

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTATitle: **Monday, October 17, 1977 2:30 p.m.**

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

PRAYERS

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

[Mr. King rose]

[interjections]

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, it takes me a moment to compose my thoughts when I enter the Assembly. I rose to a miscue. [interjections]

head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**Bill 51****The Wildlife Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce a bill, being The Wildlife Amendment Act, 1977. The purpose of this bill is to assist our citizens by providing an opportunity to better protect areas critical to the maintenance and sustenance of wildlife, to acquire lands which are critical to wildlife and to manage said lands, to provide effective adjustments to enable the designation of problem wildlife and prescribe control programs, to strengthen the act in relation to dangerous hunting practices, and to remove a number of lesser offences from the mandatory licence suspension requirement.

[Leave granted; Bill 51 read a first time]

Bill 61**The Farm Implement Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 61, The Farm Implement Amendment Act, 1977. The purpose of this bill is to clarify and strengthen certain aspects of the existing Farm Implement Act with respect to warranties and provision of parts.

[Leave granted; Bill 61 read a first time]

Bill 74**The Environment Conservation Amendment Act, 1977**

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 74, The Environment Conservation Amendment Act, 1977. This being a money bill, His Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the contents of this bill, recommends the same to the Assembly.

The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to change the name of the authority to the environment council of Alberta, to provide for administrative changes inso-

far as the appointment of members, and to clarify the functions of the new council.

MR. CLARK: The wreckage is complete.

[Leave granted; Bill 74 read a first time]

head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS

MR. HARLE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file with the Legislature Library copies of the written submissions on Bill 55, The Condominium Property Amendment Act. The hearings were held on September 22 and 26.

MR. KING: I was waiting for the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. This is definitely not my day. I hope that changes immediately.

I would like to file with the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, a petition which has been signed by in excess of 5,200 women from about 160 centres within the province of Alberta. The petition requests a particular property regime for the distribution of matrimonial property in the province; namely, retroactive deferred sharing. The petition is not submitted to the Assembly asking for particular redress from a particular individual. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, it was not presented as a petition to the Assembly earlier on the Order Paper.

At this time, I would also like to point out if I may, Mr. Speaker, that we have representatives in the gallery from 13 groups across the province which have circulated the petition. They include Options for Women, the Alberta Status of Women Action Committee, the South Peace Regional Council of Women, the Women's Institutes, and various professional, community, and other interest groups within the province.

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table three copies of the annual report of the Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation for the year ending March 31, 1977, as required by statute.

I would also like to file, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the final report of the Lake Wabamun thermal water use project.

head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege and pleasure today to introduce to you, and through you to the members of the Assembly, 14 grade 7 students from Crestomere School, 12 miles west of Ponoka. They are accompanied today by their teacher Carol Koleyak, parent Mrs. Hoar, and bus driver Russell Adams. They are seated in the members gallery. I would ask that they rise and receive the welcome of this Assembly.

head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD**Status of Women Report**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd planned to address the first question to the Premier, but I'll direct it to the

Deputy Premier. It's on the question of the status of women. Is the government considering legislation, or considering establishing a women's secretariat to advise the government on action on the recommendations of the Alberta Status of Women group?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, not at this time.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then a supplementary question to the Deputy Premier. In light of the Premier's comment in *Hansard* — I believe it was November 1, 1976 — when he indicated that no further [talks] with the group would be productive, can the Deputy Premier advise the House whether the government plans to appoint a citizens' council on the status of women so the government would get some formal input on women's issues?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, I think that matter will receive continuing consideration by the government, but no definitive action has been taken on it.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Deputy Premier. Is the government considering appointing a minister responsible for the status of women, as requested in the brief presented to the government?

DR. HORNER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. leader will read the response we made to the brief, he'll have his answers to the variety of questions he is now asking.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Deputy Premier. Is the government in an inflexible position as far as the response it gave to the Status of Women group some months ago? From the Deputy Premier's comment, are we to assume the government isn't prepared to go back and reconsider some of the mistakes it has made in this area?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, the question of whether or not one makes a mistake is a matter of opinion. I would also like to add, though, that I think the record of this government has shown that it can and will be flexible if the right cause is shown.

Women's Bureau

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. Is the minister considering an expansion of the Women's Bureau so that more topics of relevance to Alberta women will be covered by it?

MISS HUNLEY: No, Mr. Speaker. The Women's Bureau attempts whenever possible to make use of existing facilities throughout the government, and to ensure that the various departments, bureaus, and agencies of the government are cognizant of the aims, objectives, and concerns of Alberta women, and all Albertans for that matter.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The government is not then considering any expansion as far as the Women's Bureau is concerned?

MISS HUNLEY: Not at the present time, Mr. Speaker.

Public Service — Personnel

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. Can the Provincial Treasurer advise the Assembly whether the personnel planning and career development program announced in the House in the spring, I believe, has yet acquired its full complement of staff?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that from memory, but I'll check on it and report to the House later on.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one last question to the Provincial Treasurer. Is he in a position to indicate to the House whether the government has made a policy decision as to whether one-half of the proposed staff will be able to do the work outlined by the Provincial Treasurer in the House in the spring?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I didn't catch the opening words of that question.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, can the Provincial Treasurer indicate to the House whether the government has made a policy decision that would result in [less than] the full staff having to be hired for the program the Treasurer outlined, rather than the four people he had indicated?

MR. LEITCH: No, Mr. Speaker.

Alcan Pipeline

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. Premier I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Can the government advise the Assembly whether or not the government of this province agreed to the provision in the Alaska Highway pipeline agreement which apparently commits Alberta to provide gas for export at the Alberta border price to make up for those quantities of gas provided to northern communities along the pipeline route?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what clause or what part of any agreement the hon. member is referring to.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a word of explanation; then I'll put the question again. This is the clause in the pipeline agreement which indicates that the communities along the pipeline route will obtain gas from the pipeline, and that that amount of gas will be made up from Alberta supplies.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member still hasn't said who the agreement is between.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, to clarify the question then, the agreement is the pipeline agreement between Canada and the United States. Not the overall pipeline agreement but the specific agreement relating to the Alcan route. The reason I raise the question is that I contacted External Affairs today to obtain their assessment of this, and I would like to know

whether the Alberta government is aware of it and whether they agree with it.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, not being a part of the agreement, I can't commit the Alberta government to any part of it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Was there any discussion with the government of Alberta concerning this particular feature of the agreement, in view of the fact that it does relate directly to Alberta gas supplies? Perhaps I could direct that to either the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources or the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I have no recollection of the Alberta government agreeing to sell additional natural gas to any particular communities. I would recall for the hon. member, though, that the Alberta government insists as a policy position that Alberta's foreseeable future needs are taken care of first. Then the surplus, if there is any, is available first to Canadians and then, if they do not require it, it can be exported from the country.

MR. NOTLEY: A supplementary question to either the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources or the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs. At any point in the discussions of this pipeline, was there any discussion by Alberta ministers that would relate to Alberta gas supplies making up that amount of gas which would be provided to communities along the pipeline, not only Canadian communities but indeed American communities as well?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I can't confirm any discussions for my colleagues. I had no discussions with regard to it. It was not brought up to me. But I could confirm again for the hon. member the policy of the Alberta government I explained in answering his previous question, which I think should answer any concerns he might have.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. Has the government at this time studied the pipeline treaty as it relates to this particular feature, which is not a gas swap but is in fact a making-up of gas that is used, as a part of the agreement, by communities along the route?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has now introduced the pipeline treaty in addition to a pipeline agreement. I don't know which one he wants me to answer for. We have copies of both within the government. But other than the policy position I gave him regarding taking care of Alberta's needs first, then other Canadians', before any could be exported from the province, I can't help him any more with regard to those two documents.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Have any representations been made on the inclusion of an all-events tariff— a tariff which would guarantee that U.S. users pay all the operating costs — which I gather is one of the things

that is not as yet resolved in the discussions between Canada and the United States?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member is asking whether I know of all the things Canada and the United States might have discussed, I could not speak for Canada in that regard.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question. This relates directly to the question I put before. In light of this all-events tariff having a considerable bearing on the ability to obtain venture capital, at this point is the government of Alberta giving any consideration to, or has there been any discussion concerning, possible investment in the pipeline from the Alberta heritage trust fund?

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, that's been referred to before publicly by the Premier. I believe his answer — it hasn't come before cabinet — was that some portion of the pipeline might be a logical investment in a debt investment for the heritage trust fund. However, no request has been made to the Alberta government. I imagine that if such a request were made, we would give it serious consideration.

Hog Marketing Report

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. Could the minister indicate whether the report on hog pricing being prepared by Hu Harries and Associates will be made public, and when the report will be available?

MR. MOORE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I intend to make the report public. I expect that would be during the course of next week, shortly after October 22.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Phase three of the contract with Hu Harries and Associates states there will be no public release of information that's being prepared by specific firms or individuals. What method will the government be using to make decisions regarding this type of information when it's released?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, I don't have with me a copy of the contract between the government of Alberta and Hu Harries and Associates. But the intent and meaning and purpose of the section dealing with confidential information was that Hu Harries and Associates, in developing a report, have access to all information from a number of different packing companies in Alberta. The requirement is that Hu Harries report on the price relationship which should exist between Alberta hogs and hogs at other North American centres but divulge only the results of such work, not confidential information about the various companies involved in the study.

MR. MANDEVILLE: One final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the government have any proposed legislation which would prevent the Alberta Hog Producers' Marketing Board from withholding hogs from the market place?

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

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, the question is: does the government have any proposed legislation which would prevent the Alberta Hog Producers' Marketing Board from withholding hogs from the market place?

MR. MOORE: Without purporting to give a legal opinion, Mr. Speaker, I believe that if the hon. member would research the Agricultural Products Marketing Act, which we presently have, it would indicate that that authority is already in place.

Public Service Pay Differentials

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, and just a short preamble so the minister and I both know what we're talking about. As of the end of March 1976 there was a difference of about \$3,500 between the starting salaries of men and women in the public sector, and last year there was a \$4,500 difference. Mr. Speaker, my question is: is the minister considering any action to stop this increasing dollar gap between men's and women's salaries in the public service sector?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure of the figures the hon. member has quoted in his question, but they do relate to salaries earned by women in the provincial government service, as compared with men.

On both occasions when I've dealt with this matter before, Mr. Speaker, I've pointed out that the principal reason for that difference is that we have more female than male applicants for the lower paying jobs in the government service, and more male than female applicants for the higher paying jobs. I've also stressed, which is the case and is the action this government has taken, that its policy is equal pay for equal work. Whoever is doing the work, the pay is the same.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. I'd like to know if the minister can table in this House the studies that show that men and women do receive equal pay for equal work from this government.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure what studies the hon. member is referring to. I've said that is the policy, and I know of no instance where that policy isn't followed.

Day Care

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. What action does the minister plan to take with regard to implementing the recommendations of the day care task force?

MISS HUNLEY: I've been meeting with a number of organizations, including private day care operators. We've assessed the implications of the task force report and have drawn up a set of regulations, which we're presently considering. When the implications of those regulations are known, we'll be publishing the new regulations.

MR. CLARK: A supplementary question to the minister. Is it the government's intention to embark on the recommendations of the day care task force by means of simply changing the existing regulations as far as day care is concerned in Alberta? Or is it the government's intention to introduce legislation which would deal with the broad area of day care in Alberta?

MISS HUNLEY: As I recall the task force report, I don't think it requires legislation except in one section, the appeal provisions. That section which relates to legislation will be brought forward, I expect, during this sitting of the Assembly. The rest of it can be implemented in various ways by change in policy. It has budgetary implications, as well as consideration of regulations which are formulated through order in council.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last supplementary question to the minister. Has the government's interdepartmental committee of, I believe it's Social Services and Community Health and Advanced Education completed its assessment of the function of day care workers and skills necessary to perform the function? Has the committee finalized its report, and are the recommendations from that report reflected in the regulations that have now been sent out to various organizations?

MISS HUNLEY: I'd have to reflect and look at the information that's been forwarded, Mr. Speaker, but I don't believe that was contained in information we forwarded to the various citizens who were interested.

MR. CLARK: A supplementary question to the minister. Could the minister give us an indication as to whether the interdepartmental committee has finished its report, and if it has, will the report be public?

MISS HUNLEY: If it's an interdepartmental report, it's most unlikely it will be made public. It's for our own use in developing day care policies and recommendations, so it would be most unlikely for it to become public.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, the other question was, has the report been finished?

MISS HUNLEY: I'd have to check that, Mr. Speaker. I've reviewed a considerable amount of information during the course of the summer, and I'd have to check to be sure if that specific one was included.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In light of the day care task force report, is the government now giving any consideration to lifting, I suppose I could call it, the quasi-moratorium on new PSS agreements?

MISS HUNLEY: We haven't had a quasi-moratorium on PSS agreements, Mr. Speaker, other than the fact that it had budgetary implications. With the guidelines we had, it was not possible to expand the PSS as rapidly as many municipalities hoped.

MR. KUSHNER: A supplementary question to the minister if I may, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister in a position to inform this Assembly if any day care centres have been closed in the city of Calgary because they don't meet the standard required by the provincial government?

MISS HUNLEY: Yes, there has been one, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KUSHNER: Supplementary question. I wonder if the minister intends to encourage free enterprise, or are the standards going to be so high that the private day care centres might have to hop out of the business and the government will take over most of them?

MISS HUNLEY: It's been alleged by many people in private day care centres that strict regulations would do so. They don't all share that opinion, and certainly it's not our intention to make it so restrictive that private enterprise cannot flourish in that area.

Kananaskis Park

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife and has to do with the proposed Kananaskis park. Will there be any cancellation of leases or grazing permits within the proposed park?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, not within the proposed park itself within the region. If the grazing areas — and I would have to defer to my colleague the associate minister responsible for public lands. If it's consistent with the recommendations of the eastern slopes policy, there would be some consideration for possible future closure in some of those prime protection areas. But I'm not aware of any that would be closed because of the park announcement.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will any snowmobiling be allowed on any of the leases currently in use?

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any snowmobiling going on on any of the leases. I would defer that particular question. But before I defer it to my colleague, may I indicate that there will be no snowmobiling in the Kananaskis park. That park now has, within the boundary we announced last week, some area that has had quite a bit of snowmobiling. We are providing some areas specifically for the snowmobilers in other regions.

Sulphur Dioxide Emissions

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Attorney General. Is it the government's intention to appeal the acquittal of Great Canadian Oil Sands on the charge of sulphur dioxide pollution, in view of the fact that the reason for acquittal in the first trial was different from the reason for acquittal in the second trial?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I thought that we were doing so. But I'll have to check specifically. I haven't got that detail with me.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of the Environment. In view of the fact that in the second trial Great Canadian Oil Sands was acquitted because of the lack of continuous monitoring for a half-hour period — apparently the monitoring takes place every 12 minutes — is it the government's intention to insist on continuous monitoring of sulphur dioxide emissions by Great Canadian Oil Sands?

MR. RUSSELL: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that's something that goes on as a matter of course.

MR. NOTLEY: Supplementary question to the hon. minister. My question relates to the question of continuous, as opposed to the every-12-minute approach. Will that be insisted upon?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, that sort of detail is one which undergoes study and review at all times. As the hon. member is probably aware, this matter of air pollution particularly is something which the department does keep under continuous review. In that instance, if the 12 minutes should be changed to some other period or be made continuous, then we would do it.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In view of the importance of the legal decision and the acquittal in the second instance, relating to continuous control as opposed to control every 12 minutes, has the minister reviewed the judge's decision?

MR. RUSSELL: No I haven't as yet, Mr. Speaker. But I wonder if the hon. member would give me an example of the damage that is alleged to have been done up there due to sulphur dioxide emissions. I'm concerned that some members in the House appear to have a misunderstanding of what the true situation is.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. minister has asked me to take a moment and explain why I asked the question, I'd be glad to do that. I have to have permission of the House to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: We would have to devise some new rules for the question period unless the hon. minister is willing to take his colleague from Spirit River-Fairview into the cabinet.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that may be putting him a bit on the spot. Perhaps I can rephrase the question in hopes of getting it by the Speaker, and at the same time making the point so the hon. minister can answer.

In view of the judge's decision, which simply says that you cannot be convicted unless there is continuous monitoring for a period of half an hour, so that an averaging can take place over that half hour, unless the government changes the monitoring system it will be impossible to get any sort of conviction, however much emission is taking place. My question to the minister is: in view of those whereases, what action is the government taking?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, in responding to that question I tried to make two points. The first is that the kind of thing the hon. member is referring to is something that undergoes continuing review and consideration by the department. We can name for example the meat rendering industry, where guidelines are changed as a result of developing conditions. We would give that commitment insofar as sulphur dioxide emissions are concerned.

The second point I was trying to make in responding to the question was the inference that this was a very serious case and that some kind of major damage was being done, and I'm asking the hon. member to elaborate on that. Because our investigations show that that is a very clean industry.

AOC Loans

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Business Development and Tourism and ask if he's had an opportunity to review the Westglen file with the Alberta Opportunity Company, especially that portion of the file that led to the loan being granted on the basis that Westglen would produce electronic equipment in Alberta.

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, there is no Westglen file in the Opportunity Company.

MR. CLARK: Did I say Westglen? My apologies; Willowglen.

MR. DOWLING: No, I have not. But I have received somewhat of an update from the managing director of the Opportunity Company. On reviewing *Hansard*, I find that a great number of the statements made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition are in fact incorrect. One is that he suggests . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't understand the question as leading in that direction. Perhaps the hon. minister could find some other occasion for his rebuttal.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could just ask the minister one further question. Has it been brought to the minister's attention that rather than Willowglen electronics doing the production work here in Alberta, between 75 and 90 per cent of the electronics components they've been selling have been manufactured in Houston, Texas?

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I do know that most of the electronics business of which the hon. leader is obviously speaking is an agent for companies outside Alberta. I also know that Willowglen, in true Alberta spirit, does farm out some of their work to some of these other companies, which sort of makes them all grow together.

MR. CLARK: Ninety per cent in Houston?

St. Albert Civic Administration

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs that has to do with our mutual colleague the MLA for St. Albert. I'd like to know, Mr. Minister, if the Department of

Municipal Affairs has received any formal complaint about the MLA for St. Albert interfering in the legislative responsibilities of the city of St. Albert.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

DR. BUCK: I have asked if there have been any formal complaints from the city of St. Albert.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Although this certainly could be an interesting topic, as the hon. member probably knows, the limits set down for our question period in *Beauschene* limit questions to matters which come under a minister's responsibility. That does not necessarily include every random item of information that happens to come into a minister's office which might result in a question as to whether he received it.

Consultant's Contract

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might take this opportunity to answer a question asked of me toward the close of our spring sitting. I was asked to check with the Provincial Auditor as to whether payments made under a contract with Rune Associates complied with the provisions of The Financial Administration Act, in that the contract called for the payments to be made prior to the rendering of the service.

I was able to check that matter with the Provincial Auditor, who has expressed the opinion that The Financial Administration Act appears to be silent in connection with payments under contracts where the moneys payable are not tied to the prior rendering of a service or the furnishing of goods. I would simply add, Mr. Speaker, that there are and have been for years a great many occasions on which payment is made in advance of receipt of the service or goods. For example, advance payments are made in the rental of premises; also [in] arrangements for the use of accommodation and things of that nature. So there are a number of circumstances where payments are in fact made, pursuant to the terms of the contract, prior to the rendering of the good or the service.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Provincial Treasurer. Can the Provincial Treasurer give us an example of where payments have been made for personal services in advance of the services being rendered? I appreciate the point the Treasurer makes as far as facilities and accommodations. But is the government in the practice of paying in advance for personal services?

DR. BUCK: Ask Miniely.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, if the question includes the type of situation where the payment is made on a contract of services before the actual service is rendered, I understand there have been instances of that occurring, although I don't have the details of any of those instances at hand.

MR. CLARK: A supplementary to the Provincial Treasurer. Did the Provincial Treasurer say there are examples where money is paid to consulting firms or

individuals prior to their giving any service to the province?

MR. LEITCH: I understand that has occurred in the past, Mr. Speaker, although I don't have with me any specific examples of it.

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, through his line of questioning, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is implying that payments were made in advance of rendering of service. I want to make it clear to this House that there was never any payment made in advance of rendering any service under the contract in question, that in many cases the services were provided in advance or I asked for something in advance. The hon. leader is implying — and I say simply an implication — that there was at any time any payment made in advance of rendering a service. The answer to that question is that there was never any payment made in advance of rendering service.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. I can appreciate the minister's touchiness about Mr. Jackson Willis. The question to the minister then: in light of what the minister has said today, why was the contract changed? When the contract the minister entered into initially was signed, it did not make it possible to make any advance payment. Why did the minister change the contract if he didn't plan to pay ahead of time?

MR. MINIELY: Mr. Speaker, at that time it was because of the fact that actual payments were coming in about 90 to 120 days after rendering of service.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Didn't the minister know that's the way the government operates? After all, he was the Provincial Treasurer when he signed the contract. He should have known that's how it operates.

MR. SPEAKER: Quite clearly we're getting into the area of debate, which would be better accommodated by a notice of motion on the Order Paper.

Uranium Oxide Plant

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, some days ago the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview asked me a question during the question period. I undertook to look into the matter and report back. It deals with the uranium oxide processing proposal for the city of Calgary. Of course the weekend news shows that the Development Appeal Board in Calgary has turned the application down in any event.

But I want to report to the House that the proponents had been in contact with the Alberta Department of the Environment during several meetings over the course of the past year. The department had asked for an environmental impact assessment study from the proponents and had received it. They were satisfied that it was a good and safe project for the city of Calgary, and were prepared not to voice any objections and to deal with the matter of air and water pollutants and emissions at the time those licences would have been issued under the appropriate acts.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

head: **GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS** (Second Reading)

Bill 58 **The Alberta Income Tax** **Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2)**

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill No. 58, The Alberta Income Tax Amendment Act, 1977 (No. 2).

There is a group of proposed amendments in the bill which are largely technical in nature and are designed to bring certain definitions and procedures in the Alberta income tax legislation into line with similar ones in the federal income tax legislation. I wouldn't expect those sections would attract very much debate on this motion for second reading.

There is also a change in the percentages applicable to individuals claiming a royalty tax rebate. That change is brought about as a result of the change in the provincial income tax, made last spring, from 26 per cent to 38.5 per cent of federal basic tax.

There are also some amendments dealing with time limits and matters of that nature, particularly the time limit for claiming rebates under various programs. Again, Mr. Speaker, those are to enable the administration of legislation to proceed more smoothly and, I wouldn't think, would attract appreciable debate on second reading.

The principal amendment to the income tax, Mr. Speaker, provides for the extension of the Alberta royalty rebate program to the coal industry. Members of the Assembly will recall that that is one part of ALPEP, and involves rebating to Alberta taxpayers that portion of the Alberta income tax which becomes payable as a result of the federal government's decisions with respect to the non-deductibility of payments made to a provincial government in respect of non-renewable resources. In extending that program to the coal industry, Mr. Speaker, it means that in that respect the coal industry is being treated in the same way as the oil and natural gas industry.

The other part of that program, the credit portion, has not been extended to the coal industry. I can perhaps sum up the reasons for not doing that by simply saying that the formula which determines the royalty payments that are to be made by the coal industry to the provincial government is significantly different from the royalty provisions for the oil and natural gas industry, and in that difference lie the reasons for not extending the credit program to the coal industry.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that I can at this moment add anything helpful to the members of the Assembly on the proposed bill.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments on Bill No. 58. First of all, as far as the minor amendments are concerned I don't have any particular objection to those at all. The Provincial Treasurer, of course, is correct that the important amendment contained in Bill 58 is the decision to extend to the coal industry the refund of tax on royalty.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make two or three observa-

tions with respect to this particular proposal. Number one, it seems to me that it just isn't good enough to say we are doing it for one industry, therefore we should be doing it for another industry. All sorts of taxation measures that affect industries are passed by the federal level of government from time to time. We have to make a judgment, industry by industry, as to whether it's necessary to take action by the province. Simply to say that because we have a move by the federal government, which this province disagreed with, and although I've opposed the energy policies of this government over the last four or five years, I happen to think that the decision by the federal government in 1974 to tax provincial royalties, or to refuse the deduction — I should say, to put it correctly — of provincial royalties in computing tax was unfair. In that particular respect I supported the government's decision to oppose Ottawa, both in the spring of 1974, and in the fall when Mr. Turner's budget finally was introduced.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it clear that I have never supported the total ALPEP package. But regardless of how one looks at ALPEP, its cost to the people of Alberta, and the benefits it has created — because obviously any plan of this nature is going to stimulate the industry to some extent; whether it's to the tune of \$512 million, the most recent estimate I've been able to obtain of the total cost of ALPEP, is a different matter — the point that has to be made is that in my judgment it isn't good enough to say all right, we've done it for one industry, therefore we're going to do it for another. If we followed that sort of logic every time a tax bill was passed by the federal government which at one time or another ran counter to a particular industry in this province, we would be picking up the pieces from the provincial treasury. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that I would have been much more willing to support Bill 58 had the minister in introducing the bill come to the Assembly and said one of the arguments is that the royalty changes were made by the federal government in 1974 and subsequently in 1975, but in the particular instance of the coal industry it is necessary to apply this action because of the circumstances of that industry.

I read over, for example, the coal development policy for Alberta. In many respects I thought it was an improvement. The royalty rates were certainly an improvement over 10 cents a ton, no question about that. But there is no talk in this document about a refund on the royalties from provincial coffers. It seems to me that it is incumbent upon the Provincial Treasurer to demonstrate that the coal industry in Alberta needs that additional incentive. That, Mr. Speaker, has not been done in his introductory remarks presenting the bill to the Assembly.

I would just conclude my views on this legislation by saying that while I have no objection to the vast majority of the amendments, we are talking here about money which would otherwise be flowing into the provincial coffers. We don't even know how much it is. Mr. Speaker, when the Provincial Treasurer comes to the Legislature and says, hey, let's pass this amendment, we need it to make it fair; surely at the very least we could have had an estimate of what that will come to. Will it be \$10 million, \$5 million, \$2 million, \$20 million? You know, we're asked to pass a pig in a poke here, on the basis of some sort of reasoning that, if it were to be applied

across the board, would indeed see a totally different set of priorities in our provincial budget than I note in the one before us this year.

So, Mr. Speaker, when one asks the Legislature to approve changes which in fact will mean a loss in revenue, in my judgment the responsibility goes with it to demonstrate why those changes are necessary, what the impact is on the economy, what the impact on jobs will be, and what the cost will be to the people of this province. With great respect to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, I submit he has not done so in his introductory remarks. I would ask him to do so in his concluding remarks.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to participate briefly in the debate, inasmuch as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview has brought up the relationship of this bill to the Alberta coal policy, just to provide him with a little background. When the coal policy was being discussed with industry, one of the outstanding matters which was to be worked on with industry was the matter of whether or not the non-deductibility of royalties under the federal government legislation would be considered as a matter for determining the amount of royalty or tax paid to the Alberta government. We left it as an outstanding matter. The coal development policy for Alberta was introduced on June 15, 1976. We'd been working with industry to determine the implications of the non-deductibility of royalties on the coal industry, and it became increasingly clear to us that if we are against the principle of non-deductibility of royalties, it's pretty inconsistent, I submit, to be against something in principle and then grab all the money that the wrong principle will provide for you.

If I understand the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview, he says: I'm against the federal government's legislation on non-deductibility of royalties, but my principle is for sale; I'll grab the money in any event. It seems to me that's a pretty inconsistent and, as a matter of fact, irresponsible position to take in this regard. The Alberta government had to decide whether we would live up to what we believe to be the correct principle, and we have. And my colleague the Provincial Treasurer is introducing legislation to back up that kind of thinking.

I guess we could have done two other things. One, we could have ignored it and, as the Member for Spirit River-Fairview would do, take the money. The other alternative, perhaps, would have been to flow back to industry all the money, both federal and provincial, which they are forced to pay as a result of non-deductibility. Obviously the last alternative would be subsidizing the federal government and removing as well a point that I think is important: that the industry should continue to discuss with the federal government, argue with them, and make the point that non-deductibility is a bad principle. If we merely refunded to them all the money they would lose as a result of non-deductibility, obviously they'd no longer have any need to continue to argue with the federal government about that principle.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Alberta government, upon discussion with the coal industry in our province, and being ready to stand behind those things we believe in as a matter of principle, has decided that the amount of money we would get as a result of non-

deductibility of royalty should be given back to the coal industry . . .

MR. NOTLEY: How much?

MR. GETTY: . . . and the hon. Provincial Treasurer has brought the bill to the House today.

If, in fact, the hon. member has some questions specifically as to the estimate of dollars and cents — and I think it would only be an estimate, because it depends on production, it depends on price, it depends on how the coal royalty formula operates on any given project, and it depends on the resource allowance the federal government allows and whether or not the royalty exceeds the resource allowance: all of these would be an estimate and may perhaps make meaningless the amount the Provincial Treasurer could give as an estimate, based on so many assumptions.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we are debating a principle. I think the principle here is clear and that the House should, if they believe in the principle, have the courage, if you like, to stand up for their principles and not, as the Member for Spirit River-Fairview suggests, have them for sale to get a few extra dollars.

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few brief remarks with regard to this bill. I certainly support the principle of extending the royalty rebate program to the coal industry. I'm sure it will be welcomed by the coal industry in my constituency.

I happen to be a person who firmly believes it was not fair for the federal government to disallow the deductibility of royalties back in 1974. I think the province's rebate program should be extended to all mineral extraction industries paying royalties. I just have one question for the hon. Provincial Treasurer, if he could answer it in closing: are these provisions retroactive to 1974?

I'd like to say in closing that this bill has my support and, I believe, the support of other members in this Assembly.

[Motion carried; Bill 58 read a second time]

Bill 59
The Tobacco Tax
Amendment Act, 1977

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 59, The Tobacco Tax Amendment Act, 1977. The purpose of this bill, as I indicated on introduction, is to amend the legislation to make the tax payable in metric terms. That has resulted in a rounding downward, so there will be slightly less tax payable upon adoption of the bill than there is now. When I say slightly less, it's a matter of hundreds of dollars per year. So it's very minimal.

[Motion carried; Bill 59 read a second time]

Bill 60
The Fuel Oil Tax
Amendment Act, 1977

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 60, The Fuel Oil Tax Amendment Act, 1977. The

principle involved in this bill is identical to that under debate on Bill 59, except in this case there is a rounding up of the tax payable. The amount involved would be roughly \$200,000 per year, and the current revenue from this tax is approximately \$90 million per year. So the tax change is again very, very minor.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make one or two brief comments. I would like to say I will support the amendment, because it is to change it to metric. But I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that many times on this side of the Legislature we have tried to encourage the provincial government to remove this unnecessary tax entirely. I hope that by trying to motivate the Provincial Treasurer, possibly we will see it happen before the next general election.

[Motion carried; Bill 60 read a second time]

Bill 65
The Utility Companies
Income Tax Rebates Act, 1977

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 65, The Utility Companies Income Tax Rebates Act, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, there is no fundamental change proposed in this legislation with what is now happening with respect to utility companies' income tax rebates. The situation is that the federal government and the Alberta government rebate to the privately owned utility companies 95 per cent in the case of the federal government and 100 per cent in the case of the Alberta government of the income tax payable by those companies, which in turn is rebated by the companies to the consumers. Mr. Speaker, this places the customers of the privately operated utility companies on the same basis as the customers of publicly operated utility companies, at least insofar as income tax is concerned.

Up until now the funds have been flowing from the federal government to the provincial government, going into the general revenue fund, and then the rebates have been paid to the utilities companies from the general revenue fund. In my submission, Mr. Speaker, this provides somewhat of a budgetary expenditure distortion, because these are really not expenditures; they are simply a flow-through of funds that have been collected as taxes by both levels of government when the decision has been made that those taxes should be returned to the utility companies and, in turn, by those companies to the consumers. It's for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that we propose the establishment of a fund into which the federal rebates of income tax would be paid and into which would be paid from the general revenue of the province of Alberta the income tax collected by the province from those companies. In turn the fund would make the payments to the utility companies and, thence, to their customers.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would simply draw to the attention of the Legislative Assembly that Alberta is the only province that does in fact return the income tax rebates to the utility consumers. In other provinces where there is an income tax rebate of this nature, it is retained by the province.

[Motion carried; Bill 65 read a second time]

Bill 56
The Forest Development
Research Trust Fund
Amendment Act, 1977

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 56, The Forest Development Research Trust Fund Amendment Act, 1977.

There are basically three amendments to this act. The first one designates the advisory council as being the forestry research advisory council, which reports to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. The second amendment gives greater flexibility in the appointment of chairmen of the forestry research advisory council, from being an employee of the Alberta forest service to being an employee of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. Other amendments to the act provide clarification of intent and are consequential amendments arising from the departmental reorganization.

At this time I'd like to make a few comments about the responsibilities of the forest development research trust. There are three responsibilities. One is to establish forest research priorities in the province, the second is to co-ordinate forest research in Alberta, and the third is to make recommendations to the minister concerning the allocation of funds for various research projects.

I think it would be timely for me to advise members about some of the different types of research which the forest development research trust is carrying out in the province for the coming fiscal year. They are carrying [out] research into initial attack simulation. This will study cost effectiveness of forest fire initial attack programs, using various combinations of fire-fighting methods. Another research project they're undertaking is an ecological study of natural revegetation on coal mine lands in the Alberta foothills, which is important to a constituency such as mine. They're doing an ecological assessment of erosion control and revegetation operations by the Alberta forest service at coal exploration and seismic sites in the Alberta foothills and the Rocky Mountains. Another project will look into the improvement of forest wetlands for regeneration and productivity. Another project is to study the effect of harvesting patterns on wild ungulate use. Finally, there's a research project into the genetic improvement of native grasses for reclamation, range, and wildlife.

[Motion carried; Bill 56 read a second time]

Bill 57
The Forest and Prairie
Protection Amendment Act, 1977

MR. SHABEN: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 57, The Forest and Prairie Protection Amendment Act, 1977.

The primary purpose of the amendments, Mr. Speaker, is to define more clearly the maximum size of a campfire. There have been instances where people have claimed that a large stubble fire was a campfire, so it has made it difficult to control and suppress this type of fire. This is one of the provisions of the bill.

There are also provisions in the bill to amend sections 2 and 26 of the act so that the provisions of the act will apply within a hamlet. At the present time they apply to towns and villages. However, they do not apply for a hamlet, and it has led to some confusion in suppression of and protection from forest fires. Also the wording of Section 26 is clarified so that towns and villages are responsible to suppress fires only within their boundaries and not adjacent to them. This has also caused some confusion in the past.

Section 29 has been amended to provide additional authority for the fire guardian, appointed under Section 4 of the act, to enter upon private lands in order to investigate fires and fire hazards. This is made necessary because the act is not clear on this item.

[Motion carried; Bill 57 read a second time]

Bill 64
The Department of Business
Development and Tourism
Amendment Act, 1977

MR. DOWLING: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 64, The Department of Business Development and Tourism Amendment Act, 1977.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to provide additional authority for members of the department to act on behalf of the minister. As you know, the minister of the Crown is entitled, by royal prerogative, to execute documents on behalf of the government, and that authority flows to his deputy minister. But in order to expedite matters in the department, it is felt that this amendment is required, and it is in keeping with government policy. To delegate below the deputy minister level this must be in the act. Such delegation to a lower level enables the department to work in a more efficient manner, as I've said, and enables legal delegation in problem areas that may occur from time to time.

[Motion carried; Bill 64 read a second time]

Bill 67
The Department of Recreation,
Parks and Wildlife
Amendment Act, 1977

MR. THOMPSON: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 67, The Department of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife Amendment Act, 1977. This is a very straightforward and concise amendment. In fact, if it was any more concise I think it would be non-existent. I'll try to be concise too.

The amendment allows the minister to delegate to people in his department the power for such routine tasks as hiring halls, engaging lecturers, and conducting workshops. It would smooth out the operation of his department if this amendment was made.

[Motion carried; Bill 67 read a second time]

head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS

3. Moved by Mr. Lougheed:

Be it resolved that this Assembly approve in general the

operations of the government since the adjournment of the spring sittings.

[Adjourned debate October 14; Dr. Backus]

DR. BACKUS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for a few moments with regard to the excellent address given by the Premier and the effects some of the points he brought out will have on my constituency.

One of the things that has been proposed is the early building of a terminal for our airport in Grande Prairie. I'd like to dwell on this for a moment, because some months ago the chamber of commerce felt that there was a very serious need for looking into the air service in that area. At that time they wrote to the minister of transport and said they would like to do an air survey and study of the area and would appreciate any help the government might give them financially in conducting such a study. The minister of transport's reaction was so prompt that it in fact almost left the chamber of commerce speechless, in that funds were provided from the department to enable them to make this study and they were given every encouragement to do so. One of the principal concerns in their study was a need for a better terminal building at the airport.

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

The Department of Transportation of Alberta made application to the federal government to see if they could do something about improving the terminal facilities there. The federal government reacted by saying that they had it on their list but it was a long way down in the priorities. The immediate response of the Alberta government was to propose to the federal government that they would in fact build the terminal and lease it back to Transport Canada.

I've gone into detail on this because of the remarks made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who was criticizing the government for its failure to respond to public opinion and its failure to seek out expression of need by the public in Alberta, and claiming that it was insensitive to public opinion. I don't know whether the hon. Leader of the Opposition was coming down with a cold when he mentioned that his voice might pack up before he finished his speech. If he was I hope he'll soon get over it because then at least his head will be clear, even if his thinking isn't.

Some of the initiatives that have been taken by this government to stabilize and improve trade relations on behalf of agriculture are especially welcome in my area, as any improvement in trade relations with the United States to the south will also affect trade relations with Alaska. This could be a very vital outlet for the Peace River country. Although Grande Prairie is primarily thought of as an agricultural and forest industries area, a great deal of gas exploration has been going on in the area over the last year or two, which has brought a great deal of economic stability into the area when sometimes the agricultural activities have not been as stable. This I'm sure is due to the government incentive programs and has really been extremely valuable.

Also, during the summer the Department of Energy and Natural Resources reached an agreement with North Canadian Forest Industries which will help that particular forest industry in Grande Prairie to stabilize

and expand its facilities, giving a further boost to the economy in the area.

We're also looking forward to the effect the Hall commission report will have on the federal government, particularly with a view to recommendations made by the provincial government to that commission, recommending a northwest transportation organization uniting the various railways under one control. I think this is of vital importance to the whole Peace River country, the Peace River block both in Alberta and British Columbia. I hope the federal government can be persuaded to respond satisfactorily to that.

The pipeline proposal is of course causing a great deal of excitement in my constituency and in the area generally. I hope the government is fully aware — and I'm sure they are aware; they have already shown some evidence of taking steps in this direction — that this proposal of a pipeline will create some priorities in the area. For one thing, there will be a considerable increase in the trucking up the cutoff. We anticipate that a certain amount of service will come from Edmonton, and we look forward to the whole of Alberta becoming involved in it. But whatever materials will be produced or developed here in Alberta will have to be conveyed up this one route, and at present it is certainly in need of some improvement to cope with a heavy increase in traffic. There's also a possible increase in the use of the ARR, and I do know that the provincial government is looking at ways in which the ARR might be further used to facilitate the moving and stockpiling of pipes and material at the north end of the ARR.

This development, with the influx of workers, will certainly stress the importance of the need for a better hospital facility in the area. The government is working for this. I think they're aware of the fact that something that was already a priority will become even more urgent with the development of the pipeline.

The other thing that is causing some concern in the area is the temporary influx of labor. We had some experience with the building of Procter & Gamble, the very large influx of labor force during the construction period, and its associated social problems. With that experience, I hope our municipal governments and the provincial government will be more prepared this time for the influx of labor in that area generally.

I would also like to mention some of the other highway needs in the area because, besides the pipeline, coal development in the Monkman Pass area is going to create major demands on the existing and proposed highway systems in the area. I certainly hope we can develop these ahead of time so they don't become a major problem, with the increased use of the roads before they have been completely developed.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, with the advent of so many large and exciting programs like the pipeline and the Kananaskis country, coming from a centre which has grown to become a very vital part of this wonderful province but was once called the 'itty-bitty' city, I would like to say that small is beautiful, and I hope to have the opportunity to expand on this later in the session.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I welcome the opportunity of taking part in debate on Motion No. 3. Might I

begin my remarks by saying that during the summer I had the pleasure of sitting on a committee with a number of government members and the hon. Member for Clover Bar, who had as our assignment the selection of a new chief electoral officer. After a fair amount of work and, I might say, a very professional attitude on the part of my committee colleagues, we chose Mr. Ken Wark. I would just like to say, as a member of the Legislative Assembly and on behalf of New Democratic Party supporters in the province of Alberta, we wish Mr. Wark all the best of luck. We recognize he's got a tough job to be Chief Electoral Officer, but we know he will undertake those responsibilities with fairness. We wish him all the best in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move from there to take a very brief look at a number of issues before concentrating on the question of citizen involvement, pipeline planning, and saying a few words about the future of the country itself.

Mr. Speaker, in taking a quick survey of the province, members will recall that one of the most contentious issues during the spring sitting of the Legislature was Bill 29. Members of the opposition felt that the retroactive feature was particularly unfavorable and wrong in principle.

I notice today, Mr. Speaker, as a result of this matter being referred to the Alberta Human Rights Commission, that Mr. Wyman, the chairman, has issued a statement. I'd like to quote the last paragraph, because I think, Mr. Speaker, it is worth noting.

To people governed by the law, legal principles sometimes seem quite unrelated to fundamental principles of justice. In our opinion, every society should assert as a fundamental principle of justice that no right, no matter how important or trivial that right might be, should ever be curtailed by legislation on a retroactive basis. Without such a principle to guide the passing of legislation, the administration of the rule of law becomes chaotic, and the rule itself will have little meaning. It is most unfortunate in our opinion that there is a retroactive feature to Bill 29. A better course of action might well have been to proclaim Bill 29 on a "from this day forward basis", and to have allowed cases already under legal dispute to flow to their natural conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I raise that because in my view the whole question of retroactivity was debated in the Legislature last spring. I say that the government did not make the case then and, as a result of the statement by the Alberta Human Rights Commission and the very eloquent comments of Mr. Wyman, I believe the case against retroactive legislation in Bill 29 is very great indeed. I think the government might well heed the suggestion of Mr. Daniels, the president of the Metis Association, who has suggested that the retroactive feature of Bill 29 be withdrawn so that the normal course of that particular case could go through the courts.

Mr. Speaker, moving from Bill 29, the most disturbing aspect of the economy in Alberta at the moment is clearly the agricultural outlook. Prices of a number of products are low. The yield is going to be lower as a result of many acres that weren't seeded this spring, and grades will, of course, be affected by the wet harvesting conditions this fall.

Mr. Speaker, while the sun is shining and it appears that much of the crop will be taken off, the experience of the year, coupled with problems that have occurred in different regions of the province over the last four or five years, leads me to the view that this province has to take a second look at the operation of crop insurance. Members, particularly rural members, are well aware of the fact that the crop insurance program is already heavily subsidized. Half the premiums are assumed by the federal government, and the administrative costs are picked up by the provincial government. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact remains that only about 30 per cent of the producers are taking out crop insurance. The fact of the matter is that in all too many cases the farmers who count their pennies pretty carefully look at the dollars and cents angle, review crop insurance, and conclude that it is just not an attractive proposition for them.

As MLAs in the Peace River country, we had this situation brought to our minds this spring. I'm sure other Peace River members had this same representation. Crop insurance has a provision that it's not possible to pay out on stubble. Payout is based on summer fallow. The net result is that people who took out crop insurance in preceding years and this year felt a sense of, I shouldn't say betrayal, but at least felt that the crop insurance scheme was totally inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, surely [it] should be our objective to make crop insurance the kind of package that will appeal to 75 or 80 per cent of the farmers. I don't think anyone in this House feels that the proper approach is to come up with stopgap plans like the snowed-under crop program of 1974, even though those of us in the House asked for it. It was necessary and a needed program. But the longer term solution clearly is to have a crop insurance scheme which is sufficiently attractive to farmers that we don't have to come up with temporary programs as a result of snow, rain, drought, or what have you. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the time is at hand for this Legislature to completely review crop insurance, particularly in light of this year. I would hope the government moves in that direction.

The other important aspect of agriculture that I'd like to take just a moment to comment on is the hog war. I think it should be recognized, Mr. Speaker, that much of the publicity surrounding the hog war has been directed at the \$62.50 a hundredweight price set by the hog marketing board, that that was somehow a withholding action. In actual fact the major packing houses in this province went on a buyers' strike, if you like. They said they were not going to pay that kind of price. Some of the smaller packers were prepared to pay the price, but the major packing companies said no.

The minister decided to have a study. I would just like to say that while I differ with his decision to follow the course he did, I nevertheless think that in Dr. Harries we have a pretty competent person to undertake the study. However, I would just simply say to you, Mr. Speaker, that if one thinks that even a person as able as Dr. Harries can study a subject as complicated as the price operation of the Alberta hog market in the context of the North American hog industry, then I think we have to be pretty optimistic. He would need the wisdom of Solomon, and perhaps

even more, to achieve that sort of objective in a period of two months.

What happened is that the minister said to the hog marketing board, you will sell the hogs. Then he said to the packing plants, we want you to pay a fair price. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a better, more even-handed course of action for the government to have adopted in this hog controversy would have been to have followed the example of British Columbia. There the government has in place a program where they are able to subsidize the movement of pork into other markets so that if at any given time packers are in fact going on strike, then you have the competition of other markets.

Hog producers in my constituency and throughout the province find it very difficult to understand the machinations of hog pricing in this province. In the Alberta/B.C. market we have a 38 per cent deficit. We're told that the old law of supply and demand works this way: if you've got a shortage of supply, demand should put up the price. When one looks at the market place across the country, a slight surplus in Ontario, there's a slight surplus in Manitoba, a slight surplus in Saskatchewan. But over the bulk of the summer period the lowest prices have been in Alberta, where we have a 38 per cent deficit. Now this is obviously going to be one of the things that Dr. Harries has to grapple with. But for an average producer who sees these statistics, it's pretty hard not to convince him that there isn't some hanky-panky taking place in the market place.

I would just say, Mr. Speaker, particularly when it comes to getting the information from large packing chains that operate here, in the United States, and around the world, that I really doubt Mr. Harries is going to have the opportunity to come in with the kind of in-depth study necessary for us to get to the bottom of transfer pricing. I would have preferred the B.C. approach, to have strengthened the hog marketing board in their moves and to have made it clear to the major packing plants that during the time the study is taking place we are going to get the best possible price for our producers, even if it means subsidizing the movement into other markets.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move from there to take just a moment to deal with the Hall commission report. [There's] no doubt in my mind that the Hall commission report is one of the major documents in the history of western Canada. While most of the things I'm going to say about this government over the course of the next 25 minutes or so are not very complimentary, I do support Alberta's position in urging Mr. Lang to stop stalling on implementing the recommendations of the report. There should be no doubt that as far as western Canada is concerned, regardless of political stripe, we favor the implementation of the Hall report. In my judgment the effort of the federal minister to set up a prairie rail authority advisory committee will simply delay action on this important report.

Mr. Speaker, while the whole question of freight rates has been talked about in this Legislature for 50 or 60 years or perhaps even longer, and while the disparity in rail transportation rates has rightly become the focus of much of the national debate, it is, I think, worth stopping for just a moment and looking at some of the disparities on transportation questions that exist within this province. It seems to

me that's one area that has not been given the attention it should. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that because of a lack of competition, in particular because of the problems of northern regions being remote from the central population of Edmonton and Calgary, northerners more often are paying a good deal more than they should.

This summer some information was brought to my attention that I found interesting, confirming complaints I have received from small concerns throughout the Peace River block. I raise it now because before we get into a discussion of the pipeline I think we're going to have to have a pretty close look at the transportation costs within this province. The reason I raise this is because this particular concern was so incensed about transportation costs that they wanted me to table this information in the Legislature, and I am going to do this.

This is a concern that is setting up in the town of Peace River to construct camp kitchens, which is a pretty practical business to get into in view of the fact that we're going to build an \$8 billion pipeline in northwestern Alberta, the province of British Columbia, and the Yukon. In any event, to bring supplies from Montreal to Edmonton, and then from Edmonton to Peace River, we had this interesting comparison of tariffs. I think it should be noted that these supplies were small; they were trucked. It wasn't possible to bring them up on the NAR. Nevertheless, from Montreal to Edmonton, in this first example, \$58.56; from Edmonton to Peace River, one-eighth of the distance, the price was \$42.38, in other words about three-fourths as much to take it 300 miles as it was to truck it 2,400 miles across the country. Here's another example, again the same firm: \$103.25 to bring an article from Montreal to Edmonton; but to take that article from Edmonton to Peace River, \$76.07; again, three-fourths as much.

The reason this individual brought this to my attention was to make a valid point. He wasn't quarrelling with Alberta fighting the case of inequitable freight rates in Canada. He fully supported that. But he argued that if we're going to encourage diversified development in this province, we're going to have to look at some of the inequities in freight rates in the province. Mr. Speaker, I intend to table this at the end of my remarks so that members will have an opportunity to look at these particular invoices.

Another example that was brought to my attention concerns the whole question of lumber prices in northern Alberta. We have a lumber industry that has had its tough years, no question about that. And the whole situation in Slave Lake is eloquent testimony to four or five years of lean times for the lumber business.

But what concerns a number of northerners is the rather interesting pricing approach of the large lumber companies — again this concern that is in the camp kitchen business. The only way they can get their lumber is to bring it in from Mackenzie, B.C., because the concerns in Alberta have a pricing formula which is based on market price plus the freight to their major area of sales. If that happens to be Vancouver or Chicago, that's the price you pay. Mr. Speaker, the point is that it's pretty hard to be competitive in the midst of a province where we have vast acreage of timber, if business establishing in that region of the province is not able to obtain lumber,

not only at the normal market price, but to take advantage of the fact that it's right there. These were some of the concerns that have been brought to me.

The whole question of wage and price controls continues to be an issue in the province, I would say particularly for the next two and a half months, because members should recognize we are now into year three of the wage control program. That means that the basic protection feature isn't 6 per cent; it is 4 per cent. This government has indicated that we're going to be pulling out of the anti-inflation program as of December 31, unless a resolution to the contrary is passed during the fall session. What happens then to people who are caught in this two and a half month period? Are they going to be stuck with a 4 per cent increase, while on January 5 a contract can be opened up and it may be 8 or 10 or 12 per cent, whatever collective bargaining can achieve? It seems to me this is one of the problems that a number of working people especially are concerned about. I look through the Premier's speech on October 12, and I don't see any answers.

Two other brief areas before I move into the question of citizen involvement. The Premier indicated in his speech that somehow the concept of conditional grants is much better than unconditional grants because it will take into account regional differences. Well, Mr. Speaker, that may be an interesting argument. I suppose the same argument would apply for the federal government too, although this government never seems to take federal logic and apply it to the local level of government. They want all the power they can get provincially, but when it comes to the municipalities it's a different story entirely.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Alberta Urban Municipalities Association has never asked for flat, across-the-board revenue sharing. It has always recognized — and Mr. Leger acknowledged the fact in his submission — that there has to be some built-in provision in revenue sharing to take account of the geographic differences in the province of Alberta. So to suggest that somehow conditional grants will deal with regional disparities and that revenue sharing won't is to misstate the position of the municipalities of this province on revenue sharing, because they have been cognizant of the financial differences and difficulties throughout Alberta.

But it's also to misstate the basic thrust of our conditional grants. Because one of the problems with most of the conditional grants in this province today is that there is no flexibility. Just ask any school board how much flexibility there is in the grants from the Department of Education, what account is given to the differing costs of operating a school division in northern Alberta, compared to Edmonton or Calgary. So, Mr. Speaker, in my view the action of the Lougheed government makes untrue the Premier's assertion that conditional grants deal with regional disparities.

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

Another point I want to deal with is just to touch upon the Premier's comments this summer, and again during the speech on the October 12, concerning The Canadian Wheat Board. I'm certainly no fan of Mr. Lang. But I think we have to be fair and

recognize that the Wheat Board has done a good job, a very good job, even though some people may find that a little difficult to accept.

One looks at the facts. For example, in the 1975-76 crop year, we had 118 million bushels sold to the Soviet Union, compared with only 44 million bushels to China. The Premier's talk the other day underlined his concern that we were overrelying on China. The fact of the matter is, as the Premier should know and other members of the Assembly should be aware, there has been a long-standing agreement for many years — not a written agreement, an unwritten agreement — that Canadian sales come first to the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union, from my information and talking to Wheat Board authorities, has honored that agreement. When one looks at 118 million bushels to the Soviet Union in the last crop year we have figures for, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that just proves what I have said.

We have the comments of the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, looking at the Canadian system of marketing, comparing it to the chaos in the United States, and making the observation that the United States could learn a great deal from the Canadian system of orderly marketing.

I'm not suggesting there aren't improvements we can make in the operation of the Wheat Board, or any agency. But when one looks at the track record of the Wheat Board and compares it by contrast with the track record of the Alberta Export Agency, I think even the least objective would say the Wheat Board has been doing an excellent job. I note, Mr. Speaker, that is a position taken by most farm organizations in this province.

I want to move from there and deal for a moment or two with the question of citizen involvement in the whole process of government. Obviously the most blatant example of trampling on citizen involvement is the decision to emasculate the Environment Conservation Authority. I find that rather unfortunate . . .

DR. BUCK: Annihilate.

MR. NOTLEY: Annihilate, the hon. Member for Clover Bar says. I find the Premier's comments on page 1437 of *Hansard* particularly disturbing. He is saying:

The Environment Conservation Authority is of course an advisory body; I think it has been ill-named to be called an authority.

Now if one looks back to those heady days in 1970, before the Tories became the government, when we had all sorts of environmental issues and they at that time were the champions of environmental control, we find they made a number of very interesting comments. In 1970, the Environment Conservation Authority was introduced. When one looks at the act there is no question, Mr. Speaker, it's far more than an advisory body. It is an ombudsman, an environmental ombudsman. That's the legislation that was introduced in 1970.

DR. BUCK: By a concerned government.

MR. NOTLEY: Members of the government may not like it, but it was brought in by the former administration. However, the valiant little band of Tories — I don't know whether there were seven or eight then or 10; there were more than six by that time because

they had had a couple of crossovers — was taking the line that this ECA legislation wasn't tough enough. As a matter of fact the hon. Mr. Yurko, at that time just the hon. member, got up and and said, the government lacks the political courage to introduce a control authority with the teeth to set regulations and penalties and punish offenders in the manner required.

Then, on final reading, the opposition at that time moved a bill which would have taken the Environment Conservation Authority and made it a far tougher agency than even what was designed by its authors at the time. Now, Mr. Speaker, the champion of tough-minded environmental matters, making sure that you've got an ombudsman agency that has the teeth to do the job, is in a cold-blooded way destroying the Environment Conservation Authority. I think that's extremely unfortunate, and I would say to the members of the Legislature that before you do away with the effectiveness of this agency, it might be well to read back over the speeches made by Tory members when they were the opposition in the House.

Mr. Speaker, what the hon. Minister of the Environment is doing now is proposing a system of what one might call guided democracy, very similar to the late President Sukarno's guided democracy. However, we do know what happened to President Sukarno. While I'm not suggesting that the same thing will happen to the Minister of the Environment, I do suggest that a guided environment conservation authority is inconsistent with the original intention and is inconsistent with everything the Tories said when they were seeking the trust and confidence of the people of Alberta leading up to the 1971 election.

Mr. Speaker, the question of the ECA report on the Red Deer dam. It's important. I know it's going to come up later this week. But it's important because we had a report by the ECA after conducting hearings along the Red Deer and having a large number of people present briefs and submissions. It seems to me that the very least that could have been done would have been to hold a legislative debate before any decision was made on the Red Deer dam. We have the release of the ECA report saying, no dam at Site 6, then the very same day we have the announcement by the minister saying we're going to go ahead and build a dam at Site 6 without a debate in the Legislature.

Joe Clark from time to time makes the occasional good point. I thought that one of the better points he made this summer dealing with the Alcan pipeline was that before any decision was made on either the Lysyk report or the Berger report, or a final decision on the pipeline, there should be a debate in the House of Commons. And even though the House had recessed for the summer, it was called back so there could be a debate. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the House of Commons can be called back into session so there can be a special debate on the northern pipeline, surely it's not unreasonable that this Legislature of 79 members . . .

DR. BUCK: With the Bighorn Dam we had one.

MR. NOTLEY: That's right. There were special hearings of the Legislative Assembly on the Bighorn Dam. It's not impossible that we could not have called the Legislature back to hold a special session, if need be.

Or the government could have delayed a decision until there had been an opportunity to review the Environment Conservation Authority report in this House. What is at stake there, Mr. Speaker, is not just a challenge to the participation and involvement of the people of Alberta, but in my view it is an insult to the Legislative Assembly itself.

A whole series of questions has to be asked about the Environment Conservation Authority. But you know, it's only one example where the government has ignored public opinion. We have the Thorhild county dispute, where all of a sudden the county finds out from a news reporter that they have lost two-thirds of their assessment. There was no discussion with the minister, no opportunity for the people to talk to the minister formally before the decision was made. The fact of the matter is that this is just another example of the high-handed, arrogant attitude of the government.

The Premier says we're not talking about an insulation program because that is a violation of provincial rights. Well, Mr. Speaker, we're certainly not talking about an insulation program for homes. But there's no doubt that we have an insulation program as far as this government is concerned; they're insulating themselves from listening to the people. They have a pretty good insulation program in that respect.

There is a whole series of additional points I'd like to make. But just very briefly before concluding, the question of the pipeline and its impact on northern Alberta is something of immense importance. The question of roads — we've got to upgrade roads such as Highway 64 and Highway 49. We've got the whole question of northern transportation, the rail transportation system, which is crucial. We've got to find out what the relationship will be of the educational institutions in the area. Are they going to have a role to play or not? And what kind of role? We have the question of right-of-way compensation for the farmers or the landowners whose land the pipeline will cross.

Mr. Speaker, we have a whole series of rather strange admissions by the government. For example, the other day in the question period, I asked the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs whether or not his department had researched the pipeline treaty, because there are implications in that pipeline treaty. I think we do have the right to tax — that's my personal assessment of it — but there are some ambiguities, and local municipalities want to know. We had this sort of answer from the hon. minister: "Mr. Speaker, I think this is somewhat of an unfair question, because I haven't seen the treaty." What do you mean, you haven't seen the treaty? You know, the treaty is in the Legislature Library. A whole host of people have copies of the treaty. Most of the opposition members have had an opportunity to read the treaty. And the minister says, "I haven't seen the treaty."

DR. BUCK: He's been sick.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, here's a government that claims it's on top of the issue, they know what they're doing. Today we have this business of the question I put to the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources concerning the . . .

DR. BUCK: It's a federal matter now.

MR. NOTLEY: . . . export or the taking of supplies of Alberta natural gas to make up that natural gas used by the communities along the route. That's part of the agreement. But apparently the hon. Minister of Energy wasn't aware of it.

Where was this bunch, Mr. Speaker, when it came to negotiating the agreement on the Alcan pipeline?

DR. BUCK: Talking at patio parties.

MR. NOTLEY: On the patio? Asleep at the switch? One really wonders. But it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that what has happened is that clearly instead of having a good idea of what is going on, instead of being on top of the issue, we see that the government is playing the entire issue by ear. Small wonder then that the Premier suggests that this is an example of a federal government that is favorable. They know so little about the treaty at this stage and the agreement that they're hardly in a position to know whether it's good or bad, from what I've been able to gather in watching and listening to the government so far this session.

So on one of the really crucial issues facing Alberta the Premier said almost nothing in his remarks of October 12 about how we are going to deal with the challenge of the pipeline.

I see that my time has elapsed. Mr. Speaker, may I end where I began by saying that we have an excellent choice in Chief Electoral Officer. He's going to have his hands full, because for the next period of a year or a year and a half I suspect the political dialogue in this province is going to heat up. I might say it's about time.

Thank you.

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I too welcome the opportunity to participate in Government Motion No. 3, that we the Assembly approve in general the operations of the government since the spring sittings. They say that it's a long look ahead and a short look back. It's interesting to reflect when we talk about things like the high cost of energy that almost a hundred years ago in southern Alberta, in 1886, Kootenai Brown discovered the first oil in Alberta at Waterton and sold it at \$1 a gallon. Now certainly that wouldn't make any Minister of Energy very happy when you consider that a few short years ago we were selling 45 gallons for a couple of dollars. So one would question indeed whether the price of oil is high today at all.

Another observation, Mr. Speaker. It is just ten short years ago, the centennial year in Canada, when the total provincial budget for Alberta was \$682 million. Here we are today in 1977, ten short years later, where our hospital and medical budget alone exceeds the total provincial budget. Indeed it must be time for reflection. I'd like to make some comments regarding the Premier's address to the Assembly the other day, and incorporate it with what I believe are pertinent points concerned with the area of southern Alberta that I represent, namely Lethbridge.

I couldn't help but be amused when I saw the Member for Spirit River-Fairview get excited about the point that democracy perhaps isn't working. I'd simply like to quote a well-known man named Alexander Woollcott who said:

I'm tired of hearing it said that democracy doesn't work. Of course it doesn't work. It isn't supposed to work. We are supposed to work it.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the constituents of Spirit River-Fairview have spoken in putting him here, and I would hope they'll speak again in '79 and put him somewhere else.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the highlight of southern Alberta over the summer months was the visit of the Alberta cabinet to southwestern Alberta. Surely it's an indication of responsible government that not only are they prepared to listen to Albertans, but they are prepared to travel around the province seeking information from Albertans in general as to the policies the government's been following. It was a very exciting time for many members in the south, Mr. Speaker, and I think much information in the form of briefs was given to the government. If it's the same situation that prevailed in past years, we'll see that enunciated in government policy in the not too distant future.

Of particular concern to southern Alberta, Mr. Speaker, is of course irrigation — water. I was pleased to see and hear the Premier, while in Lethbridge, make a statement, and I quote him from *Hansard*: "the unequivocal position" of the Alberta government is "that there would be no export of water from Alberta south of the border." I think that is particularly significant, Mr. Speaker, when we discuss irrigation. The Member for Macleod has said on many occasions that 4 per cent of Alberta's land produces 20 per cent of the agricultural receipts of Alberta, and surely it doesn't need particular emphasis to say, if we could only increase that to 6 per cent of Alberta's land.

One of the difficulties we have now is markets. But surely that's only in the short run. When we consider the world scene, where the population of the world is increasing at 200,000 people a day — that means every 10 days we create a new Alberta, and every three months a country the size of Canada in terms of population in the world — surely the onus is on those areas of the world which are capable of producing foodstuffs to produce them. How anyone could equate that with the federal policy only a year or two ago of destroying millions of dozens of eggs and millions of laying hens — I can't quite perceive the rationale behind it except to answer the Member for Spirit River-Fairview that I suppose that's how they prove the law of supply and demand. That's how they keep the price up.

Mr. Speaker, the announcement in southern Alberta, in the fall of 1975, of the \$200 million earmarked for irrigation out of the heritage savings trust fund has sparked a tremendous amount of enthusiasm for the program, which unfortunately has only been forthcoming this year. The Mayor of Lethbridge as recently as last month hosted in Lethbridge a conference on water use and water resources, specifically geared to irrigation, and it was attended by elected members from all over southern Alberta. A resolution to be forwarded to both the federal and provincial governments encouraging getting on with the studies was unanimously passed.

Mr. Speaker, there are people in the south who undoubtedly would be affected by a dam in the Oldman River basin. I suggest that perhaps some of their claims are justified, in that it's just not satisfac-

tory to go ahead and spend perhaps \$110 million of that money on water storage and the other \$90 million on the distribution system. But indeed if their claims that up to 25 to 40 per cent of the water used in southern Alberta through irrigation systems is wasted because of the type of sprinkler equipment, surely the Minister of the Environment and the government are correct in saying, look, we are studying the situation, we've had studies on the problem, and we will make a decision by Christmas 1978. They've said that specifically to give people who have strong cases, in their opinion, to be heard against a dam the opportunity to air those thoughts. I certainly commend the minister and the government for having the strength to resist those who say, set aside the studies and build the dam.

I couldn't help but reflect, Mr. Speaker, when the Member for Spirit River-Fairview was referring to the Red Deer dam, because on the other side of the House — that's the other side from me, but not opposite — we have had members this past summer saying the government was totally wrong to ignore the ECA and make a decision on the Red Deer River. History may prove that correct. But surely, Mr. Speaker, this government had the fortitude to make the decision. The party that member represents had been in office for 35 years prior to this government, and never did make that decision. At least this government has made that decision, and I am very confident with regard to the Oldman River storage system that it will be given adequate hearings and opportunity before that decision is made.

Mr. Speaker, this summer we had in the city of Lethbridge the opening of the largest building ever to be opened outside of Calgary and Edmonton. I think it proves that although Alberta may have 55 per cent of the population in those two cities, it does have something to offer outside of those cities. And Lethbridge being the third largest city in Alberta, I think it was so appropriate to open, in June, the largest building ever to be constructed by any government outside of Calgary and Edmonton. It houses 24 government departments and, I think, represents the philosophy of this government that it is designed and elected to represent the people, and to present to the citizens of Alberta all-inclusive government virtually on their doorstep.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the municipalities in Alberta have valid concerns, and the residents and the citizens have some justifiable concerns. I would like to mention a few of them.

Perhaps schools and education have never prompted so much interest in the past 25 to 30 years as they have in the past two years. It's interesting to note that with the rate of information available to our students doubling every four years, with the tremendous burst of technology we've seen in the world, in Canada and in Alberta, in the past ten to fifteen years, with a man on the moon, that the school year this year in Lethbridge, Alberta, is identical to 1945 — 193 days of the 365 — which says something remarkable either for the students of today to absorb that or the teachers of the day to impart that. I haven't quite resolved which one has the advantage. I do know, though, that the cost of education is at an all-time high.

At the moment 3,000 teachers in Alberta are out of work. One of the discomfiting facts to me is that the

Lethbridge Public School District 51 has 500 teachers on staff, who I believe are dedicated people concerned about youngsters and not just salary negotiations. But the disquieting factor to me, Mr. Speaker, is that for every school teacher in that school district, we have half a teacher as a support person. I think it gives the illusion that for the number of students and the number of teachers, we work out a student-teacher ratio, where in reality many of those support people could perhaps be set loose in the classrooms to teach our children. I have had many teachers tell me that grades 1, 2, and 3 should have perhaps 10 to 15 students in a classroom, but that grades 10, 11, and 12 can get by with 40. But that's not the way we've structured our school system with the teachers. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that bears looking at.

As recently as Saturday I attended a meeting where the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff was the guest speaker. I must say I was particularly impressed with his comments regarding the goals and objectives of Alberta education as produced by the Curriculum Policies Board. I would commend the document to all members of the Assembly, Mr. Speaker, because since I have been elected I have yet to see a document able to speak in such simple language on problems and solutions of education.

Certainly law and order is a concern, Mr. Speaker, and the resolution presented by the Member for Drumheller the other day generated some very interesting debate, particularly from the Solicitor General. I would suggest that most Albertans are concerned not only with the crime rate but also with the environment in which some of these youngsters grow up. It's interesting to note that very few Eskimo children, and certainly no Indian children, have become delinquents until they've hit the white man's school. I would suggest there's a uniqueness somewhere in our schools.

If what we must do, Mr. Speaker, is fund schools to a higher degree to see that there is more individual concern shown for those youngsters, instead of segregating them and putting them in a separate system like a Borstal school . . . certainly the time has arrived when we must pay more attention to the fact that we create the juveniles because we are the legislators. Rather than resolve the problem of the juveniles, I suggest we spend a little more time in preventing juveniles happening. We've got to start that about 10 years earlier, because one must never forget that a definition of man is: that which happens to a boy. We in our wisdom in this Assembly have the power through dollars and cents to change our educational system, a system that hasn't worked for a hundred years.

Last year, 4,000 of the 6,000 people who went into our institutions were there for the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh time. The shocking thing is that 2,000 of those 4,000 were under 20 years of age. When some members of this Assembly were elected eight years ago, some of these inmates were 8, 9, or 10 years old. That's the time when some of these decisions should have been made.

Hindsight is cheap. And it wasn't done. Okay. Let us not stand in our places in this Assembly today and talk about locking up 16 and 18 year olds and hoping to correct the system, and at the same time generate those very people in our system. So I suggest, Mr.

Speaker, there are areas where, as concerned members of the Assembly, we should be a little more serious. Instead of knocking the system, I suggest we get a little positive and try to correct it.

Mr. Speaker, the civic elections to be held Wednesday have certainly generated a lot of interest in all parts of Alberta, not just the periphery surrounding Edmonton. I would hope that the issues — one of them is revenue sharing — are sufficiently important that we'll have high turnouts at the polls. This is the one opportunity Alberta citizens have to make their candidates stand up and say not only what they believe, but indeed what they'll do if elected. It's encouraging to me.

Among those concerns facing the municipalities we have day care. Mr. Speaker, I suggest day care is a very important issue. Those who make the statement that the state should not look after the children are, I think, totally out of touch with the system. In Alberta two out of every three women work. In Alberta we have 13,500 single parents, with an average of two children each, all on public assistance. Perhaps there are another 40,000 single parents, but fortunately they're not on public assistance. Day care is a fact of life.

Day care is a fact of life, not just for economic reasons. In Lethbridge, just seven years ago, we had four or five divorces a month. Now with the Attorney General shifting the court system so that they won't be sitting in Lethbridge, we have 20 divorces every two weeks. Forty divorces a month may be very positive for mental health. I haven't looked into that part because I haven't been through it. But I suggest, Mr. Speaker, when you have this high rate of divorce, when you have the creation of single parents like we do, surely one must recognize that on the one hand we either pay more attention to the youngsters to prevent juvenile delinquents from developing, or on the other hand we encourage day care centres to look after these children. For I kid you not, Mr. Speaker and members of the Assembly, 10 years from now — and the members of the Assembly won't be able to say they didn't know, because all around us people are telling us this — it will be too late.

It's been said that Alberta is an island that has no water around it. Well we're not an island in terms of communications or social conditions; we're one of the leaders. And we in Alberta have a golden opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to set some examples for all Canada to see. It just takes a little bit of gumption, a little bit of perseverance, a few dollars, and an elected majority. God knows we've got the majority.

I'd like to make a few comments, Mr. Speaker, about two other areas of concern. One is the cost of utilities. I don't want to say very much about it, because most members in this House hear about it every day. Certainly you're going to hear it from the constituents before the next election. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, there's a matter of communication involved. Very few citizens in Alberta know that because the environmentalists have demanded certain standards — and perhaps government has supported them — a company like Calgary Power, in the past four years, has had to spend \$78 million extra on environmental standards. If I'm a shareholder of Calgary Power — I'm not, but if I were — I would certainly demand that Calgary Power give me a return on my investment. Surely, Mr. Speaker, it's not asking too much to

expect a utility company like Calgary Power to make a reasonable return on their investment, if they're forced to spend \$78 million on environmental standards. I think the public should know and understand that when they put the rates up and make application to PUB to have those rates increased, that should be brought out in the open. Unfortunately it's not broadcast across Alberta. Natural gas and the rest I would leave to more learned speakers than I, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to touch very briefly on an area I feel somewhat close to, and that is housing. In a recent study, carried out by the Minister of Housing and Public Works, we get an insight into some of the problems of housing. The study was done between five centres — Edmonton; Calgary; Lethbridge; Great Falls, Montana; and Billings — the smallest community being Lethbridge. Perhaps not many members are aware of this — I wasn't aware of it until I read this — but in a two-year period, from the fall of '74 to the spring of '77, raw land in Lethbridge went from \$2,500 an acre to \$26,000 an acre. When you start carving 3.5 or 3.8 lots out of that, Mr. Speaker, pretty soon, without any services at all, you've got some pretty expensive real estate. Is it any wonder that we're into the affordability problem.

In the past couple of years there have been some records established. In his speech the Premier referred particularly to housing. He talked about last year, when Alberta produced 39,000 units. This year if they're on target, and they are on target, there'll be about 31,000. I think, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to point out that in the few years since the 1975 election when this government became committed to an election platform that had housing as a number one priority, because it was a number one problem and concern for many Albertans, they created the ministry of Housing and Public Works.

In the United States we've seen, since that time, eight housing units built per thousand population. Because our migration policies into Canada were somewhat loose, we were getting many people from abroad, and the demand on housing in Canada was somewhat acute. In Canada we produced 11 housing units per thousand people. But in Alberta — and I think, Mr. Speaker, it's a record of which this government and the minister should be proud — recognizing that housing was the number one problem and the number one priority, they've produced 20.6 units per thousand population. That's a record unsurpassed anywhere in the world and certainly in North America.

The problem is, how do we get people in them? Now we're into the affordability problem. Some people have said housing is expensive. Is it expensive? I bought a home in 1961, when the great white father in Ottawa said that three to five times annual income was a good price to pay for homes. I suggest today it's not much different. Three to five times annual income will buy most people a house.

The significant fact we seem to forget, Mr. Speaker, is that interest rates have gone up 100 per cent. Legislators were wooed and persuaded 10 years ago to change the Bank Act. Bank stocks were a good buy in 1965, because lots of people have them and all they could charge was 6 per cent interest. But because the Bank Act could only be changed every 10 years, strong pressures were brought then to change it. What happened? Bank rates went up 100 per

cent. If you're paying on a mortgage and you have a 100 per cent increase, it goes without saying that out of every \$100 bill each year you pay on a mortgage, about 3 dollars is principal and the rest is interest. So when you get a 100 per cent increase in interest, you've got a real problem. That's the situation we're into in Alberta today.

The minister has proven that we've gone through that cycle of expensive housing. The average house price last year in Lethbridge, Alberta, was \$54,000. They have new houses this year in the show homes — because of actions taken by this government in terms of demonstration, new homes on their own land selling at \$48,000. So it works. The problem is affordability. With affordability we have two problems: one I've mentioned, and that's interest rates. Interest rates are at an all-time high, except for the year 1931-32.

The other area, Mr. Speaker, is the cost of utilities and taxes. Taxes on real estate are at an all-time high. As some members of the Assembly know, I'm in the process of building a house. I bought a lot from the city of Lethbridge. On it was nothing but weeds. It didn't take long — three months — and I got the tax notice: \$1,320 on that raw piece of weed-infested land. When I went to complain about the taxes, they handed me a notice telling me to get rid of the weeds. It had been there 10 years under them, but as you know on some of these municipal governments they're above responsibilities. And they didn't have to do it.

On the one hand, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where, when a ratepayer or citizen buys a lot, we're quite prepared to tax it. But when we look at people in this province who own the land surrounding our metropolitan areas, on certain parts of agricultural land — five sections — the taxes don't come that high. Neither this government nor any government has seen fit to change it. The new Planning Act hasn't changed it. The assessment regulations haven't changed it. I suggest that if we want to talk about affordability of housing, we've got to look at the total picture. We've got to look at what a person earns on the one hand and what he has to pay out, including mortgage interest and municipal taxes. And they're at an all-time high.

In *The Albertan* on Friday they were looking for salesmen around the Los Angeles area. Twenty-seven miles from downtown Los Angeles they want a salesman to sell 1,200 lots for \$975 apiece. And they've got water on them. I think you can find where the problem is if you look. Builders in Alberta today are not making what people think they're making. How can you pay \$40,000 in Edmonton for an acre of raw land; another \$40,000 to service it; the overhead in terms of interest charges; and the infrastructures, the lawyers, the accountants, and the city halls — and you end up having to sell that at \$40,000, as a lot. There's no way, Mr. Speaker.

The Minister of Housing and Public Works has been telling us this. But we haven't really believed him. The study the minister has concluded points it out. For those who haven't read it, I would recommend it. It's extremely interesting reading. I've had many favorable comments from members of HUDAC, from house builders who it appears have had a running battle with the minister over the past year or two because he doesn't always put things the way people

want to hear them. They've read this and said: finally the minister understands we're not the culprits, because we don't own the raw land, that only sufficient is released to keep the market up.

I'd like to close, Mr. Speaker, with just two minor comments. We hear about revenue sharing. I don't really know much about it. But I know that in the city I represent along with the Member for Lethbridge East, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in 1970-71, prior to this government, the total grants received by the city of Lethbridge were just over \$700,000. Last year, in 1976, the city of Lethbridge received \$5 million. I suggest that's pretty reasonable sharing. I for one, in my limited experience as a member of this Assembly, have never known a member of our Executive Council or the government *per se* to turn down any reasonable request by a municipality to solve a problem. This government has simply said, look, we're elected to raise taxes to run this province. We're prepared to participate with you, but we don't feel our mandate allows us to share with you part of those dollars we were elected to raise. Maybe it's right and maybe it's wrong. I would simply say for my constituency, and perhaps others, that they've done reasonably well.

I wanted to comment on something the Premier mentioned regarding hospitals. But in view of Bill 66, which was introduced on Friday, I'm sure that's going to be a very interesting debate.

Let me conclude, Mr. Speaker, by commenting on the very interesting contribution on unity made Friday by the Member for Calgary Buffalo. It seems all you hear in Canada today is about the price tag of Confederation; what it's costing either Quebec or the other provinces. I think the very excellent speech made by the Member for Calgary Buffalo the other day gave many Albertans, and probably all western Canadians, much to think about. I cannot visualize a Canada without Quebec. I cannot picture any country losing 26 per cent of its citizens overnight without being seriously affected. I also sincerely believe that if anybody from Prince Edward Island, British Columbia, or Quebec had the audacity or nerve to try to come into Alberta and dictate what I should or shouldn't do as part of Confederation, I know what I would tell them. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that some members in the province of Quebec have the very same idea when people across Canada try marching in and telling them what to do.

Thank you very much.

MR. MANDEVILLE: In making a few remarks to Government Motion 3, Mr. Speaker, I just want to carry on where the hon. member who just spoke left off: with water resources and water management. I want to add some more there.

I must also say I'm very pleased we're getting our hospital in Brooks. Even though the hon. member for Lethbridge is getting the largest building in the province, we're getting the most needed hospital in the province. I want to congratulate the minister for starting our hospital in Brooks before putting the moratorium. It was certainly a needed facility in the town of Brooks, and it's certainly appreciated by the constituents.

I do believe the Minister of Housing and Public Works on what he's trying to do as far as the cost of housing is concerned. I've been watching his reports,

and I certainly see that the cost of housing is getting out of hand. It's getting to where our people can't afford to buy houses any more.

While I'm dealing with the Minister of Housing and Public Works, I would like to recommend that we do more decentralizing when they're adding to our senior citizen homes in the province. I appreciate the senior citizens units that are being built throughout the province. However, in some of our senior citizen accommodations, our lodges, I think that would be well worth while. For example, in Brooks we're adding to our senior citizens' lodge from time to time. We're adding in Medicine Hat. Then we send our citizens from some of the smaller areas down to these lodges in the bigger centres. I think it would be well worth while to put up some smaller lodges. I realize they've got to be put up in units; it's got to be feasible. I'm thinking of the one at Bassano, and I'm pleased that the minister is looking at putting a lodge in Bassano. I think it's going to be an asset for the people in Bassano and some of our smaller areas to be able to stay in the areas where they grew up and are living.

I'd have to say, Mr. Speaker, that one of the highlights this past summer for me was a trip to northern Alberta. It was in regard to the pipeline in the north. It sure enlightened me as far as studies and the Berger report are concerned. We met with people in Inuvik, Tuktoyaktuk, and Yellowknife. We certainly didn't get the feeling that we got from the Berger report from the grass-roots people we visited with. We just didn't find any opposition to this pipeline in the north. The people realized and appreciated that the time has come when they can't live off the land. I would say there was some objection as far as the Brotherhood was concerned. However, we found the Eskimo, our Metis, and the other people almost unanimously supported development of industry in the north.

Touring the pipeline, I do agree they're putting the pipeline on the route it should go. However, I do hope we're going to be looking toward getting the Mackenzie delta developed and another pipeline from the Mackenzie delta down through the Yukon Territory. From the information we got up there, Arctic Gas and Dome Petroleum have spent a terrific amount of money in not really developing but searching out our resources in the Beaufort Sea. They certainly need some recognition for the amount of money they spent in this particular area as far as searching for resources up there. They've spent a terrific amount of money. I'm sure this is what's going to happen. However, I think they spent a lot of money on all the studies they did on pipelines. I really don't know if they accomplished that much.

One area gives me a lot of concern: the natives, the Brotherhood, our Indian people up there want their native claim. They're asking for exactly what Quebec is looking for: separatism. They want a small area up there which they can call their own. I certainly had to disagree with this, because I don't think we should be promoting anything like separatism in the north as Quebec is trying to promote down in Quebec. We tried to impress upon them that if they were getting claims on land, if the government was to allocate land to them, it would be separatism from Canada.

I certainly think the pipeline is going to be a great asset to Alberta, because there's certainly going to be

a lot of spinoff that's going to be appreciated by the province of Alberta. So I certainly agree with the announcement that they're going to go ahead and develop our northern natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the Premier recognizing in his speech the problems we have in agriculture. This is one industry we always do have problems in — and I think we always will. But it's nice to see they're being recognized, because the first step toward solving our problems is recognition of them. Sometimes I think we're putting too much emphasis on oil and gas development in this province, appreciating that that's a non-renewable resource. Somewhere down the line we're going to have to recognize that agriculture is going to be the prime industry in Canada. The sooner we're able to appreciate that, the better.

As I say, we always have problems in the agricultural industry. For example, in the cattle industry in the past four years, we have seen a terrific depression. It's been hard for our cow/calf operators to survive the depression we've had in the cattle industry. We do have a program that's going to be introduced this fall. It's the federal cow/calf program. However, I don't think it's going to solve the situation as far as the cattle industry is concerned. The reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that they're going to take the average over the last five years of the net income for the calf producer, and then they're going to pay 90 per cent. Well for anyone who has been following the cattle industry in the last five years 90 per cent of the average is an unrealistic figure, because we've only had one year in which we've had a reasonable price as far as the cow/calf producer is concerned, and that was in 1973. With the market situation as it is, I can't see any money coming from the federal government into the cow/calf industry this coming year.

I think what's going to happen, and I can see it happening now, is that it's going to switch from the cow/calf operator to the grain producer. I agree we're getting \$3 a bushel guaranteed on wheat right now, but this is not a significant factor. Because they can guarantee us \$3 a bushel for wheat, but if they don't take this wheat, where are we going to be with it? Last year we ended up with a small quota and this year we could end up with another small quota. What we've got to do, as the Premier said, is compete in the international markets. We've got to compete with Australia and the United States as far as our grains are concerned. I can certainly see where it's going to create many problems for our farmers in the next two or three years. Because with the high cost of input in agriculture for machinery and land, it's certainly getting out of hand for the farmers.

As I say, there are always hazards in our agricultural industry. This spring we were concerned about the drought. This fall we're concerned with wet weather, not being able to get our crops off. This is the type of hazard we're facing in agriculture. However, it's pleasing to see that we are having some favorable weather and that the farmers throughout the province are making great progress in getting their crops off. If we get a week of nice weather, I certainly hope they'll be able to get their crops off.

I'm going to be interested in seeing what the Hu Harries commission is going to do on the Hog Producers' Marketing Board. We certainly face problems

in the hog industry, where the Hog Producers' Marketing Board put a freeze on marketing hogs to the packer. I certainly hope we don't have to run into this type of situation, because it's certainly hard on the producer. I would like to see the Hog Producers' Marketing Board solve their problems without getting into areas where they've got to restrict our hogs from going to market.

I was interested when the hon. Member for Calgary Bow was talking about the Senate. I would just like to say to him — he's not in his place — that I was pleased. It's one of the first good things that's come out of the Senate. The Senate agricultural committee indicated they're going to present a bill to Parliament if they can't get some recognition as far as oceanic beef coming into Canada is concerned. I think this is certainly a step in the right direction.

MR. MOORE: They took my advice.

MR. MANDEVILLE: That's right, Mr. Minister. They took your advice, and I'm very pleased we got something coming out of the Senate.

DR. BUCK: That's going to be the first thing you've done.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Another area that does give me some concern is that under the compensation coming in now, they're going to take a lot of areas. I think eventually they're going to take everything under the wing of the Compensation Board. Some of the areas they're taking in, not only in agriculture but in other areas, concern me because it's hard to come up with a favorable schedule of fees as far as the Compensation Board is concerned. I hope the minister involved in this particular area will give it some consideration before we let too many of our industries and operations that really don't need to be under this type of legislation get under the wing of our Compensation Board.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, one of the major concerns I do have — and I was really pleased to hear our Member for Lethbridge West, who just spoke, mention — is water resources. I think this is an area the provincial government and the federal government neglect. I think we need much more emphasis on water management. We do have most of our emphasis on oil and gas. However, we're going to have to look down the road at some point, and we're going to have to look at water as one of our very important resources. I think we've got to come up with an overall water policy for Alberta. And I would like to see an overall water policy for Canada.

When we come up with this policy, what we've got to do, Mr. Speaker, is put priorities on where we're going to develop our water resources and which basins we are going to develop. I wouldn't like to see us just picking out one river and developing a basin without looking at the overall picture as far as the province is concerned. We have to take many factors into consideration: what returns to the province and so on we get as a result of developing our water basins. I am in full support of developing all the basins, as far as our water basins and water development in the province of Alberta are concerned. I really don't think we need all these extensive studies on our water development. I think we went over-

board as far as the studies on Site 6 on the Red Deer River are concerned. Whether the studies were adhered to, or whether we got information out of the studies, is not up to me to determine. However, I do think we spend too much time studying this. I think what we need is an overall water policy and to put priorities on our river basins.

As far as Site 6 is concerned, I understand it is going to involve 22 farmers. Whenever we're going to develop our water resources we're always going to be stepping on someone's toes, no matter how careful we are when we're developing our water resources.

While I'm on water resources, there's one decision the Minister of the Environment has made: to repair the Bassano Dam. I think to spend \$12 million to repair the Bassano Dam would be critical. The reason I say that, Mr. Speaker, is that if we repair that dam, I don't think it's going to be any advantage to the people of this province or to the agricultural industry. If we repair it, we're going to put a moratorium on developing any more agricultural land from there east for at least 50 years. If we're going to spend \$12 million, and it's going to be the PFRA that's going to be spending this money, I think the province should get involved, even if we have to hold it up for two or three years — or whatever period of time it is — before we go into developing the Bow River basin. Because I certainly don't like to see us spending \$12 million to repair that Bassano Dam, when anything could happen — it could go out the next year after they repair it. There's nothing saying it's not going to go out. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the Bassano Dam is only for diversion. It doesn't store any water whatsoever. It only diverts the water into an irrigation district.

In the letter that came back to the eastern irrigation district from the minister, the minister had indicated from the study that it was going to cost \$200 million to build the Eyremore dam. Well, I'd have to say this figure is unrealistic. I can recall when I mentioned in the House that it would cost \$50 million to put the dam in, the Minister of Housing and Public Works questioned me on my figures. However, we had this volume on our water resources done by 1970 by the Alberta Department of Agriculture. This study indicates that they could have put the Bassano Dam in at that time for \$26 million. However, that would only store 300,000 acre-feet of water. What the minister is talking about, \$200 million, stores a million acre-feet of water. And if we store a million acre-feet of water we're going to have an Indian war down there, because it's going to put a lot of our Indian reserve [land] under water. It's going to disturb farmers. But if we put 300,000 acre-feet of water in the Eyremore dam at \$26 million in 1970 — well, if I take the same figures we had on the Bassano Dam and take three times, it will take \$72 million to put that Eyremore dam in for one phase. I would certainly think this would be the way to handle this situation. As far as the irrigation districts are concerned, I know this is what they would like to happen, even if it is going to hold up our development for a short period of time.

I do think we've got to have internal storage in all our irrigation districts, and I'll agree that it's up to the irrigation districts to get involved to some degree in internal storage. But there's one point we've got to keep in mind when we get into internal storage: it's going to cost a lot of money. It's not just storing the

water; it is to enlarge the canals. We have to enlarge the canals to feed this internal storage, and this is going to cost large sums of money.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Minister of Agriculture will get involved in looking at rehabilitation of the Bassano Dam. I have talked to officials of the PFRA in the federal government, and I don't think at this point we should go ahead with the rehabilitation of the Bassano Dam.

I think before we do something like this, we should take a look at a new earth dam just downstream from the Bassano Dam where we could store some water. If we do put the Eyremore dam in, we don't need diversion. The water from the Eyremore dam will back up over the top of the Bassano Dam, we can use the canal we have there, and we don't need the Bassano Dam. So at this point I hope that the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of the Environment will certainly take a good look before they spend \$12 million or agree to spend \$12 million on the 1973 agreement with the PFRA. I think it will be a detriment to this province and a detriment to the agricultural economy for us to spend \$12 million or \$12.5 million repairing that Bassano Dam.

Another area I would like to make just a few brief remarks on is parks. I have had a lot of complaints from the parks in the province this past year. We do promote tourism, and the problem is when we promote tourism people come to our parks and we don't have room for them. We're turning campers away from our parks. I'm going to use an example of a park in my own constituency, and I don't think it's any different from some other parks. Down there they're putting in the stalls as far as our campers are concerned, and they reduced our camping accommodations by 50 per cent this year by doing this. I had many complaints from my own park down there. People couldn't get into the park as a result of putting in the stalls and cutting the campers down to half in the park.

As far as our regulations are concerned, I think they are too strict. I think our wardens in the park are spending far too much time regulating and controlling our tourists, our day people in the parks and campers. They're spending far too much time regulating and policing them. I think they should spend more time taking care of the parks, and our tourists can pretty well take care of themselves.

While I'm on this topic, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the minister in charge of parks that there is a proposal on the Kinbrook park down there that is certainly getting lots of criticism and opposition, and that is to eliminate day use of the Kinbrook park. This proposal was presented to a chamber of commerce meeting. I'm really pleased to see the minister shaking his head and saying no, because I think if there is anything to the proposal it is just backwards. I think if we got any new area down there we should use it for camping and use the present park, the 95 acres, for day use and cabin owners. We've got lots of land down there. The eastern irrigation district has acres and acres of land around the lake that could be used for development for day use or camping. So I'm real pleased to see the minister indicate they're not going to change our park at Kinbrook.

MR. ADAIR: As long as you don't flood it, you'll be all right.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Just so long as we don't flood it. I think there is a possibility of increasing the lake by three feet this year. The study that the Department of the Environment just had done on the eastern irrigation district indicated that they might be flooding the park later on.

MR. ADAIR: That's what worries me.

MR. MANDEVILLE: Mr. Speaker, I was going to make some remarks as far as The Planning Act is concerned. But The Planning Act, I understand, is going to be coming up for second reading on Wednesday, so I think I'll save my remarks on The Planning Act for Thursday. I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak on this resolution.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I move we adjourn debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion, do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, we'll be sitting again at 8:00 to continue debate on this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: I sense an implication in the remarks of the hon. Deputy Premier that we call it 5:30. Do you all agree?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Assembly stands adjourned until 8 o'clock this evening.

[The House recessed at 5:25 p.m.]

[The House met 8 p.m.]

[applause]

MR. MUSGREAVE: I wish I had that enthusiastic support last week, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the people of Calgary McKnight for giving me the opportunity to speak on this resolution this afternoon.

DR. BUCK: No campaign?

MR. MUSGREAVE: It's too bad the hon. member from north of here was not present.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to touch briefly on some areas that have come up in discussion of the resolution. One item that has been mentioned quite frequently which I have some concern about is sharing of hospital costs at the local level of government. I'd like to point out that while hospital costs are certainly rising in rather an alarming way, 60 to 70 per cent of the costs of running hospitals are for salaries, a matter that is under control of provincial legislation subject to global budgeting. So I do have some concern if we pass back some share of hospitalization costs to local municipalities before we've had an opportunity to hear from the Provincial-Municipal Finance Council and its consideration of this very important point.

I would like to see our government take more positive steps on preventive medicine. Many citizens are beginning to object to having to pay taxes to take care of citizens who are not looking after themselves. They're smoking, eating, drinking too much and exercising too little. They're objecting to paying high hospital costs to look after people who are bent on not looking after themselves. I would like to suggest that our government consider more educational programs to promote better health.

DR. BUCK: That includes conditioning, Paproski.

MR. MUSGREAVE: I appreciate that we are spending vast sums on research into popular medical fads, yet there is enough basic worldwide knowledge of health care: that diet, for example, or physical and mental practices do have very significant effect on our health. I think we should do more research on how we can help Albertans help themselves before they become sick, not after. Let's emphasize education more and compulsion less. I think, Mr. Speaker, if we did this we'd definitely see a greater saving in our tax dollars.

In a different vein, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who is concerned about our province's involvement in the pipeline debate. I'm quite sure that as he sees the events unfold he will realize that the interests of Albertans have been well protected. I have to echo, though, the thoughts of the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo. It's rather strange to hear members of this House who are now criticizing the government for not becoming involved in the pipeline debate, yet a short few weeks ago they were criticizing us for becoming involved in trips to the United States, or world tours which, I might point out, were arranged through the co-operation of the government in Ottawa. But they still felt our Premier and government were taking unilateral action, even though it was in the best interests of the province of Alberta. They seem to want it both ways all the time.

I agree too, Mr. Speaker, that there are some concerns with our Planning Act. All of us have been getting letters on some parts of the present act. A lot of constituents are not aware that many requirements of the present act were in the old act. But I think I would have concern if the act was not amended so there was not more concentration of power in Edmonton. I think all of us agree there should be more of this in the local areas, particularly where it's going to improve the planning process and, for example, get more housing on stream much faster.

The other area of the [speech] of the Leader of the Opposition that I'd like to debate, Mr. Speaker, is that he seemed to be concerned about building the dam on the Red Deer site, but he wanted it built on the expensive site. He wants us to continue to build hospitals regardless of the cost. He wants us to give more moneys to cities regardless of the responsibility to taxpayers who pay the bill. It's very clearly spelled out in his speech that he wanted us to spend more money. He even suggested that the heritage fund was becoming a slush fund. Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that if the opposition got into power, that's exactly what they'd make of the heritage fund, a slush fund to try to ensure they'd stay in power forever.

DR. BUCK: At least you'd get to talk about it in here.

MR. MUSGREAVE: That's right, Mr. Speaker. This is the place where it should be discussed.

Mr. Speaker, when you review the speech of our Premier, certainly it was a glowing report of the condition of our province. I think credit has to be given to the government and to the people of our province. I think we all have to recognize the good fortune we have in living in an area where we have a strong agricultural sector. We also have strong resource development. And in fairness to some members of the opposition, we had good government over many, many years before the Progressive Conservatives came to power.

But, Mr. Speaker, Alberta is an island of prosperity in a sea of uncertainty which is the rest of Canada. There are high living costs in other parts of the country, high unemployment, and terribly high government service costs. I recently motored across Canada and was amazed at the reaction of people, particularly in eastern Canada, to the problems of conservation of fuel and energy, of heating homes, and how very conscious they are of this and of the increasing cost. Nowhere did I find any resentment toward western Canada. If anything, I found apathy and almost an ignorance of western Canada. But many people in eastern Canada are certainly aware of the heating situation, the fuel problems, and our declining natural resources of this nature.

Mr. Speaker, we hear today of our dollar still declining and, you know, people are almost wringing their hands in doom and dismay. But according to a recent annual report of the C.D. Howe Research Institute, the incomes of Canadians in the period 1969 to 1975 have increased an average of 5.1 per cent per year, and these are disposable, after-tax dollars. In the same period of time, American citizen income increased 2.2 per cent per year; the West Germans, 4.1; France, 3.7; and British, 3.3. Even in a year of restraint, 1976, the increase in disposable, after-tax dollars was 4.5 per cent. What this has meant to some members of government in Canada, particularly those of a socialist bent, is that they are still complaining that the labor sector of our economy is not receiving enough of the economic pie. Yet obviously, according to the statistics, this is not the case.

But, Mr. Speaker, what has this increase in living standards meant to Canadians? Are we a happy, bright, cheerful, optimistic people? Have our riches brought us happiness? In our own province we have a high divorce rate, a high suicide rate, and a high alcoholism rate. As Miss Maxwell of the C.D. Howe Research Institute points out, it has brought Canadians bitterness, hostility, violence, alienation, mistrust, and uncertainty.

When we listen to the rhetoric of Canadians and compare our lot with other citizens of the industrialized world, we seem to have collectively lost our senses. We in the west have never had it so good, yet we're dissatisfied economically with Confederation. We cannot go back to the status quo. The west buys from the east, and we're hoping to sell our agricultural products in world markets at a profit. Mr. Speaker, even in spite of high unemployment Quebec is doing better. In 1969 the average income in Quebec in relation to Ontario was 79 per cent. In 1976 it's 89 per cent.

As we all know, an increase in the pay packet after two or three pay cheques is quite ordinary. We want more, and the politics of envy grips our country. It's not I'm all right Jack, but I'm doing better than you.

According to Maxwell, Canadians have lost confidence in the social contract that held our country together. The member from Buffalo mentioned the other day that we did nothing in a united way. I have to take advantage of my grey hairs and point out to him that many of us thought we did something in a united way during the 1939-45 period.

But, Mr. Speaker, what holds our country together today? Do we encourage our young people to go to university, to get degrees and professions so they can work hard, make more money, and take a more effective part in the community? Do we advocate to them a high code of ethics? Do we say, society will reward you as you are worthy? Do we reward a businessman if he's thrifty and hard-working? Do we allow him to keep the results of his toil, or do we take it away in taxes? Do we say to our farmers, you're not going to live poor and die rich; rather you're going to see some of the efforts of your work here on earth coming to you in your lifetime when you can enjoy it? We can do this only if we're not subject to excessive tax laws that see many of our people having to sell out to big companies, or projects stifled by excessive wage demands, in some cases set by example of unionized government employees.

Unfortunately today, Mr. Speaker, labor doesn't take its part in our community from the worth it contributes to a project, but rather [from] what it can organize itself and get, with a strong union, regardless of whether or not the project succeeds. Perhaps our doctrinaire socialists will get this message, Mr. Speaker, that the workers are not fighting the boss anymore; rather, they're fighting each other.

To add to our problems, salary has become confused with status. Many teachers resent the fact that blue-collar plumbers make far more than they do. Perhaps it never occurred to them that they may be contributing more to our economy.

A further cause of resentment, though, in our community is the fact that unearned income — unemployment insurance and welfare payments — has risen much faster than earned income. These all contribute to a feeling of national disunity.

Mr. Speaker, touching on national unity, I would come back again to the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition, and I'm sorry he's not here to hear this. But when he criticized our Premier, does he really expect Alberta to take a weak position in regard to national unity? Surely, Mr. Speaker, a strong Alberta will make a strong Canada. Our Premier has always spoken vigorously on behalf of Canada. As an Albertan but always as a Canadian, he's concerned about our nation, about our citizens, about our feelings for the future. Surely the Leader of the Opposition knows in his heart that our Premier is one of the strongest, most sincere, and most capable politicians in Canada and is working to keep our country together.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to rise and speak on Government Motion No. 3. In our Premier's review of the activities in this province on the opening day of our fall session, I was pleased to listen to the activities that he's been involved in in the

last several months. I was very pleased with his efforts on behalf of agriculture: his trip to Russia and the Far East to try to assess at first hand the possibilities of expanding agricultural markets in that area; his trips to the United States to get to know the people in the administration of that country, to find the opportunity of a better deal for agricultural products as they leave this country. There has been criticism of this by some people in this Legislature, trying to misinterpret the intentions of what was going on. I think our Premier has worked in closer relationship with the federal government than possibly any premier in his efforts to create for the people of Canada, not only the people of Alberta, a better opportunity to market their products in the world markets.

I think it's recognized that as inflation has taken a strong hold in this country, we are gradually pricing ourselves out of the world market. I don't think there is any doubt about this. It doesn't matter whether it's manufacturing or what it is, we've almost become non-competitive. Certainly with agriculture we are tied entirely to the world market price. Unfortunately, the world would certainly like to buy our food, but there aren't enough dollars in some of those countries to take this opportunity.

Tariffs certainly have been a long-standing problem as far as exports to the United States are concerned. We have been in a very unfair tariff situation. Our products have to go into that country at a higher tariff rate than theirs come back to ours, which is well recognized by the people in western Canada. It has been advocated by many people involved in the industries that some effort be made to try to correct this. Certainly when our Premier made this effort, I think it was well received by the Americans and well recognized by the people who were sincere about it in the federal jurisdiction. But I'm sorry that people who would rather criticize than do anything else have taken exception to this. I think time will tell the tale that probably these efforts will payoff, and agriculture will get a much-needed opportunity to compete on an equal basis in that export market.

The Premier has been criticized for his involvement in this matter and, on the next hand, saying that he should have sat in on the pipeline negotiations, which is hardly consistent to my way of thinking. His explanations were well understood by any who wanted to understand. I fail to see where opposition criticism for the sake of criticizing is going to be a very saleable product if some of these negotiations happen to bear fruit.

I would like to dwell just for a moment on the fact that the pipeline that will be coming out of the north and going through this province is certainly going to be a boon to our industrial economy and to our labor force. When we see Syncrude successfully winding down on schedule, we're certainly going to have men and material available for the pipeline construction. If we can keep our labor force occupied in construction of this nature, certainly the whole economy is going to benefit from it.

To go on now, some of our newer legislation has come in for criticism by the opposition, and they have been doing quite a job of selling it to the people in Alberta in a negative manner. I feel that with any legislation that is put on the books at the close of the spring session and put out to the public for the summer, we're certainly in a position where we can

honestly say that the legislation is going to have every opportunity to be understood by the people of the province before it is enacted. I feel that some of the amendments that have been made to correct old legislation, and have been accepted since 1963 and not recognized as being too harsh — we're now prepared to write guarantees into the legislation that things of concern will be written in in such a manner that they will not be oppressive.

I feel that criticism of The Planning Act has been more a fear of the people of rural Alberta that more legislation that could be more restrictive was taking away some of their rights. But if we recognize the rapid growth that is taking place at the edge of our metropolitan areas and around our smaller cities, we recognize that planning certainly has to be part and parcel of the way development takes place. It would be utter chaos if we hadn't had a Planning Act in the past to control growth and the form of development that has taken place. I feel that The Planning Act, as it has been rewritten, is mainly an effort to try to streamline some of the bottlenecks that have taken place in subdivision development. I think the time lag has certainly been very expensive in some developments. With the enactment of the new Planning Act, I hope this streamlining will help.

Being a rural member, I feel that agriculture has to be uppermost in my mind. I'm going to try to express the feelings and greatest concerns of the people involved in the industry in my area.

Anybody who's been at all close to agriculture over the last five years recognizes that while this province is in an economic boom, agriculture certainly is not. Our livestock has been sold at a very meagre price over the last four years, and our grain is now well below the price that it was even two years ago. With the steady increase in cost, there isn't any doubt that the profit margin in agriculture is getting very thin.

One thing that strikes home to me particularly is the fact that our younger farmers are the most vulnerable. The large percentage of land that has changed hands in Alberta since 1970, at escalated prices, has put probably the heaviest debt load in history on agriculture at the present time. While in the past we've seen depressions, times of poor markets, and poor crop conditions, the overall operating cost of a farm in those days was a fraction of what it is today.

With the better farming methods we've got, I think we certainly have with a limited amount of labor and a maximum amount of equipment probably the most efficient agricultural production in this province that there is anywhere in North America. I think our farmers are to be commended for the fact that, as labor costs went up, they were able to keep production up while we've lost a big share of our farm labor pool. With today's prices it's almost back to where the family farm is the only one that can function. Anyone who was out in the country over the last weekend found farmers, their wives, and their teenage children running combines around the clock to take in a harvest that we thought might get snowed under. In 10 days of decent harvest weather I think this crop will be in the bin with a minimum of outside labor involved. At the present time it's almost a non-existent thing for farmers to be able to compete in the labor market.

I think we've got to recognize that if we operate

selling our grain on the world market and our cost of production continues to increase, we're going to get to the point somewhere down the road where the cost of production is literally going to exceed any hope of breaking even. If agriculture gets pushed into the corner, the young people will be the first to suffer and the first to fall because they are carrying the high mortgage loads of today. If we lose these people out of the industry, there is no doubt they will be reluctant to return. I would hate to see agricultural production in this country drop off simply at the expense of other industries competing for labor, and our cost of production literally exceeding what the world will pay for our products.

I'd like to commend the Minister of Education for the completion of his curriculum study and the wide acceptance it has had among the professional people involved in education. I think it shows that a distinct and honest effort was made to produce something that people really wanted in education. We've heard that back to the basics was too extreme, that the philosophy was going possibly too far. But I think we've come up with what the people are looking for in education. Certainly I feel that if we can produce an acceptable system of education, our young people possibly will be more enthusiastic about it. The more people we have completing their formal schooling, the better equipped they are to go on and take their place in the world.

There have certainly been some stormy times over the last few years in our school system. I'm certainly not of the opinion that all the blame can be laid on the door of our educational system. I think the children of today are the product of an environment where things have been very affluent, and as parents we have possibly not been quite as strict as we were brought up ourselves. I think we can't lay on the door of our educational system all the problems that have arisen, because the family is the place where discipline is first taught. If it's not properly done there, certainly the educational system can't do all the work that has been left undone.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I've mentioned a few of the things that are important to me. I hope as this debate goes on that the rest of the members will have the opportunity to express their views. I look forward to the opportunity of listening to them.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few remarks related to the Premier's comments of last Wednesday. I too was very impressed with his remarks. He covered a great many areas with such obvious in-depth understanding. I would like to congratulate the Premier on his speech. As the Member for Calgary Buffalo said so well last Friday, the Premier's drive and energy are an example not only for all of us here in this Legislature but for all Albertans.

In listening to the Premier's remarks last Wednesday I was reminded of the great Roman statesman Cicero. Cicero made a number of suggestions that could be used as criteria for citizens to examine whether their government is doing a good job. His suggestions were that the budget should be balanced, the treasury should be filled, public debt should be reduced, and the people should work and not depend on the government for subsistence. Keeping in mind that Cicero lived about two thousand years ago, I

think his criteria seem to be pretty relevant today. In any case I think he would judge that Alberta is getting good government today. I think that needs to be said; after all we're not going to get too many bouquets from the opposition members.

Since the spring session, Mr. Speaker, I have spent a considerable amount of time in my constituency of Calgary Bow listening to the views and concerns of my constituents. I think I can say that in general, it is their view that they are getting good government here in Alberta, and they are pleased to be living in a healthy and prosperous province.

I'd like to turn, Mr. Speaker, to the economy, not only of Alberta but of Canada in general. For some time now I think the news media have paid and are continuing to pay a great deal of attention to the questions of national unity, Confederation, the French language issue, and the upcoming Quebec referendum. In fact, I checked *The Albertan* this morning, and of the seven headlines on the first three pages, six were dealing with Canadian unity, Quebec, bilingualism, and the French language. The whole matter is important and worthy of much discussion, but I think it's directing the public attention away from some of the very serious economic issues this country needs to address itself to.

I was pleased when the Premier outlined in his remarks last week a number of longer term structural economic problems which arose from the premiers' conference in New Brunswick. They are indeed important to the economic future of this country.

I'd like to spend a moment on the third area outlined in the New Brunswick communique: the need for a more aggressive trade policy and improvements in the balance of payment situation. In 1976 Canada's international balance of payments was a net deficit of \$4.9 billion, with an accumulated deficit between '72 and '76 of over \$11.6 billion. Other members who spoke before me, Mr. Speaker, said that Canada's competitiveness in world markets is going downhill. It's been declining since the mid '60s. According to a report of the OECD, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, the volume of Canada's manufactured exports, excluding automotive products, has decreased by 25 per cent since 1962. Today Canada's share of world exports to all countries is only three-quarters of what it was in 1969. With increasing deficits forecast due to increasing oil imports, I think the whole balance of payments situation is going to get worse, and can only be described as disastrous.

I'd like to mention a couple of more stats related to our servicing of debt to the United States. For the first three months of 1977, Canada sent payments of over \$1 billion to the United States on its U.S. debt. That was a 21 per cent increase over the same period in 1976. During 1976, the total servicing of debt to the United States was \$4.1 billion, about the same as our overall deficit. We are, I think, a country living beyond its means. We are like a home-owner who's borrowing money from a bank in order to finance our mortgage payments.

The Premier pointed out how fortunate we are with respect to our own economy in Alberta, with the exception of course of agriculture. My constituents, I think, are pleased with the economic benefits that will be forthcoming with the new pipeline. I think they also recognize that there are going to be a

number of social problems in the city of Calgary, related particularly to possible influx of unskilled workers. Still, I think it's more pleasant to be dealing with the problems of growth and prosperity than with the problems of lack of growth that some parts of our country are dealing with today.

Switching from the topic of the economy, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a look at a topic that I don't know has been discussed here for a while. That is the implications in Alberta resulting from the changing age structure of our population. Members may recall the baby boom following the Second World War, or maybe have even contributed to it. This boom was followed by low birth rates in the '60s. The result is that a bulge is moving through our system, much like a bulge moving through a python that has eaten a rabbit or a pig.

AN HON. MEMBER: Pregnancy.

DR. WEBBER: Pregnancy. This bulge will go through our system until it's digested. But I think this bulge has had significant effects on us as a province and a country, and it will continue to do so.

First, we had the enormous expansion of the post-secondary educational facilities of the '60s. Secondly, the labor market has absorbed, and is being asked to absorb, unprecedented numbers of new workers, many of whom are overqualified for the jobs they are performing. There should be, I think, a slackening off in the new entrants in the early '80s as the bulge moves through. The 18- to 24-year-old age group, in particular, is expected to decline from the period 1983 to 1992. At least it's expected to decline nationally; whether it will in Alberta is difficult to say. It may only level off. This 18- to 24-year-old age group has traditionally been the principal age group for colleges and universities. So what is going to happen to enrolments in our Alberta colleges and universities in the next few years as this age group declines or levels off?

With the economic activity expected to continue in Alberta, there should be substantial migration of 18- to 24-year-olds to this province. However, I think most of the people in that age group will be coming to Alberta with the purpose of trying to find jobs rather than going to colleges or universities. Therefore we might expect there would be a decline in this particular age group in our postsecondary institutions. However, this may not mean there will be a decline in the overall postsecondary enrolments.

I say that because of some recent changes that have taken place in the age breakdown of students at our postsecondary institutions. For example in 1968-69, the 18- to 24-year-old age group made up 82 per cent of the total postsecondary student enrolment in Alberta. In '74-75, that dropped to 63 per cent. So we have more older people going back to school, more people going back who are thinking about embarking on a second career which would require more training and education.

As the enrolments level off or are expected to level off, we might expect several fairly serious implications. One is that educational funding will be tighter for postsecondary education. Secondly, colleges and universities will be competing for the available pool of students in the province. Because of this competition, I think we may see these institutions utilizing

well-established techniques of the business world — such as market surveys, feasibility studies — in order to try to reach more students or get students to come to their particular institutions in both credit and non-credit areas. I think more women, more retired people, and more people who want to embark on a second career will be the targets of postsecondary institutions in their attempts to get students to come to their particular places.

A third implication for universities is that I think we are going to have difficulties with younger prospective faculty members getting jobs in postsecondary institutions. This will be particularly difficult because of the tenured faculty remaining and not being able to move around because of lack of jobs. I think this could have implications on the quality of scientific research. I say that because I think it tends to be the younger researcher with the younger, more creative mind who does the better research at our postsecondary institutions. I think the situation in Alberta, in Canada, maybe even in North America, can be described as it was by a gentleman named Clark Kerr. He says that higher education is tenured in by its faculty and walled in by its physical plant for the next 20 to 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to turn to the effects of this ageing as it pertains to our senior citizen population. In Canada now, somewhat over 8 per cent of our population are senior citizens. This is heading for 12 per cent in the next 20 to 25 years. This increase in seniors, I think, certainly has many implications for priority changes in our planning in such areas as housing, medical facilities, and social institutions. In Alberta, we've been meeting the needs of our elderly by building large numbers of senior citizen homes, self-contained units, lodges, nursing homes, and auxiliary hospitals, but can we continue to meet the needs of the coming senior citizen increases in the same way? Possibly a higher priority should be the consideration of alternatives to reduce the increasing rate of institutionalization. One alternative may be the provision of home care or home support services. This would enable the elderly to remain in their own homes longer. In fact this summer the Senior Citizens Central Council of Calgary stressed this point in a meeting with Calgary MLAs. I guess there's been a follow-up on that in terms of their making a written presentation.

Mr. Speaker, I think this ageing phenomenon raises another problem: pensions and the age of retirement. It has recently been predicted that the Canada pension plan will be a financial disaster by the year 2000. What's the solution? Do we increase the retirement age or do we eliminate compulsory retirement at age 65? Right now the U.S. Congress is expected to pass a law prohibiting compulsory retirement at age 65 or at any other age. The Ontario Human Rights Commission recently called for a similar law. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there are pros and cons to the argument of compulsory retirement at age 65. However, I feel there are more cons than pros. The Canadian Union of Public Employees this month either has dealt with or is going to deal with a resolution that retirement should be voluntary, and the Canadian Labour Congress is also opposed to compulsory retirement.

Mr. Speaker, during the month of June I spent considerable time door-knocking, talking to people in my constituency, and as a result of that I would like to

talk briefly about just two more things. One is the area of utility costs, where more people indicated concern than on any other issue brought up. Those who were particularly concerned were senior citizens or those on fixed incomes. I would like to say two things about this, Mr. Speaker. First, I think the public tends to be unaware of this government's commitment to have the lowest heating costs in the country. They tend to be unaware of the fact that we have the natural gas price protection program. A number of them were surprised when we mentioned that we have this program in place.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, I think people tend to be unaware, as mentioned earlier by the hon. Member for Lethbridge West, of the reasons for rate increases and that these rates are established by the Public Utilities Board. So I think there has to be more emphasis on informing the public as to why their heating and telephone bills are going up. And I think each MLA in this Legislature can play a role in informing our constituents of the reasons for this. I feel that not only MLAs but the utility companies themselves have a part to play in this information process.

I would just like to say that the utility companies, primarily the companies that supply electrical energy and those involved in telecommunications, need to secure rate adjustments to ensure that utility revenues are sufficient in order to attract capital. Again this was mentioned by the Member for Lethbridge West earlier today. Both these areas are very highly capital intensive, and the needs that have come about in the last few years in these areas have been phenomenal.

Mr. Speaker, the other area some of my constituents brought up was Bill 41. I would say that during the course of that month I encountered approximately 40 to 50 people who are civil servants themselves in the province of Alberta, and not one indicated that he was concerned or upset with this particular bill. All the complaints I have received have come from executive members or people involved in the Alberta Union of Provincial Employees.

Recognizing the length of time I have been talking, I'll close now and indicate that I look forward to the rest of the fall session. Some hon. members have referred to The Planning Act. In particular I look forward to the debate in that area.

Thank you.

MR. WOLSTENHOLME: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to speak on Government Motion No. 3 by the hon. Premier. My remarks will be rather short, because as you get down this far on the list most of the remarks have been made, and I don't like to do too much repeating. Most of the items have been quite well covered. The remarks made by my urban colleague the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo about the hon. Premier's speech said it much better than I could, so I'll just heartily endorse and concur in what he said.

But I can't say that I can concur in some of the remarks made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The hon. Leader of the Opposition said that no hospital board in its right mind would criticize the government or the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. The hon. leader has apparently condemned many hospital boards as not being in their right minds because many of the hospital boards did criticize.

The Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Spirit River-Fairview criticized the government for not doing anything during the last six months, not being very responsive to the needs, and just in general ignoring the feeling of the people. Well, in the last six months in my constituency I must indicate that the cabinet and the government have been very responsive and sensitive. Just to name a few, the hon. associate minister responsible for public lands came to my area to meet and speak with concerned ranchers about Crown lands, and this was a very worthwhile exercise. The Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care met with the High River Hospital Board.

Another worth-while trip was the cabinet tour, which kept many hon. ministers very busy and took them out to meet the people in the southwest portion of the province. As a result the Premier and some cabinet members, in consultation with me, agreed that the High River hospital area had the highest population growth in Alberta and a very high senior citizen population. So, by listening and responding to the needs and concerns of the people of southwestern Alberta, they relaxed the holding pattern on the High River General Hospital, and they are very, very pleased down there about it.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has responded dramatically to a good many of the concerns about Bill 15.

So it would seem to me that these few items I've mentioned would indicate that the government of Alberta is very sensitive and listens and responds accordingly to the needs of its people. Mr. Speaker, I must say I'm very proud to be a part of that government for the work that they must have done in the rest of the province, as they did for the constituency of Highwood.

MR. ZANDER: Mr. Speaker, it certainly is a privilege to speak for a few moments on Motion No. 3 and the address the Premier gave us a few days ago regarding the state of the province of Alberta and as he looked into the future of the dominion of Canada.

I listened to the Premier very intently that day, and I think, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say he's probably the greatest statesman, the greatest politician of this day. There is nobody on the horizon who could even compare to the man who is leading this province. It likens to me as he spoke — if this hon. gentleman from Clover Bar would only pipe down, his turn will come — and I compared the two gentlemen. As a teen-ager sometime in the '30s when I was going to Concordia College, we hired Frank Adby's truck to listen to a great savior, a great politician who had come to save the economic ills of this province and also Canada. Mr. Speaker, I am of course referring to the late hon. William Aberhart, former Premier of this province.

I can recall that day, standing in Kelly's Hall as a bewildered teenager. Here was the great saint, the person who was going to save the province. I might say I think he achieved this to a great degree. But I can also recall the words he said: in Alberta we have 50 millionaires today, and when I'm through there aren't going to be any. Well I think the Social Credit government in previous years proved that they have to have these millionaires, people who are willing to invest money, who are willing to take the chances and the risks. The free enterprise that both the

former government and this government proclaims and tolerates is probably one of the best influences in western Canada today.

Mr. Speaker, it is sort of sickening to see the daily newspapers, the screen, perhaps four or five times a day, dealing with separation and the bilingual problems that we have in Canada. Frankly, the people of this province, at least in my constituency, are sick and tired of reading it on four pages of the news dailies, and probably about three pages of the weeklies, and having it on the tube every day.

I think we know what our problems are. But I also think the unity issue in this Canada of ours is not as severe as is unemployment, the economic issue. I think if you give these people sufficient jobs, pride in a job, take-home pay, ownership of a home, they'll soon forget they were talking about separatism, because idle hands are the devil's workshop.

If any of you hon. gentlemen saw the federal government's issue on CBC the other night you would probably liken it to the thing that was on the Syn-crude offer some few weeks ago. It is strange that we have to look at a federal government that has wasted money in every corner — in anything we can think of, it's there. It brings one thing only to mind: the almost \$1 billion that's trying to create, or foster, bilingualism in the civil service, and is only receiving a 10 per cent achievement. This is certainly something we regret.

The hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo outlined in this Legislature just the other day what most people feel, not only in his constituency but also in many other constituencies in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the new pipeline is supposedly coming in and will be upon us within next three or four years. I think we as Albertans will enjoy some of the benefits, but we will also have some of the social problems that go with it. One goes in hand with the other. I know that part of this pipeline will be going through my constituency, as we look at the map of the proposed route.

MR. GHITTER: You've got all the money.

MR. ZANDER: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, all of us throughout the province look about our constituency and the neighbouring constituency and see how each one fares and what the various needs in our constituencies are. I did one thing this year that I had never done before, and I certainly can recommend it — especially to the urban members, because they don't seem to get out of their urban environment into the rural areas.

AN HON. MEMBER: We're too busy working.

MR. ZANDER: Well, Mr. Speaker, my tour first of all took me through — as I was employed two weeks in the northern part of the province. By the way, I see the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview is not here. I probably already told him what I was going to say, so he left. I did a very thorough drive through his constituency and that part of the Peace River and Grande Prairie block. I was surprised.

First of all the crops were late, but they were good crops. I certainly hope the farmers were able to reap the benefits. I found the rural roads — and I will underline this, Mr. Speaker — far superior to any

within a 30- 40- or 50-mile radius of Edmonton. Their highway system was good. There are excellent hospital facilities . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: They must have an opposition member.

MR. ZANDER: . . . far superior to some of the constituencies.

DR. BUCK: Must have been roads Taylor built.

MR. ZANDER: So I wonder why the hon. member sometimes complains about rural roads, because he should be looking at some of our constituencies where roads are subjected to more and heavier traffic than up there. I think this is the reason their rural roads are in such good shape.

Secondly, I went to the well-known constituency of the former Minister of Highways, the hon. Gordon Taylor. He was minister there for a number of years. I took quite a drive through there. I will say this: he has served his constituency well, regardless of what anybody says. I found the roads to be excellent and in good condition. The feeling amongst the people is that if he should run on an NDP ticket I think he would get elected. But I don't think he would ever do that.

I found the health facilities . . . Now, Mr. Speaker, this is something I found and cannot understand. Perhaps this government is not at fault, because I think some of it was brought in by the other government. I think we'll have to give some credit to the present Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care. He's trying to do something that nobody has had the courage to do for a long time, that is to do away with the Hospital Services Commission. I'll give you my reason, Mr. Speaker.

I found there were four hospitals within a 41-mile driving range. Two were new, and two were not. Now I ask you hon. gentlemen to judge whether the need was there or whether the Hospital Services Commission had erred, because in this day and age, with the improvement of roads and highways, it surely should not be necessary to have a hospital every 10 or 12 miles. Consequently, how can we expect to staff those hospitals with doctors, who are hard to come by. How can these hospitals then operate, probably on a reduced basis, because they are not able to get enough doctors to staff them. It is as reasonable to expect that we should have a hospital 10 or 12 miles out of the city and four large hospitals in Edmonton which have excellent services. They not only have excellent service, they also have the staff which is far superior to any the country hospitals can possibly get. Surely it should be known that we have a 40-minute drive to hospital, which would get most people to hospital where there are good services. Let's reduce the costs of hospitalization and convert some of these hospitals to extended health facilities, and keep some active treatment beds as well.

Mr. Speaker, in the northern part of this province we've had perhaps the most rain recorded for a good many years. My constituency did not escape the rain. I can well recall that we were planning for a very dry year when we were sitting in here this spring. I said it was questionable that anybody who was born in this area could certainly say that we've had at times

at least more rain than sunshine so close to the mountains.

The improvement in the price of cattle has come about gradually. The people that stuck with the cattle industry will perhaps come out in the next few years and not lose too much money. But I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker; if we didn't act with haste when the hog question came about. I know many producers in my constituency have questioned that. Maybe we should have waited a week or two longer, because all producers were willing to wait.

This year the grain farmers have had one of the worst setbacks they've had in a number of years. Prices are depressed and the grain is of low quality. Perhaps if the weather continues we will be able to salvage some of it.

This brings me to the constituency again. In the past two or three years we have poured millions of dollars, perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars, into the tar sands. We have forgotten some of the areas that were doing the producing some 20 years ago, and still are. I'm referring to the discovery of a new field in my constituency, the second in 23 years. Probably the rumours are not true. I don't know. I'm not going to comment on them. Certainly I will have to give credit to the Minister of Transportation who saw fit to give us a small grant on that road leading into the field. I went over it just yesterday and found the county had made marvellous repairs to the road. It seems traffic is moving again. So I would say, Mr. Speaker, I think . . .

MR. GHITTER: Paved with gold.

ANHON. MEMBER: Zander's gold.

MR. ZANDER: You know, Mr. Speaker, listening to the speakers all around me, I have one from Calgary Buffalo and one from Whitecourt who say the streets are paved with gold. I would like to have taken him out there the Tuesday when school opened. I had a number of mothers waiting patiently in my home to get an answer as to when the school buses were going to run. It seems that in the past two years we had difficulty moving children to school. I can't understand why the hon. gentleman from Calgary Buffalo is saying we have gold-paved roads. Maybe he does get some of the gold from us, but none of it stays there very long.

AN HON. MEMBER: Gold's what you fill teeth with.

MR. ZANDER: I'll have to see the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

But this is our problem. I think in looking at the roads in the south and north, Mr. Speaker, when you have traffic going over a road — over 1,200 vehicles clocked in a 12-hour period — we can't liken a road of this nature to any other part of the province because no county, no municipality, can maintain a road of that kind.

Then of course I have to say something about The Planning Act.

ANHON. MEMBER: Impossible.

MR. ZANDER: Mr. Speaker, I've had probably the most letters — they weren't very complimentary to

the Minister of Municipal Affairs, whoever dreamt of that act. But I think I probably distributed something like 65, maybe 100; I don't know how many letters I answered.

But frankly we have to have planning; there's no question about it. But I question the planning, the representation on the planning commission or on the region. When the planning commission here in the city of Edmonton can determine what is going to happen a hundred miles west of here, it doesn't seem reasonable. The reason I'm making that comment is that I have talked to people. I've gone through the transaction where a farmer was trying for two years to give his son five acres, the first parcel of a quarter section. After two years I don't know whether he gave up but I'm sure he did, and all because it has to go through the regional planning commission.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have to have planning around the major centres of this province, maybe 30 or 40 miles out from the centre, because they have to have orderly planning. But can you expect to see the Edmonton regional planning commission sitting on a question of subdivision out at Lodgepole, 123 miles from here, where the moose run? It just doesn't make sense. Yet we have to go out and make the application; it is turned down and goes to the Edmonton appeal board. I venture to say the appeal board deals with it more. I think they're backed up a long way. I'm going to speak on that bill, Mr. Speaker, but I believe where common sense prevails there is room to deal with subdivision through the provincial part of planning rather than the regional planning commission.

I have to mention this one thing, though, that I wanted to talk about, and that is I feel for the Minister of Hospitals and Medical Care, as I said before. I was in one hospital that we as a government built at a cost of almost \$7 million. I'm not going to tell you which one it is. I would say, Mr. Speaker, going through that structure, that if somebody opened the doors I could drive the patient right up with the ambulance to the admitting office. Maybe I could even negotiate the curve, but I would say that I could back that thing out. Something as elaborate as that is certainly not called for. I think when there are as many hospitals that need upgrading in this province, that was one of the things that should not have happened.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DR. BUCK: I will just take a few moments to take part in this debate. There are several things I would like to respond to in the Premier's speech on the state of the union. I'm glad the hon. Member for Drayton Valley brought up the question of, I think, lavish, extravagant, and uncontrolled costs that have gone into some of these hospital facilities. I don't know where the minister or the commission were when they were handing out the money for some of these magnificent edifices. I know of one too, hon. Member for Drayton Valley, where — and my eyes are getting a little weak — I can hardly see from the front door to the centre of the nursing station. You could have a square dance for about 40 people in the waiting room. Well, you know, you don't look after patients in waiting rooms. You look after patients in hospital beds.

So I would like to say to the hon. government

members that I think the first thing they should do is get rid of the minister who is responsible for that. We've been trying to say that to the Premier, and he hasn't been listening. So if the minister — and I am sorry he isn't here — hasn't resigned, he should be asked to resign. Because how can you suddenly find out that there's a problem, when you've been a minister for a year and a half or two years?

MR. TRYNCHY: [Inaudible] the hospital commission.

DR. BUCK: The hospital commission? The dollars ultimately come from the government side, and the government is responsible for that expenditure of money.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get back to the response to the speech on the state of the union. It's quite interesting to call that a state of the union speech, because we seem to be getting the presidential system more and more in this Legislature. The only portion of it that doesn't work is that we don't seem to have any spending restraints on the Premier. He flies around the province and we'll drop a park here, and we'll drop a hospital there, and we'll drop a provincial building here. I'm afraid, when we have the election in the fall of 1978, how many goodies the Premier is going to be dropping on his rounds at that time out of the heritage trust fund. You can quote me on that, Mr. Speaker. In the fall of 1978 we'll be having a general election in this province.

MR. TRYNCHY: What date?

DR. BUCK: I will let you know the date in the spring sitting, hon. Member for Whitecourt.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier mentioned the congratulations to the new president of the Indian Association of Alberta, Joe Dion. I know the gentleman well. For you members who do not know the gentleman, all you have to do is look at the area where he has served and see what that man has done for his people. I am sure he will do the same for all of his people in this province. I say to the president of the Indian Association that our doors are always open, and we are willing to co-operate with the native people of this province to help them to help themselves. I know it's a little difficult to get through government doors, but our doors are always open.

The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview mentioned the fact that several of us under the chairmanship of the Minister Without Portfolio responsible for Calgary affairs, the Hon. Stewart McCrae, who was chairman of the committee to select the Chief Electoral Officer — and I would like to say it was a pleasure once again to work with the hon. Minister Without Portfolio from Calgary. I'm glad to see he is doing a little bit to earn his \$35,000 a year. I couldn't figure out what else he was doing, but I'm glad at least he's been doing that. But he did a good job on that, so maybe with a little bit of luck and musical chairs — which I hope will occur before the next general election, because after that the Premier may not have that prerogative. The Minister Without . . .

MR. KOZIAK: You and who else, Walter?

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to caution the hon. members on the government side. That's what

Premier Bourassa said, and that's what Premier Schreyer said.

[Mr. Notley entered the House]

MR. KOZIAK: Here comes your lieutenant.

DR. BUCK: It can never happen to us. But I would like to remind the hon. government members that there are a lot of people in this province who didn't trust this government when they put them in, and they trust them even less now. And when we go through the charade of the public hearings — and I say "charade" because that's all it is, Mr. Speaker; it's nothing but a charade when we have the public hearings that now go under the guise of the completely destroyed Environment Conservation Authority. It is nothing more than a charade.

I would relate to the hon. members of this Assembly just exactly how this tokenism operates. In my constituency in the south Cooking Lake area we are afraid the big hand with the green pen is going to come and put a great big RDA from the western end of Cooking Lake to the end of Beaverhill Lake, an expanse of approximately 20 miles. The people in that area are afraid that they will not have the due process of law to fight big government. At that so-called public meeting the Department of the Environment laid on us one Wednesday evening — the information arrived for some of those people Wednesday morning that there was going to be a meeting Wednesday night — the Department of the Environment people said, don't take too many copies of the report, because we don't have that many available. That night the people from the Department of the Environment asked those people who will be directly affected to make a decision whether they thought this was a jolly good plan the Department of the Environment had come up with.

Mr. Speaker, if that is public input, if that is the kind of public meeting this government thinks serves the purpose of democracy, I think they have been listening to different people than I've been listening to. At that follow-up meeting there was a man I think I would like to have as my campaign manager. If a politician stands up and lambastes the government they think, well, that's just a lousy opposition member speaking. But when a gentleman stood up at that meeting and tried to inform the reeve of the County of Strathcona and me, who were invited guests . . . The Minister of the Environment was invited but I'm sure he had another appointment. There must have been somebody in the Department of the Environment who could have showed up. But they were all too busy to show up at the meeting. That gentleman got up, Mr. Speaker, and laid it on the line to those people. He said, we think we're going to be had because we asked the people in the Department of the Environment to go back to their minister and say, we want to have further dialogue with the Department of the Environment and the minister; we don't want this to be our only token input into the question under study.

Shortly after that first meeting in south Cooking Lake, Mr. Speaker, when the people gave specific instructions to the Department of the Environment people to please take back to your minister that we would like to find out how we can have continuous dialogue and continuous input, that we do not want

you to make a decision until you have consulted with us, two days after the second meeting here in Edmonton there was a press release that said there will be no further public meetings. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that's not tokenism, I don't know what is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Close the door.

DR. BUCK: Just pat the people on the head nicely, government members. Just pat them nicely and say, boys, you've had your chance to have your little meeting; now the government will make its decision in all its wisdom. I'm sure they must have all the wisdom, Mr. Speaker, because they don't listen to any of the recommendations of the Environment Conservation Authority.

MR. NOTLEY: They're all experts.

DR. BUCK: They're all experts? The Minister of the Environment is the expert. Why do we go through the charade of having these so-called public meetings when we don't listen to the people in the area, when we don't listen to our own authority, and the Premier says, well, it shouldn't really be called an authority because it shouldn't have that kind of power. But as the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview said in the Conservatives' own words, when we the former government that was interested in protecting the environment brought the Environment Conservation Authority into being, the government didn't think it was strong enough. Now they have completely wiped it out. So do they care about the environment? In a pig's eye, Mr. Speaker, they care about the environment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Order, order.

MR. FOSTER: That's imparliamentary language.

MR. NOTLEY: There's nothing imparliamentary about a pig's eye.

DR. BUCK: That's an old agricultural term that many of you city slickers might not know or appreciate. [interjections]

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not what the people want when they go to these so-called public meetings. And that gets me back to the point where I say the people of this province are becoming more and more suspicious of this government because . . .

MR. NOTLEY: With reason.

DR. BUCK: With reason, because they say, you know we go through the platitudes, we have little public meetings and little social gatherings, but there is not really much point in going to those meetings because they won't listen to us. They won't listen to us.

But you know the government's not all bad. The government's not all bad [interjections] because people power did at least temporarily delay the Dodds-Round Hill project. But the people in the South Cooking Lake area are afraid that the reason the government may spend millions of dollars on the Cooking Lake moraine is that they do want to run a pipeline in that area and on to Dodds-Round Hill, and that may be the first step.

MR. KING: Ask Stromberg to organize the people for you.

DR. BUCK: So the government did hesitate, and I compliment the government on that. They did listen. You know the government should listen once in a while, but this government doesn't listen enough.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, so much for tokenism. I would like now to discuss a little further the restrictive development area or the big green hand. The Heppner brothers in south Edmonton found out through legal means that a restricted development area doesn't mean a pipeline corridor. But do you know what we're going to get? We solved that problem very quickly the same way this government solves a lot of the problems they don't like. They solved it with Bill 29. A little bit of retroactive legislation will just clear up everything. Just a very innocent little amendment.

MR. NOTLEY: Change the rules when we begin to lose.

DR. BUCK: Sure. When you're losing the ball game, change the rules a little. Extend the ball game a little longer or say, instead of three outs you can have four. Just change the rules a little bit, fellows. We have a big majority; people in Alberta don't worry about us changing the rules; they don't worry about the freedom they're losing. But they're starting to find out that they're losing more and more of those freedoms. Which brings us to The Planning Act, which will be discussed a little later, Mr. Speaker, so I won't say too much about The Planning Act.

MR. FOSTER: It's the soft underbelly of the Conservative party.

DR. BUCK: Well it's a big belly, and it's getting softer. As I've stated in this House many times before, it's the disrespect this government shows for the Municipal Affairs Department. They put a junior member in, a novice minister, because they don't really care about municipal affairs in this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: True.

DR. BUCK: No, they just put a guy in there. Anybody. You get a minister from the south and that keeps the people happy down there. It doesn't matter if he doesn't do anything. He gestated this Planning Act for heavens knows how long — 18 months. We kept asking and asking. And what did it produce? It produced an abortion. With that length of gestation period it certainly didn't produce a baby worth talking about. But people are talking about it and wish it would go away. Mr. Speaker, I can't believe that a minister with powers that the minister has, who has had that much time to prepare a bill with such wide-ranging powers — that takes away that local autonomy the hon. Member for Drayton Valley was talking about; a bill that took so long in the planning. Then the minister hardly even knew what was in it. If he had known what was in that bill, Mr. Speaker, he'd never have let some of that stuff in.

So my advice to the minister is, please read the bills before you bring them in. That's all we ask of a minister who's getting 45 grand a year: at least know what's in his own bills.

MR. NOTLEY: Let the caucus in on it too.

DR. BUCK: So, Mr. Speaker, regarding The Planning Act, we feel confident that many amendments will be brought in that will allay the fears of many, many people, especially in rural Alberta. The right to own property doesn't seem to be a right anymore, especially in this province. You have to just look at some of the county maps. Look at all the restricted areas. A man's land doesn't belong to him anymore. One of the areas under study by the Land Use Forum would make it the same as they have in some areas of Europe, that anybody can walk across your private property. It took us \$600,000 to bring in one of those areas to be looked at. I hope, knowing the hon. Deputy Premier, that would never happen. But he isn't going to be here forever. He can't control some of you other people.

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't be so sure.

DR. BUCK: He will be out there clipping his coupons. You know what happens to all successful, retired, medical doctors; they clip their coupons.

DR. HORNER: What do dentists do?

DR. BUCK: Dentists don't make enough money. They have to drill and drill and drill.

Mr. Speaker, in another area, I want the Deputy Premier to keep an eye on this Minister of Municipal Affairs. He'd better not bring in any taxation of farm buildings while I'm in this Legislature, because if that's brought in, we'll filibuster until the cows come home — another old farm expression. That had better not happen from the Department of the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Another minister who isn't here — and that's too bad, because all these fellows should be gone and stay out permanently — is the Minister of Utilities and Telephones.

MR. NOTLEY: Ah, yes.

DR. BUCK: I have never seen such a mess as seems to be going on in Utilities and Telephones now. How do you convince people on wages that their wages are going to be frozen at 4, 5, and 6 per cent, when their utilities start going up 5, 10, 15, 20, up to 35 per cent in some areas? What is the minister doing? Nothing, that's what he's doing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NOTLEY: As usual.

DR. BUCK: As usual, that's what he's doing. I thought we had had some bad ministers of Utilities and Telephones, including some on our side, hon. Solicitor General. But from that time things have really deteriorated. So, as I say, people are confined to the AIB guidelines with their wages, but what is happening to the utilities? They don't seem to go under any guidelines.

Now in the area of decentralization, the hon. Minis-

ter of Business Development and Tourism gave a very interesting talk at the Jasper Conference on Productivity that was held last week. The minister did a good job of telling us what this government is trying to do to decentralize industries and spread them out. That's commendable. You know, we win a few, we lose a few. The minister says, what's \$5 million or \$6 million if it was lost on some of the bad ventures; but we're a high risk company in the Alberta Opportunity Company so, you know, we are going to lose a few million here and few million there. If we don't, the Alberta Opportunity Company will buy them out anyway, so it won't matter too much.

AN HON. MEMBER: What the heck!

DR. BUCK: But the one point the hon. minister did make is that this government is genuinely trying to decentralize some of these industries into the smaller towns. I commend them for that. But decentralization of industries is not the problem. It's the centralization of power into that Big Five that runs this government that concerns me.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which five?

DR. BUCK: Do you want the five named? You mean you backbenchers don't know who the five guys are who run this government? Boy, oh boy, what do you guys do in caucus?

MR. NOTLEY: They listen a lot.

DR. BUCK: They listen a lot. That's quite obvious, because they don't say much.

But the centralization of power — and when the hon. Premier mentioned that this government will not implement revenue sharing, all I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that this government doesn't really believe in local autonomy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: If this government believes in local autonomy, there has to be some type of revenue sharing, some other type of revenue production from the municipalities, because it cannot go on the way it is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: The Premier says the municipalities would lose their flexibility. What nonsense. Utter nonsense is what it is. Democracy and the democratic process work best at the local level. As the hon. Member for Drayton Valley says, it's the people at that level who know what their needs are. They know how to spend their money.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is a beautiful system we have going now, because the minister, with his largesse, gives you a grant. It may not be enough to do what you have to do, but then the local people will be on the backs of the local councils. They won't be up here marching under the dome. They won't be marching here because we can say, well look, we've given you all that money. In essence, you don't know how to spend it, so that's why you're having problems down there.

So we must get some local autonomy back. We

must get away from these conditional grants. We must let the local people run their own show. It's just that simple. But if you want to have that power, if you want to keep that power, and if you want to keep the power in the Big Five up there, don't ever go for revenue sharing, because you lose that power.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who worries about it?

DR. BUCK: And a power-hungry government like this would never want to lose that power because then, you know, you couldn't go out and hand out a Kananaskis park here, a Milk River hospital there, or an airport there or a hovercraft here. You couldn't do all these things. It sounds like Old MacDonald's farm — here, there, everywhere type of thing.

MR. NOTLEY: Just wait till next year.

DR. BUCK: Next year the floodgates will really open before that fall election of 1978. It should be interesting.

MR. FOSTER: How did you find out about that?

DR. BUCK: It should be an interesting session.

Mr. Speaker, this government in its thirst for power, in its centralization of power, is displaying the kind of arrogance that it took the former government — and I say the former government — 35 years to build up even close to what this government has built up in its six years.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to relate to the hon. members of this Assembly and especially to the front bench and the Deputy Premier that I phoned a minister's office with a problem that I had on behalf of one of my constituents. The minister's away. I buy that, because ministers are busy people, and they should be busy people. I'm not going to tell which minister it was; the last time I told the Premier and I got that straightened out. But I'm just making this example to show how this government doesn't listen to people. I told the secretary my problem. She said would you speak to a — what are those young fellows who run around?

MR. NOTLEY: You mean a Tory bagman?

DR. BUCK: No, no, not the Tory bagman. An executive assistant. You know, one who keeps you away from the minister's door and the minister's telephone. I said no, I'll give you the problem I have; pass it on to the minister and have him call me Monday morning. The secretary says, I don't know if we can do that; the minister has priorities. I said, pardon, I have priorities too. And if the minister . . . Somebody must have instructed the secretary, because secretaries are usually pretty easy to get along with.

If that's the type of government we're running, what chance does the man in the street have when he phones a minister's office, Mr. Speaker? He doesn't have a chance of getting to talk to a minister.

But I say to the hon. members with the smirks on their faces that, you know, it happened to Bourassa, it happened to Barrett, and it happened to Schreyer. You know, governments come and governments go.

MR. KOZIAK: Liberals and NDP.

DR. BUCK: And when you start losing touch with those people at the grass roots, you are in more trouble than you think you are.

You know things may get so tough in another year that the Deputy Premier may have to make a speech or two in this Legislature. We look forward to the Deputy Premier's fiery speeches, because we know when we've got the government going they have to bring out the heavies. The rest of the time, there are only four of us here; they go through the motions.

In the last six years, Mr. Speaker, it used to be a tradition in this House that the ministers would report to this Legislature on their departments. I wonder what has happened to that? Don't they want the people of Alberta to know if they are doing anything in their departments?

You know, I think we should return to that tradition in this Legislature, because really I used to think that's what the legislature was for. Now I think it's become nothing but a social club. We come in here, the government puts up with the little speeches we make, the 20 minutes. Then, they pat us on the head and say, nice boys, you've done your bit for today; now get on with it so we can go back home.

I was a little upset when I saw we were going to have a short, snappy session and get these guys out of here. Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, it may not be so short and snappy after all because there may be only five of us on the opposition side here.

AN HON. MEMBER: I think you've got Grant converted.

DR. BUCK: There only may be five on the opposition side, but we can keep going for quite a while. We will dictate the length of the session. I can forewarn the Minister of Municipal Affairs, in that disaster department, that unless some of the amendments are compatible with the wishes of the people of this province, we may be here until after Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to briefly mention something about the Russian trip. Nobody has mentioned the \$400-a-night room. But I can appreciate the problems of putting up in London, because I had to sleep in a van. You know, I'm not travelling at the government's expense; I'm travelling at my own expense. I couldn't find a room. They had one for \$90 a night, but they wouldn't allow my four kids to use sleeping bags in that \$90-a-night room. So we had to sleep in a van. So I can appreciate the problem the Premier had.

MR. KOZIAK: Cheapskate.

DR. BUCK: You know \$400 a night . . . You see, that's also a symptom of the arrogance, Mr. Speaker. That's a symptom of the arrogance — a cheapskate. They're blowing the poor old taxpayers' bucks. They're easy to blow. Four hundred bucks a night.

MR. NOTLEY: Let Koziak tell that to the pensioners in his riding.

DR. BUCK: That's right, Mr. Minister, Mr. Koziak. Tell his pensioners about the Premier's \$400-a-night room in London. But at least that little old opposition

and the press complained a little bit about \$400 a night, and I think they cut it down to \$200 a night. We made a little progress; that's 50 per cent. If we could save some bucks on the provincial budget, that'd be all right too. But it's a serious matter, a symptom of the disease, the \$400-a-night thing.

MR. NOTLEY: Agreed.

DR. BUCK: Let's go gung ho, boys, money is no object; just blow 'er. We've got lots where that came from.

Two minutes? I'm just getting started, Mr. Speaker.

I couldn't believe my ears, and I think you'll appreciate this, Mr. Speaker. Here's why the Premier really went to Russia. "With regard to our visit to the Soviet Union, as you know they're the largest oil-producing country in the world." Now listen to this: "We wanted to determine whether the CIA report presented by President Carter was valid. We made our visit to west Siberia. Our conclusion was that it was probably exaggerated." Now, if that isn't a bunch of hogwash. How a government body could go on a conducted tour and find out what the CIA can't find out is unbelievable. That is unbelievable.

DR. HORNER: You know how the CIA operates, I take it.

DR. BUCK: But, Mr. Speaker, what the Premier did not do on that visit — and I know he washed it over; he said, we were guests — is ask what is happening to the political, the minority dissidents in that country. The President of the United States had the intestinal fortitude to lay that on the line, if we believe in the rights of humanity. But where was our Premier? People from minority groups who have been living under that impression have asked me that question: why did our Premier not ask these questions?

Mr. Speaker, I have other things to say. Even though the government thinks it's going to be short and snappy, I think I will have a further occasion. Thank you for your time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KING: Mr. Speaker, it's my intention to save most of my remarks for another opportunity I hope to have to debate this resolution. I have a news release dated October 5, 1977, from the Department of the Environment, respecting the Cooking Lake area study. In light of earlier comments made by my hon. colleague from Clover Bar, I couldn't resist the temptation to quote a couple of paragraphs from it, before we adjourn for the evening.

He's first of all very critical that the Department of the Environment is attempting to impose on the people of the Cooking Lake area its idea of what should be done with the Cooking Lake/Beaver Hills moraine. He is then very critical that the Department of the Environment is not in there organizing public meetings, and organizing the vehicle by which they would be able to impose their ideas upon the people of the community. Point number 5 of this news release, if I may read it, states:

Department of the Environment staff are available to meet with County Authorities, Regional Planning Commissions or other groups at their request to further explain the recommendations from the study. Written briefs from individuals or

groups wishing to respond to the management proposal will . . . be welcomed by the Department. No further general public meetings organized by the Department are planned at this time.

The statement in the news release seems to me, Mr. Speaker, to be at considerable variance with the description of arrogance, not to mention ineptitude, that was painted for us earlier by the hon. Member for Clover Bar.

Finally, before I adjourn, as all hon. members know I am interested in the traditions and practices of the Legislative Assembly. If any of them can ever recall for me another occasion on which an hon. member has been able to have his speech writer present with him in the House while he is giving a speech, I would appreciate knowing about it. Because to the best of my knowledge this has been a first in the Legislature: speeches given simultaneously, not to mention a member who is able to have his speech writer with him in the Assembly.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the motion by the hon. Member for Edmonton Highlands for adjournment of the debate, are you all agreed?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I move that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow afternoon at 2:30 o'clock.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

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

[The House adjourned at 9:48 p.m.]

