

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA

Title: **Wednesday, March 9, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

head: **PRESENTING REPORTS BY
STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES**

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in reporting the standing committees, I inadvertently left out the Standing Committee on Public Affairs chaired by Mr. Musgreave, including all elected members. I would like to have that included in the list.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 17
The Public Lands
Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. SCHMIDT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Public Lands Amendment Act, 1977. The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to meet the requirements of the reorganization of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources as it relates to the public lands division. It is to provide the minister [with] the right to purchase land, and a revision in the process of transfers will result in ease of administration and will reduce the time factors involved.

[Leave granted; Bill 17 read a first time]

**Bill 19
The Public Highways Development
Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. HANSEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Public Highways Development Amendment Act, 1977. This bill will delete an advisory board to the minister and will also give the minister direct control over forestry and secondary 900-roads.

[Leave granted; Bill 19 read a first time]

**Bill 20
The Names of Homes
Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. STROMBERG: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Names of Homes Amendment Act, 1977. Mr. Speaker, the proposed amendments in this progressive bill will enable many Albertans who take pride in ownership to protect the names of their farms and farm homes.

[Leave granted; Bill 20 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 17, The Public Lands Amendment Act, 1977; Bill 19, The Public Highways Amendment Act, 1977; and Bill 20, The Names of Homes Amendment Act, 1977.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I request leave to introduce Bill No. 229, An Act to Amend The Securities . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. member just wait until the question has been put.

Having heard the motion by the hon. Government House Leader, would all those in favor please say aye.

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Those opposed please say no. The motion is carried.

**Bill 229
An Act to Amend
The Securities Act**

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, I'm hoping it'll have some impact, having been introduced twice. I request leave to introduce Bill No. 229, An Act to Amend The Securities Act. The purpose of this bill is to remove two exemptions from the part of The Securities Act governing takeover bids and thereby ensure that all shareholders obtain a proportionate benefit from any takeover.

[Leave granted; Bill 229 read a first time]

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS**

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I'm very pleased to introduce to you, sir, and through you to the members of the Legislative Assembly, an outstanding Canadian who is in your gallery today, the Premier of the province of Newfoundland Mr. Frank Moores.

Mr. Moores is here today as part of the completion of a transaction announced in this Legislative Assembly some days ago, and the documents arising out of that transaction were executed. He's accompanied by the Deputy Minister of Finance, government of Newfoundland, Mr. Martin; the Assistant Deputy Minister of Finance, Mr. Warriner; the Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Macauley; Legal Counsel for the government of Newfoundland, Mr. Poole; and Mr. Callaghan from the Premier's office.

Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate if these gentlemen would rise and we could welcome to the House the Premier of Newfoundland and a number of his colleagues from that important province.

DR. HOHOL: Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to introduce to you today the third class this week from my constituency of Edmonton Belmont. Today's visitors, from the Northmount Elementary School, number 65 students and two or three teachers headed by Mr. Dame. The three classes in total number 175 visitors from

Edmonton Belmont this week. Today's guests are in the public gallery. I should like to ask them to rise and receive the recognition of the House.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to introduce to you and members of the Assembly 26 grade 6 students from the Grassland school in the Athabasca constituency. They are accompanied today by their teacher Joyce Semenchuk; one of the secretarial staff, Diane Ponich; and school bus driver Dwayne Pysyk. But, Mr. Speaker, I also notice the group in the members gallery has been joined by Mr. Jeff Edwards, who is the original settler from the Amber Valley district in northeast Alberta. I would like all this group to stand and be welcomed to the Assembly.

MR. PLANCHE: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure today to introduce to you, sir, and through you to the members of the Assembly, from the Calgary Hebrew School in my constituency of Glenmore 40 children, fresh from giving me a workout in room 119. With them are their teachers, Mrs. Miller, Mrs. Lyseng, Miss Peever, Mr. Pomp, and Mr. Alimah. I would ask that they please rise in the members gallery and be recognized by the House.

head: **TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the annual report of the Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1976, as required by statute.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the sixth annual report of the Environment Conservation Authority, and file with the library two copies of the Erosion of Land in Northwestern Alberta report by the Environment Conservation Authority.

head: **MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

Department of Housing and Public Works

MR. YURKO: Mr. SPEAKER, I am pleased to announce today the details of phase two of the highly successful senior citizen home improvement program, better known as SCHIP.

Members of the Legislature will recall the initial announcement of the program by the Premier in March, 1975, as applicable to senior citizens of limited income for repairing their homes. The program has been successfully implemented and is a credit to the staff of the Department of Housing and Public Works.

It is province-wide and is being made available to Albertans living on Metis settlements and Indian reserves.

The initial phase of SCHIP will repair and improve approximately 30,000 senior citizens' homes in the province. This first phase of the program provides a grant of \$1,000 to senior citizens who are homeowners in Alberta and who qualify for the Alberta assured income supplement. So far over 26,000 senior citizens are using the program.

The details of the second phase of SCHIP, which

was announced in the throne speech, are as follows. Phase two will become effective on April 1, 1977. It is expected to repair and improve an additional 20,000 senior citizens' homes. Phase two will apply to senior citizens of limited income who are homeowners and whose incomes exceed the Alberta assured income supplement.

First of all, senior citizens with a total income under \$6,500 per year will receive the maximum grant of \$1,000 if they qualify. Secondly, senior citizens with a total income between \$6,500 and \$8,000 per year will receive a grant of \$750. Thirdly, senior citizens with a total annual income between \$8,000 and \$9,000 will benefit to the extent of a \$500 grant.

Phase two will be advertised at intervals from April to November in daily newspapers, local newspapers, the *TV Guide*, and on some public transportation vehicles. Pamphlets describing phase two and application forms will be available at the following outlets: treasury branches, chartered banks, participating credit unions, senior citizen drop-in centres, the Department of Housing and Public Works, and the offices of the Alberta Housing Corporation and Alberta Home Mortgage Corporation.

Phase two of the program will be administered in the same manner as phase one, that is credit will be established in the financial institution of the senior citizens' choice, such as a treasury branch, chartered bank, or participating credit union.

To qualify, a senior citizen must have lived in Alberta for one full year prior to application. All approved applicants will receive a SCHIP identification card.

Eligible improvements under phase two of the program will be identical to the improvements permitted under the first phase and will cover expenditures for both labor and materials.

The department encourages recipients of the grant to purchase fire protection equipment, such as smoke detectors, which is a sound investment by the senior citizens in their own personal safety. In addition, the department will be stressing expenditure on such items as insulation, weather stripping, and storm windows which result in savings on monthly heating bills.

Eligible improvements include the following: alterations or repair to the exterior or interior of a home or garage, including windows and the roof — and it is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that during the first phase, over 43 per cent of the expenditures were on roofing and eavestroughing — the purchase, installation, repair, cleaning, or improving of heating systems, electric light, power, and control systems; thirdly, the construction or installation of sewage disposal systems, water supply systems; and any other alteration or repair as may be approved by the Alberta Housing Corporation and Public Works and is deemed to improve the property.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that phase two of SCHIP will encourage senior citizens, as did the initial phase of the program, to remain in their own homes. Programs like SCHIP help ease the demand for publicly built and subsidized accommodation in the province.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in responding to the announcement made by the minister, might I say that we commend the government for moving on this program at this particular time. I just remind the

members of the government that the initial announcement in 1975 was made in such a manner that all people 65 years and over thought they were going to get the benefit of the program.

The other comment I would make, Mr. Speaker, is simply this: with the announcement today, it now becomes increasingly important for the government to recognize the need for a home care program so that many of the people who are going to be able to take advantage of this program and phase one of this program will not have to leave their homes because of the lack of some medical care, especially the need for a home care program centred on either the Victorian Order of Nurses assistance or some nursing assistance through health units or other types of programs. That kind of addition to this program would really make it even more possible for a large number of our senior citizens and pioneers to remain in their own homes for an extended period of time.

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to revert to Introduction of Visitors.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **INTRODUCTION OF VISITORS** (reversion)

MR. FARRAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce through you to the House 16 students and their teacher Greg Archibald from the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology, more commonly known as "Tech". I don't need to remind members of the excellent reputation of our technical colleges. It is upon the skills learned there that we largely depend for reaching our goal of a diversified economy in Alberta. I ask them to rise and be recognized by the House.

head: **ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**

Management Contracts

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. The question flows from concern expressed by a number of people with regard to the awarding of the management contract for the Diamond Shamrock plant being built at Fort Saskatchewan. The question to the minister is: were Canadian firms asked or given the opportunity to bid on the management contract for the Diamond Shamrock plant?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I understand one of the principals of the Diamond Shamrock organization will be in town on Friday. I suggest the hon. leader ask that question of him.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could ask a supplementary question then. Has the minister received representation directly, or does he know if the Premier's office or ministers have received representation expressing grave concern that in fact no Canadian firm had the opportunity to bid on the management contract at the Diamond Shamrock plant?

MR. DOWLING: No, Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge. My departmental officials keep me apprized of developments as they proceed in the province relative to balanced economic growth. But I have had no representation of that kind.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, that's one area you are uninformed in.

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Can the minister indicate to the House what Alberta or Canadian firms had the opportunity to bid on the management contract at the Alberta Energy Company power generating facility at Syncrude?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I read the papers as well as the hon. Leader of the Opposition. If that information is available to him like me, I'd suggest he follow the *Edmonton Journal* and those indications were there.

MR. CLARK: I'll put the question this way: is the minister aware that no Alberta firm had the opportunity to bid on the management contract for the power plant at Syncrude?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I'm not on the board of directors of Alberta Energy Company.

MR. CLARK: That's fortunate for us. Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CLARK: Calm down fellows.

AN HON. MEMBER: There are a couple of gals here, Bob.

AEC Tenders

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question. Is the minister aware that the second phase tenders for the Syncrude gas pipeline are now being called and that tenders are only being asked of union companies?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker I'm not sure, but it appears to me that the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that his party's philosophy is to make further intervention into the private sector.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Oh nonsense.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, another question to the hon. minister. Is the minister aware that 97 per cent of the pipeline construction in Alberta last year was in fact done by non-union contractors, and is the minister prepared to intervene to see that non-union contractors at least have the opportunity to bid on this contract?

MR. DOWLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be fairly clear that our department has no involvement in the management decisions of the Alberta Energy Company or of the Syncrude organization. But there is a board of directors, and those questions might properly be put to them.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then a supplementary question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. I'd like to ask the hon. minister if he has discussed with the president of the Alberta Energy Company the fact that the company is restricting invitational tenders for the second phase of the Syncrude gas pipeline to only union firms.

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Would the minister discuss the matter with the president of the Alberta Energy Company and with the responsible officials of Syncrude and report back to the Assembly?

MR. GETTY: No, Mr. Speaker.

Drilling Incentive Programs

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a second question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. What kind of assessment is the government doing on the effectiveness of the exploratory drilling incentive program, which I believe runs out the end of 1977?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the government's been conducting a fairly detailed assessment of the exploratory drilling incentive program in conjunction with a variety of associations in the oil and gas industry: the Canadian Association of Oilwell Drilling Contractors, IPAC, CPA, the geophysicists association, and companies which offer their views on the program. We hope to be able to announce fairly early a decision on whether the program will be continued past the end of the year, because companies will be making budget and drilling program decisions for the winter of '77-78.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In the course of the consideration going into the continuation of the program or modifications to the program, is it the government's intention or desire to extend the program on more than a year-to-year basis so in fact there could be some longer range planning involved, once again affecting primarily the smaller companies?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I think that's certainly part of the decision and a worth-while consideration that we should take into our decision-making process.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, is it the government's intention to look at the geophysical incentive program in the course of this review and make a decision whether it will be continued or modified?

MR. GETTY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I mentioned that we were also discussing the matter with the geophysicists association, and in that regard I was referring to the geophysical incentive program as well.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary to the minister. What target date is the government looking at as far as an announcement is concerned?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to give target dates, because it seems that when you do you have

trouble making them. But I would say that we are trying to do it as early as possible so that companies preparing budgets and drilling and geophysical programs for the coming months will have some idea as to the possibility of the program being continued and the details of the program, should it be continued.

Chemical Supplies

MR. DONNELLY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Business Development and Tourism. It is my understanding that there is growing concern in our province over the impending shortage of building-block chemicals used in the oil and gas industry. These chemicals are used in the production of oil wells as well as in many processes in our gas plants. Would the minister please respond to this concern? What steps is the government taking to rectify this situation?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, first of all the department and I have had meetings with chemical companies of one kind or another. Last November was the last one I had. At that time one of the companies identified what company principals thought was a problem of insecure supply of chemicals coming into Canada from the United States.

Those chemicals are proprietary chemicals manufactured by companies such as ARCO, Whitco, and another one I have just forgotten for the moment. We don't identify any potential shortage of those proprietary chemicals. The situation is simply this: the organization I'm referring to manufactures anti-corrosive chemicals for use in oil wells where the oil is heavy or where the gas is very corrosive. There is no problem in that. There may be a problem in the demulsifying manufacture because that is where the proprietary chemicals come into the picture. These are imported in bulk after having been manufactured in the United States. The proposal was that our department become involved and supply a grant of some considerable size so research could be undertaken to develop these chemicals here.

However, our policy in the Research Council is that we cost share, in the main, most of the research done. A company will contribute a portion, the Research Council a second portion, then the rights to anything developed are jointly owned by the two groups. However, we do not have a policy that will automatically fund research for a particular organization. It becomes public property and not property of an individual organization.

One further point, Mr. Speaker, if I may. An organization called PAIT is the federal program for the advancement of industrial technology. There is a possibility that that program will be expanded in April of this year to accommodate the request of the particular company I'm talking about.

New Towns Legislation

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. During this session of the Legislature will the minister introduce amendments to The New Towns Act that will give greater flexibility to these new towns, allowing them to elect their own mayor?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, that's not anticipated for this session.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Has the minister been approached by the town board, the Chamber of Commerce of Fort McMurray, to allow Fort McMurray to elect their own mayor?

MR. JOHNSTON: I received information, Mr. Speaker, from the chairman of the board of administration, Mr. Knight.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Will the minister act on that information and make that possible for them?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the results of the plebiscite have only been given to us in the last week, as I recall. It's somewhat difficult for us to get legislation into the House that quickly for the spring session.

DR. BUCK: At your speed, that means five years.

MR. NOTLEY: Supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the government of the opinion that the Commissioner of Northeast Alberta is still required, or can we go back to what one might consider ordinary or normal self-government which was the situation prior to the passage of Bill 55 in 1974?

MR. SPEAKER: There is some doubt as to whether a question which elicits government opinion is intended for the question period. If it can be related to government policy, that would be different.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the government giving any consideration to amending or changing Bill 55, passed by the Legislature in 1974, as it relates to the powers and jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Northeast Alberta?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, the critical period in the construction of the Syncrude plant is 1977. We feel the role of the Northeast Commissioner has been excellent and perhaps one of the outstanding methods by which the Syncrude plant and the development of that town has been able to proceed on target. In fact I would indicate to the House that not on one occasion has the powers of Bill 55 been employed. It's been more participation and co-operation.

So two things are important. First of all, I don't perceive any changes in Bill 55, secondly I don't perceive any changes in the new town status for the town of Fort McMurray.

Sheep Industry

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate what steps the government is taking, or if there are any plans to ensure that there is an adequate supply of lamb for the Innisfail plant? At the present time have they imported any lamb from other areas to slaughter at the plant?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated yesterday in my remarks during Ministerial Statements, the future of the lamb industry in Alberta is very important and depends on the continued operation of the Innisfail plant. I think it is fair to say that the reasons for building that plant are probably more valid today than they were when the idea first came into being.

Perhaps I should explain first of all that early in his term of office as Minister of Agriculture, my colleague the Minister of Transportation undertook a complete assessment of the lamb industry in this province with a view to determining whether government and producers working together could in some way or another provide the kind of atmosphere that would result in an increase in sheep and lamb production.

More than half a dozen different areas were identified where improvements and changes could be made. Among those was the development of a specialty killing plant. I think it's fair to say that was the most important objective and change that could be made to assist producers.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, we developed a ewe-lamb retention program where individuals are paid a certain amount, by way of grant, to retain additional ewes and increase the numbers in their flock, thereby providing additional lambs for market.

In addition, the Department of Agriculture embarked upon a fairly ambitious program of upgrading their knowledge, expertise, and skills in regard to the kind of production information they could supply through our district agriculturist office, regional office, and sheep specialist with respect to assisting farmers.

At the same time we undertook, in conjunction with the lands division at that time of the Department of Lands and Forests, a review of the kind of pasture requirements in this province in relation to the sheep industry and embarked upon a couple of experimental programs utilizing grazing lands with both cattle and sheep.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we implemented a program of providing predator control officers in the Department of Agriculture who, since that time, have worked very closely with the fish and wildlife division officers under my colleague the hon. Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. Indeed predator control has been one of the major problems. I think we've come a long way in some effective means of controlling predators that didn't exist previously, and I would be pleased to elaborate that another time.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, we're keeping very close contact with research facilities, not only in Canada but in other parts of the world, with respect to breed development. Anyone who knows anything about the sheep business knows how important it is that we progress in this area.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, on specific programs in this province, within the last year we signed a research contract with Lakeside Research in Brooks, Alberta, involving the feedlotting of lamb, the thought being that it may be possible — and particularly would help the processing plant — for us to improve their position by bringing feeder lambs into Alberta from other parts of Canada, perhaps from the northern United States, and feedlot them in this province so we can have a regular supply of lamb for the plant.

Mr. Speaker, those are only a few of the areas

we're working on with respect to improving and developing the sheep industry in the province.

DR. BUCK: Very impressive, but we have fewer sheep than we had before.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. To this point has any lamb been imported from the United States to be slaughtered at the plant at Innisfail?

MR. NOTLEY: We're now back to the original.

MR. MOORE: I would have to say, Mr. Speaker, that as far as imported lamb is concerned, some small numbers may have been imported. But certainly lambs in any significant numbers have not been imported into Alberta for purposes of slaughtering at that plant.

MR. CLARK: A supplementary question to the minister. In light of the announcement the minister made yesterday with regard to the \$2.3 million, would the minister be prepared to table in the Assembly a copy of this detailed assessment by the government which led the government to move in the directions the minister outlined today? Would the minister be prepared to table that detailed assessment, so we could all have a look at it before the estimates?

MR. MOORE: What I'd be prepared to do, Mr. Speaker, is table with the Assembly an outline in more detail of the various programs in the sheep industry that I today advised the Assembly we're involved in. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the assessment indeed was different from the one done by the previous government. The assessment done by my colleague in 1972 didn't say that the sheep industry in this province had no future and should die, and that those who had been involved in it for many years should not be assisted. That's quite different from what happened, as I understand from the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition yesterday.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, if the minister would like to get back to the question, would you like to table both reports then, the assessment done by our government and the assessment you say your government did?

MR. SPEAKER: Would the hon. leader please use the ordinary parliamentary form in addressing questions.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Would the minister like to table both assessments, both documents?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware until yesterday, as a matter of fact, of the existence of a document developed before 1971 that said the sheep industry had no future in this province. I'll see if I can find it. With respect to what was done after that, I'm prepared to provide additional information on the initiatives we've taken . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The assessment, the assessment.

MR. MOORE: . . . in a variety of areas. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that after doing that the hon. members will realize the importance of the lamb industry. [interjections]

MR. NOTLEY: A question to the hon. minister. Will the minister specifically agree . . . [interjections]

MR. CLARK: They never did one.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if we could just pursue a supplementary question. Would the minister agree to table in the Legislature specifically the assessment done by this government, not the overall programs but the specific assessment done by this government?

MR. HYNDMAN: Put it on the Order Paper. You know the rules.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, it may well be a good question for the Order Paper. But I want to assure the Assembly that the assessment done by the Department of Agriculture and the minister and this government after August 31, 1971 was one that may not contain 50, 70, or 100 pages of written information. It was an assessment that covered a broad variety of areas. Indeed there is a feasibility report with respect to a lamb processing plant. There were meetings with the sheep industry in this province, meetings back and forth across the table where we discussed with them the importance of a ewe-lamb retention program or something of that nature.

I'm prepared to tell you what we've been doing and why we've done it. Insofar as tabling any specific reports is concerned, I'll have a look to see what's available. If one is available, developed before 1971, that indicated the sheep industry had no future in this province, I might table it first. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Alberta Game Farm

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Recreation . . . [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. Mr. Speaker, this is regarding the major cultural/recreational facility program dollars used to purchase the Alberta Game Farm. I wonder if the minister would clarify whether funds granted under this program could be used to purchase the fixed assets, or the fixed assets and animals of the Alberta Game Farm.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, if I can start by clarifying the fact that the municipal authority which may in fact apply at the request of, say, the foundation or whoever may be the successful applicant would put in place an application of that particular nature that would relate to facility development, purchase, renovations, or whatever. It would not in my mind necessarily apply to the purchase of animals, which may not be classed as a fixed asset in this case. But I think to clear that up — and I have had a number of calls about that particular point, Mr. Speaker — the

program relates to facility development in the province of Alberta. I'm quite pleased to indicate again that some \$13 million worth of projects were approved last year in that first full year of operation.

DR. PAPROSKI: One supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister would indicate whether he has information or reports to indicate that an application or applications have been made to date regarding use of this program for the purchase of the Alberta Game Farm.

MR. ADAIR: I'm not aware of any application made to this particular point. I am aware there have been some queries to the city of Edmonton as to whether it may be used for that purpose.

DR. BUCK: Supplementary question to the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister in a position to indicate if he's had any discussion with the director Mr. Maser to this point in time as to how the foundation memberships are coming? Is the group getting a large membership? Would the minister indicate what position it's in?

MR. ADAIR: I can't indicate that, Mr. Speaker. I did have a meeting yesterday at noon. Mr. Maser dropped in to bring me up to date. He indicated to me that to this point in time it appeared to be successful, but no numbers as to how many he has had, nor did I ask him. I indicated to him again that they are in the same position as any other applicant may be between now and April 30, that is not a preferred position but an equal position with anyone else who may apply.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Unless I missed something, can the minister indicate what other groups have indicated interest in the purchase of the Game Farm, or has it been just the one group?

MR. ADAIR: As I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, other citizens have contacted me as to what the February 1 press release meant. We're seeking some information as to whether they in fact could apply.

If I can clarify that for the interest and humor of some of the members over there, the point was that any non-profit organization, municipal authority, foundation, may prepare an application for us, providing they can provide financial capability, management capability, a long-term operating plan. Indeed, once that particular application was considered, the successful applicant would then allow us to enter into negotiations for the purchase of the land base of the Game Farm, either that particular site or a possible alternative site.

Now, other people have contacted me to this point. I'm not aware of any other application coming in. There has not been one application to date. I am aware that Mr. Maser and the group in the Alberta Game Farm Foundation have been advertising in the media for memberships by way of a \$1 membership, I believe, and support in any other fashion.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister had any meeting with Mr. Oeming to find out if members of the minister's department can do an assessment on what it would cost to duplicate the actual physical facilities in place

at the Game Farm, if they were moved elsewhere in the province?

MR. ADAIR: Number one, Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. member's question as to whether I have met with Dr. Oeming: no, I have not recently. As a matter of fact, the last time I met with Dr. Oeming personally was to indicate to him that we would not purchase the Game Farm. That was actually through my executive assistant delivering a letter to him. I wasn't able to catch up to Dr. Oeming. He's a very busy man and doing an excellent job in that particular area.

In response to whether we have done an assessment, we have the general overview as to what we feel are the costs of the Game Farm and the assets there. We also have a copy of one the city of Edmonton has done. Those things will be taken into consideration at the time we get into that particular dealing with the purchase of the land for the Game Farm.

Snow Motion Campaign

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my question to the hon. Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. I would like to know if any claims for damages have been laid against Travel Alberta for its recent series of misleading advertisements promoting great family skiing and a comfortable lodge at West Castle Ski Resort, where there is no snow and the lodge burnt down two months ago.

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I know nothing about that matter. Perhaps I might ask if my colleague the Minister of Business Development and Tourism has any knowledge.

MR. DOWLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can. Of course we're not tuned in with number one upstairs, so we aren't in a position to forecast snow. When the Snow Motion campaign was undertaken, which by the way has brought about a 45 per cent increase in patronage of ski areas outside the national parks, we took it on a blanket basis and advertised for each one of those ski areas that indicated they wanted to participate. We undertook to advertise in the *Lethbridge Herald* that West Castle was an excellent place to ski, which it most certainly is. Unfortunately their chalet burned down, and the snow did not drop. We weren't in a position to forecast either of those items.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the minister indicate how they go about this Ski Alberta program? I asked this in the spring. Just on a point of clarification, I think the minister hinted at it just now and I missed it. How does the minister go about devising this advertising program he uses for Ski Alberta?

MR. DOWLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We send a letter to each ski area, naturally understanding that the major ski areas happen to be located in the national parks. But there is potential for others outside so we contacted each area outside the national parks, told them we would undertake a cost-sharing advertising campaign with them if they wanted to participate. The amount of contribution by the entrepreneur was fifty-fifty with Travel Alberta, based on the patronage of that particular ski area.

We found it extremely successful. The first year we got involved in the campaign, we had perhaps two-thirds of the ski areas involved. This last year almost a hundred per cent were involved, and they all agree the campaign has been successful in that ski areas outside the national parks have had one of their best years this year. Bearing in mind the snow conditions, that's a significant fact.

AEC Annual Meeting

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Leader of the Opposition. I have in my hand an instrument of proxy which I received from the Alberta Energy Company. In view of his statement some days ago in this House that he felt himself in conflict of interest if he purchased shares of the Alberta Energy Company, yet on the other hand believes that in order to perform effectively in the House he must have information respecting the AEC which is only available to shareholders, I wonder if he would be prepared to vote my proxy at the upcoming annual meeting, and could I deliver the proxy to him?

MR. CLARK: It's unexpected but the opportunity . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I take it the hon. leader has answered the question. But I must say that I fail to detect in the question anything which would bring it within the ordinary scope of the question period.

MR. KING: Just to be clear. Did the hon. member respond "no" to the question? Since you've indicated that an answer is going to be recorded in *Hansard*, do I understand the hon. leader to state clearly that he is not interested in attending the annual meeting of the company and asking questions?

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, we can continue this for some time. Many Albertans will be at that meeting who will be looking after the best interests of Albertans. Some of them will be there to do the job the government isn't doing that that's giving some direction to the board of directors of the Alberta Energy Company. Next question?

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly we should cut this off here. [interjections] I trust hon. members will not consider what has just happened to be a precedent in any way.

Blue Ridge Hamlet

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact it might not be a bad idea if it was a precedent.

I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. Is the government aware of a report by the medical health officer in the Stony Plain-Lac Ste. Anne health unit regarding sewage disposal problems in the hamlet of Blue Ridge? Among other things the concern expressed is that sewage effluent is being leaked on the ground where it's exposed to children in the hamlet.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to check with the department and report back to the member on that.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Is the minister aware, or has the government received any petitions from the hamlet of Blue Ridge concerning the question of water and sewerage systems in the hamlet?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, going by memory, I can only recollect one representation from Blue Ridge. That was along the lines of making the point that they wanted a share in the economic growth taking place in that part of the province, and were inquiring as to how our assistance programs might apply to their municipality. If there are others, I'd have to check.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. Minister of the Environment or the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the government in a position to advise why residents had been quoted a cost of \$7.60 per front foot, after the original estimate of \$3.80 had been conveyed to the community? Perhaps since the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs seems to be nodding his head, I could direct the supplementary question to him.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the concerns which have been expressed by the hamlet of Blue Ridge, first of all because it has applied for funding to the Local Authorities Board for that purpose and, secondly, because it's a hamlet within the improvement district.

When I saw the first proposal for sewer and water for the hamlet of Blue Ridge, I was somewhat concerned about the costs which were then reported, about \$3.75. The department then undertook to do a further study which revealed the costs on the existing front footage would probably come closer to \$8.00 per front foot. It appears that some of the calculations presented by the consultants use the total front footage as well as the side foot on the lots. Therefore the calculations were out of proportion with respect to the cost.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Given the information, is it the government's view that water and sewerage installation should proceed in Blue Ridge?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's up to the hamlet itself. We have now given them the information. They'll have to go through the advertisement process to inform all property owners of those anticipated costs. My own view would be that I think a level of service is required for the hamlet of Blue Ridge, and generally we would follow a policy of infill in that city. Presumably we would have to find a method of providing sewer and water services to the community.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. In view of local concern, is the minister in a position to advise the Assembly whether there has been either formal or informal consideration about restricting the size of the hamlet of Blue Ridge?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I just indicated in my previous comments that I thought we would likely follow a policy of infill, as opposed to the policy of

allowing the hamlet to expand, for the very obvious reason that the Blue Ridge timber plant is in the proximity of the hamlet itself.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question for clarification. Does the government mean by infill that the population, which I understand at present is around 300 to 350, will be stabilized at that level? Or does the government foresee that the community's population could grow to the natural bounds, which I understand would be somewhere around 1,500, people adjacent to the mill?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, it's very difficult for me to give an estimate of what the population may be, or the growth rates expected. But I do know that land is available within the hamlet itself which could absorb some future human settlement.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. minister. Has the government held any discussions with officials of Simpson Timber on the future development of Blue Ridge vis-a-vis Whitecourt and Mayerthorpe?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I can't give specific dates of actual meetings, but I do know the department has been in contact with elected officials in the three communities mentioned. As well, there is liaison with the Simpson Timber Company.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. In light of the minister's comments about infilling as far as Blue Ridge is concerned, is it the view or policy of the government at this stage that the population growth which will accrue as a result of the Simpson Timber project — all phases of it, when it's completed — should be focussed in the neighboring towns of Mayerthorpe and Whitecourt as opposed to the adjacent community of Blue Ridge?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, of course the options for growth are almost — as the hon. member pointed out, each of these communities will experience balanced economic growth [and] population increases as a result of the decentralization of that plant in that area. It is very difficult for me to give a conclusive answer as to what projections can be expected for the hamlet of Blue Ridge or, for that matter, for the towns of Whitecourt and Mayerthorpe, which are now experiencing a vitality, a new growth experience, and very strong economic potential.

Pharmaceutical Industry

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism. What studies are currently under way to determine the economic feasibility of a pharmaceutical manufacturing industry in Alberta?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, we have earmarked for this year, hopefully, an amount of money that will be used to undertake such a study. However, in-house our department has been examining the possibility for some time. A matter of about two and a half to three years ago, we did venture into one of our sister

provinces to determine what types of drugs were manufactured, the feasibility of the manufacture of those drugs in the province of Alberta, what the feedstocks were, and the potential for the drug industry as it relates to the petrochemical industry but, beyond that, the fermentation process and others of like nature. Since that time, we've had meetings [between] Dr. Gunning of the university, the Deputy Premier, myself, and others, with regard to that potential.

It is our hope that we can further study the matter and perhaps somehow stimulate this very clean and very important industry for western Canada. The transportation [of] the product is obviously not a problem. It is a problem with so many industries that it would be nice to be involved in one that doesn't have transportation as a major detriment.

MR. TAYLOR: Supplementary to the hon. minister. From the discussions and studies already completed, do the prospects look good for the establishment of such an industry in Alberta?

MR. DOWLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Of course I'm rather an optimist in this regard. It would seem logical that it is an obvious industry to establish. However, there may be some shortfalls regarding high capitalization, if it's to be a research-based pharmaceutical industry. I know the cost for infrastructure to support a Ph.D. involved in research some five or six or 10 years ago was about a million dollars. So there may be some shortfalls I've not yet identified.

Fish and Wildlife Officers

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife. It's a follow-up to the question I asked the minister last week with regard to the concern about career development counselling services. Are the career development counselling sessions still being carried on within the minister's department?

MR. ADAIR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, they are an *ad hoc* arrangement whereby anyone in the department who may wish to discuss promotions can sit down with the person involved and discuss what may be best for them in that particular case. It's an *ad hoc* arrangement and is still going on.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Are these career development counselling sessions still under the direction of Mr. Caldwell?

MR. ADAIR: To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, yes.

MR. CLARK: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Is Mr. Caldwell still responsible for transferring fish and wildlife officers and for promotion within the department?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, would you clarify the question? I'm sorry.

MR. CLARK: A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. Is Mr. Caldwell still responsible for transferring fish and wildlife officers?

MR. ADAIR: In part, Mr. Speaker, yes.

Accident Claims Fund

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Attorney General. It rises from a brochure sent out from the motor vehicle accident claims fund yesterday. In view of the fact that the fees have now increased from \$1 to \$3 per vehicle licence to decrease the amount that the fund is in deficit, and due to the fact that some persons having judgments against them are only paying the fund back at \$5 per month — and that's not people on fixed incomes either — will the government reassess these judgments in order that these people will pay back a greater amount?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the facts given in the course of the question are accurate, and I would like the opportunity of checking. I know there is a great deal of money owing to the fund and that collection processes are under way. Whether those who have the capacity are paying a small sum when they should be paying a larger sum is something I'm just not aware of at the moment. I would be happy to check.

MR. PURDY: A supplementary question to the Attorney General. I understand that within this fund no interest is being awarded against judgments. Will the policy be changed to charge interest? The interest rate could have gone to decrease the deficit instead of having fees increased.

MR. FOSTER: Well, judgments of the court are subject to interest, Mr. Speaker, so again whether interest may not be charged in certain circumstances by some arrangement I don't know. The facts of the question are not readily available in my hands at the moment, but I would be happy to check.

House Prices

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. Regarding his caution to the consumer regarding purchasing of homes and his indication to be wary of prices exceeding \$45 per square foot, I wonder if the minister would clarify what he meant in his caution "\$45 per square foot": for home and land, or for home alone?

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that there may be a very small fraction of the real estate industry that might have construed my remarks to mean that I was speaking of \$45 per square foot of the building alone rather than including the land. I wish to assure the House and everyone else who is interested that I was speaking very specifically in offering a guideline of \$45 relating both to the structure and the serviced land in every case.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Since the minister has indicated that \$45 is to cover both the structure and the land, and since the cost of land will vary in the province, what would be the approximate breakdown between those two in the minister's mind?

MR. YURKO: Well, Mr. Speaker, several studies have been made in this regard. An excellent study has been put together by HUDAC showing a complete cost breakdown with respect to the cost of each component: legal, sales, land, and indeed the construction component. If the member wishes I'm prepared to make that breakdown available to him.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

1. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:

Be it resolved that the Assembly adopt the following amendment to Standing Orders, to be effective until the prorogation of the Third Session of the 18th Legislature. The following standing order is added after Standing Order 36:

36.1 Notwithstanding any established precedent to the contrary, a member not being a Government member may have two notices of motion in that member's name on the Order Paper at the same time.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, this motion is not unfamiliar to hon. members, having been on the Order Paper and having been passed during the course of the first and second sessions of the 18th Legislature. It is proposed again this year. It is temporary in nature, and gives those members of the Assembly who are not government members a special privilege: to have two motions on the Order Paper rather than one at a given time. So this gives the opportunity for a total possibility of 12 motions by non-government members to be on the Order Paper. It is proposed by the government in the hope and on the basis that it is a fair and equitable temporary situation which will assist the non-government members.

[Motion carried]

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

Moved by Mr. Miller:

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

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

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

[Adjourned debate: Mr. Gogo]

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, in continuing the debate where we left off the other day, I was discussing the area of social services and community health with particular reference to the PSS or preventive social services program.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would do all of us some good to consider that all those in Alberta receiving assistance are not indeed parasites on the public purse. I find it very interesting, Mr. Speaker, in a recent document from the department that of the 34,000 people in Alberta on assistance — and it might do members well to take some time to visit some of these people — we find only 6 per cent or 2,260 people are not employed and not interested in looking for work, which I suggest is a very, very low number. So when one reads the annual report from the department, one shouldn't get hung up on the fact that 34,000 people are collecting assistance unnecessarily. Because within that we have 6,000 who are aged, 12,500 who are single parents and looking after their children, another 4,000 or 5,000 who are physically disabled, plus those who are mentally disabled, and so on.

I would like to make special mention, Mr. Speaker, that in the Speech from the Throne the comprehensive services of southwestern Alberta are indeed seriously being considered by the government in recognition for the work they're carrying out. It's long been a policy of the government — and I believe it's a good policy — that this government recognizes in a very tangible way the volunteer sector of groups in the province of Alberta. Last year the Lethbridge Association for the Mentally Retarded, with 50 or 60 volunteer parents very anxious to do something for the mentally disabled people, indeed encouraged one Wayne Newton from Las Vegas to come to Lethbridge for a benefit concert. They raised \$60,000 to purchase equipment in I think a very commendable effort to show that indeed the volunteer sector of this province co-operates with this government in providing those services.

Mr. Speaker, an area I'll speak about in a moment or two is the family court system. It is a system I think the Department of the Attorney General should look at.

Prior to that however, Mr. Speaker, I — along with most members of the Assembly, I'm sure — am very concerned about an area that we don't particularly have total control over: productivity in our nation. If I may quote a parallel to the productivity that's perhaps going on in many parts of Canada:

If the human body replaced its blood cells at the grossly inadequate rate at which the nation is replacing its productive resources, it would soon develop . . . anemia and destroy itself.

Mr. Speaker, I think enough is said about the productivity in Canada. I would like to comment about the efforts the Alberta government has taken to increase the productivity of the province.

We see that last year in the province of Alberta 107,000 man-days were lost due to strikes and lockouts. One gets a little concerned that perhaps labor is getting the best of something. Yet we read the statistic — and this I think is very impressive, Mr. Speaker — that 853,000 man-days were lost due to sickness and accidents. Is it any wonder that Bill 39, The Occupational Health and Safety Act, had to be introduced, surely in the interests of productivity in

the province of Alberta. Our problem is not labor strife nearly as much as it is injuries and sickness on the work site. Mr. Speaker, I think the commercials now on The Occupational Health and Safety Act are indeed very impressive in getting the message to the worker that he too has a responsibility if we're going to increase productivity by lowering that rate.

One can't help but think, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about productivity — we read the history of France during the French Revolution. At that time, oddly enough, in the National Assembly of France a declaration of rights was introduced, and one member had the audacity to suggest that perhaps they should introduce a bill of duties. His voice was lost in the babble. It's never really come about. I suggest that when we look at the productivity going on, perhaps it's high time the drafters of legislation give some consideration to it.

Earlier, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Housing and Public Works mentioned the very exciting phase two of the senior citizen home improvement program. I think it is a commendable effort by government to recognize the fact that the pioneers of this province, who have done so much to build the province, only want to be left alone in their homes, provided they can stay in them. But because of leaky roofs and faulty furnaces, they were finding they could no longer stay in their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I think we as a government should make a determined effort to get across to citizens in Alberta the message that a dollar saved is a dollar earned. Indeed with the high cost of electricity and gas, if we could get across the message that people should insulate their homes, they should perhaps take steps to conserve energy — and in this Assembly might not be a bad place to start, Mr. Speaker — many of these people would be better off in the days to come.

I notice that in the province of Ontario they recently carried out a survey about lost energy. It was somewhat astounding as to the number of homes in the Toronto area that were losing dramatic amounts of energy.

I would think that if we look at the program instituted recently by the federal government — they have provided \$75 million for the provinces of Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island to assist people in improving their homes. I'm not saying we should go that far in getting people to insulate their homes. I do say that when I read the proliferation of advertising in the province's papers, it would be very well justified to do a little advertising to encourage people to insulate their homes. However, should we do that, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest we include in the advertising some description of the senior citizen home improvement project. Because traditionally when government gets into the business of writing reports and advertising, it gets somewhat carried away.

I would like to indicate to the Assembly that some of the more important speeches in history have been noted for their brevity. For example, the Lord's Prayer has only 56 words, and the Twenty-third Psalm has only 118. The famous Gettysburg Address by Lincoln had only 266 words, and the Ten Commandments, 297 words. But a report last year out of Ottawa — the federal government — on the price of cabbages was 26,911 words. So I would encourage those people in this government who might follow my

advice of writing suggestions for insulating homes to bear that advice in mind.

Mr. Speaker, the area of the Attorney General: it seems to me that in discussing single parents and the social problems many of our citizens face today, there are a couple of things we haven't come to grips with. I see that in the Department of Social Services and Community Health at the end of January there were 3,845 cases of non-support. This is a case where a judgment of a court said that a husband would support his wife or family. There were 3,845 who either would not or could not comply with the court order. Mr. Speaker, I think it's time, and I think Albertans are demanding, that the government take some action in ensuring that these court judgments are enforced.

Perhaps the route to go is the unification of the courts. We now have a situation where it takes as many as three courts to look after family law, divorce, child custody, separation, support orders, and alimony. I would certainly encourage the Attorney General to bear upon the federal minister. I see he's quoted in 1974 as saying the time has come when we should merge these three courts into one. I suggest the duties and responsibilities of the Minister of Social Services and Community Health would certainly be reduced in terms of enforcing these orders if it were carried out.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something on lotteries; however, I don't think the Assembly is quite prepared. I tried to move a motion here last year, and they let me know what [they] thought. I can't help but reflect that governments of Canada traditionally have said you cannot and should not play roulette, you shouldn't play craps, you shouldn't bet the horses. The government's involvement and attitude toward some of these things is very startling. When we look at the statistics, we find that in roulette 95 per cent of the money goes back to the bettors; in blackjack, 96 per cent; in dice, 97 per cent; in horse-racing, 82 per cent. But in lotteries, the very thing governments choose to get involved in, 38 per cent goes back to the participants. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, we're long past the time when we should be doing something about this monolithic creature that's taking over and changing our way of life.

Let me simply conclude, Mr. Speaker, on the following note: I [am] a member of a government committed to the principle of helping those who need it, of serving the needs of the people, of belonging to a political philosophy that says, look, go to the people, ask them what they want. If they agree with you, if they vote for you, give them what they want. Now I'd like to caution that with the fact that I think:

The duty [of a] government in a free society is not to take care of its citizens, but to make it possible for the citizens to take care of themselves.

I think there's a fine line here, and governments of Canada and of the world should very closely observe this line. I think that when it comes to freedom and dependency, those citizens who continually insist that government give handouts are indeed only asking for the privilege of losing their freedom and democracy.

Perhaps a quotation is in order as I close, Mr. Speaker. If a person wants freedom or dependency, he should remember that the first destroyer of the liberties and freedoms of people is he who first gives

them bounties. Back in the time of Socrates, somebody wrote:

More and more the state became a charitable institution, the chief object of which should be to provide for each citizen the most comfortable and the easiest life and the most entertainment possible.

That came about. That's how people governed. But only 50 years later:

every national policy was abandoned, and only material interests were promoted. The people had bread and circuses, bounties, bonuses, doles and pensions: but it was easy for Philip of Macedon to overrun them, secure the surrender of their political independence, and reduce them to vassals.

I simply say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate your indulgence in allowing me to express my concerns and the concerns of my constituency to the members of this Assembly.

Thank you very much.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, at the opening I would like to say that it's certainly a privilege to rise in my place and address a few words to this Assembly in this throne speech debate. I would like to compliment the Lieutenant-Governor for the stamina he showed in reading this massive document, which really said very little. It's a tribute to him as a man that he has been appointed Lieutenant-Governor of this province, because he is a man who has shown leadership to his people, he is a man who has shown leadership to the people in his community. Through his work at the municipal level, through work with his people, he has been shown the honor of being Lieutenant-Governor of this province.

I would like to pay tribute to the mover and the seconder of the speech, the hon. Member for Lloydminster and my good friend the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff. I would like to say to my honorable friend the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff that the Premier must be worried about that seat. Because we've had a bit of a public relations campaign, we've had the cabinet meeting down there. I know the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff has tried several times to get to this Assembly. So I wish him well. But I don't wish him well so enthusiastically that I won't do everything I can to make sure he's not back the next time. That's not an affront, I hope, to the hon. member. That's just the way the political process goes.

Mr. Speaker, in taking part in the debate on the throne speech, we as an official opposition have tried to set out certain causes we feel are very, very important at this time. The first cause is the right of the people of this province to know what is being done in the administration of their affairs. Mr. Speaker, the role of the opposition is unique. We have no intention of opposing just for the sake of opposing. We do intend, though, to keep a vigilant watch for error. I'm sure that by doing so there are going to be times when you might consider we are doing it merely obstructively and wasting the time of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, never, never.

DR. BUCK: It is in these times, Mr. Speaker, when there are complex questions, when there is a growing bureaucracy in Alberta and rapidly changing conditions, that our responsibility of watching for error is even more demanding and significant, I submit, than it ever has been.

What do we propose to do about this, Mr. Speaker? We intend to take the lid off and see what's inside this enormous bureaucracy in Alberta, the bureaucracy which has grown in size in such a significant way. Because of the growth in size there is much potential for error. Because of that increased potential there is also great potential for secrecy, mystery, cover-up, waste, and whitewash. That is a quotation from the Premier of this present government, given in his reply to the throne speech, February 19, 1968. How times have changed. My, how times have changed.

In pursuing the public right to know public business, we on this side of the House are blocked in every move to obtain the information the government uses in trying to make its decisions. An excellent example, Mr. Speaker, is the question that was posed in this Assembly yesterday or the day before when we asked for the salary of the president of the Alberta Energy Company. Mr. Speaker, I think it is not unfair to say to the government that when we are hiring a man for a position as important as this, a man who had an excellent position, we wouldn't offer him a salary. I mean, we had to offer this man a salary before we gave him a job, before the legislation was in place to set up the Alberta Energy Company. I know even the minister of Calgary affairs would go through that procedure when we were hiring a man. Mr. Speaker, this is just a small example of what is happening to this Assembly.

I read with a bit of amusement an article in one of the local newspapers, where the members of the back benches were complaining they were not getting sufficient publicity. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say they're not getting sufficient publicity because they're not saying anything, except what their party tells them to say. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we are elected to this Assembly to express the views of our constituents even though they may differ from the government's. It's fine to say we express these views in caucus, but that is not our responsibility. It behooves the members of this Assembly on both sides of the House to express their views.

I'm waiting with bated breath for the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, the hon. Member for Calgary Glenmore, the hon. Member for Calgary McCall, Mr. Little, many men and women in this Assembly who have something to say. Because I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, there are views these members would like to express. But they don't have that freedom, and that concerns me.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion we made in moving the amendment that the heritage trust fund chairman be a member of the opposition was a valid wide-ranging amendment that should have been accepted by this House if we want to conduct public business in public. Mr. Speaker, I'm always trying to do favors for the government. That way would remove any suspicion from that committee that anything is being done behind closed doors. But the government didn't allow us to help them with that favor.

But, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon their arrogance

was showing through very, very clearly when the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism gave his flippant answers. That to me just shows the arrogance this government shows for this Assembly. It is almost becoming a mockery of the democratic system and process.

Mr. Speaker, I try not to be too hard on the hon. members from the government side, because they're all fine people. But why don't they do what they're supposed to do in this Assembly, express the views that have been brought to them by their constituents? We don't hear that, and I think that is very regrettable.

Mr. Speaker, there are concerns — we have concerns on this side of the House, and I have personal concerns. The first one I would like to bring to the attention of this Assembly and to the people of this province is the waffling that has been going on in relation to the Alberta Game Farm. I'm sure there must be a legitimate reason for the government caucus not to do more than they're doing as far as the situation goes with the Alberta Game Farm. I say, Mr. Speaker, it is the Alberta Game Farm. It is not the Edmonton game farm, the Calgary game farm, the Ardrossan game farm, or the Fort Saskatchewan game farm; it is the Alberta Game Farm. When the hon. members get representation from young people, from adults of all walks of life saying, this is an Alberta institution, let's leave it here, let's keep it here, let's make sure it's kept here, it's very, very interesting to see the about face some of the hon. members on the government side have done.

My honorable friend the Member for Edmonton Kingsway — when the issue of the Alberta Game Farm first came up, in 1976 the *Edmonton Journal* interviewed some of the hon. members of this Assembly to find out what they thought about the Alberta government purchasing the Game Farm. I would like to quote very briefly some of the answers we got. The one that really intrigues me was from the member who has done the greatest turnabout, the hon. Member for Edmonton Kingsway. The hon. member said: "At some point I sense we have a rebellion from the MLAs from other parts of the province." This was going on when they were talking about the Game Farm. The hon. member Mr. Ashton said there would be some problem.

Then this most interesting quotation: "I sometimes find it hard, Dr. Paproski, to equate the heritage of Alberta with a giraffe. The Game Farm isn't pure heritage. Dr. Paproski has suggested, however, that Edmontonians form a citizen foundation to buy and operate the Game Farm. With only a small amount such as \$3 to \$5 per capita required to make it possible, it would certainly give Edmonton a lot of pride." I agree it would give Edmonton a lot of pride, but I think the people of Alberta are the ones who are proud of the Alberta Game Farm. This big division in the government caucus, Edmonton versus Calgary, is something we should put in the background. We should put this aside, because in some of the letters to the editor that have been written by young people . . . When we talk about heritage, I would like to see government get involved in this one area.

Mr. Speaker, I know I will get arguments from hon. members on the government side saying, oh, but you don't like us buying things. That's right; that's true. I'm not doing a flip-flop on this. I would like to

suggest to the honorable government members that the people of Alberta buy the Game Farm, the facilities and the animals, as it presently sits, then allow the foundation the hon. Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife is proposing and trying to encourage to operate the Game Farm. That way we do not have to worry about increasing the bureaucracy, because the farm is in position, it is there, it is really part of Alberta. It's not the Edmonton Zoo or the Calgary Zoo. It's unique in the world, one of possibly only five of similar stature. That's why I want the Game Farm to stay in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that if the members of the government side are getting the same numbers and types of representation we are, they are missing a political bet if the Game Farm leaves Alberta. I say to the hon. government members that's what politics is all about, responding to the wishes of the people. At this point in time the people of Alberta want the Game Farm to stay right here in Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, that moves me to another topic: the foreign ownership of Alberta land. I am again appalled at the silence from the government caucus, from the backbenchers, from the frontbenchers on the issue of foreign ownership of Alberta land, especially farmland. I would like to say to the hon. Attorney General that I'm not satisfied with his monitoring, because I don't think it's giving us the full picture. We received from the Premier a release telling us really how insignificant the problem was. A portion of that release said:

Between June 1, 1975 and May 31, 1976, a total of 3,137,796 acres of rural land was transferred in Alberta. For the same period, non-Canadians, excluding landed immigrants, purchased [79,000] or 2.5% of the total acres transferred.

now that 2.5 per cent may seem small, but ask the young farmer who is trying to get started in farming what that has done to the escalation of the price of farmland in Alberta. He will tell you it has drastically escalated the price of farmland.

So what are we doing? By allowing the sale of Alberta farmland to non-Canadians — we as the taxpayers of this province are pumping more money into the Ag. Development Corporation so that Alberta farmers can compete with non-Canadians in buying our own land. Mr. Speaker, that is another issue the government members surely must be hearing — these representations. We're not getting all the information from Albertans. You members must be getting the same type of feedback we are. Albertans are concerned. Why is the government not concerned? [interjections]

Since the information that was given to the Legislature and to the public last year, Mr. Speaker, there have been one or two massive transfers of land. Seventy-two thousand acres changed hands in one block in southern Alberta last year. A large ranch of 100,000 acres changed hands last fall. [interjections] The minister says the V Bar V.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who bought it?

DR. BUCK: Non-Canadians bought it, Mr. Member from Edmonton, from non-Canadians. That's fine. Okay. So what is the Deputy Premier going to do about it? Nothing. That's what he's going to do about

it.

I say the Deputy Premier is the last man who should be taking no action. In fairness to the Deputy Premier, he tried to do something to help the young farmer of Alberta. He set up the Ag. Development Corporation. Of course he didn't tell us who was borrowing the money or if we are ever going to get it back. But that's part of the government's policy of keeping everything secret.

Mr. Speaker, it is a concern in the southern, central, and northeast part of the province. People are saying to us, what are you people in the Legislature going to do about it? We tell them, there are only four of us in the official opposition. We will do everything we can through our representation in the Legislature, through talking to the media people, who are more concerned about this question than the government is, to bring the matter into focus so the government will move. I beseech members of the government caucus to do something about it, because right now they are doing practically nothing.

Mr. Speaker, while I'm speaking to the Deputy Premier, I would like to make a comment or two on some of the recreation complexes in this province that are in desperate, desperate financial straits.

DR. HORNER: We need some cold weather.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, we need more than cold weather. We need money.

The government, under the Alberta Agricultural Societies Act, initiated the program of building recreation complexes throughout the province. I would like to inform some of the members who may not be informed how easy it was to set up an agricultural society. All you did was go down the street and get everybody to chip in a dollar apiece. Once you got the magic number of people you needed, you formed an agricultural society. Now that's not bad. There is nothing wrong with that. But what was wrong with the program, Mr. Speaker, is that there was no planning whatsoever about where you put these complexes. That was the biggest problem; it was not the program *per se*.

And I do want to compliment the Deputy Premier, because not everything he does is bad. He makes a lot of mistakes, but he has done some things. [interjections] And I do wish him a happy retirement if he doesn't run again. Things may get a little uncomfortable if he comes back another time, if they are the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh. [laughter]

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the arrogant members of the government . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: What kind?

MR. CLARK: Arrogant.

DR. BUCK: . . . which includes 95 per cent of them, that some of the problems we have in these recreation complexes are going to come back to haunt the members of the government. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to read a very brief letter into the record.

AN HON. MEMBER: Table it.

DR. BUCK: I can table it, but I think it's worth hearing. [interjections] I would like to read it to the hon. members. This is a copy of a letter written to a news outlet:

Dear Newsday:

We in Holden, Alberta, are faced with a problem. We have a \$250,000 arena that is not in use and we, the hockey players, are terribly disgusted. I heard in the news that Alberta lent Newfoundland \$50 million at a rate of 10 per cent, but why won't the Premier of Alberta invest in Alberta's future, like those teenagers who are interested in hockey but have no proper facilities. I know there are other communities in this same position . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. There are certain letters and items which can properly be read in, especially when they provide facts perhaps from expert sources and so on. The hon. member has the usual time given to all hon. members to debate the throne speech and any related matters. That time is not accorded to those who might happen to write letters from outside the Assembly. I would suggest that the hon. member, if he wishes to, debate according to the arguments which he has rather than according to the arguments which other people might use in debating the issue elsewhere.

DR. BUCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am not using the letter as this young man's representation to the government. I am using this letter as evidence in argument about some of the problems, Mr. Speaker, and it's only about two more sentences. I really think a letter like this should be read into the record, so that people in Alberta will know what is happening in some of the communities. [interjections]

Because I am not allowed to complete the letter, Mr. Speaker, this young man's representation shows very, very validly the concerns that people especially in rural areas have as to what is going to happen to their recreation complexes. This is not an isolated case.

I would like to say to the Minister of Agriculture, who I know had to leave on legitimate business, that people from the Department of Agriculture have been going out to these agricultural complexes and telling them, we are going to close you down. The hon. members can read the newspapers. I'm sure the ones in the Edmonton area have read the article about the Calahoo arena and the concerns those people are showing. These people from the Department of Agriculture have been going around telling the people in the agricultural societies complexes, we are going to close you down and use your facility for a Department of Transportation machinery storage facility. I say to the honorable government members, Mr. Speaker, you are going to have a lot of Department of Transportation machinery storage facilities.

Not only do these people not have the financial wherewithal to retire any of the debt; they don't have sufficient capital to even operate the facilities. It behooves the government to look at some type of long-ranging program so these facilities can operate — to serve the people they are meant to serve — and also retire some of that debt. Is the government

going to come out with a policy just before the next election? Are they going to wait that long?

MR. JOHNSTON: What do you suggest?

DR. BUCK: I suggest, Mr. Minister of Municipal Affairs, that you got these people into this problem, and you are going to have to bail them out . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I regret to interrupt the hon. member again, but it does seem that we should get back to the ordinary parliamentary practice of not addressing members personally, but referring to them by their constituencies in the long-established and very proper way.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Member for Lethbridge . . .

MR. CLARK: East.

MR. SPEAKER: Or by their portfolios, I'm sorry.

AN HON. MEMBER: Saved him.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, the hon. Member for Lethbridge East, I would like to say there is a problem. I say to the members of the government that there is a real legitimate problem, and the government had better move because the chickens will start to come home to roost. The programs were fine, but there was absolutely no foresight in where these facilities were located; no regional concepts that we don't have a covered rink with an ice facility here and 10 miles down the road where there's pavement a duplicate facility. And neither one can operate. Mr. Speaker, if the government had had any foresight they would have said, we will put a recreation complex here with an ice plant and a curling rink, and 10 miles down the road we will tie in a swimming pool with the high school facility. That would have shown some foresight.

Mr. Speaker, that brings me to my next subject, local autonomy and what we are doing to it. Mr. Speaker, there has been more centralization of power under this government than has ever occurred in the history of this province.

MR. KOZIAK: You would probably know.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, that concerns people at the municipal level. Because we could cut out reams and reams of people who are working for this present government, just trying to administer and keep the strings tied to the funds that have strings attached which are being handed out to municipalities. If we really believe in democracy, it functions most effectively and efficiently at the local level. When the present government was over here we had this holier than thou speech many times about how they were going to return to local autonomy. Mr. Speaker, they completely reversed that and took away practically all the local autonomy from our municipalities, cities, towns, and villages. And they centralize all that power right there in that front bench, and don't even let the backbenchers in on the action. It wouldn't be so bad if the back bench could get in on the action,

but they don't.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak very briefly on some of the educational priorities this government says it has. We haven't seen them yet. I would like to compliment the hon. Member for Athabasca, the hon. Member for Edmonton Norwood, the hon. Member for Edmonton Jasper Place, and the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands, because we met last night, Mr. Speaker, with the board of directors and governors of Grant MacEwan Community College. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in this Legislature that this concept of community colleges is very exciting. I was excited, and I'm sure the members over there were, by the enthusiasm these people are showing for the small colleges system we have established in this province. But at the same time they're excited, they are also concerned. They have tried to take a responsible attitude in their dealings with government, hoping the government will realize there are some problems. The basic problem, Mr. Speaker, is that they don't have sufficient funds to do the job they would like to do.

Last year Grant MacEwan Community College could not take 1,000 students because of a shortage of space, a shortage of funds to provide that space, and a shortage of funds to provide the personnel to staff those facilities. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I say, the board of directors over there are trying to be very responsible. They said, we haven't used the pressure method that other groups use, because it seems the only way to wake this government up is to go to the media, do a big publicity campaign. That's the only time the government will listen. But they said, we've tried to be responsible . . .

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. FARRAN: Sit down, Walter. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: With great respect, it would be very difficult for the hon. member's clairvoyance to tell whether there was a point of order until it's been described.

MR. APPLEBY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member's remarks that the board of governors at Grant MacEwan Community College said they did not want to use the usual pressure groups and refer to such things is not correct. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. It's been well established that a disagreement among members as to facts does not constitute a point of order.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, the board of directors was saying, we're trying to act responsibly, we don't want to use other . . . I believe the quotation, give or take a word or two, was . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: How about 10?

DR. BUCK: . . . we didn't want to use "other techniques". So the hon. Member for Athabasca can read into that whatever he wishes.

But some of the problems, Mr. Speaker, are problems of space, the number of hours their staff has to work as compared to some of the other institutions of higher learning . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Fifteen?

DR. BUCK: . . . and non-variable fees. Mr. Speaker, I'm just bringing this to the attention of the Minister of Education — the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower isn't here. I'm sure the hon. members who were there will bring the same information to caucus — at least I hope they do — because really what we and the board of governors are trying to do, Mr. Minister of Education and Member for Edmonton Strathcona, is to bring the legitimate and real problems they have to the attention of the government. The basic problem is that their base line — that's what the bureaucrats call it — was frozen two years ago. So when we look at increases in budgetary appropriations, when there is not enough to start with and then you get 10 per cent of that, that's still 10 per cent of not enough. That's basically it.

So when the Minister of Education and the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower look at their budgetary appropriations, I will be making a pitch on behalf of this board to look at this very real problem. Because not only will we be losing qualified, enthusiastic staff; we will not be providing the education opportunities to which Albertans are entitled. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the government members that this is a real concern. If the government really means what it's saying about re-establishing some priorities in education, this is certainly an area I ask the Minister of Education to look into very closely.

Mr. Speaker, when one speaks in the throne debate, one could go on for hours and hours on some of the areas that were not covered. The problem in rural Alberta that is very prevalent and that is mentioned only very briefly is the problem the gas co-operatives are having.

I think the Leader of the Opposition outlined it very well when he said: the citizens who are participating in that program, who in good faith went out to their neighbors and said to their neighbors, we are trying to get this program off the ground, we want you to participate, the price of gas will be such, we've been promised this by the government, there will be naturally small increases in prices — and they had their neighbors sign in good faith. Now when we see what is happening with the prices that are being charged to these people, I know the Leader of the Opposition expressed real concerns for those people who tried to organize the gas co-operatives amongst their neighbors. When these people, who are directors, have to go back and face their co-operatives, I don't blame them for never wanting to get involved in a government program again. These people were led down the garden path. Nobody can argue with the program of gas co-operatives, but the feasibility study that this government proceeded with certainly was not a feasibility study at all.

When we participated in the debate setting up the gas co-operatives, we tried to warn the government of some of the pitfalls, because we wanted to see that gas program go ahead. But we wanted the government to inform the people how the program was going to work, how long they could be assured of a stable natural gas price, and some of these other ramifications. Because I say to the government members that when you're trying to sell a government program that reflects upon your government,

then you'd better have more facts than what you did have. So, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inform the hon. Member for Calgary North Hill . . .

MR. CLARK: Who fouled it up.

DR. BUCK: . . . who helped foul it up, and now the new minister has to take all the abuse, that if the minister had looked at the fine job done with the REAs and done a little bit of a study, then they might have had a good program. And I say now, speaking of REAs, that the government had better look at salvaging that program too, because the replacement of many of these lines is forcing the REAs to sell out to the major power suppliers. [interjections] The hon. minister can mumble as much as he wishes, but that is a fact.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, there are major concerns. The public's right to know what is going on in the management of their affairs is one of our prime considerations. The lack of leadership in trying to control foreign ownership of land is a major concern. What is happening with our recreation complexes is a major concern, and there are many, many, many others.

Mr. Speaker, the note I'd like to conclude on is that the government does listen once in a while. I would like to compliment the Minister of Social Services and Community Health, in that the minister did listen to the people when there was grave concern about whether we should have just civil marriages or whether they should still remain in the church. I would like to compliment the minister and say that this government does listen to the people, but it doesn't listen to the people as often as it should.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to have the opportunity of taking part in the throne debate. I would like to congratulate the hon. Member for Lloydminster and the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff on the very excellent addresses they gave in launching this debate.

The time limit makes it necessary for me to deal with the number of items I want to deal with and I'm consequently going to get right into the debate itself.

I was very pleased indeed to see His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor come to the Legislature dressed in full Indian regalia. I think this is most appropriate on this, the hundredth year of the celebration of Treaties 6 and 7. I'm particularly interested in Treaty 7 because it concerns the Blackfoot Indians, a great many of whom I have the pleasure to represent.

I had the opportunity, along with the hon. minister responsible for native affairs and several of the counsellors and the chief of the Blackfoot Indians, to go down to the crossing at Bow River where the big celebration will be held this coming summer. I am very happy indeed that Prince Charles is going to be at that event. I hope the event will be not one of commemoration of the treaty signed in 1877 but of a new era for the Indian people.

Treaty no. 7, when I read it today, gives great concern. It presumed that the Indians were going to become farmers and accept the white man's culture and the white man's ways. It assumed that they were going to continue hunting throughout the area, and this has been true. They gave one square mile of

land for each family of five. They arranged for payments of \$25 to the chief, \$15 to the counsellors, and \$5 to every Indian that year and every year afterwards. Two thousand dollars were given for ammunition. There is provision made for that to be used for other things. Clothing was provided. Schools and teachers were promised. And for the use of the bands they had things like axes, augers, handsaws, and grindstones. Every family of five got two cows. A family of between seven and 10 got three cows, and 10 or more got four cows. [If] they wanted to break the land, they had one cow deducted and they were able then to get two hoes, a plough, and a harrow for every family of three.

Well, the Indians surrendered their lands on the basis of this particular treaty and 100 years have gone by. Today I don't think many people can be proud of the results or the achievements of those 100 years. Nor should we be too downcast. The Indians today are getting a better break in the province of Alberta than they've ever had before and I think better than in any other province in Canada. The government has set up a minister who is prepared to go into the reserves and talk over the problems. He has terrific problems himself because the federal government's jurisdiction in Indian reserves is something he can't transcend. They still are listening to the Indians. I believe the Blackfoot Indians appreciate that very much indeed.

I'm hoping that the big celebration which thousands of people will be attending this coming summer, celebrating 100 years since the signing of that treaty, will be the beginning of a new era for the Indians in which we will recognize that their culture can become part of the great mosaic culture of this province and of this country, and that Indians themselves will be made to feel that they are welcome, that they are part of our civilization, that we want them to contribute in their own way, and that there's no reason for them to simply draw welfare and live off the good of the land, as many have been led to believe they should do. They have a contribution to make.

I hope the next hundred years will see the integration of our Indians, the perpetuation of their culture, and a distinctive advancement for those who were born within the Indian settlement — and a great deal of pride because they were. I'm not going to say anything more about the treaty. I'm hoping that this summer will be a real move forward on behalf of the Indians and the Metis of this province.

I'd like now to say a word or two in connection with national unity. The hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to this in an arrogant type of way and seems to indicate nothing was said in the Speech from the Throne that was worth dealing with. As a matter of fact, twice in his speech he referred to page 20 as if that had something bad about it. Because it was on page 20, there could be nothing good about it. I don't know how immature and childish the Leader of the Opposition can get. But that is one of the most immature and childish statements I've ever heard in this Legislature, and believe me I've heard quite a few. What is the basis of saying that because it's near the end of the speech it's not good? The greatest book in the world, our *Bible*, has one of the greatest promises to people who are Christians, at the end of the *Bible*. Not only in Revelations, the last

book, but in the second last chapter the promise has been given that has been of consolation and solace to millions of people all over the world. I quote from Revelation 21: and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain.

When the Leader of the Opposition tries to make people think the government is not in favor of national unity simply because they put their statement near the end of their speech, that's poppycock. I think the hon. leader should have something more to talk about than that type of palaver.

Well, what did the speech say? It's not where it was, but what it said that matters. Surely that's a sensible approach. If the speech said something wrong, I can understand him dealing with it. But to put his whole emphasis on the fact that it was on page 20 was childish and immature as I said before. What does it say . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hon. member is certainly entitled to comment on the arguments of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. But he is not entitled to try to bring that hon. member into any kind of disrepute or low regard by referring to his own personal characteristics. I would respectfully ask the hon. Member for Drumheller, if he wishes to comment further on the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, to deal with the arguments rather than the person.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am dealing with the arguments. It is his argument that the whole thing was based on page 20. In my view that was an immature and childish argument. I'm not downgrading him; he downgraded himself, sir. That's his business, not mine. Not once did he refer to what the speech said about national unity. I am suggesting he tried to mislead the people of this province in regard to the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hon. member is definitely overstepping the line when he accuses another hon. member of trying to mislead. That certainly is beyond any doubt. I would ask the hon. member to change the trend of his argument.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll leave that to the judgment of the people of the province when they know what the Speech from the Throne says. And in my view, the leader did not deal at all with what the Speech from the Throne said on national unity. Consequently there is certainly no indication to me that he was trying to give the people what the speech said when he made no reference to it, but simply downgraded it because it was on page 20.

What does the speech say? Because surely the words should be the relevant matter. And I quote:

My government reaffirms its commitment, on behalf of our citizens, to national unity.

And then a little further on:

. . . my government has every confidence in the future of the country. My government believes that the future depends on the continuation of strong provinces and recognition of the diversity which has enriched our country.

Now that in my view is a sensible policy of any

provincial government, to work towards national unity, for the right of the provinces to have some say in that national unity, and to recognize the diversity.

The diversity of this country, in my view, is one of the strong points of national unity. It is because we are different in different parts of Canada — that gives us strength. I want to emphasize that particular point because diversification in language, customs, and culture — including the language, customs, and culture of the Indians, the Metis, the French, the Ukrainians, the Germans, the Hungarians, the Polish, the Dutch, et cetera — have contributed to the greatness of Canada and to our national unity. These are enrichments. In my view they make a mosaic. But more than that, I think the point should be made that Alberta and the government of Alberta have contributed to national unity in a way that is equal to, if not greater than, that of any other province in Canada. I just want to refer to one or two points in which the government has contributed. I think the government should receive credit for it and not downgrading.

In the days before the present government came into power the sale of western Alberta crude to the east was arranged on all those who were west of a line running through the Ottawa River Valley. That was done by the government of Canada who said to those people, you have to buy Alberta crude, even though it costs more than what you can get the crude [at] from other countries. The Montreal people, being east of the Ottawa Valley line, were able at that time to buy their crude from other countries and get a cheaper price. Because of that very fact, the people of Ontario in 1971 and 1972 paid something like \$290 million more than they would have had to pay for the privilege, I suppose, of using Alberta and Saskatchewan crude — but I'm talking about Alberta crude. So there's \$290 million the people of Ontario paid that they really didn't have to pay if they had bought at the cheapest place. I think that's a credit to the people of Ontario for going along with that program. Because it meant we were able to develop our oil and our gas in this particular province.

But 1973 came along and then the picture was different. At that time, comparing the cost of crude oil landed in Montreal from outside Canada with the cost of Alberta crude in Toronto, we found that the people of Alberta contributed about \$379 million by selling it at a lower price than the people could otherwise have bought it. There, the people of Alberta made a contribution to the people of Canada — and certainly eastern Canada — of some \$379 million. In '74 the difference was \$2,208 million that the people of Alberta contributed to the unity of Canada, through not insisting on the top price for oil. In '75 it was \$1,600 million and in '76 \$1,400 million, making a total of some \$5,700 million. Now if you take off the \$290 million that the people of Ontario contributed in 1971 and 1972, you still have \$5.5 billion that you can properly say was contributed to the unity of Canada.

I ask anyone: is that not showing greater faith in unity and doing more for the unity of Canada than simply saying a few words? Well, I think it is. That of course doesn't even take into consideration the export tax. The export taxes from '73-76 were some \$2.9 billion. This came from Alberta's production. Consequently it was a contribution to Alberta unity. Even if you take half of it — because some of it did

come back to the province of Alberta — there's a grand total of between \$6.8 and \$7 billion being contributed by the government and the people of Alberta towards national unity. I challenge anyone, Mr. Speaker, to say that is not contributing to national unity in a very, very definite way.

I'd now like to deal with some representations that came to me through the 21 preessional meetings I held in the constituency. A few minutes ago the hon. Member for Clover Bar was telling us what the people of Alberta thought about certain things. I don't know what criteria he used to reach the conclusion that everybody in Alberta wants to buy the Alberta Game Farm.

I know what criteria I use in my own constituency to find a cross section of the thinking of the people of that constituency, because I'm very concerned about the principle of representation as we see it in Canada today. There's a trend for MPs, MLAs, and school board and council members, once they're elected, to think they then tell the people what's good for them, instead of reflecting the thinking of the people who sent them to that particular position. It is becoming far too common for elected representatives to vote in accordance with their own thoughts, to represent things in accordance with their own thoughts rather than on the matter as given to them by the people who sent them there.

Perhaps the most notable example is that of capital punishment; in the House in Ottawa, several members arrogantly stood up and said they knew their constituents wanted capital punishment, but they were not voting for it. In my view, Mr. Speaker, that's a negation of democracy.

It gets to the point where some people think that once they're elected they become the fountain of knowledge, that they become in a position where they should tell the people what's good for them. Well, that might be a socialist attitude, but it's certainly not my attitude. I don't think it should be carried into the various governments in our province.

Many times we see school board members, hospital board members, municipal councillors, city councillors, city aldermen who do not go back to find out what their people want in regard to many things, and many times carry out policies that are contrary to the thinking. It's true they can be replaced at the next election, but sometimes many things are wrong in that connection.

Now, one of the points that's been advocated in this House — at least has been advanced by the government — is higher fees for foreign students at our universities and colleges. I heard various members from the official opposition and the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview advance thoughts that this was not right, that this was wrong. So I tried to ascertain what the people of my constituency thought about this particular item.

So at the 21 preessional public meetings — to which anybody could come, and to which a great many people of every political faith and religious faith came — I brought up the subject and outlined some thoughts on both sides in an endeavor to be objective, and then threw the meeting open for discussion of the various pros and cons. Anybody could get up and say what they thought. Then a vote was taken to see whether or not the people at the meeting wanted higher fees for foreign students compared to our own

students.

What was the result? Sixty-eight per cent of the people at those meetings wanted higher fees for foreign students — 68 per cent. Only 10 per cent wanted the fees left the way they are today. The balance did not vote; they abstained. I always tell the people that if they don't want to vote they can abstain. They abstain in the United Nations, so they can abstain in Standard and Michichi if they wish to. Well, 68 per cent, though, said they want foreign students in this province to pay a higher fee. These are the people paying the bill.

Now, I'd like to know who the hon. Leader of the Opposition is representing when he is condemning this program. I'd like to know who the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is representing when he is opposing this program. If they've gone to the people who sent them here and are representing what they think, that's one thing. But if they're simply talking off the top of their heads, it's another thing, and in my view a negation of democracy.

Another item raised at the preessional public meetings was the matter of pornographic magazines. Without going into all the reasons, 83 per cent of the people at the meetings wanted control by government, even though many expressed that they don't like to ask the government to get their finger into this and their finger into that. Eighty-three per cent wanted the government to get some control by having a room marked "for adults only" in which this pornographic stuff could be put, or to put it under the counter, but to get it out of the view of growing boys and girls. And many meetings said, not only growing boys and girls but men and women who object to this type of literature.

Well, the people have spoken as far as I'm concerned, and 83 per cent want something done about pornographic literature. They're tired of having this stuff shoved into the faces of their children who are 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12 years of age. There was high praise at practically all the meetings for the bill the hon. Member for Calgary McCall has advanced in this Legislature. I hope the hon. member keeps that bill going and that the members will support it. It's a good bill and it's time we deal with that.

I don't think it's necessary for us to censor this stuff. If an adult wants to read this kind of trash, it's his business. But certainly we shouldn't be shoving it into the faces of our growing boys and girls, to whom we don't know what damage it will do.

The hon. Member for Clover Bar referred to the representations of the honorable Ombudsman in connection with making the civil marriage ceremony the norm and requiring some type of mandatory counsel. The people of my riding felt very strongly about this. Eighty-eight per cent of the people at the meetings wanted The Marriage Act left the way it is now, where there's freedom of choice for the people to have a church wedding or a civil ceremony, whichever they want. I commend the hon. minister too for listening to the people and for declaring that the government would not change The Marriage Act, even though it was brought to the government by a person who is the Ombudsman of the province.

They don't want mandatory counselling either. They certainly want more counselling, but they don't want it mandatory. This type of legislation would chisel away the rights of the people, and too many of

our rights are slowly being taken away in a very subtle manner. Well, I'm glad that right is going to remain: people can have a marriage ceremony in the church of their choice, or if they want to go to a civil marriage commissioner they may do so.

The next item the people in the meetings dealt with was the sale of land. This took a lot of time in all the meetings, not only the rural meetings but those in the towns and cities. People are concerned about the sale of land in this province and in this country. They're greatly concerned about the amount of land being sold to those who don't even live in Canada — who don't even live here — who are buying land. Whether it's Arab, German, Italian, or French money doesn't matter very much. If the people buying this land are going to be absentee landlords, then it's something very serious.

It was interesting to listen to the various comments of the people in the discussions. One meeting in the small hamlet of Michichi went on and on and on. The people just didn't want to stop talking about this particular subject. Well, when the final votes of the people of the whole constituency were taken, 72 per cent wanted the government to pass legislation making the sale of arable land to foreigners — that's non-residents of Canada — illegal. Of that percentage, 1 per cent wanted sales made only to residents of Alberta. But that was only 1 per cent, and I was happy to see that small a number who wanted to be so provincial in their outlook. And 19 per cent of the people favored the present system, which is wide open.

Now this is no easy problem to solve. When you say that nobody from another country is going to come into Alberta and buy land, you are also saying to the people of Alberta: you can't sell the land to whom you want to sell it. That's taking away rights too. So it's not an easy matter that's just going to be solved by a flick of the hand or by a simple piece of legislation. It's pretty serious. As many people in the meetings said, a few years from now we don't want to wake up and find that much of our good, arable, producing land is in the hands of those who don't even live in the country.

I'm not going to deal with the other effect, the inflation of prices, because that's a concern too. These prices are shoved up to where you're paying \$500, \$600, \$700 an acre, which may seem reasonable to somebody from Germany where they have to pay \$1,200 an acre; but it seems very, very high in this land. I had some criticism about the Agricultural Development [Corporation] refusing to advance money to young farmers who wanted to buy land at a price comparable to that of foreign money because the land will not pay back that capital. Why should we put our young people in a position where they are going to mortgage themselves with a mortgage they cannot get out from under in the years ahead?

If this foreign money were kept out of the country the competition would be in the country. Some people said, you have similar things with the Hutterian Brethren. That's right, but at least they're living in the country. At least they're Canadian citizens. There may be a problem where they offer huge sums because they can garner them, because of the nature of their living. But that's at least in this country. In my view the people have spoken very clearly in regard to the sale of all these items I've mentioned, and 72

per cent of them want foreign land sales barred to people who do not live in this country.

Those were not particularly my thoughts, but the thoughts of the people who sent me here. I'm outlining them to the hon. ministers of the government and the hon. members of this House as what the people of one constituency think and would like to see.

Now I'd like to deal with another item for a moment or so. That's the matter of the natural gas co-ops in this country. I'm not going to go into this whole program in detail. In my view, this is an excellent program and I'd hate to see it go sour. For many years the people in this province wanted natural gas to be extended into our rural areas. I even brought delegations to the minister in charge when I was in the previous government. We could not get to first base in getting gas to our rural people. Arguments why it couldn't be done were forever being advanced. It makes me smile sometimes when I listen to the hon. members of the Social Credit Party condemn and find fault with this program so glibly. If the government hadn't taken the bull by the horns and launched this program we'd still be talking about it. There would still be 36,500 rural people without gas who have it today. That's what the program has done: provided gas for more than 145,000 rural people.

So a program like that is good. Twenty-three thousand miles of pipe have been constructed. Some of the pipe may have been bad; in that amount of business you're apt to find something wrong. But I think that can be dealt with. Capital grants of \$68 million, and the rural gas program is now only 50 per cent complete.

One of the things that bothers me a great deal is the continual escalation of the price of gas. This is worrying the rural people of this province. The price of gas today, with regard to the rebate program, is 56 cents support. The field price is \$1.01 per million cubic feet and the government has provided a 56-cent shelter or support. So actually if the government were not providing the rebate today, our prices would be somewhat like they are in some of the other provinces — at least 56 cents higher in almost every category. The Toronto city gate price is \$1.50 per million cubic feet. Much of the comparison in Canada is based on the Toronto city gate as base point. Presently these prices are set at 85 per cent of the heating value, and that's important. But there has been escalation and escalation so that now, compared to when the gas co-ops went in, the people have had an almost one hundred per cent increase in the price of gas. I'm suggesting to the honorable government that is coming too fast. As a result the gas co-op program is starting to slow down.

Some who have hooked up are refusing to take gas now because they're finding that coal or propane can do their heating for a lesser amount than gas. This is serious because most of the gas co-ops started their organization so they could operate on the basis of the number of farmers available in that area. Now if there are 800 farms and only 500 take gas, it puts that co-op in a precarious position. A number of these people are now waiting and watching. In my view it's something we should give very careful thought to. Because the program is too splendid a program to let go sour at this time. The excellent program should be studied to see what can be done

to provide an incentive to get the gas into every rural farm home.

When I was talking about \$1.01 per million cubic feet — MCF, did I say something wrong in that connection — it's \$1.01 per MCF, [thousand] cubic feet. Well what can be done in this regard? The minister has already said that the rebate program will be continued and that has brought a great deal of relief to many, many people. We don't know how much it's going to be continued. If that same rate of \$70 million used in the rural rebate program were continued, I understand from some of the studies in Public Accounts that it will probably amount to \$150 million this coming year.

Whatever the amount is, I think there are good grounds for giving the rural people of the province some extra consideration in regard to the price of natural gas — for many reasons. I'm saying that because for many years they did not have it available. Secondly, they've had to advance a lot of their capital costs. Those in the towns and cities didn't have to advance capital costs. In the third place, they're paying for that capital cost in the price of their gas, but they're paying it at a high rate because the capital cost each year is increasing and accelerating. And so each year that the gas co-op goes on means that those people are having a greater rate imposed on them to pay the capital cost of that system. Had it all been done 10 years ago, probably the amount of money that's already been made available would have put in the whole system, but each year the price goes up. Because of that I think the rural people do require some extra consideration.

Another item that I think very important in regard to this is that we should make sure the people in the rural areas feel they should sign up and get into the gas co-op. That will be an economic decision. If they can get some other type of heat cheaper, they'll do it because the farmers today are not flush with money. So I think there are sound reasons for the government to give special consideration to this price of natural gas for rural people particularly.

Another thing that's bringing it to a head is that the farmers are not getting as much money today as many people think they are. They didn't get the payments they were expecting from the Wheat Board. That's been reduced. They've had a bad three or four years on cattle. That's had an effect. So I think the picture is rather one of dismay to many rural people today. I'm urging the government to give special thought to this particular program.

At the present time there's a difference in rates between rural and town people. In some cases one's higher than the other. In most cases I would say rural people are paying higher than urban people because they're now paying at the higher rate the capital costs of '73, '74, '75, and '76. It was no fault of theirs that the program didn't come in until those particular years. So there's sound reason in my view for a two-price system even there.

But I'm hoping the government will slow down the escalation as much as possible. I base that on the program I've advanced in this Legislature a number of times, namely that in my view there should be a three-price system in this country for our oil, gas and other resources. Surely the people of Alberta who own the resources should get the best possible price. The farmer who raises eggs isn't expected to pay the

market price for the eggs. He uses those eggs at the cost they were to him alone. We can go into various industries and the same thing is the result. I think our natural resources should be at the lowest possible price. The rebate goes a long way, but because of inflationary trends and because resources were not under the inflationary guidelines, they've gotten out of hand somewhat compared to the wages and incomes of the people.

Another reason I think the rural people should have extra consideration is they can't pass on the price. The gas co-op can raise the price but it can't be passed on. If the price goes up in the industries of our towns and cities and any other place in the province, that can go on. The people pay that in buying the product. But the farmer doesn't set his price. So these things can't be considered in the sale price of the things he sells.

I think there's good reason to go slow on the escalation of resource prices. At one of the public meetings — I believe it was in the hamlet of Wayne, where the people are not rich. It's an old coal-mining town, now a ghost town and people go out and work and do all they can to make their own living. Very few of them are on welfare. But they have to make every nickel count to look after bread-and-butter items for their children and so on. They said yes, we're in favor of the inflationary guidelines, we want inflation controlled. But, they said, we would like everything controlled in inflation. It irked them when they found that the price of utilities, of their gas and power, was not controlled, while their wages were controlled. So they had to find money somewhere to pay that increased cost — which was a considerable sum — in power and light and so on, in that community. They want inflation controlled but they don't want to become the victims of having only wages controlled, and everything else going up and up and up.

I want to bring it to a conclusion now. In my view the escalation has been good. This has been in the interests of the people of Alberta. It's in our interest to get up to world price at the earliest possible time. If we can get a three-price system in this country, where the people of Alberta who own the resource will continue to have the best possible price the people of Canada get the second-best price, and the people outside the country pay world price, I think that will bring revenue into this province. But with that revenue we should endeavor to make sure that the people of this province are not going to be put in the position where they can't meet their needs because of the price of utilities. Much of that rebate . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hesitate interrupting the hon. member, but he's very substantially over the time limit provided in *Standing Orders*.

MR. TAYLOR: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I thought I had seven minutes more. I didn't read the whole note. I'm very sorry. Well, I'll bring it to a conclusion. I certainly don't want to take any special privileges or advantages. I want to thank you for giving me the extra minutes. I really thought it was seven minutes more when you sent me the note.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to join in the debate I would like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne, the members for Lloydminster and Medicine Hat-Redcliff. I think they did a very good job of it and make it very hard for me to give a speech such as they gave.

The first subject I'd like to talk about is that of senior citizens' housing. Over the weekend I made a visit to the house of one of my senior citizens. He was showing what he had done with his \$1,000 from the program, and he was very happy. He said if we've got any more coming, he'd quite willingly take that too. The thankfulness he had in this program was very evident.

Another subject is that of senior citizens' housing. I was advised that shortly there will be advertisement of a 15-room extension to the Pleasant View Lodge, the senior citizens' home in Bow Island, with distinct possibilities in the future of some self-contained units being put in because of the design of the structure.

Also in the field of hospitals, Mr. Speaker, the new extended-care wing of the Bow Island Hospital, some 20 beds for nursing home or extended-care patients, was very much appreciated in the district. It allowed a great many senior citizens to move back into the area who were normally in areas further away, and made it a lot easier for their families to visit with them. This project has a bit of a soft spot in my heart because the groundwork was started in my years on the hospital board. I was very happy with the completion of this project and the moving in of patients a number of months ago.

Still in the field of medical care, the announcement in the Speech from the Throne of the new facilities at Medicine Hat Hospital: I think the proposed plan, Mr. Speaker, is really a tribute to the planning committee [in] that they had their medical staff, their board and all the other people involved put together a plan, as they have, to spread the construction out over a number of years and to put in portions of the building and facilities over a number of years.

In the field of Social Services and Community Health I'd like to talk about the Community Resource Centre in Medicine Hat. It's a project whereby a number of provincial government agencies are housed in the former nurses' residence at the hospital. This, among other things, made use of an empty building. It has many government agencies together in one building where they can work more efficiently. It's been estimated that duplication of services may have been removed, if there was any at the time. It gives the people of each department a better feeling for the activities of the other departments and people involved and promotes a very good working relationship amongst departments, as well as promoting better ideas when a number of departments are working together to propose any kind of a program that has to go through the total board. The board is made up of a number of the department heads as well as a number of other appointed people. I believe, Mr. Speaker, this kind of mix in the board is very beneficial to the operation of the centre.

Also over the weekend I talked to a senior citizen from Medicine Hat who had a letter from one of her friends in another province. This friend had to have a substantial amount of dental work. She told her how much it was going to cost. She wrote back and told this lady the benefits senior citizens have in Alberta.

She wrote back again and said she couldn't believe it, she just didn't think it would be that good. This lady said she wouldn't live anywhere else, and that lady who lives elsewhere is beginning to think the same thing.

Agriculture, Mr. Speaker, is our basic renewable resource in this province, and through proper management we are going to make it last for many more years. This is a fact rural people know. People keep telling everybody that the oil industry is the basic industry in the province. I think some of the agriculture people are doing a very good job of convincing these people that maybe this industry will last a long time in years, maybe not. But agriculture will always be there, and be the backbone of our province.

The people in this area readily praise the government for their moves toward trade incentives. They are tired of sitting and having their produce, which ultimately is their income, bargained away for the advantage of people elsewhere in this country. They feel it is time they got an even break, and believe the Premier and other members of this government are doing the right thing when they make their trade missions or whatever you want to call them. They have been called a number of names by a number of people. They feel this is a good approach to try to open up programs and convince the federal government that we do believe we should have a fair share.

As far as what the Member for Clover Bar said about condemning the government for the operations — maybe "condemn" isn't the right word, but [he] didn't exactly praise the operations — of ADC as per land sales, I've got the 1974 annual report from the Department of Agriculture. It shows the loans approved by the Alberta Farm Purchase Board up to May 1972, and those of the Agricultural Development Corporation up to August 1974. Mr. Speaker, this is in the form of a graph. You have to look quite closely at many of these lines, because instead of a thin line it's almost a thick black line denoting the number of loans approved in that time by the Alberta Farm Purchase Board. The only line which is at all difficult to see from the time the ADC took over is that of the first month. From then, with the exception of the first four months I believe, the loans approved have never been below the highest point of those approved by the Farm Purchase Board in previous years. Mr. Speaker, this is up to the end of 1974.

The Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation has grown substantially since then. As we can see in the 1975-76 annual report of ADC, the total lending activities in millions of dollars between direct farm lending and guarantees — \$103 million in 'agrobusiness', [\$]32.3, for a total of \$135.6 million. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that that is a far cry from the amount of money transacted by the previous farm purchase board.

Mr. Speaker, if any time I made my throne speech I didn't talk about irrigation, as the hon. member says, there'd be something wrong. Just a few statistics about irrigation from the irrigation division office in Bow Island, which covers an area of ranges 10, 11 and 12 and a strip of land approximately 20 miles wide through this area. This covers a total of about 64,000 acres. Last year there were 66 circles from pivot systems in the area. A pivot system probably covers two circles in most cases, about 70 to 80 per cent of it. There were 66 circles in the area at that

time.

I spoke to the accountant from the office two days ago. This year there are 85 in total that have now been surveyed for and lines laid, or lines about to be laid. The day I talked to the person in charge, they had four new requests for surveying these units. Mr. Speaker, for each unit applied for, a farmer is probably spending somewhere around \$50,000 to \$60,000. It involves 80 per cent of the time set-up on a half section of land with up to half a mile of plastic pipe buried underground, a pumping unit, a dugout. As I've said, an investment of \$50,000 to \$60,000.

This shows the faith farmers have in irrigation. The \$200 million extra has renewed the province's commitment in that area. But the only trouble is that the systems were neglected for so many years that it takes a substantial extra amount of money to upgrade them. The placing of the water in the fields is the latest technology available, but one person has said that some of the delivery systems are back in the horse and buggy stage.

A group of people in Bow Island have left this morning, I believe, for a tour of an irrigation project in the United States to see what they do with their systems. The engineer in charge of this system, Mr. Speaker, has just come back from a time in the Middle East. He said to one of the persons arranging the tour that their systems are ultramodern compared to ours, except we don't have the ultramodern delivery system, we have it at the other end. So we do have a weak point we're working on. And with the help of this Assembly . . .

MR. HYLAND: And water. And maybe something else to make it snow so we get that water.

MR. GHITTER: And our money.

MR. HYLAND: And our money, as the hon. member said . . . we'll cure this problem.

MR. GHITTER: And our water.

MR. HYLAND: And water. And maybe something else to make it snow so we get that water.

Another project in the area immediate to the town of Bow Island is the Forty Mile Coulee reservoir site. The irrigation water presently comes through a 25-year-old flume crossing this coulee. It has some leaks, in fact quite a few leaks. An engineering study was done by a firm for the irrigation district about what they could do to improve the water delivery system. This study suggests that one of the alternatives would be this reservoir. Of late the district has received considerable support from various groups in the area toward going ahead with this reservoir to improve the delivery of water. The construction of the reservoir relieves substantial amounts of water upstream from it that can be developed on the existing canal without making the canal bigger or wider. It also improves the possibility of the amount of acres that can be served downstream from it.

One of the best advantages is that it improves water management. It takes four or five days to cut down on the water from where it leaves the last reservoir in the system to where it gets to the end of

the system. I believe it has some 70 or 80 miles of canal to go through. It takes a long time to cut the water on this. This kind of reservoir in the middle of the system would indeed help control the water as well as be a substantial place for storage.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to commend the Department of the Environment for the assistance they presently have for small villages for water and sewerage systems. Also I'd like to convey to the minister the request I had from one of the small town councils that I met during my preessional tour. They appreciated very much the help they had, but any time the minister is doing any new programs and has any new moneys they would very much like to hear from him. They'd be very appreciative of it.

Transportation: I have to say something about Highway 3 through my constituency, mostly because the final contract was let last fall, and there's about 2 or 3 miles of dirt work done on it now. That only leaves an 8-mile stretch in between, which will be completed by this fall. Of the other highways in the district, quite a number of miles were placed or recapped on Highway 61, which really improved the service to the southern part; the 887 is paved for about 10 miles from Seven Persons to Orion and an additional amount is upgraded but has not received approval for construction this year, at least so far it hasn't. We're still working on it. I notice in the gallery one of my councillors in the gallery who is working quite hard toward this, and I would like to say that we haven't given up yet.

Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to adjourn the debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, on a procedural matter I'd like at this time to ask unanimous leave of the Assembly to move rescission of the first reading of Bill 20, which in its printed form today contained a printing error and will be reintroduced tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: May the hon. Government House Leader have the unanimous consent . . .

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: To introduce a motion, that is.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move rescission of first reading of Bill 20.

[Motion carried]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention of the government to have the House sit tomorrow evening.

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

[The House adjourned at 5:30 p.m.]

