just the start of some very significant things to follow in my constituency. I believe the advent of scheduled passenger service will attract other new industries to the constituency. I think when corporations are looking around a province or an area for places to settle, that's one of the important things they look for, whether a community is serviced by air, and has a scheduled passenger service. I think this is

of tremendous significance in terms of what this government has been doing to further, aid, and help economic diversification in rural parts of our province.

Following along with transportation matters I should also like to comment on the question of Highway 3 in my constituency. We've had some very significant developments there. We've got a construction schedule and we'll see this section of highway completed over the next period of years. This will finish construction of Highway 3 through southern Alberta.

A group is being formed to represent Highway 3 from Hope, British Columbia, to Medicine Hat, Alberta, the city which Rudyard Kipling referred to as having "all Hell for a basement". As I referred to in the past, Highway 3 is really the road from Hope to Hell. This new association, called the Crowsnest 3 Highway Association, wants to promote Highway 3 not only as a freight transportation route but also as a tourist route through the Rockies. They are requesting the government of Alberta to have that route designated Crowsnest 3. I would like to lend my support to that designation of the route.

A very significant area affecting my constituency regards municipal government. At present there are five municipal governments in the Crowsnest Pass. At times it is very difficult to have these bodies act in a unified and co-ordinated way, which would be in the best interests of the entire community. But things are changing from 1910 when one of the local papers heralded the proposal that the communities in the Crowsnest Pass should in fact unite. Today the communities are involved in amalgamation studies, which the Department of Municipal Affairs is heading. In the very near future we expect to have a report from the department outlining the benefits of a proposed amalgamated form of government for the Crowsnest Pass.

I think this will be a significant step toward resolving some of the land-use conflicts we have there, some of the conflicts or competition we have between municipalities for industrial and residential development. I think this will go a long way toward resolving some of the historic problems there. I think we will see from an amalgamated form of government, if in fact we do head in that direction, a significant new growth and development in the Crowsnest Pass.

I would be remiss in my remarks today if I didn't mention the fact that the Crowsnest Pass Symphony Orchestra is still performing well. I know that the former Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest often referred to the Crowsnest Pass Symphony orchestra. I think the fact that this government is continuing to support that orchestra shows we are concerned with the level of amenities our smaller communities have. We are in fact attempting to resolve some of the cultural inequities, let's say, between our large and our small urban centres by supporting these local cultural and musical groups.

Mr. Speaker, I stated in the Assembly before that coal mining is the backbone of the economy in the Crowsnest Pass. Presently over 650 persons are directly affected by that industry. It is important that the coal industry become a viable and stable industry in the area. There have been some dampened expectations with the announcement of the coal policy. There are those who thought that the Pass would boom overnight. That has not happened yet. Coleman

Collieries is one coal company presently operating on the Alberta side of the Pass and they are faced with some major decisions in the near future as to the direction of their development. They have one underground mine at Vicary Creek, north of Coleman, and they have another strip mine operation at Tent Mountain. They have to make some major decisions as to where their expansion is going to occur over the next three to four years.

One other group, Consul-Scurry Rainbow, has property in the Crowsnest Pass area and they are awaiting a decision on their preliminary disclosure to the government on whether they will be permitted to proceed to develop. I believe their proposed development at Grassy Mountain would result in a great improvement over the present state of that site, which was left very significantly devastated by previous resource development.

The Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and the Minister of the Environment recently visited my constituency to discuss with municipal leaders in the Crowsnest Pass their local concerns about the coal policy. A very frank discussion took place with regard to the effect of the coal policy on the development of coal mining in that area. I do not intend to review all those discussions but rather to summarize the conclusions that were drawn. The communities were assured that the coal policy is a flexible document which provides for development of the coal reserves in the Crowsnest Pass, and in fact there was a great potential for future development in that area.

Later on I would like to make further remarks on the development of coal technology which the province has been spearheading.

I'd like now to turn to the Speech from the Throne. First of all I'd like to comment on education. The motion put forward by the hon. Minister of Education today relating to educational priorities — I think that at a later date I will get in on that debate in this Legislature. I think it's important that this government has set a priority that we reassess the goals and objectives of education and the priorities that we're going to set on them.

Further on education matters, there's a mention of the compensatory component of the highly successful educational opportunities fund. I think that we should be directing some of this funding to areas in the province that have a lower equalized assessment than the provincial average. I think particularly the Crowsnest Pass would qualify if we were to go in that direction.

I am very pleased that the government is recognizing the importance of libraries in this province, and that we're going to see increased funding for development of public libraries. I think that's important to all parts of this province. A good library is certainly a source of information. I think it is long overdue that we are going to act in this direction.

I'm looking forward to the government's new science and research policy. As a member of the Alberta Environmental Research Trust I am cognizant of our initiatives in those areas. I think it's time for us to come out with a new science and research policy which will co-ordinate research activities in this province. We presently have a number of bodies which are doing research: the Alberta Research Council, the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority, the three universities, a forestry research trust, an

agriculture research trust. I think this is timely that we come forward and co-ordinate our approach to these various bodies.

I'm sure that most citizens in the province and citizens in my constituency will be very much pleased with announcement of phase two of the senior citizen home improvement program. A number of senior citizens have made inquiries of me as to when this phase two will come on stream, and I think it was timely that it was announced during the Speech from the Throne.

Also mentioned, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne under social services and community health, is the support which is going to be given to the Com-Serv Association of southwestern Alberta. This group deals basically with mentally retarded persons and the services which can be given to them. They attempt to co-ordinate various service groups which do things for our mentally retarded people. I think it's of significance that we are funding a demonstration model in southern Alberta. This is a very active group and they deserve our support.

Another area which is mentioned under Social Services and Community Health is the fact that the department is going to co-ordinate with the Attorney General's department an effort to enforce delinquent single-parent family payments for maintenance and alimony. I think this is an area of our social assistance system which a number of citizens have focussed on, and in fact feel that this type of review and enforcement is necessary. I also applaud it.

The Speech from the Throne outlines a number of major initiatives with regard to international trades and tariffs, getting access to markets for agricultural production, development of agricultural processing in the province, continuing those initiatives which were started in the earlier days of this administration.

It also brings forward the announcement of a new international marketing branch of Alberta Agriculture. I think this is important. I don't think we can sit back and not proceed with developing new markets for our agricultural production. I'd like to wish the Premier the best in his trip to Russia, in his attempt to secure long-term wheat contracts for Canada and for our western grain production.

I'll skip over the announcement of a second major research program with regard to our energy resources. I'd like to spend a little bit more time on that. The announcement of a new inventory of forestry resources in 1977 — as mentioned earlier by the hon. Member for Athabasca, I think this is long overdue and I think it will provide us with a necessary base to look at the future areas of development in our forest reserves with regard to lumbering. I think this is an important area for us to be getting involved in.

With regard to the announcement that the land-use zoning on the eastern slopes of the Rocky Mountains is almost completed, there are numbers of citizens in my constituency who will be welcoming this announcement. There's been a lot of delay with regard to recreational and industrial developments on the eastern slopes. This is following on the Environment Conservation Authority hearings held in 1973 with regard to east slope development. I think the sooner we have these land-use questions resolved on the eastern slopes, the better we'll be able to proceed in the future with decisions that have to be made with regard to development.

There's mention in the Speech from the Throne about the land reclamation program under the Alberta heritage savings trust fund. I've been assured that a large portion of those funds will be spent in the Crowsnest Pass area with regard to reclaiming abandoned coal mines and coal spoil piles there. I think this is a very long overdue initiative, and with regard to my constituency I cannot think of a better place that funds from the heritage savings trust fund program could be spent.

Under the Department of Labour I notice there will be proposed increases in benefits from The Workers' Compensation Act. I think that laborers and widows in my constituency will certainly welcome those increases.

I also noticed a reference to the wilderness challenge program at Nordegg correctional institution and that it will be expanded. I think this is a very important area we should be looking at in terms of . . . We speak about our prisoners and attempting to bring them back into society. I think these bush camps our correctional institutions have are a very important area in which we are able to bring some of these minor offenders back into the mainstream of our society. They have an opportunity to be outside working. I think it has tremendous benefits for them. Also the work which they do in our forest reserves, either through thinning programs or road construction, has immense benefits for the citizens of the province of Alberta.

Under Business Development and Tourism there is a significant announcement, that a new industrial assistance program will be forthcoming. A number of our smaller communities are looking at setting up industrial parks, but they don't have the money to finance them. I think this new program will certainly be of benefit to them. I think it also reflects this government's policy of decentralization of industry in this province. It's an important follow-through on the commitments that were made by this government in the early days of the administration.

Also I note that the Alberta Research Council will accelerate its energy-related programs such as coal gasification research. I should like to spend some time on that in a few moments.

Also outlined in the Speech from the Throne was the fact that we're going to be putting a greater emphasis on protection of our historical resources. I don't think there could be a more timely initiative with regard to historical resources that we have in this province. A number of them are deteriorating quite rapidly. We only have a very short time frame within which we are able to preserve those resources. I can think of a number in my constituency, and I'm sure other hon. members can think of examples in their constituencies. If we don't act soon, that heritage in buildings or landmarks is going to disappear very rapidly. I think perhaps there's a need for a historic resources inventory throughout the province. Maybe get historical societies to set it up on a local regional basis, identify those landmarks or buildings or historical resources which they feel should be preserved, and then develop some sort of priority system where we can get at those buildings or landmarks which we feel are really a reflection of the opening up of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I should now like to turn to the announcement of the second major research pro-

gram: over \$100 million is being spent on Alberta's conventional petroleum, coal, and other energy and renewable resources research. I think this is a significant area. In a province such as Alberta, blessed as we are with an abundance of energy resources, we are committing, along with the federal government, major funds to research enhanced recovery of oil and other alternatives to provide energy for the future as our non-renewable resources decline. There are several alternatives: solar, wind, geothermal, nuclear, and biomass to name a few.

Last week during the question period I found very informative the exchange between the hon. Member for Drumheller and the Minister of Business Development and Tourism with regard to coal gasification and how far we're going in this province. I should like to concentrate today on a few of my thoughts with regard to coal gasification and coal liquefaction. I believe there are several opportunities and options to be considered.

Coal makes up 44 per cent of Alberta's total energy resources. Alberta's coal is 51 per cent of Canada's total coal resources and makes up — just to give you some statistical impact, I suppose — 27 per cent of Canada's total energy reserves. So it's going to play a very important part in the future energy requirements of this nation. As depletion of oil and natural gas resources progresses, the cost differential between premium fuels — oil and gas — and coal will make the conversion of coal to clear gaseous and liquid fuels economically attractive. Mr. Speaker, with existing technology, we may see coal gasification produce high BTU gas at a cost of \$3.50 to \$4.50 per MCF. This would compare with oil priced at somewhere from \$15 to \$25 per barrel.

We're going to have to make some important decisions in the near future. I'd like to quote from the February 1977 edition of the *Pipeline and Gas Journal* in regard to this very important decision we'll have to make:

In any event, the economics of producing high-BTU gas from coal should not be considered in relation to current prices of oil and natural gas. Rather, the proper approach is to compare today's costs of synthetic high-BTU gas with the incremental cost of new supplies of natural gas or the incremental cost of electricity.

And further in this same article:

Although the economic disincentive against the use of low-BTU gas provides a greater hurdle than against high-BTU gas, it would be clearly in the national interest to develop a substantial production base for low-BTU gas in applications where a clean gaseous fuel has a high form value, in anticipation of the large price increases and severe shortages in the world oil market which can be predicted with great confidence sometime during the next 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, the decision which faces us is whether we proceed now with the development of coal gasification plants. This is important from two aspects. There are now several proposals in the United States for construction of coal slurry pipelines to transport coal from the pit to thermal electric generating plants near large cities. I recognize the significant breakthrough the construction of slurry pipelines will make on the transportation costs of coal, now the major barrier to marketing Alberta coal

in Ontario.

We may have to construct slurry pipelines in order to get this transportation freight cost break, but I should like to leave another idea with this Assembly. If we construct slurry pipelines to transport Alberta coal to Ontario, we will be locking ourselves into the position of not only exporting coal for thermal electric generation in Ontario but also the future potential for development of coal gasification plants, the products from which can be used for feedstock for petrochemical plants and spinoff secondary and tertiary manufacturing. In essence, we could be locking ourselves into exporting job opportunities from this province.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I believe the approach we should be taking is to develop coal gasification plants in Alberta and keep the job opportunities here. Of course we can export gas from this process to eastern Canada to meet their domestic requirements through existing gas and oil pipelines, but the important opportunities for creating jobs will remain here in Alberta through development of secondary and tertiary chemical industries. The control of the decisions as to where a new economic diversification relating to coal will take place will then remain in Alberta hands.

MRS. CHICHAK: Mr. Speaker, today is going to be one of those days when I will be delivering what we sometimes refer to as an eleventh-hour, off-the-cuff speech. It seemed to me today that all the thoughts I'd put together in the past week really didn't jibe and didn't suit today's atmosphere. So you may find my remarks somewhat disjointed. You may find me saying Mr. Speaker, over and over again to give me time to think about what I want to say next. I think it takes a great deal of courage perhaps to admit one's shortcomings. That is for the benefit of the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

I expect to cover basically four areas in my speech today: initially a few acknowledgments, then the matter of needs in my constituency, a number of items concerning elementary and advanced education, and the women of Alberta.

First of all, my acknowledgments of course must go to the Speech from the Throne and the Lieutenant-Governor. I will not attempt to paraphrase again all the fine words that have been put forward in congratulations by my colleagues, but will join with them to say that I too express the same feelings.

As well, I wish to compliment my colleagues from the constituencies of Lloydminster and Medicine Hat-Redcliff. I think the hon. Premier certainly made a very wise choice for this year's speakers to acknowledge the Speech from the Throne. I think it would be difficult to compete with the two gentlemen, my colleagues, in expressing their points of view and the issues of the throne speech any more eloquently.

We have acknowledged the hundredth anniversary of the signing of treaties nos. 6 and 7 by the Indian people and the representatives of Her Majesty. Although the speech recognizes as well the twenty-fifth anniversary of the reign of our Queen, Elizabeth II, not very much comment or reference has been made to this particular recognition. I think it is perhaps important to reflect again on the fact that our democratic system has continued to survive and flourish on the basis that it has been established under the Crown. Albertans, Canadians, and all

members of the Commonwealth countries would do well to reflect on what has been handed to us by the democratic system we have inherited.

[Dr. McCrimmon in the chair]

The other acknowledgment I would like to make before I go into my remarks with regard to my constituency needs and what we have received in the way of government programs or how we have benefited from them, is the paragraph on our national unity. There is no question that, apart from the fact that the paragraph is on page 20, it is as much number one — we cannot have all our paragraphs number one, although I think the priority of this particular paragraph is number one on the list. I think we as Canadians, as a country from sea to sea, recognize that there will be times when stresses and strains occur. We must certainly acknowledge these and be flexible, co-operative, and neighborly and convey to each other the kind of understanding it will take to accomplish in the future the existence of one country as it has continued in the past hundred years. I believe very strongly and firmly that like all other Canadians Albertans will do their part in maintaining this unity.

In reference to constituency needs, I think I could not begin to outline all the problems that are experienced within a constituency such as the one I represent, because of the very wide diversity and nature of the people who live therein, from the weakest to the strongest. I simply have to say I recognize, as do the people of Edmonton Norwood, that we have come a long way in a very short six years in attempting to meet the kinds of needs that have been existent for a very long period of time — for many, many more years — but have now been recognized and are being met.

I am pleased that in our throne speech consideration is being given to a library program, which I think is currently at the top of the list of priorities for the Edmonton Norwood constituency, as I am sure it is for many others. I say particularly for the Edmonton Norwood constituency because of the high percentage of young children and families who are new Canadians living in a new environment and who have a great deal of difficulty adjusting to the Canadian and Alberta way of life. It is totally different. Many of the children have stresses with respect to language problems, cultural acceptance, and financial situations within the home environment where they are not able to take advantage of the many programs that other more affluent families are able to.

I'm pleased the hon. Minister of Social Services and Community Health has taken steps to help resolve the problem of providing day care services, for having an adequate program put in place. I have no doubt that the task force the hon. minister has selected and appointed to carry out the kind of review that is necessary — I would simply like to say that in addition to the recommendations that will eventually come forward from this task force, we would not of course just simply accept the recommendations on their face [value], but review them within our own context as well.

We as elected individuals are aware of the problems and situations within our constituencies and whether in reality many of the problems would be

resolved by adopting the recommendations put forward. I know there is a great deal of concern that the recommendations may not be realistic. Although I am not prepared to accept that at the outset, we of course have the obligation and duty to be sure that in fact there isn't an unrealistic kind of requirement which would preclude those people who most need the service from being able to benefit from it.

I'm certainly pleased with the extensive strides we have made in housing, particularly senior citizen housing, because I think that as well was one of the top priorities on my list of items for the constituency of Edmonton Norwood.

I'm pleased that we are now having put in place at least some basic semblance of meeting the needs of self-contained senior citizen units. Although the programs that have currently been approved are not going to meet the needs totally, there has to be a recognition that one must not oversaturate an area with one type of facility to the detriment or absence of other types. The other types I refer to are the auxiliary hospitals and the nursing homes, particularly the nursing homes at this time.

As well, I think we could diminish the need for senior citizen housing if we were able in some manner to devise a program of assistance for senior citizens who remain in their homes but are not able to carry out the tasks of maintaining their homes, where they reside in their own homes and not in rented premises. I know it would be important if we could put that kind of assistance in place through voluntary groups or organizations, but this doesn't appear to be adequate in meeting the need. Many senior citizens are now asking to move into the fine accommodations the province is providing for senior citizens simply because they are not able to carry out the day to day tasks of maintaining their own homes. Yet they would be able to remain there if they had some assistance with regard to daily tasks.

The other area where I feel that perhaps we need a little more examination with respect to housing is in financial assistance for older homes, both in assisting young people to purchase older homes and in their improvement where the young people are at an income level just slightly exceeding the maximums we have set in our standards today. However, although we may try to depress the cost of homes to keep it from skyrocketing and not contribute to those who are simply holding properties for speculation or simply demanding out-of-reach prices, it doesn't currently appear that the maximum ceiling on the price of homes enables these people to purchase homes in older neighborhoods. This is an area I would ask the Minister of Housing and Public Works to have examine again to see if we can make some adjustments.

With regard to the matter of education, many of my colleagues have identified a lot of the problems that currently exist, either real or imaginary, or the questions that are today being asked about standards and goals of education. I'll not repeat the points that have been raised, but I would just like to identify some of the areas, problems, and concerns that I and certainly a good number of my constituents have.

With regard to the area of learning disabilities, I'm not sure the Minister of Education is able to have a great deal of impact on or do very much about it, but perhaps a direction to the school boards might be

helpful with respect to the allocation of assistance staff, particularly for classes, where there is a concentration of children with learning disabilities. I find in visiting the schools in my constituency there doesn't seem to be adequate recognition in providing the additional staff needed to cope with the numbers concentrated in the schools.

Some of the problems contributing to that concentration are that programs are being concentrated into key schools. Children are being bused from areas like St. Albert into the Edmonton Norwood area, which overloads the schools there. However, even with that concentration of students, the school board doesn't seem to recognize there should be some variation or flexibility in the allocation of the number of resource or aid people provided for such classrooms. Whether that is as a result of the kind of directive that has come from the Department of Education, I'm not sure. If it is, I hope the Minister of Education would look at the formula that has been devised, and perhaps make it flexible so it recognizes certain areas of need which are different from those in other parts of the province.

I've had a fair amount of concern expressed from professional staff in the schools with regard to a saturation of variety programs, courses that really do not add to the basic education requirements. They simply minimize the amount of time a teacher has in a classroom to teach the core subjects.

It would seem to me that if students are to come out of our elementary classrooms with a kind of standard that would enable them to meet, without a great deal of difficulty, their onward progress into postsecondary education or to whatever direction or area they then move, the frills we sometimes refer to, or the extra-curricular programs, should not be part of the basic curriculum and basic school course content, without any additional cost.

All these matters add so greatly to the cost of education. They are very nice to have. But I have had a great many express to me that these courses should not be within the school time frame. They should be extra-curricular, out of the classroom time, and perhaps an additional cost should be provided. Where parents and children have the benefit of such programs, I think the cost of such programs should not be the burden of all students who are not really finding these additional courses part of their basic need in achieving a good, sound, basic education.

We know that all kinds of experiences are educational experiences. However, it would appear to me that we must have some kind of guideline or framework in which we draw the line and say, this is what we must basically provide for each student to enable such students to cope with their requirements as they go out in life to make their contribution to society.

I think perhaps another area has not been adequately recognized, and that is those children who excel. I know some provision is being made there, but it seems to me that parents, particularly of young children, have come to me time and time again . . . We have in our early childhood programs an age guideline in which young children may be enrolled in the early childhood classroom. Under three and a half or four, they may enter only if the parents pay the cost of such an enrolment. However, it is found that some children at the age of three are really performing and are capable of conducting themselves at the age level of five, and we do not have any provision for

recognition. I'm not saying that when parents think their children have the age level of five we should just simply accept them. But I think a mechanism can be put in place to test them. If indeed they are children who excel from that early age, we should make some provision in that regard.

I see the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway is shaking his head in the negative. It may be that he hasn't had that experience. I haven't had that experience with my children, but I know there are parents in my constituency who have.

I'd just like to refer quickly to the subject of advanced education. Currently that has perhaps been a very hot topic or issue in some corners. I'm not sure that it ought to have been or that it should have been considered in that way. I would just like to make some reference to advanced education with respect to our universities. I'd like to refer to a number of articles that have been written. Initially I'd like to refer to the Commission on Canadian Studies — I doubt that I need to do this for the hon. members, but perhaps for those who read *Hansard* — and identify that:

the Commission on Canadian Studies was . . . appointed in response to a very real concern on the part of members of the academic community, and of the public at large . . .

I would like to just stress again

. . . the public at large, that there should be a careful examination to determine whether the country's universities were paying adequate attention to Canadian conditions and circumstances, and to the needs and problems of this country, in the programmes of teaching and research.

I think that is a real concern. It has been expressed in many kinds of ways by our citizens across the country. I know it is not isolated. Members of my constituency of Edmonton Norwood have come to me time and time again about the difficulties their sons or daughters have had in being accepted for university, even though their academic standards or marks achieved were sufficiently high to qualify them for the university, and many of the other problems they have had.

With regard to the study that the Commission on Canadian Studies carried out, they have expressed a number of items or concerns and a number of conditions. I would just like to refer to a few of them. With regard to the area of curriculum, the commission had this to say:

[They were] struck by the fact that few of the learned societies representing an academic discipline in Canada have made any serious examination of the extent or adequacy of the attention being devoted by their members to Canadian subject matter and concerns.

When I refer to some of those recommendations or quotes with respect to this particular commission, one may or may not accept wholly or in part the conclusions they have drawn. However, I think the thought certainly reflects the question of our society today, the real concern being expressed by citizens all across this country and across this province.

The commission had also

noted with concern the extent to which the curriculum of Canadian universities is being shaped by the teaching interests and research priorities

of the academic communities of other countries

.
I think this is important to recognize that they have found this to the extent that they have commented on it and made a recommendation. I think it perhaps confirms the concern that has been expressed again by our public with regard to foreign academic staff in our universities and colleges. That is not to say they should be eliminated or that they don't have an important role to play. They certainly have. But I think the degree has to be recognized and there has to be some balance.

Another of the areas that the commission reflected or recommended on — and I pick particular ones because I feel that today's discussions very much relate to these areas:

Scholarship and teaching in Canada have much to gain from the rich academic traditions of other countries.

They're acknowledging, which is acknowledging just what I previously stated, that they do have a great deal to contribute and we are that much richer for them.

However, we should not adopt as our own the academic tradition of any other country in the misplaced belief that it is the only one deserving of attention or that our own is not worth developing.

I don't think our society has gone that far to think that this is really happening. But I think there's a great deal of merit in what they're saying. There's a great deal of reality in that. Perhaps "merit" isn't the word, because I don't think I agree that should be happening to any great extent.

To refer again to this particular report of the Commission on Canadian Studies, there is one other thing I wanted to say before I made a few of my own remarks. In one of the paragraphs they have indicated that the studies have expressed concern with regard to the citizenship and academic background of teachers and students at Canadian universities. They've dealt with that. The commission has argued that given the country's rich, human, and physical resources, Canada has an obligation both to herself and others to become more self-reliant in meeting her own needs for qualified personnel.

I particularly wanted [to note] this item, because I think it is essential. We educate many young men and women in our universities, and it appears that we don't give them sufficient opportunity to then become involved in continuing their education at our universities by taking them on staff. There has been a constant complaint about the number of foreign academic staff in our universities, and it appears the commission has found that there is some basis for the concern.

I would just like to refer to another item which was in fact an excerpt from a speech delivered by the vice-president of the University of Missouri in October 1975 to the University Club at Columbia, Missouri. In his remarks he stated:

. . . I do not believe that universities are part of some platonic ideal displaced to earth. Rather they have been created by the society of which we are part . . .

And he's referring to universities

. . . and like other social institutions, they owe a fundamental allegiance to that society and ac-

countability to it. I believe that society has every right to refuse to support such an institution or to terminate its existence if it no longer serves the purposes for which it was created.

Well those are rather strong words. I don't think that any society would allow any postsecondary institution to reach a stage where they would have to withdraw their total support because it no longer served that particular society. I think that long before that time there would be a change in the whole consideration.

I quoted this particular one because I wanted to make just a couple of references to the recognition of cost in the public support of students at our universities, the public support of foreign students, over which there has been a great deal of controversy. I might take this opportunity to say that I and a great many of my constituents whole-heartedly support the action the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower has taken with respect to the two-tier system.

The other item that I think has to be taken into consideration is one that I referred to in my references to the Commission on Canadian Studies; that is, the number of foreign academic staff in our universities. I think there must be a balance based ... I think it's necessary to have this taken into consideration.

Because I only have about two minutes to go, I would like to say that another underlying factor must be taken into consideration: people out there have expressed concern over tenure at our universities. I would like to know how many private industries offer absolute tenure to their employees. Do they really do that, or do you have tenure so long as you perform? I think it should be no different in our educational institutions or in any other institution. I think it's necessary for us to have a very close review of this matter. Whether we like it or not, it is a matter that certainly has to be dealt with very carefully, with a great deal of consideration. We can't just simply disband what has been in place in the institutions for a long period of time. I don't think it would be fair to simply disrupt everyone's life and expectations, but I think one of the items of accountability has to be performance. You cannot have performance if you have tenure of the kind that there's absolutely no question of your ability to carry out your function at all. That is never to be questioned, if you know you will there for as long as you wish to be or as long as your health can carry you.

I think it's basically wrong in our free democratic system. I think it takes away from the incentive of new young people, young students, young men and women, who obtain an education and wish to receive an academic standing and have something to offer. There should be that opportunity, and it should be competitive.

I would just like to close and say that today I had the pleasure to meet with His Excellency, the High Commissioner for Zambia. I particularly questioned him with regard to the matter of the cost of their universities, their system. I hope hon. members will bear with me for just a couple of minutes. I might indicate his response when I asked about what they had in the way of a program for assisting young people from Zambia in covering the cost of coming to attend universities in Canada. He advised that any student, irrespective of financial capability, was able to apply for assistance through government, and their

funds were coming through foreign aid. If they met the standards that were being set by their own government, they were able to qualify to go to any university that offered the kind of educational standard or training they felt they needed in their country.

Surely there has to be recognition that a two-tier system will not discriminate against students coming to this country from foreign countries. I think it is time the academic community and the student body recognized that the matter of foreign students coming to our university has absolutely nothing to do with the matter of fees. That can be overcome through our foreign aid program, through scholarships, and in other ways. One of the ways was identified by His Excellency from Zambia. They have a program with Canada, and he indicated that the University of Alberta was one of the universities where they had the highest number of students. I was very pleased to hear that, and I just wanted to convey this message.

I'm sorry, on the matter of education I perhaps went on a little bit long and don't have any time left to deal with the question of women in Alberta and some of their needs. But I will find another opportunity in this session.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm just rising on a point of order to clarify a point the hon. member made regarding my negative nod for not wanting the below three and a half year old age group to enter early childhood services.

Mr. Speaker, the negative nod in reference to the hon. member's speech was merely to indicate that I'm not in favor of three and a half year olds and younger entering early childhood services at this time until all those three and a half years old and older are well accommodated. Only then should we consider that aspect.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, as I rise in this Assembly to participate in the Speech from the Throne debate, I'm reminded that it's only a short period of almost two years since the electors of Lethbridge West sent me here. I feel honored and challenged, and with the co-operation of the hon. member for Lethbridge East and Minister of Municipal Affairs I welcome the opportunity of serving the people of the city of Lethbridge.

I was quite taken, Mr. Speaker, when I heard the response to the Speech from the Throne from the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Never let it be said that my role in the House is that of criticizing my superiors. I don't criticize any of the opposition very lightly. However, he went on at great lengths to explain and criticize the length of the Speech from the Throne. As I listened I became more and more interested. Then I stopped and thought a minute, Mr. Speaker, and it seemed to me that in the two years since I've been here, I've never heard a more eloquent address to the Speech from the Throne than from the hon. Member for Lloydminster. It was full of empathy and warmth and understanding of the problems of Albertans. As I listened to him, my eyes naturally elevated to the row of the fourth and fifth estate, and I didn't see anybody here to report it.

Now is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that a government that can and should be proud of its record should take the time to spell it out in detail, because

obviously the only way it gets reported is when everybody is vying to get a seat here the day it's delivered by the Lieutenant-Governor. Those who have the responsibilities of informing Albertans and reporting the speeches don't seem to come to the House. Again, I say I was so moved by the hon. Member for Lloydminster, that I felt it was so necessary to mention that today. [interjections]

Even though I've been here only a couple of years, Mr. Speaker, I'm discovering it's turning out to be somewhat of an occupation. I would hope it doesn't become a profession, particularly when I read quotations from a man like Mr. Louis McHenry Howe back in 1933, the year after I was born. He says, you cannot adopt politics as a profession and remain honest. If that is true, then I obviously wouldn't want to have politics as a profession. In the same light, Mr. Speaker, one thinks of that famous man from the '20s, Will Rogers, who says, there is more independence in jail than there is in politics.

I begin to wonder as I look around the House and listen to responses to the Speech from the Throne. When I heard the Leader of the Opposition criticizing the speech, I thought of the old stand-by — and it's as good today as it was in 1886 when a fellow named Matthew Quay mentioned it: if you have a weak candidate and a weak platform, simply wrap yourself in the American flag and talk about the constitution. That was my interpretation of the criticism of the Speech from the Throne.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be remiss if I didn't mention for the benefit of members of the Assembly, something about the constituency which I represent, along with the concerns I have about the direction and achievements of this government. I say that mainly because only too often do we hear of Edmonton, Calgary, and other areas. Other areas happens to include 50 per cent of this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

MR. GOGO: We don't very often hear them identified. With the indulgence of the members, I would like very quickly to run through some of the attributes of the city that sent me here.

Mr. Speaker, I never ever say that some people are overpaid, but I am tempted at times to say that people should receive their pay cheques giftwrapped.

Lethbridge, Mr. Speaker, is a city of 48,000 people. It's the third largest city in Alberta, 50 per cent greater than any of the other cities, except two.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which two?

MR. GOGO: As an example, Mr. Speaker, one of the firms Lethbridge, Alberta has — it's not a big firm, but it's typical and it touches the heart of the Minister of Transportation — is Time Air. Many people do not know, but last year Time Air flew 140,000 people around this province. That's a substantial number. They had a payroll of \$100,000, and in addition they spent \$60,000 a month in fuel. They employ 130 people, and I suggest that with 16 flights a day it is a rather major airline. Now to keep that in perspective, one would have to remember that between the capital city of Saskatchewan and Saskatoon there are two

flights daily. In cities like Yorkton, Brandon, Swift Current, and Moose Jaw, there are no flights at all. So I would suggest that when looking at Time Air you get some idea of the significance of the irrigation city of Lethbridge.

Now it's not without problems. For example, Mr. Speaker, as I've said earlier, we hear about Edmonton, Calgary, and other areas. One area that's particularly important today is law enforcement. The province of Alberta says that Calgary and Edmonton should have one policeman for 550 people. Other areas, because they're not quite so crime-ridden, should have one in 800. Well I suggest, Mr. Speaker, without detracting from other parts of Alberta, Lethbridge is somewhat unique and shouldn't come under the same category. Let me just quote from a very substantial source, the chief of police of my city: "Last year, in Lethbridge, the city police had to house 5,000 prisoners." They don't have a remand centre like the major cities. They have to put up with this within their police station. They have the additional problems of being the catch basin of the south, and having people come in from other areas, adding to the law enforcement problems. I just point out for the benefit of the Solicitor General, who is in the House, that the one in 800, which is recommended, is not good enough for the city of Lethbridge. Indeed, they have one in 685. But it takes a few more dollars, of course, from the local taxpayer.

I don't consider myself qualified to talk about education, Mr. Speaker, unless it affects my constituency. And it does. I'm proud to have in front of me the results of a test of academic skills carried out between grade 9 and 10 students in Alberta and the province of British Columbia. Naturally they looked for that part of the province where the students would show up rather brightly when compared with the other province. So they chose Lethbridge. And I see, Mr. Speaker, that in every case — in the three R's, reading, writing, and mathematics — that the grade 9 and 10 students in Alberta were indeed superior to those in the province of British Columbia. I think that's a credit to the system of education here in the province.

But we do have some problems, Mr. Speaker. In Lethbridge at the moment we have, and I'm sure this is duplicated many times around the province, the 13 to 15 age group. As members of the Assembly, we spend a lot of time talking about the 16 and 17 age group and boozing. But the 13 to 15 age group is the pre-high school level, the junior high. In Lethbridge we have from 30 to 100 of them, and they're becoming a problem. They are becoming a problem in that, although The School Act says parents must ensure their children are in school until they are age 16, all the parents can do is take them to school. They go in the school's front door and out the back door. On the other hand, The Child Welfare Act says that if the parents cannot control the children, the state will. And we're in somewhat of a dilemma, Mr. Speaker. Because of these numbers we find that the elected school boards in our municipalities are really hopeless — or helpless — to do what they should do. [laughter] Very simply, Mr. Speaker, it's a matter that the funds the school board has are tied directly to the number of students enrolled in that school.

So I would think attention should be paid to perhaps amending The School Act in such a manner that

school boards can be funded in such a way that these 13 to 15 year olds, who quite clearly break the law — and we're not prepared to change the law — could be put into a work program under the auspices of the school board. Now the blessing of the school board goes along with this, and I think it's a good idea. It's an area that, if it's in Lethbridge, believe me, it's all over this province.

In the area of housing, Mr. Speaker . . . The minister is not in his place. I'm particularly intrigued when I look at what's going on in housing both in the United States and in Canada, because the argument I hear in Alberta constantly is that on the one hand we have an oversupply. An oversupply in the free market system means that the price falls. Well then, we can't have an oversupply because the price is not falling. We saw last year in Canada about 220,000 housing units were produced, which was about 11 for every 1,000 people — a remarkable record. In the United States it was about eight.

But in the province of Alberta the Minister of Housing and Public Works, as a result of an election platform by this party, was charged with the responsibility of providing housing to Albertans. Let's look at the record, Mr. Speaker. We shouldn't be too proud to look at the record, and we certainly shouldn't be ashamed, because we see 11 houses per 1,000 people have been produced in Canada. We in Alberta have the record for all Canada, last year 20.6 houses per 1,000 people — a new record in Canada. I think the Minister of Housing and Public Works is to be congratulated.

Now we come to the problem. Who can buy them? Because I quote, Mr. Speaker, the president of a well-known Toronto mortgage company who says, there's a lot of affordable housing around, there hasn't been affordable housing like this for some time. Perhaps he should take an Air Canada trip west — as PWA doesn't go east — and look at the situation. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, it's not a question of supply any longer; it's a question of affordability. He goes on to say, profits are already marginal — and this is a builder talking — I can't afford to reduce prices by even \$100. For me to believe that, Mr. Speaker, he would have to have a member like the member for Calgary Buffalo even to talk to me about it.

Mr. Speaker, on a more serious note, I think we should stop for a minute and consider the serious implications that lie ahead for health care and delivery in Alberta. I believe the introduction of medicare in Canada was the result of the 1965 election, and with it the ramifications of cost sharing. I think we as Albertans have witnessed what happens with cost sharing with Ottawa. If you're a farmer, you probably know what udder I'm referring to, because that's the one you end up at.

As of September of this year, Mr. Speaker, the cost-sharing system has changed completely. No longer will Ottawa be involved with the equal sharing of health delivery costs with the provinces. I say that is a good thing, a great thing. For some years we in Alberta have said there are better ways to treat people than in acute hospital beds. There are better ways. We can treat them at home, we can have ambulatory care. There are a variety of programs. So finally — and I assume the provinces were united in this — the tax sharing has now been changed. We as

a province will receive the dollars, and we will determine our priorities. That's a principle of this government at the municipal level: always let them set their own priorities. Finally we as a province are achieving the same thing. Mr. Speaker, I believe that's particularly significant when you consider that on average every family in Canada spends \$1,000 per year in health delivery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we get to an area I feel very strongly about: social services and community health. You know, marriage breakdown can't be very nice for anybody. I look around this Assembly — and if we're all here, there are 75 of us — there are not many single parents. But Canada has many single parents. Alberta has a great number of single parents. We have 12,500 on welfare alone, and there are those who aren't on welfare, believe me. Mr. Speaker, last year in the city of Lethbridge alone there were 535 marriage breakdowns. Now assuming you're a normal person who works a normal week, that's two for every working day of the year, which is a substantial number. And naturally it brings hardship. I think it brings tremendous hardship if you're one of the principals involved. As a single parent, I don't know who has a greater requirement for day care facilities. And this government rightly introduced the PSS program. I think it's been extremely successful.

DR. BUCK: Well now, let's have that right. Who introduced that program?

MR. GOGO: This government condoned the use of the PSS program, and I think it's been a great program.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's better.

MR. GOGO: As I qualified it, Mr. Speaker, I've only been here a couple of years and, although I'm not above being corrected, I'll bow to the hon. member.

The PSS program has been successful for one main reason, not necessarily for what it achieved, but it gave the authority and the determination of priorities to the level of government that could best handle it, and that was the local level. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the PSS program was partially funded by the Canada assistance plan, and like all federal programs — and perhaps rightly so — they put strings on it. What better indication and illustration do we have than in day care where, because of the assistance program from Ottawa, we as a government cannot fund day care centres by funding the people who need the service as opposed to the bricks-and-mortar side.

So we have an unusual situation at the moment, Mr. Speaker, in my constituency and in many constituencies. We're faced with a private operator on this side, trying to run a viable business under the free enterprise system, and competition on this side from the public day care centres. I don't believe it's working very successfully. I would urge the minister, if the Canada assistance plan is being terminated, to reassess the type of day care operation now going on. It's greatly appreciated. It's just that there's a conflict between the two groups. Hopefully when the task force the minister so wisely appointed reports in April, it will resolve this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have many more comments to make,

and insofar as I've only used half my time, I would ask the House if I could beg leave to adjourn debate.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move the Assembly adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at half past 2.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

[The House adjourned at 5:33 p.m.]

