

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

[Leave granted; Bill 222 read a first time]

**Title: Wednesday, June 13, 1979 2:30 p.m.**

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

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the special committee to select members for the various standing committees, it is my pleasure to table membership of Privileges and Elections, Standing Orders and Printing; Public Accounts; Private Bills; Law and Regulations; Public Affairs; The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act; the Offices of the Auditor General and the Ombudsman; and Members' Services.

**head: NOTICES OF MOTIONS**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to give oral notice of a motion that I propose to make tomorrow that the report of the special committee appointed under Standing Order 46, presented to this Assembly today by the hon. Member for Stony Plain as chairman, be received and concurred in.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 6**  
**The Fuel Oil Administration**  
**Amendment Act, 1979**

MR. GOGO: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 6, The Fuel Oil Administration Amendment Act, 1979. The principle of the Bill is to expand the definitions with regard to the exemptions from the tax on fuel consumed by aircraft weighing less than 34,000 kilograms.

[Leave granted; Bill 6 read a first time]

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move that Bill No. 6 be placed on the Order Paper under Government Bills and Orders.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 222**  
**The Environmental Bill of Rights**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 222, The Environmental Bill of Rights. The Bill would give all Albertans the status of public protectors of the environment by allowing individuals, whether or not they own the land affected, to initiate legal action against polluters.

**Bill 227**  
**An Act to Amend**  
**The Individual's Rights Protection Act**

MR. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 227, An Act to Amend The Individual's Rights Protection Act.

The purpose of this Bill is to grant to an individual who has reached the age of 65 the right to choose whether to continue employment or to retire. Under the current provisions of The Individual's Rights Protection Act, no recourse is available for persons who wish to remain in the work force beyond age 65 and are prevented from so doing because of age.

[Leave granted; Bill 227 read a first time]

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to file two copies of supplementary information relating to the estimates of expenditure, 1979-80, being reconciliation of historical data. Copies will be made available to members this afternoon.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS**

MR. BATIUK: Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of the Assembly, 47 grades 8 and 9 students from St. Martins school in Vegreville. They are accompanied by their principal Mr. Spak, teacher Mrs. Cheremshynski, and bus operator Mr. Zubritsky. They are seated in the members gallery, and I would ask them to rise and receive the welcome of the Assembly.

MRS. FYFE: Mr. Speaker, it's my pleasure to introduce to you, and through you to members of the House, 15 grade 8 students from Vincent J. Maloney school in St. Albert. They are seated in the members gallery, accompanied by their teacher Irene Lapointe. Could we give them a cordial welcome.

MRS. OSTERMAN: Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I introduce to you, and through you to the members of this Assembly, a grade 9 class from Trochu, who incidentally have travelled here by train. I don't know many people who travel by train nowadays. They are accompanied by their teacher Mr. Neil Runcie. Would they please rise and accept the welcome of the House.

MR. COOKSON: Last but not least, Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure to introduce to you and the members of the Assembly a group of grades 5, 6, and 7 students from that great constituency of Lacombe. They come from Clive and are accompanied by Mr. Sturgeon, their teacher. I would ask that they rise and be recognized by the Assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members the presence in the Speaker's gallery of the distinguished Clerk of the Legislative Assembly of Yukon. Mr. Patrick Michael is probably known to

many of you as a former legislative intern here. I have particularly fond recollection of how he helped us in quite a spot; that is, helped a returning officer in the 1975 general election. I would ask Mr. Michael to stand and receive your welcome.

#### head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

##### Oil and Gas Price Agreements

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to either the Premier or the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources. I raise the question in light of comments emanating from Ottawa regarding the pricing agreement between Alberta and the federal government and the comments made by the new Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, quoted as saying that he's now waiting for Alberta to make the first move. It was certainly my understanding that Alberta had a binding agreement with the federal government of a \$1 per barrel increase July 1, and \$1 the first of next year.

My question to the Premier or to the new minister is: is Alberta now going to make that first move and hold the federal government to what we've been told in this Assembly, and I think we all believe, is a binding agreement?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the hon. Leader of the Opposition isn't mixing two things. As I recall, the article I suspect he's referring to mentioned the gas pricing agreement. The \$1 per barrel that he refers to is, of course, an oil pricing agreement.

The situation with the oil pricing agreement is that it is in place and provides for an increase of \$1 per barrel on July 1 this year and \$1 per barrel on January 1, 1980. The natural gas pricing agreement is much different, and the current agreement expires on August 1 this year. I was in touch with the federal minister's office shortly after he was appointed, and anticipate meeting him next week to discuss the natural gas pricing agreement.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. Then it's the position of the Alberta government and. I take it from what the minister has said, the position of the new minister of energy, that the oil pricing agreement is in place and is not a matter of discussion between Alberta and the federal government.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, as we've stated a number of occasions, it's our position that we have an oil pricing agreement in place, and we expect it to be carried out in accordance with its terms.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, one last question to the minister, dealing with that agreement. What position has the Alberta government taken, having regard for the fact that Alberta agreed to pass by the \$1 per barrel increase which was to come into place January 1, if my memory is accurate, and which Alberta agreed with the federal government would not take place? What is the position of the Alberta government with regard to that \$1 per barrel?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid the hon. Leader of the Opposition will have to be a little more clear. I'm not sure what he means by our position with respect to that \$1 per barrel.

The situation was that late last year a question arose as to whether the \$1 increase would move the Canadian price through the composite or rolled-in United States price, which had been a ceiling, if you like, on the price of oil within Canada. Discussion about that occurred late last year, and the new agreement incorporates within its terms a method of calculating the United States rolled-in or composite price. I filed those letters in the House recently, Mr. Speaker.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, following that up with the minister. Is it the position of the government of Alberta that no effort will be made by the Alberta government to pick up the \$1 per barrel increase which should have come into place January 1 this year and did not?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, if one says "should have come into place", I take it that depends on how one interprets the agreement then in place.

As to picking up that \$1 per barrel price increase, the House will be aware that under the agreement negotiated late last year, there were provisions for additional increases that weren't covered in the agreement it replaced.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'll phrase the question to the minister this way: what is the position of the Alberta government in approaching the federal government with regard to natural gas pricing? Are we still in a position of attempting to have a relationship between the price per barrel and the price per MCF?

MR. LEITCH: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would expect we would continue to have a relationship between the pricing of natural gas and the pricing of oil.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, the same kind of relationship the government has agreed to in the past?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I don't know.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the minister, I'm sure that's right. But what is the objective of the Alberta government when it meets the federal minister? Are we still looking at an arrangement which, if I recall correctly, was about a 15 per cent discount of the equivalent BTUs? If 15 per cent isn't right, I'm sure the minister will correct me.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, the current arrangement is that natural gas will be priced at Toronto city gate at 85 per cent of the price of oil on a BTU basis. But as I perceive his question, the hon. leader is asking me what our position is going to be in discussions with the federal government in respect of natural gas pricing. I would certainly like to be able to give that information to the Assembly, but I don't feel we should. There will be negotiations on that item between the provincial government and the federal government, and I feel that one simply can't carry on these negotiations effectively if we state our position publicly before we go into them.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, the minister's predecessor, the hon. Mr. Getty, certainly on occasion in this Assembly indicated his objective and what he was attempting to attain from the federal government when he commenced negotiations.

I would put the question to the minister this way: what is Alberta's starting place going to be in its negotiations with the federal government, recognizing that the minister's predecessor certainly was in a position to say what he thought Alberta's position was as it approached the discussions?

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, it is true that on occasion my predecessor mentioned Alberta's objectives before entering those negotiations, and I would think there may be occasions when that would be an appropriate position for us to take. But we'd have to examine each occasion and consider whether it would improve our negotiations if we had a public position. It may be that other governments have put out public positions that would be appropriate for us to respond to at that time. But in the present circumstances, Mr. Speaker, it's my very strong feeling that any public comments by me before we open discussions with the federal government are merely going to jeopardize those discussions and make it much more difficult to bring about an agreement for the benefit of Albertans.

#### **Transport of Chemicals**

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to put this question to the hon. Minister of Transportation. It concerns the transportation of hazardous goods, both existing goods and new types that will be produced as a result of expansion of the petrochemical industry in the Fort Saskatchewan area.

Has the Department of Transportation determined the type and volume of hazardous goods that will be transported to and from the Sherritt Gordon and Dow Chemical plants in Fort Saskatchewan?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, our department is working out some basic approaches to this in conjunction with the Department of Economic Development, since most of the goods being referred to here are probably carried in tank cars, which would fall into that department's jurisdiction. We are working on it, but I'm not in a position to define where we are at the moment.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. In the review by the department as well as the Department of Economic Development, what assessment is being made of alternative spurs so hazardous goods can be transported somewhat away from populated areas, particularly in the case of Fort Saskatchewan, where I understand the track goes right through the middle of the community?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, that specific one falls into the Department of Economic Development and, while we're working together on it, I can't answer that directly. However, I would take that as notice if you like.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Have any studies been commissioned by either department with respect to the feasibility

of separate rail and road corridors for the transportation of hazardous goods?

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

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Have any discussions been held with the federal counterparts concerning a joint federal/provincial task force to study the question of alternatives for transporting hazardous goods?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, my first contact with the ministers in other provinces won't come until September, at which time we will be discussing many of these areas.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to either the hon. minister or the hon. Premier, in the absence of the Deputy Premier. Has Disaster Services made any assessment of the impact of the derailment at Crestview, Florida, as well as the many other evacuations necessitated in the United States because of the transportation of hazardous goods? What program or assessment has Disaster Services of a contingency plan should such an event occur in the Fort Saskatchewan area?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, although the question would seem to me rather suited for the Order Paper, I'll be prepared to take it as notice on behalf of the Minister of Economic Development.

#### **Videotapes — Impaired Drivers**

MR. PURDY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Attorney General if he's considering introducing legislation making audio-visual means admissible evidence in court, regarding offences under The Highway Traffic Act, such as impaired drivers picked up through Check Stop.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for advising me earlier today of his interest in this subject.

My reading of the report available through the media today in regard to the British Columbia program was that it was a pilot project that police forces in one British Columbia community had used, and that the British Columbia government had now made certain conclusions about the wider use of that type of procedure.

Whether it is accurately referred to as a matter for evidence in the courts is another matter. It would be subject to all the rules of admissibility, and perhaps could not be covered by a provincial evidence statute because of the fact that in the example given by the hon. member the charge would be laid under the Criminal Code.

However, I think the use to which it was put in British Columbia was somewhat different from the matter of evidence in court. It was in fact the question of whether an accused might see it beforehand and treat it as some guidance as to whether he might plead guilty or not guilty in his particular case. With reference to the activities of the police in this regard, I think my colleague the Solicitor General might be in a better position to comment.

**Land Reclamation — Blairmore**

MR. BRADLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the hon. Minister of Environment. Would the minister advise the House if he has received a report from the Energy Resources Conservation Board on the Trina Maree application to reclaim or reprocess coal spoil piles at Blairmore?

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Assembly I might add that the Energy Resources Conservation Board has held meetings in the Pincher Creek area with regard to an application by Trina Maree to dispose of those slag piles. We recently asked for a report from the ERCB on this particular issue.

MR. BRADLEY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I understand that Trina Maree has withdrawn its application to reprocess those coal piles. Will the minister advise whether the government of Alberta is prepared to reclaim all the coal spoil piles located at Blairmore as a land reclamation project under the capital projects division of the Heritage Savings Trust Fund?

MR. COOKSON: That's a good question from the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest. My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that a commitment has been made on the part of government to reclaim the coal spoil piles in that particular area.

MR. BRADLEY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Will the minister have the Department of Environment undertake the necessary negotiations with Scurry-Rainbow, the present owners of the Blairmore coal spoil piles, to enter upon those lands in order to reclaim the piles?

MR. COOKSON: My understanding on this point, Mr. Speaker, is that since 1978 Scurry-Rainbow has offered to provide access to this area so that the coal spoils may be reclaimed.

MR. BRADLEY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister advise when this reclamation project will proceed?

MR. COOKSON: I think the hon. member is starting to close in on me a little bit.

Mr. Speaker, I think it would be fair to say that I understand there will be reclamation of the piles. The anticipated date is in or about 1981. This work will hopefully be co-ordinated with the Minister of Transportation, and the funds available through the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, so that the two projects can be co-ordinated to save the extra costs.

MR. BRADLEY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. minister advise approximately what the cost of the reclamation of the Blairmore coal spoil piles will be?

MR. COOKSON: My information is that it will be considerably more than \$1 million to do the total project in a manner acceptable to the residents of the area.

DR. BUCK: Is that '79 dollars or '81 dollars?

**Cold Lake Project — Transport**

MR. ISLEY: Mr. Speaker, my question will be directed to the hon. Minister of Transportation. It arises from my concern as to our level of preparation in handling the potential rapid growth in my constituency. My question is: has Alberta Transportation any projects planned or under way for handling the increased transportation demands in the area?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, working on the premise that you have to be able to get there before you can work there, yes, we're there with a number of projects. I can enumerate two or three, if this will help.

We're doing some upgrading and about 10 miles of paving on primary 55. In line with the resource funding developed, we're going with an upgrading of the resource road presently designated 892. There is a 3-mile section in the Primrose Lake area that I can't identify positively. We're into the truck route in the Bonnyville area with a contract in the neighborhood of \$800,000 to \$900,000.

There are some more, Mr. Speaker. I don't have a handle on all of them.

**Embassy Move**

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Member for Calgary West. I'd like to know if the hon. Premier has received any communications from Arab countries regarding the federal government's proposed move of the embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

MR. LOUGHEED: If I have, Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as the MLA for Calgary West, I will no doubt respond as all members will to the suggestion made on Friday by the president of the Executive Council, and refer them to the federal government.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, can the hon. Premier indicate if the government has assessed the demands for accelerated depletion of Alberta's oil reserves that could follow an embargo of oil exports from Arab countries to Canada?

MR. LOUGHEED: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I missed the opening part of the hon. member's question.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, have any assessments been made by the Alberta government as to the accelerated demands that could be made upon our oil reserves if there were an Arab embargo against Canada?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, I may have to refer that question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, because I believe it envisions a response as to the degree of capacity not being fully utilized by the province today. There is some extensive technical information on that subject. Perhaps I could ask the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources if he could respond, or if not, take notice of the matter.

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, as members of the Assembly are probably aware, we are now producing from our conventional sources at maximum capacity. Obviously that producing capacity could be increased by drilling additional development wells and installing

additional facilities. But at the current time we are producing at capacity. So I'm not really sure in what direction the hon. member's question is leading; whether he's asking about an assessment as to an increase in the rate of development of our other immense hydrocarbon resources such as the oil sands or heavy oils and coal, or whether he's confining his question to conventional oil.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. The minister is indicating to the Assembly that should such an embargo be placed on Canada, Alberta has no increased capacity at this time which could be used to lessen the impact on our fellow Canadians of such an Arab embargo.

MR. LEITCH: At the current time, Mr. Speaker, we are producing at capacity.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the Premier indicate if there were any discussions with the U.S. governors the Premier met with the last day or two as to any concerns of the governors that a shortfall in Canada could affect our exports to the United States?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we are really exporting so very little crude oil that it wasn't a factor, and it wasn't raised.

#### Day Care

MR. COOK: Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Social Services and Community Health met with the mayor of the city of Edmonton. I wonder if the minister could explain to the House what took place, and the route of future negotiations for resolving the day care dispute.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I did meet with the mayor of the city of Edmonton. Five issues raised by the mayor were discussed. At this time I would rather not make further comments about the meeting. I say that in light of the fact that the decision as to whether or not the city enters the master agreement with the province regarding day care rests solely with city council.

#### Tourist Industry Personnel

DR. PAPROSKI: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Tourism and Small Business. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House whether he's developed or changed any new policy to deal with a major item of concern in tourism, namely that of service personnel in the industry.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, three programs are in place within the department now: a customer relations program, a management seminar program, and the trainer program.

At the annual meeting of the Travel Industry Association of Alberta I indicated to them that one area of concern that had been expressed to me was the inability, if I can use that term, of the industry to treat tourists, or generally all Albertans — and I think we as well are tourists in our own right — as such. So I would like them to be directing themselves, along

with the programs in place, toward the attitudinal changes necessary to treat all of us as tourists at all times, and thus make it much easier when a tourist does show up on the scene.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, on a point of clarification. I wonder if the minister would indicate if he's developed a public relations policy that is being televised, or by radio or pamphlets, to assist the tourist industry in that regard.

MR. ADAIR: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any television program in place at the moment. I could take that as notice and check. But we are working with the industry toward that particular goal.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Advanced Education and Manpower. I wonder if the minister would indicate whether his department has developed or is developing any special policies for the training of service personnel for the tourist industry.

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, as hon. members should be aware, both the northern and southern Alberta institutes of technology have fairly extensive programs under way at the present time with regard to training people to work in the service industry. Probably colleges in the province have had programs of this nature available from time to time. In all fairness, Mr. Speaker, I think these institutions should be responding to representations from representatives of the tourist industry to provide course offerings which will be of assistance.

I might point out that later today, along with my colleague the Minister of Tourism and Small Business, I will be in Calgary at the Southern Alberta Institute of Technology to attend an informal seminar with leaders of the hospitality industry to determine with them their needs with respect to training programs. Of course that will be part of the ongoing consultation we have with various segments of the industry to see what we can do in Advanced Education and Manpower.

#### Transport of Chemicals (continued)

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a further question to the Minister of Transportation in regard to the transportation of hazardous materials. At the present time the federal government has a program commonly referred to as HM-144 Retrofit. Under this program tank cars carrying hazardous materials are required to change the couplers on the cars, insulate and jacket the cars, and provide head shields. These are all added safety features costing in the neighborhood of about \$15,000 per car, on cars which originally cost around \$30,000.

My question to the minister is: (a) what is the status of this program in Alberta, and (b) does the program have any impact on the ability of Alberta businesses to deliver their products?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, two points: one, that's a very complicated question; and two, it does fall into the Department of Economic Development, and that's complicated too. So could I take that as notice, get the information, and bring it back.

DR. BUCK: A supplementary question to the Minister of Transportation. In his previous answer the minister indicated that steps to reroute the movement of hazardous chemicals around Fort Saskatchewan were being looked at, and the greatest danger was from track movement. Can the minister indicate what steps are being taken by the provincial government to possibly reroute tanker trucks moving through the community?

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, the step being taken in that regard is that we're studying the situation. I suppose if the restrictions on the tanker movement became too great it would transfer to rail, so the two are interrelated. Again I would ask you to be patient and let me get the information for you.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, just one supplementary question the minister can also pursue while he's looking. In the discussions with the federal department, can the minister find out what steps, if any, will be taken as to movement of these hazardous chemicals through other communities after they've gone through Fort Saskatchewan? Because some of the major problems in derailments occur after the train is put together.

MR. KROEGER: Mr. Speaker, I have to think back to the time I was invited to assume this portfolio. I forgot to ask the Premier what it was, and he didn't volunteer the information. However, I was told that the department was being downgraded. I appreciate the way it's being upgraded now. However, I will take your question as notice.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Minister of Transportation. In your consideration of the question, would you please give special reference to the propane and butane industry in Alberta?

MR. KROEGER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

#### **Rural and Native Housing**

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. It flows from the answer the minister gave yesterday in the House regarding the rural and native housing program, when he indicated to the Assembly that the corporation or the department has not contracted a study on housing in Grouard.

I'd like to repeat the question to the minister, and ask if the Alberta Housing Corporation or the department has done a survey of the rural and native housing program, or caused a survey to be commenced and not finished?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure I get the import of the question. Obviously, as part of the budgetary process, and on an ongoing basis, the department is evaluating the need in various areas for this type of housing.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, then let me put the question this way to the minister. My information is that a study was started, either by the Alberta Housing Corporation or on a contractual basis with some consultants, regarding the effectiveness of the rural and native housing program: that the initial results of that

survey were very negative; and that after the first draft was finished, a decision was made either in the minister's department or in the Housing Corporation not to finish the survey. So my question to the minister is: did that happen?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I thought I responded to that question yesterday. Having checked carefully with the department and the corporation, there is no such study.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I raise the question with the minister, because in the answer to the House yesterday he said that the corporation or the department has not contracted a study of housing in Grouard.

I want to repeat the question to the minister. Has a study with regard to the effectiveness of the rural and native housing program, and the satisfaction of the people moving into those houses, been done by the corporation or consultants for the department?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was asking me specifically with regard to Grouard. However, I am not aware of any such study — certainly no contract study — pertaining to any other area, although obviously the department looks at need on an ongoing basis as part of the budgetary process.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, will the minister undertake to check the Alberta Housing Corporation and his department again to see if a study has been started, and then not finished, with regard to the rural and native housing program, and report to the Assembly?

MR. CHAMBERS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to check again.

#### **Alberta/Montana Oil Discussions**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Premier. It deals with reports of a fuel shortage in the state of Montana. Is the Premier in a position to advise the Assembly what discussions he had with Governor Judge concerning this matter, and whether any follow-up is planned by the government of Alberta?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to. In my discussion with Governor Judge, he raised the fact that the diesel fuel shortage in the neighboring state of Montana is very, very serious. In fact his view is that it's much more serious in Montana than in any other state. He asked me, first of all, if I would assist him in determining whether there is any excess supply of diesel fuel from refineries in Alberta that might be made available on a short-term emergent basis — that is in process through the provincial Department of Energy and Natural Resources; secondly, to lend our offices in a co-operative way through to the National Energy Board, if he's able to obtain from the United States federal government a communication which confirms that there is a special case of need in the state of Montana. We've agreed to do that, subject of course to there being significant enough supplies to be helpful.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier. Were the government of Alberta

or the hon. Premier given any indication as to the dimension of the problem, the shortfall that presently exists in the state of Montana? Does the governor have an assessment of the shortfall? Are we looking at 10 million gallons, 200 million gallons? Do we have any definite request in terms of volume at this stage?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, no definite request was made to me, nor did the governor quantify it. He feels the situation in his state is so emergent and desperate that he certainly would be delighted with any sort of significant quantity being provided on a short-term basis to the state of Montana. He didn't quantify it in those terms.

The two matters going on by way of follow-up today are an assessment within this province as to the degree of excess supply of diesel fuel: how much, over what extended period of time, and under what contractual terms; and secondly, in communication with the governor's office, whether direct communication will occur from that state to the National Energy Board of Canada with the support and endorsement of the United States department of energy.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary question to the hon. Premier concerning the possibility of an embargo that could affect the energy requirements in the eastern part of the country. Was there any consideration in the Premier's discussions with Governor Judge of a swap arrangement with the United States; that is, that we would make supplies of diesel fuel available, if we have temporary excess supplies in Alberta, in return for some access to the American market in other parts of the country?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we raised it in our discussions with Governor Judge, but neither he nor his officials thought that was practical, because the situation is apparently tight throughout the United States, in varying degrees, and in their judgment there wouldn't be a situation where that could be worked out.

DR. PAPROSKI: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Premier. I wonder if the Premier would indicate to the House whether any other mutual item of concern, of a long-term nature, was discussed with the governor.

MR. LOUGHEED: There was no particular matter other than our general discussion on natural gas supply. The Governor of Montana is at the moment taking the position with us that he really appreciated the efforts we made two or three years ago to support them. So the special circumstances of Montana, in terms of acquiring natural gas from Canada, through Alberta gas in particular, were recognized.

#### **Workers' Safety**

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'd like to supplement an answer I gave yesterday. The hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview asked me a number of questions regarding joint worksite health and safety committees. I would like to present a further response to the question regarding contemplated changes in legislation, permitting voluntary worksite committees to have parallel powers with designated

committees.

The duties of designated committees are clearly set out in The Occupational Health and Safety Act. I understand that the voluntary committees are set up outside the legislated framework and have duties and consequently powers very similar to designated committees. The advantage of the voluntary alternative is that the duties can be tailored to meet the needs of the individual worksite, rather than being restricted to the more rigid directives required by legislation. Once requirements for such committees become legislated, then the activity is no longer voluntary. Guidelines setting out the duties and authorities for voluntary committees must therefore remain outside the legislated framework.

MR. NOTLEY: A question to the hon. minister. Is the minister able to advise the Assembly what powers the voluntary committees have in the absence of power designated by regulations under an Act passed by the Legislative Assembly?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, I referred to *Hansard* [Blues], and as I indicated yesterday, the powers are similar with the exception that it is a co-operative approach: both employer and union work toward the benefit of the worker, in some cases more successfully than where they are legislated. But to measure powers — there are no powers, because it is a voluntary agreement.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question for clarification. A voluntary committee would in fact be able to seek an agreement. But what enforcement authority does a voluntary committee have, if in fact it is an agreement between two parties as opposed to a committee set up under the regulations? That's a crucial question: what enforcement authority does it have?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, there is no enforcement authority. Again, it's a voluntary agreement between the two parties.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In light of the minister's answer that it has no enforcement authority, is the objective of the government of Alberta to encourage voluntary committees in preference to mandatory designated committees, in which case there really wasn't much point passing the Act?

MR. DIACHUK: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has raised an argumentative question, and I don't know if I want to debate it at this time.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I won't be argumentative at all. I'll just ask the hon. minister whether or not it is the intention of the government of Alberta to continue a policy of promoting voluntary committees, as opposed to choosing ministerially designated worksite committees as a policy decision?

MR. DIACHUK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I answered yesterday that my office and my officials are continuing to encourage voluntary worksite joint safety committees, rather than approach and legislate them through a ministerial order.

**Alberta/Montana Oil Discussions**  
(continued)

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Premier. It flows from the answer the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources gave us earlier today with regard to Alberta producing oil at or near capacity, and then the Premier's comment in the Assembly that Alberta has agreed to endorse, I think it's fair to say, the urgent need from Montana.

The question to the Premier is simply this: in the course of the discussions with the Governor of Montana, was it made clear that on a long-term basis Alberta's capacity could be somewhat short in this area, having regard for the national policy of self-sufficiency?

MR. LOUGHEED: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I made very clear to all the governors that our position was that unless there was a breakthrough in *in situ* oil sands they couldn't look to Canada from a crude oil supply point of view. As far as the Governor of Montana is concerned, we're only talking about a short-term emergent situation, if there happens to be a refinery surplus of diesel fuel at the moment.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. What length was involved in the discussions — a matter of months, less than a year, or longer? What is a short term?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, we're trying to define the parameters of something before the facts have been ascertained. I think it's clear that that would have to be a decision of the National Energy Board which our department would look at. They have a short-term emergent situation; I wouldn't want to describe it either in quantity or weeks. They're merely asking us as good neighbors if there is something we can do to help them. We said we'll look at it and see if we can.

MR. R. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the Premier. Was it not the reported position of Alberta at the meeting with the governor that Alberta was prepared to help? I have no problem with that at all, as long as it was made clear to Montana that it may well have to be on a short-term basis.

MR. LOUGHEED: Framed that way, Mr. Speaker, the answer is quite clear: it was certainly on a short-term basis.

MR. SPEAKER: The final supplementary by the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo, followed by the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview. Then we'll have run out of time for the question period.

MR. SINDLINGER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the Premier indicate whether or not the governor's concern in regard to the short term is due to restrictions in refining capacity, as opposed to supply of crude oil?

MR. LOUGHEED: Mr. Speaker, it's an overall problem in the United States. Some states have refinery difficulties with regard to gasoline; in other states there are refinery deficiencies regarding diesel fuel. Those deficiencies vary extensively, and the position

put to me was that our neighboring state of Montana was the most severely affected.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Premier, and I don't make it in an argumentative sense. Could the Premier advise the Assembly what policy considerations lead the government of Alberta to be willing — and I think correctly so — to make representation to deal with a short-term problem in Montana in an area of federal jurisdiction, but not to make representation on behalf of Alberta businesses as to changing an embassy, also a federal area of jurisdiction?

MR. LOUGHEED: I can't think of a more argumentative question than that, and I don't see the relationship between the two at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could respond to several questions asked several days ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Assembly agree that we may extend the period for a few moments for the hon. Minister of Environment?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

**Pest Control**

MR. COOKSON: Mr. Speaker, one of the questions was asked by the Member for Stony Plain, with regard to the problem of tent caterpillars that I understand are munching away through the rural countryside these days.

Just to reaffirm, our department does not provide chemicals; however, we do register under The Hazardous Chemicals Act and The Agricultural Chemicals Act. One of the chemicals is called thuricide, a bacterial pesticide which we hope will be effective against this particular little pest.

**Municipal Works — Cold Lake Area**

MR. COOKSON: The other question from the Member for Clover Bar yesterday dealt with the representations to the ERCB at Cold Lake with regard to water supply.

In checking that point, our staff participated in the hearings and questioned the proponent — in this case Esso Resources — on the matter of water withdrawals from the lake and alternative sources of supply. This is all in the transcript. We have not carried out any specific studies of our own, but we did a thorough assessment of the studies done by Esso Resources. These too are a part of the public recording during the hearings.

**ORDERS OF THE DAY**

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

7. Moved by Mr. Hyndman:

Be it resolved that this Assembly approve in general the fiscal policies of the government.



[Adjourned debate June 11: Mr. Gogo]

MR. GOGO: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I welcome the opportunity to participate in the budget debate. First of all, I would thank you, sir, for the courtesy of having typical Lethbridge weather during the day that one of the members from Lethbridge participates in the debate.

Secondly, I'd like to congratulate the Treasurer on a truly outstanding budget the other evening. I read in the press this morning that in meeting with some of the northwest U.S. governors, our Premier was somewhat embarrassed relative to the budget that had just come down. It seemed that Alberta, with about 10 per cent of the population of one of the great southern U.S. states, has a budget which is approximately half of that. I think that's truly remarkable.

Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to express an opinion, based on my observation as a member who has served four years, on the truly outstanding calibre of the new Members of the Legislative Assembly. In no small measure, I am very impressed with the fact that we have female members represented from all parts of Alberta. I think it's indicative of the insight many Albertans put into choosing their elected representatives. Listening to the speeches to date, I'm more than impressed that this session of the Legislative Assembly of Alberta is indeed going forward.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments relative to the area in Alberta I represent, along with Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs, the Member for Lethbridge East. As many members know, Lethbridge is Alberta's largest city following Calgary and Edmonton, although when one looks at the projections for northern Alberta and Fort McMurray within the next two to three years, unless a new town is established up there somewhere, it will be in the neighborhood of 60,000 and will be the third largest city in the province. That's not without some problems. For example, in Fort McMurray in just the past three years, I see that welfare cases have gone up 100 per cent. I think that's indicative of rapid-growth areas throughout the province, where opportunity for adequate planning is not available.

The Lethbridge area, Mr. Speaker, is basically an agricultural regional centre. It's off the Trans-Canada Highway as we know it, even though the Member for Pincher Creek-Crowsnest has managed to get No. 3 designated as Crowsnest Highway to attract some tourist business to the south. But because it's an agricultural centre, it's virtually dependent on both the service industry and the agricultural community.

As, most members know, things haven't been going too well for the agricultural people of this province in terms of selling what they grow. Indeed, I understand some members of this Assembly are scrambling very hard to use part of their indemnity to pay off some spring seeding bills. Knowing what we know about farmers, when they have money they spend it, and when they don't have it they don't spend it.

As a result, we see at the moment in southern Alberta a somewhat soft economic climate. There are many indicators of this. One is not the sales of the ALCB. That always tends to be rather constant regardless of economic activity. But house prices are generally about 20 per cent lower there than in the rest of Alberta, which I think is indicative of the economy.

Members may be interested that Lethbridge happens

to house the largest research station in Canada. It is a federal research station currently shared with Alberta Agriculture. For the beer drinkers of the province, we also have a very aggressive and traditional brewery that does more than carry its weight. In addition, we have the Prairie Agricultural Machinery Institute, one of three in the western provinces, that looks into, researches, and tests agricultural machinery sold to Alberta farmers, so that it can be fine-tuned for the soil conditions in which Alberta farmers use it.

We have as well, of course, the third largest university in the province, the University of Lethbridge. Its enrolment is currently about 1,500, but it offers a rather unique liberal arts education to all Albertans, not just those who come from southern Alberta.

DR. BUCK: And a shortage of funds, John.

MR. GOGO: With that, we have the very successful Lethbridge Community College, which is an extension of policies established by previous governments. Today it's a very aggressive type of community college. Indeed we're finding that many graduates with BA's are now looking at pay scales and taking up plumbing, electrical work, and carpentry through the community college. That really wasn't done many years ago, and it offers a great opportunity for many people through the catch basin of southern Alberta.

They're not without their problems, Mr. Speaker. Like many institutions, they seem to find that in days gone by when there was no shortage of surplus funds, they perhaps got into the habit of sending a little too much mail, and incurred some heavy expenses. Now they're trying to live with the realities of the time, within the context of — like other Alberta programs — being amongst the highest per capita in Canada. But they're struggling, and they're managing. I'm sure as people come to know Lethbridge Community College and its product — that is, the people who graduate — they'll add a great contribution to Alberta.

Then of course, Mr. Speaker, we have Time Air, which is a third-level carrier and has 14 flights daily in and out of Lethbridge. I was very pleased and proud to introduce that Bill today, which in no small way is going to mean, I would hope, at least \$100,000 in fuel savings to the largest third-level carrier in Canada. It should be noted that between Saskatoon and Regina there are only two flights a day, and between Thunder Bay and Winnipeg, one flight a day. So when you look at Alberta and Time Air and recognize there are 14 flights from a so-called small community to the rest of the province, I think it's indicative of the fact that Time Air has done remarkably well over the years. Of course the 135 employees are very important to the Alberta economy as well.

I would like to comment, Mr. Speaker, on two other points relative to Lethbridge. One would be the fact that Lethbridge is the irrigation capital of Canada. Through its wisdom in decentralization, this government saw fit to centre the irrigation headquarters in southern Alberta. As members know from the 1975 election, it was the intent of the government, along with the wishes of the people, to spend approximately \$200 million on irrigation. Studies have been carried out several times, the public hearing phase has been closed, and within a very short time we will know whether or not we will go forward.

Should that happen, should the original \$200 million in expenditures, perhaps \$300 million, now take place for the supply and distribution of water through southern Alberta's irrigation system, I think consideration will have to be given to how to utilize it. As I recall, in 1975 we imported about 7 million TV dinners into this province. If we produce 50 per cent of Canada's beef and grow all these vegetables, why we don't manufacture these types of things as an industry in the south is a good question.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would think there's a role for the University of Lethbridge in terms of agricultural research, marketing research, and transportation research as a result of this irrigation spending. I hope it's an area the institutions Lethbridge would look at, because I think it can play a very meaningful role in terms of employment.

Unlike the rest of Canada, we in Alberta have seen some extremely exciting growth in terms of numbers. For example, I understand we have just passed the 2 million mark. In the first quarter of this year alone we had a growth of about 15,000 people, 0.75 per cent in a three-month period. That breaks down to roughly 5,000 through natural growth. I don't know whether the effects of the pill are wearing off, but we're seeing that birth curve change. Perhaps people can afford to have children again; maybe that's the reason. We're still having about 20,000 a year die, so obviously that's not affecting it.

The other 10,000, Mr. Speaker, — and I think this is important — are immigrating to Alberta, primarily from other provinces. I think the total figure is about 9,700, of which about 300 are from outside Canada. Certainly they're coming to Alberta for some very good reasons. But I suggest their coming to Alberta presents some very unique problems to the province. On these lines, Mr. Speaker, because we've heard so much good news, I would like to point out what in my view should be the concerns of the government; certainly they're concerns of mine. I'd like to share them with members in the House.

First of all, I think there's some extremely good news: in 1979 in North America, church attendance is still the greatest spectator sport. With all the football, baseball, and hockey, for those who wish to be critical of the church in not fulfilling its role, I think it's important to point out that if one were to rate it, church attendance would still be number one on all network channels. I don't know whether it's at an all-time high, but it still has the highest attendance in North America. I think that's particularly encouraging.

Mr. Speaker, we look at the budget and at the 160,000 or so senior citizens of Alberta. It's interesting that Alberta has about 8 per cent of Canada's population and the percentage of senior citizens province-wide is about the same. Lethbridge, the area I represent along with the Member for Lethbridge East, has about 12 per cent, about 50 per cent more senior citizens than other parts of Alberta. I think that presents unique problems to my area.

We've all seen in the speech and as a result of the programs introduced over the past few years that we have a government that recognizes their needs and is very concerned about rewarding senior citizens in some tangible and meaningful way, with programs to make their remaining years better years. I would refer to the pioneer program, which followed the senior citi-

zen home improvement program; the recently announced, and I suggest successful, home care program; the fact that there is no obligation on senior citizens, regardless of whether they're millionaires — and that could be a moot point — to pay health care premiums. They can get spectacles, hearing aids, teeth: all these things. That's just some way that the government has chosen to reward or make life easier for senior citizens.

But has the government concerned itself with something along the lines of the resolution introduced by the Member for Calgary Currie? A very traumatic effect takes place when a senior citizen who has spent perhaps 50 years in one home moves into a senior citizen self-contained unit, lodge, or nursing home. There's a tremendous change in life style. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that they go through some rather important phases in their minds. The net effect, I would think, would be loneliness. When we're in a province as affluent as ours, and we're so busy in economic factors, it makes me wonder whether we really take the time to understand — never mind respond to — some of the things these senior citizens go through. I would urge the members of the House to give very serious thought to the resolution introduced by the Member for Calgary Currie, in addition to the debate that's already taken place, about some of the effects on our seniors that we perhaps don't take time to think about.

Reference is also made, Mr. Speaker, to the average income of Albertans having gone from about \$7,000 in '67 to \$20,997 in 1977. Projecting, that's probably about \$22,000 today. I for one would like to meet some of these average-income people. I don't know any in here. I'm kind of mystified by that figure, because I happen to think that many of the problems facing Albertans today are related to dollar income. If not, why do we have 55 per cent of Alberta women working? Is it because they want to do their own thing? Because they're working, we have these day care concerns and problems. Maybe because we have some of those problems, 65 per cent of the children in Lethbridge need dental care.

So if incomes are really as high as we tend to believe — and I would caution members on the word "average". It can be a dangerous term. I think I recalled one earlier time that the Oldman River flowing through Lethbridge has an average depth of 12 inches. We had a professor from the university walk across the river and drown, because he forgot there was a 10-foot hole. But on average it was only 12 inches. So I would urge members to be cautious with the term "average".

Mr. Speaker, we have some unique problems in Alberta that maybe don't occur in other parts of Canada. They're pretty well all attendant on the life styles that have been adopted, and they affect our children. It's great for those members in the House who seem to think that parents should raise the children, educate them, and look after their sex education. That's fine. But when I'm told that about 45 per cent of Edmonton residents are single parents, what does that say about children? When I'm told 65 per cent of the children where one of my youngsters goes to school have single parents ... That sounds great, to tell the parents. But what about the single parents who are out scrambling to make enough to look after their children? Is that not a concern? If it's not, shouldn't it be? I suggest it's a major concern.

We sometimes get hung up on what education is all about. Surely, Mr. Speaker, education is not academics only but indeed, as was debated here just a couple of years ago on the goals and objectives of education, lies in preparing young people to grow to adulthood and cope with life. That's part of education. For some reason I have yet to understand, school years in this province, certainly Lethbridge, are 191 days. That's because 100 years ago it was so hot during the summer you couldn't go to school. We've maintained that tradition, notwithstanding air conditioning. I begin to wonder: if we don't have parents capable or willing to do the job, should we not be looking to some other agency? Maybe that's schools. Maybe we should be beefing up schools, not in terms of the working day of the teacher but in terms of the resource people within schools, so we can assist these children. I happen to believe that peer groups have more influence than parents anyway. Is it not an area we should be looking at? I know that sounds kind of drastic, but perhaps we should look at it.

A topic that's important to me in recent months, Mr. Speaker, is the area of alcohol and drug abuse. Not that I profess to be an expert, but I've now had occasion to look into it. As a result of the annual report tabled by the Solicitor General, I look at the amount consumed in Alberta just in this past year. The best way of describing it, I guess, is to picture every man, woman, and child in this province, and they number 2 million. They each have a jerry-can, which holds five gallons. They go to some central point and fill it up, not once, not twice, but four times each. And when they get rid of that, they go back for one more gallon. That's what was consumed last year in this province. The only salvation is that of course we had so many tourists that they drank three-quarters of it. But we know that's not true, because affluent Albertans are drinking elsewhere.

Now I don't care to judge whether it's an abuse. But a judgment I would make is, what's the effect? Well, we know from Stats Canada, if one could accept that as factual, that the death rate in Alberta due to cirrhosis of the liver has gone up 100 per cent in the last 10 years. The population hasn't gone up 10 but death from cirrhosis has gone up 10. The only consoling feature is that next door, British Columbia has gone up 300 per cent. I don't know whether that helps us, because it's a slower rate. But certainly that's an effect. A question mark I have, and that I hope other people would have, is that in Newfoundland it's gone down 50 per cent in the same period. So perhaps that area should be looked at.

The cost of alcohol abuse — and what I'm really leading up to, Mr. Speaker, is an area the previous minister tried to concentrate on and give some leadership in: the rapidly escalating cost of health care. In America, for example, the cost of alcoholism equals one year of the Vietnam war. That's \$30 billion, about five times the heritage fund. That's the directly related cost of alcoholism. Here in Canada it's 12 per cent. Well, if we relate our billion-dollar Alberta budget for health delivery costs, not counting prevention, 12 per cent could be directly related to alcohol problems in Alberta. I suggest that's quite a price to pay.

Now to those who think there are better ways and point to France, where you raise your children with the use of table wines and so on and get them accustomed to it, I would point out that in France 51 per cent of all

admissions to hospital are because of alcoholism. In Ontario, it's 20 per cent; in the United States, 33 per cent.

Here at the Royal Alex Hospital in Edmonton just a year ago, of 96,000 people through emergency a true 34,000 registered over .15 on the breathalyzer. Remember, .08 is enough to lock you up if you're driving. So that's 100 per cent more. There's no question it's a problem. I guess the question is, what are we going to do? If we do nothing else than become aware of it, I suggest we've gone some distance in recognizing it's a problem.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a minute to mention drug abuse, a sensitive area with some people. We're finding that in Alberta, Canada, and North America, about two-thirds of all prescription drugs are for Valium, for mood-altering drugs, or drugs that for one reason or another are prescribed for people who don't quite feel right. The statement has been made that about 70 per cent of the reasons for seeking health care are life style, whether it's puffing a pipe or taking it out of a brown bottle or off a prescription pad. That's a terrible price to pay. It's not a terrible price to pay if that's what people want. But if people are looking for leadership, I suggest it's an area this government can and perhaps should look into in the very near future.

How do you handle drug and alcohol abuse? Should society ignore the victim of the abuse? That's one option. Should addicts be punished in the courts? That's another option, a dark-age option. Should they be treated at public expense? That's another option. I suggest all these are wrong, Mr. Speaker. Unless we find the source of the problem, we just don't have the resources in this province, this country, or North America to treat the problem. We have to find an alternative.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to comment on an area I feel somewhat sensitive about. I think it's been debated before, certainly spoken about before. That's the influence of television. The case has been made — not rightly so, I think, but it's been made — that with a television set you always have the option of the on/off button. Now is that true? I suggest that the airways are public. With the change in life styles we've seen in the last 10 years, with the advent of the single working parent, the children who are glued to television sets, the fact that the average child today going into school at age 6 has already had 12 full years of exposure to television, I suggest we're reaching a point — and perhaps this is a point for the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs — where we're going to have to look at the content of what comes over television. No longer is the option of the on/off switch viable. I think we're rapidly approaching the point where we're going to have to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, the report of the Solicitor General dealing with jails was tabled just recently. For those who believe that the purpose of a jail — the place with bars on that you can't get out of — is to protect the public, please consider whatever figure I mention and multiply it by \$40 per day, because that's what it costs. The *per diem* allowance for a member in this Assembly, wherever he stays in Edmonton, is the same as what we pay for an inmate at Lethbridge jail. I don't know who's getting a better deal. If you eat where I eat, I know who is getting a better deal.

Last year, for impaired driving and breathalyzer in-

fractions alone, we had 1,570 people locked up behind bars; for robbery and armed violence, 130. I think that's what jails are for, to protect the people from criminal violence. Under The Liquor Control Act, another 2,065. How long are they in there? It seems to me the procedures laid down are very costly. From the time a man is apprehended, goes through the system of administration of justice, is committed to a jail, and goes through this whole review committee in the jail to find out how they're going to rehabilitate him, it takes about 30 days, and he gets out in 29. For example, we find that 65 per cent, that's 800 people, are in the Lethbridge jail for less than 60 days. I don't care how long they're in. But let's not con ourselves into believing we're going to rehabilitate anybody if, out of that, 460 are there for less than 30 days and it takes 30 days to determine that. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if we're going to talk about saving money — to think about saving money is still not old-fashioned — we should then consider the use of jails for the safety of the public, not as a drying out tank for some fellow who's been out on the night.

Mr. Speaker, I want to comment on two final points. One is the mobility of Canadians. I am told that the average Canadian moves once every four years. If that's true, if we have that highly mobile society, is it right therefore that we should all, under the strong and retentionist feelings of sections in the BNA Act, feel that we shouldn't consult with other people in areas of education and health delivery? Recognizing that an Albertan today is a B.C.-ite tomorrow, and vice versa, shouldn't we spend a little more time in consultation with other provinces as to their problems in education, social drinking, and housing? Because eventually, if mobility continues, and I see no reason for it to change . . . One advantage to being in B.C. is that you can't go any further unless you swim. But when you get to Alberta there's still some option of going out. I think we should spend a little time that way.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be inappropriate if I didn't say something about health. As you know, we're 2 million Albertans. Last year we made 14 million claims against the system. Everybody in Alberta makes a claim every 6 or 7 weeks, and we're one of the healthiest specimens on earth. I don't know how we equate that. But not many years ago, in recognition of the problems Americans had — last year about 15,000 went bankrupt because of medical expenses — we reached the point where we brought out universal health care, with a concept and several conditions. We all subscribed to it whether we wanted to or not. I suggest we're now on a collision course with the provider of that health care, namely the physician, for whatever reason. Hopefully the Member for Calgary Millican will come up with the answer next week, because he's chairman of that committee. But it seems to me that, on the one hand, we accept the universality of medical care and hospitalization for people who make claims against the system, recognizing that perhaps up to three-quarters of them are life style, self-inflicted, or self-induced, like smoking, drinking, preaching. [laughter] A tremendous number of people visit a physician because of psychotherapy. If you can interpret that and figure it out, you can probably understand it.

Mr. Speaker, we in Alberta are very fortunate to have come as far as we have. I suggest many problems need to be resolved. We seem to spend so much time racing

just to keep up, that I question whether we ever take enough time to stop and think of some of the implications of the concerns mentioned today. I would urge all members to give a little consideration and thought to some of those concerns.

Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker.

[Two members rose]

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview won the tie.

MR. NOTLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In addressing the 1979 budget, first of all in my judgment there are a number of positive features in the budget. Clearly the decision of the government to proceed with an assured income for the handicapped is a step in the right direction, one that is long overdue. Having served for a number of years on a committee of MLAs and the handicapped in Alberta, knowing that handicapped associations have for some time been requesting an assured income, it is gratifying to see us at least move in this direction this year. Similarly, the decision to lower the tax rate for small business is welcome.

One area of the budget that I suppose has received a certain amount of controversy is the decision to expand capital works construction this year. But I believe it's probably the correct approach to take. I don't think it's the kind of thing we want to see in the long term, Mr. Speaker, but quite clearly it is better to expand our public works at this juncture than to have people presently in the construction industry receiving unemployment insurance. We are clearly between major projects, and there is a lag, if you like, a gap between the private investment available to continue the construction boom and the necessary investment to ensure overall full employment in that area. It seems logical to me that in the short run we should be moving many of our capital works projects ahead. I'm sure all hon. members will have suggestions as to their favorite capital works projects.

Nevertheless, the principle of using public works, if you like, to bridge the investment gap is really just an application of Keynesian economics to the Alberta scene. I don't know whether our Provincial Treasurer is a red Tory or a pink Tory; nevertheless, this is a version of Keynes. How that will sit with some of the right-wing members of the caucus, I wouldn't venture to say. [interjections]

DR. BUCK: There aren't any.

MR. NOTLEY: However, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move from there, if I can, not to spend my moments today congratulating the government — you have 73 members to do that — but to look at some aspects of the budget which, in my view, aren't quite as favorable.

First of all, let's take a look at the economic analysis behind the budget. The suggestion is made that there's going to be a slow recovery in industrialized countries. I'm rather interested to hear that, Mr. Speaker, because at the OECD conference that Ms. MacDonald is attending on behalf of Canada — she has the problem of trying to interpret economics for our new Prime Minister, as well as trying to extricate him from the unbelievable fiasco of this embassy move.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, at the OECD conference

the general assessment is that there's going to be a slow-down this year; that inflation is in fact going to be a bigger problem, largely because of higher oil prices; that we're going to see a lower rate of growth than we saw in the industrialized countries last year; and that unemployment will probably increase in the industrialized world. So I find it a little difficult to understand where the government of Alberta concludes that there's going to be a recovery. The best information from other quarters in the world would indicate that unless there's a sudden decision on the part of the OPEC nations to change the course of planned energy price increases, it is almost a dead certainty that we will see at least stagnation and possibly a recession throughout the industrialized world over the next couple of years.

I want to move from there to deal with the question of tax reduction. Of course, we had a very happy group of Tories before the last budget, Mr. Speaker, and after the Budget Address, when we decided to take off the gasoline tax. At that time we were thinking of an election in the fall, so we were handing out tax money very generously. This year, I see the Provincial Treasurer has moved in a modest manner. A number of Albertans will be dropped from the income tax rolls of the province. I would certainly applaud that.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would say to members of the House that a better way of getting money into the hands of people who need it at the low end of the income scale, rather than simply eliminating income tax, is to have a form of refundable tax credit. The present budget will help the 116,000 people who are no longer going to pay provincial income tax. That's laudatory. But the 144,000 who weren't paying it already, the low-income people who need the assistance most, don't receive anything under the new program.

I say to members of the House that one of the merits of a refundable tax credit is that you get purchasing power into the hands of low-income people who, first of all, need it more and, secondly, are in a position where the tax benefits they receive are, in most cases, spent buying goods and services produced right here in our own province. Tax cuts for high-income people may well be great for the foreign travel business. It may be a good thing when it comes to importing English bone china, but it's not going to do much for the brickworks in Medicine Hat. It's not going to do much for the corner grocery store in Thorhild. On the other hand, tax cuts designed to get money into the hands of low-income people, who buy their goods and services right here in Alberta, are a form of tax policy that is going to maximize purchasing power where it counts: in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move from there, if I can, to survey the Alberta economy in 1979. We've heard so much from this government about its decentralization and diversification thrusts. It's probably useful every now and again to do a little report card on what the government has or hasn't achieved. Unfortunately, when one reads through the appendices of the provincial budget, all one gets is the glowing picture of what a great job this Tory government is doing. But as one goes through the reams of statistical information available in this province, one sees a different picture emerging.

First of all, let's look at the Alberta net commodity production. The source is the Bureau of Statistics, the Alberta Statistical Review. We're looking at the dif-

ference between 1971 and 1977. Yes, there's been an increase in net commodity production right across the board. But the most significant increase has been in oil, gas, and mining — our non-renewable resource sector. In 1971, 38.7 per cent of net commodity production was in the oil, gas, and mining sector. By 1977, Mr. Speaker, that figure had risen to 53.5 per cent; in other words, an increase of almost 15 per cent. More than half of Alberta net commodity production is now in oil, gas, and mining.

On the other hand, when one looks at agriculture — and we had the Provincial Treasurer talk about the increase in receipts by Alberta farmers. Yes, receipts have gone up. But look at the net commodity production: in 1971, 14.7 per cent; in 1977, 9.9 per cent. This is something, Mr. Speaker, the new Minister of Agriculture is going to have to get busy and address. Even construction: in 1971, 23.4 per cent; in 1977, 20 per cent.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I would think most important in any government's effort to develop an overall economic diversification policy. For the last eight years we've heard one speech after another by Tory members saying, we have to diversify the economy, that's the thrust of this policy and that policy. Certainly, manufacturing has to be a major objective of any diversification policy. Well, let's look at how well the government has been doing in that area. In 1971, 19.7 per cent of net commodity production was in manufacturing. That has fallen to 14.6 per cent.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is fairly obvious that when it comes to additional production in the province of Alberta, to a very large extent we are even more dependent on the oil and gas industry in 1979 than we were in 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move from there to the whole question of job creation. First of all, there's an inconsistency in the figures contained in the budget and, surprisingly enough, an inconsistency that doesn't favor the government. It's about the first time I've seen a statistical conflict that doesn't favor this government. The Budget Address says 282,500 jobs were created between 1970 and 1978. But according to the Bureau of Statistics, it's actually a little higher than that: 334,000.

Mr. Speaker, let's take a look at where these jobs were created. First of all the oil, gas, and mining industry saw a very substantial increase in the number of jobs: 23,000 to 53,000, an increase of 130 per cent; manufacturing, a slight but disappointing increase over eight years, 23.5 per cent; in the case of agriculture, however, a net loss of jobs from 94,000 to 85,000. Mr. Speaker, the source of these statistics is the Alberta Statistical Review, Alberta Bureau of Statistics.

In the construction industry there has been an increase from 43,000 to 100,000 jobs, an increase of about 132 per cent. One of the criticisms that opposition members have made of this government's management of the economy is that we are too dependent not only on the oil and gas industry but, in terms of employment, on continued capital booms related directly to the oil and gas industry. While I said just a moment ago that I think we have to bridge the gap to maintain the construction industry, the fact of the matter is that all Albertans have to ask this government what it is going to do for an encore after some of these major projects we've heard so much about — the Alsands project, the Imperial Oil project, Cold Lake, and the Alcan pipeline — are completed. Are we going to have a continued number of major projects?

Is that going to be the future diversification of this province? Or are we going to be emphasizing secondary industry, manufacturing, the kind of industries that provide long-term job availability that isn't directly related to a capital boom.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the proposed industrial projects as of June 30, 1978. Again this is from the Alberta Business Development and Tourism list of construction projects, June 30, 1979. There are 52 petroleum and petrochemical projects; the cost of these projects is \$10.6 billion. Mr. Speaker, 84.2 per cent of the capital of these major projects and 76.9 per cent of the jobs are directly related to petroleum or the petrochemical industry.

You then look at mining, again a substantial amount. Manufacturing, a disappointing amount: only 14 projects, 12 per cent of the investment capital, 9 per cent of the jobs. When you look at forestry, again a very disappointing amount: only 0.2 per cent of the capital and 3.4 per cent of the jobs. Agricultural processing, perhaps the most dismal of all: 0.1 per cent of the capital and about 1 per cent of the jobs created.

So, Mr. Speaker, despite what we've heard about the great job the Alberta Conservative government has done in diversifying the economy, emphasizing what we do after oil and gas gradually wind down, we find that in 1979, whether one looks at the value of commodity added, whether one looks at employment — the jobs created — whether one examines the major industrial projects, the bottom line, and it is the bottom line that concerns the people of Alberta, is that we are more dependent on oil, gas, and a construction industry dependent on oil and gas than ever before in our history.

One has to look at the amount of money necessary to create a job. Again we look at the information contained in Alberta Business Development and Tourism statistics. We find that the oil industry produced jobs, but at a very large cost: about \$2,367,000 per job, in the case of petroleum and petrochemical enterprises. Utilities are even more capital intensive for each job created. I find that interesting, because various local Conservatives in the north Peace were convinced that all we had to do was build a dam on the Peace River and we'd have the employment problems of the entire Peace River country solved forever. The average cost of a job in the utility industry is \$6,400,000. But, Mr. Speaker, contrast that with manufacturing, at \$268,000 a job, a difference of almost 20:1; forestry, \$96,000 a job, a difference of 60:1; agricultural processing, \$208,000 a job, or about 30:1, compared to utility development. Clearly many comments of people like the leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Nick Taylor, are probably more relevant than many members in this House would like to admit; that is, we're going to create better long-term job opportunities by gradually shifting away from an economy based to a very large extent on non-renewable resources.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to examine the three major projects the government seems to be flirting with at this stage. Of course, we're told the ERCB is going to be conducting hearings, and no decision is going to be made on Cold Lake before the ERCB renders its decision. I am really pleased to hear this. I'm a little sceptical of it, but I always await with interest these answers in question period about the sober gentlemen across the way who aren't going to be jumping to any conclusions; they're going to wait till they have

all the facts in from the ERCB. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we're looking at . . .

DR. BUCK: Very cautious.

MR. NOTLEY: Very cautious, indeed. We have three major projects: Alsands, Cold Lake, and the Alcan pipeline. I didn't have a chance in the question period today, but I will in the next several days, to query the Premier on what some of these reports from Calgary about prebuilding the Canadian section of the Alcan pipeline mean, and whether we're going to be flirting with investment from the heritage trust fund in that particular project.

Mr. Speaker, I raise these three projects specifically in light of the Northern Alberta Development Council. If you look at the annual report of the Northern Alberta Development Council, you'll see that all three of these proposed projects are in the domain, the geographical area, served by the council. Now wouldn't you have thought that with these three crucial projects being contemplated, with all sorts of social implications for the people in the area, we would in fact be making major changes to strengthen the Northern Alberta Development Council?

As a member of the House, I want to say I have the greatest respect for the hon. Member for Grande Prairie. As a matter of fact, many of us in the Peace River country were told during the election campaign that the hon. Member for Grande Prairie would be in the cabinet. Considering the huge number of cabinet ministers we did appoint, it strikes me as rather surprising that he wasn't appointed to the cabinet, because he has the ability to make an excellent cabinet minister.

DR. BUCK: He's not eligible for the pension yet.

MR. NOTLEY: But, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that these major projects are all in the area serviced by the Northern Alberta Development Council, what struck me as incredible is that in the new structure we take away the chairman, who was a member of Executive Council, and replace that structure with a northern development council chaired by a very able backbencher. And I say, who in heaven's name does this government really think it's trying to kid? People know that if we're going to be making decisions, if the Northern Alberta Development Council is going to be relevant, it has to have access to those meetings every Tuesday morning where the decisions are made, that discussion in the Northern Alberta Development Council fed second hand to the government isn't really good enough. I say to the members of the House that I find it rather strange indeed that with these major projects so clearly in the offing, we didn't restructure and strengthen the Northern Alberta Development Council. And if it was the choice of the hon. Premier I had the Member for Grande Prairie be the chairman, fair enough, put him in the cabinet and make him a minister of northern development.

Some of the members here are looking the other way. I remember the debate we had in 1974 on Bill 55, and one of the most eloquent speeches in that entire debate over whether we should have a commissioner for northeastern Alberta, with all those extraordinary powers the government was going to and did grant the commissioner of northeastern Alberta. The debate took place over whether we should do that, or whether we

should have a minister accountable in the Legislature. I remember the hon. Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc at that time. Jim Henderson, standing in the Legislature and making the point that if you're going to go ahead with these major projects, and enormous powers are required to do certain things, at least have somebody in this House who is accountable on an ongoing basis.

The point the former Member for Wetaskiwin-Leduc made was valid in 1974, and it's equally valid in 1979. What are we going to do? Are we going to have a czar of the Cold Lake region, if we go ahead with that? Are we going to perpetuate the powers of the commissioner of northeastern Alberta as far as the Alsands project is concerned? Are we going to do the same thing in northwestern Alberta with the Alcan pipeline?

Would it not be more sensible, Mr. Speaker, to take a close look at the total role of the Northern Development Council and give it the kind of strength that is necessary so there can be local input, some sort of local planning, and a minister in this House who can be accountable day in and day out for the problems of co-ordination. You know, what we're going to see in the Cold Lake area, in Fort McMurray, and even in the Peace River country if the Alcan pipeline proceeds, will be just incredible foul-ups due to lack of co-ordination. I think the Northern Development Council could play an important co-ordinating role, with a minister sitting in Executive Council, answerable on an ongoing basis to this House.

Mr. Speaker, I want to deal with one other major area before I conclude my remarks. Last Friday we got into the habitual discussion that occurs every now and again, about whether we should have a *quid pro quo*, a trade-off, some cushioning of energy prices, in return for a different arrangement on freight rates. Of course the Premier once again restated his position that there was going to be no trade-off; they were two entirely unrelated things. And all the hon. Tory members of the House banged their desks in appreciation. Before the government retreated on that one, we were planning trade-offs several years ago with the United States: no natural gas to the United States unless we get concessions for our boxed beef and petrochemical products. They were even including rapeseed at one time.

Mr. Speaker, whether this government wants to admit it or not, trade-offs are part of the democratic process. What democratic government anywhere does not always have to make trade-offs? What federal state can exist in the absence of trade-offs? For people to say, we're going to get our way in every single item, or else. Or else what? Or else we have what has happened over the last five years: we get nothing in return. We are substantially under the world price. The balanced American price that the hon. Minister of Energy and Natural Resources was talking about is now about \$4.25 a barrel higher than the price in Canada. So we're making enormous concessions to the energy needs of Canada, but we're not getting anything in return. The government is saying, oh, we're not prepared to bargain one for the other. We'd rather get nothing in return, except the opportunity every four years to scream to high heaven before the television cameras and turn it into a plebiscite once again to re-elect the Tory party with a huge majority.

Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Alberta have a

right to expect a little more from this government, especially now that we have a new prime minister from Alberta of the same political stripe. Although I sometimes wonder at the rather cautious approach, shall I say, of our friends in this Legislature at making any representation to Ottawa. I sometimes wonder if their caution stems from the fact that they realize that where it counts, in the Prime Minister's office, they really aren't going to get very far, and that in deciding public policy in Canada, the Prime Minister is going to be a little more willing to listen to Mr. Davis from Ontario than Mr. Lougheed from Alberta.

A lot of people have a sneaking suspicion that because the province of Alberta is neatly tucked in the back pocket of the Conservative party, and the decision whether the Tories become a majority or a minority government in the next election is going to be made in central Canada, the demands of politicians from central Canada are more likely to be listened to. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I suspect that one of the reasons the government of Alberta has this pussyfooting, soft-soaping, very cautious, diplomatic approach is that it realizes that when it comes to the bottom line, its stock in trade in a conflict/confrontation situation with Ontario isn't very strong with the present government.

Mr. Speaker, I raise the issue of trade-offs because for a long time western Canadian politicians have been urging the federal government to move on this matter. The Western Economic Conference in 1973 allowed the premiers of western Canada to outline very articulately the transportation concerns of this region. I thought we had some excellent beginnings at that conference, including the Hall commission on transportation as far as grain and farm products were concerned, and the Snavely commission on rail rates.

But there hasn't really been much follow-up. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that one of the reasons there hasn't been much follow-up is that we have not been prepared to say, look, in the interests of Canada, let us consider cushioning energy prices. With the usurious prices being demanded by the Arab countries today, I think many Canadians ask, should we have the world price? With its vast geography and distances being such a factor, could this country possibly survive if we had world prices?

Mr. Speaker, if we are to receive substantially less than the opportunity price for products produced in Alberta and Saskatchewan, it is high time that we begin to press Ottawa, particularly with the present administration, to move on transportation matters. A moment ago I said I didn't think this government had too much credibility in a confrontation situation with Ottawa; I suspect that's true. But I think they have considerable latitude in the area of rail transportation, because of the statements that have been made, and because the federal Member for Vegreville is now Minister of Transport. There has never been a better time for this province to renew the request, and to say that in the interest of Canadian unity, in the interest of the Canadian economy, in the interest of jobs throughout Canada, we are prepared to see a trade-off as a reasonable step in order to achieve this larger goal.

Mr. Speaker, I'll just conclude my remarks with one final comment. One of the good things in this budget is the commitment of \$300 million for medical research. But let me very sincerely pass on to members of the Assembly the comment made by a rather respected

scientist who said to me, for heaven's sake, don't let this government talk itself into getting a lot of big names to come. It would be very nice to have these big names, they capture the headlines, but they've already done their work. If this \$300 million is going to be really meaningful, we want to get people who are on the threshold of their work in the scientific field, rather than people who are prepared to rest content on the laurels of achievements made in years gone by. I think this was a rather sound suggestion from someone in a position to know university politics and the politics of professionals very well. I would hope that if we're going to make this \$300 million program something that will make us all proud — proud because we have results — we'll keep that advice in mind.

Thank you.

MR. OMAN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to debate the budget, I go back to a sense of my responsibility as an elected member for Calgary North Hill, and of this Legislature, in trying to place priorities on where my responsibilities lie. Certainly they are perhaps first to my constituency, or equally with the total constituency of Alberta. Obviously, we're here to protect the rights of Albertans and Alberta as a province. This budget seems to serve Albertans, as it ought to. I don't suppose any of us would claim there can't be some changes, trade-offs, or whatever the case may be. But as I look at it, I have to say it is basically a compassionate budget, certainly people-oriented, that takes in some real concerns and meets some real needs of people living in the province of Alberta.

The speaker before me, the Member for Spirit River-Fairview, made some criticisms, particularly with regard to refundable tax credits so we could benefit those who were under the level of income and therefore didn't get any benefit from tax reductions. I would simply point out that I think this budget does do that. Not in that kind of language, but when you see what it's doing for the handicapped in raising some kind of assured income for them; when you think of what it's doing as far as our senior citizens are concerned in increasing their benefits for renter assistance; for health care; for social services — indeed people who are underprivileged as far as income is concerned, I think this budget is very well doing that.

I have some questions with regard to his statements on manufacturing. I note that in Alberta, manufacturing shipments grew last year by 21 per cent, compared with 18.6 per cent in the country as a whole. Furthermore, investment in manufacturing — which I think is indicative and probably won't show up until three, four, five years down the line — grew by 34 per cent in Alberta, compared to only 2.6 per cent for the nation as a whole. So I think that indicates that manufacturing on the whole in Alberta is in a pretty good state, and certainly is growing. That will show up in the figures about four or five years from now.

Many things could be said about this budget. One I want to zero in on today is the last two pages of the presentation by our hon. Treasurer, and that gets into the surplus funds and the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. You see that in less than a year from now — by March 31, 1980 — there will be over \$6.2 billion in the trust fund and some \$2 [billion] surplus in general revenue, giving the province surplus funds — if you want to call them that — of approximately \$8 billion. That's kind of mind-boggling. I don't know if any of

us are able to grasp that. Furthermore, in the years to come this is only going to increase proportionately.

I read a speech not long ago by our present Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, which I believe he gave in London in the middle of May. In that speech he indicated some of the possibilities for resource development in Alberta, indicating that with regard to oil itself we are good for somewhere between 15 to 25 years, certainly 25 years for gas, and 500 years for coal. As far as the oil sands are concerned, we probably have the greatest reserve in the world.

So I see this fund and surplus rising, almost alarmingly, because I'm sure it's going to be our greatest problem. I think we were right; the administration and the government in this province were right in setting up the Heritage Savings Trust Fund. If we had used that fund like some OPEC countries have, it's hard to say what the results would have been. I think we are preserving something for the people of the future.

But when you're talking about \$25 billion or \$30 billion in a period of, say, 10 years from now or maybe less, there's no question that has to have a severe — I don't know if that's the right term to use — certainly a very strong economic impact on the rest of Canada, as well as Alberta, and perhaps on the world. It seems to me that it's impossible for us to live on an isolated, protected island of wealth forever.

The Marxist-Leninist line indicates — I don't know if I can use that term in this Assembly or not, Mr. Speaker, but I think there's a point to be made. I'm sure I can. They indicate that because the rich oppress the poor, inevitably there is going to be revolution when the oppressed people rise up and overthrow those who have been oppressing them. I think there's enough truth in that analysis to say that there's validity there. I think we see that sort of process taking place right now in Central America with the Somoza regime. Of course, I think the real criticism of the communist stance is that their proposed cure is much worse than the disease. For that reason I wouldn't want to follow it through to its logical end.

Yet I think it's true that we have a tremendous responsibility, because it's harder perhaps to handle wealth than it is to handle poverty. History will be our judge. I guess it's a severe, unforgiving system of judgment. I think the greatest challenge we face in this province is to succeed in the handling of wealth where other nations have failed. I mentioned some of the OPEC states and perhaps Iran as examples. I hope future generations will be able to rise up and say we've made some wise decisions. But I think it's a time when we're called upon to put our imagination to work, our best brains to work in working with this sum of money and kind of opportunity.

I see a couple of things here. Really we can't take all the credit for what we have. For an accident of both history and geography puts us in the place we are, a favored place perhaps in all the world. I note that the hon. Treasurer refers to this when he says that this is a God-given endowment. I think we recognize that.

I think also of another important personage in history who gave us what is known as the golden rule, which says in effect: do as you would be done by. There's a revised version of that, by the way, which says: he who has the gold rules. Very often that's the case. I think, however, that that's the thing we want to be aware of, because the only way to preserve our wealth is to share its benefits. I'm not talking now



about give-away programs, but to share the benefits of our wealth — first, I would say, with Albertans. I think this budget indicates we're doing that. Just yesterday we went through the kind of grants we're giving for debt reduction in Alberta, to the tune of approximately \$1 billion, indicating that we're sharing our wealth with all Albertans. The transportation grants — they're all there.

It seems to me, however, that we've also got to be willing to share our benefits with all Canada. Again, I think the government has seen this in the sense that they've been willing to make loans to other provinces, indeed at rates that are desirable. But I think the phrase that was somewhat popular here a few years ago — let the eastern bastards freeze in the dark — is not necessarily the best phrase to use or attitude to take, either for them or for our own interests when it comes right down to it, because I don't think any of us are unaware of the fact that others look upon our wealth with some sense of envy. If we don't use it, and indicate we will use it, for benefit for all of Canada as well as ourselves, there could be moves, particularly constitutional, to deprive us of some of our privileges. We certainly will have to be aware of that.

I move on, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that we are also, I think, responsible for using our wealth beneficially beyond Canadian borders, because again ours is a shrinking world. I am sure you're aware of the statement of Marshall McLuhan, who talks about our world in terms of a global village. I think our government has recognized some of its obligations to the rest of the world. Obviously a medical research fund is going to profit Albertans. But if it profits Albertans in research and discovery, it's obviously going to profit all Canada and all the people in the world. So I think we can take some satisfaction in saying, here, we're doing a service for all mankind in setting up a fund like this.

I don't know if we're all aware of the Alberta Council for International Cooperation. It's made up of approximately 40 non-government organizations. I picked up their annual report the other day, indicating that the government of Alberta works in co-operation with these organizations in raising funds for developments in third-world countries. I think our former Minister of Culture is to be congratulated for his co-operation with these people in instituting this kind of program. Incidentally, our present Minister of Culture was involved in an executive manner with this organization, and I'm sure will show the same kind of sympathy. Last year the two groups raised some \$8.6 million for foreign aid from Alberta, the government giving half of that and the NGOs the other half.

In looking at the countries that have benefited, I thought it would not be a waste of time to read to you the world-wide implications of this. In Asia we have given aid to Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burma, Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Korea, Laos, Malaysia, Nepal, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam; in the Middle East: Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, and Turkey; in South America: Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, and Surinam; in Central America: Barbados, Belize, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama, and Peru — it looks like maybe Nicaragua needs some more; in North America: Mexico, the West Indies, Antigua, Dominica, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Santa Lucia, Trinidad, and the Windward Islands; in Europe: Romania, Turkey, and Italy; and then in Africa: Benin,

Botswana, Berunda, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central Africa, Chad, the Congo, Egypt, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Rhodesia, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Swaziland, Tanzania, Togo, Upper Volta, Zaire, and Zambia. The pronunciation is not guaranteed in every case, Mr. Speaker.

I think that's a great program. I'm sure we're just scratching the surface, but I urge the present minister that perhaps we should look at increasing the ratio the private sector is raising. I'm absolutely sure these dollars are much appreciated and, in effect, go to secure our standing in the world.

Let me fly even beyond this, for I don't believe in simply give-away programs. I think they only breed dependency. And one of the great problems of course is, how do we invest this fund at a return that's greater and increases faster than inflation? I wonder — it may not be possible — if we could aid our third-world brethren by some kind of foreign development corporation, whether through the World Bank, through which we would make loans, or actually going in, in the development sense of industry on an equity basis. I simply throw these things out as ideas. There may be some political overtones which make them impossible. But at the same time, we live on an island of great financial security. I think we ought to recognize that nevertheless we do live in a world which, in some cases, doesn't understand or can't comprehend the riches either you or I individually have.

I want to close, Mr. Speaker, by reading from a speech by Robert McNamara, who I suppose was best known to us as the Secretary of Defense, but has been head of the World Bank for 11 years. Two weeks ago at the University of Chicago, he was given an award for his promotion of world understanding. He says in his speech:

"... there are today more than 1 billion human beings in the developing countries whose incomes per head have ... risen only about \$2 a year: from \$130 in 1965 to \$150 in 1975.

That's a yearly income.

But what is beyond the power of any set of statistics to illustrate is the inhuman degradation the vast majority of these individuals are condemned to .... Malnutrition saps their energy, stunts their bodies and shortens their lives. Illiteracy darkens their minds ...."

The poverty could be alleviated greatly by "a comparatively small contribution in money and skills from the developed world," said McNamara. Making the contribution would help stabilize poor nations and thus help the security [in this case] of the U.S. In addition, it would assist the American economy, which, McNamara said, "increasingly depends on the ability of the developing nations both to purchase its exports and to supply it with important raw materials."

But McNamara believes the main reason for helping struggling countries is not self-interested economics. Said he: "The fundamental case is the moral one. The whole of human history has recognized the principle that the rich and powerful have a moral obligation to assist the poor and the weak. That is what the sense of community is all about — any community: the community of the family, the community of the

nation, the community of nations itself."

Mr. Speaker, I hope therefore that we take our position and our place in history seriously. I think we have a great duty to perform, and perhaps we are faced with one of the greatest challenges of all time.

MR. PAHL: Mr. Speaker, I would first like to compliment the hon. Provincial Treasurer on a budget that will:

... continue to build upon Alberta's strengths, to improve the quality of life, to diversify our economy, to balance growth, to stimulate the creation of thousands of new and better jobs, and to seize the initiative in moving to overcome our geographic and regional disadvantages.

In listening to the other tributes to the hon. Treasurer — and I thought it was very manful of the hon. Member for Spirit River-Fairview to join in that. Despite his artful and dramatic use of statistics, which brings to mind President Truman's definition of what statistics do, I kept looking for that bottom line. What I found in the bottom line was agreement that the Department of Economic Development was a good idea. It's good of him to say that. I would only caution him, after listening to his definition of refundable tax credits which might mean negative income tax, and in view of his proximity in the House, that I would wonder whether economic theories are contagious.

From the perspective of the community of Edmonton Mill Woods, Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly comment on a few elements of this mind-boggling budget, in part on its stated as well as its implied implications.

Alberta's strengths: agriculture and energy are at the economic base of Alberta, Mr. Speaker. There is some agriculture in the constituency of Edmonton Mill Woods, but inasmuch as I suspect that most of those farmers are millionaires-in-waiting, I will address the question of energy. In budgets there is necessarily a revenue side as well as an expenditure side. And as gratifying as our revenues are, in my view we are mortgaging our future in Alberta by, as a nation, not facing up to world prices for our energy sources of oil and gas. We must honor our agreements and do our share and more for the nation, but we must do it at fair prices for our resources.

Mr. Speaker, in my view there is a common misconception regarding the availability of oil and gas. There is and always will be enough oil and gas available to us if we are prepared and able to pay the going market price. This truism explains the success of the oil industry in proving up additional reserves of gas. More gas reserves will be made available if reserves excess to Alberta's and Canada's needs can be exported at market prices. I believe that export sales of gas and oil should be encouraged for the continued good health of Alberta's conventional oil and gas exploration, drilling, and production industries, and ultimately for the development of heavy oil and oil sands resources.

This industry and its support services are prime employers in Mill Woods and, I know, in the rest of Alberta. I also feel inclined to indicate that this industry, from its Alberta base, enjoys prestige, an important market share, and participation the world over. Concern has been expressed in my constituency at the needless provocation by our federal government, and we hope this might be avoided in the future.

Mr. Speaker, in my view the quality of life is well-addressed in this budget, first in planning for immediate and long-term job opportunities and diversification in the province's economy. I guess I'm old-fashioned, but I think a job whereby a person can make a positive contribution to his or her own future well-being is extremely important. Not only is having a job important, but I think being able to keep more of what you make in that job is revolutionary in these days.

Think of it: an estimated 290,000 Alberta citizens will benefit from the personal income tax reduction plan. That's nearly one-third of Alberta's labor force. I wouldn't call that modest. Added assistance to renters, both senior and low-income wage earners, will improve the quality of life in a direct financial way to an estimated 225,000 households. The Alberta small business corporate tax reduction will help an estimated 17,000 small businesses, which are the backbone of our economy, to the tune of \$40 million. All these programs have the effect of putting money in the hands of working people who, by definition, are in a better position than governments to identify their spending needs and priorities. That has to be a benefit.

The additional \$35.6 million benefit for assured income for severely handicapped persons in the 18 to 65 range is just great. I would like to relate to you an experience of a constituent of mine who has multiple sclerosis. He has an income of slightly over \$200 a month. He operates a specially equipped car so he can go out and do part-time selling to supplement his income and get him out of the house. The problem is, though, that he's limited to earning another \$50 before it cuts into his income. Now I appreciate that that income will in effect be increased by this program, but I think it's the sort of thing that hurts incentive. Mr. Speaker, I would hope we can do a little fine-tuning on a well-meaning program so we can provide some incentive and dignity to handicapped people who would still like to work.

In addition, the \$2.2 million for quality day care will be very important in Mill Woods, where there is a shortage of these facilities and a very large participation of both parents in the work force. I sincerely hope the city of Edmonton will not deny these available funds in the manner that happened last year.

The \$300 million Alberta heritage foundation for medical research is important because it could provide the legacy of an important advance in treatment of a serious disease. I think this important step toward a brain centre could build upon strengths already established in Alberta. I think of the Alberta Research Council, the Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority, the Chembiomed project, coal development, and others. I think there is both a critical-mass concept and a synergistic relationship in the development of this sort of brain industry; for example, the joining of the surgeon and the engineer to build the plastic heart valve. So you need a number of these who can spread their expertise across different areas. It has to build, particularly as it relates to Alberta's industrial strengths.

The creation of jobs anticipated from seed money for the development of a brain industry are the best possible kinds of jobs. They are non-polluting; they sometimes prevent pollution through the development of improved products. And, more important, they create wealth and further development through the use of the

intellectual process rather than resource development. Again, this is the sort of thing we find very encouraging in Mill Woods, where we have an 80 to 85 per cent participation in the Alberta labor force.

Mr. Speaker, another highly positive job-producing benefit, particularly to the constituency of Edmonton Mill Woods, is the government's 1979-80 capital construction program. This program will smooth out the valleys or quiet times in the design, procurement, and construction industries. The importance of the new Department of Economic Development in supporting this brain-oriented industry is to help it compete on a worldwide scale. That merits notice, because I think it's important for these sorts of firms not only to compete domestically but, in order to compete internationally, they have to build up some achievements domestically so they can attract clients worldwide. That increased capital spending will be an important boost to them.

The municipal debt reduction program has been enthusiastically met by my constituents in Edmonton Mill Woods. I think we, like other citizens in Edmonton, are looking forward to the city council's answer to our \$62.5 million question. Perhaps the opportunity for municipalities to wrestle with the challenges of prosperity, as my seatmate mentioned, is a positive thing.

In concluding my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to observe that this government's excellent stewardship of our God-given resources, that has created the Heritage Savings Trust Fund, needs to be and I'm sure will be directed further to the challenges and opportunities the Heritage Savings Trust Fund has created for our province and our country.

Thank you.

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to make a few comments on the Budget Address. I would like to limit the thrust of my comments to one very small but extremely significant portion of the Department of Social Services and Community Health, the area of the handicapped.

I would like to do that, Mr. Speaker, because a great deal of interest has been generated by members of this Assembly, not to mention the emphasis placed on services to the handicapped by this government. Members will recall that in our Speech from the Throne, delivered a few short weeks ago, six priorities were outlined by the Lieutenant-Governor, one of which related to our handicapped citizens.

I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, that we take a moment to reflect on the road we've covered as a government, to look at the gains we've made and, yes, some of the disappointments we've had. I'd like to go back to 1972 and look at the way handicapped individuals were dealt with at that time. Prior to the 1972 amendments to The Mental Health Act, handicapped services were delivered primarily through our institutions. Legislation provided very little distinction between the needs of the mentally retarded and the mentally ill. As well, people who were physically disabled had limitations imposed upon them which were not always accurate.

The Blair report of 1969 advocated a greater thrust in the development of services for the mentally retarded, with particular emphasis on developing more community-based services and on opportunities for all the handicapped. On April 1, 1972, the new Minister of Health and Social Development, the Hon. Neil Craw-

ford, who had been in his position for less than eight months, took a bold step by creating another division of the Department of Health and Social Development, a division of services for the handicapped.

I would like to sketch quickly for members of the Assembly some of the dramatic things which have happened since that eventful date. First I'd like to share in a graphic way with my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, the dollars and cents implications of the unfolding drama of services for the handicapped. In the 1972-73 budget, the total dollars allocated for services to the handicapped amounted to slightly more than \$14.25 million. That \$14.25 million was broken down in this way: a little more than \$11 million was earmarked for what we now call Michener Centre in Red Deer; another \$3.2 million was committed for community services. During the next two fiscal years, two very important things began to happen. First, more dollars went to the division itself; and second, the ratio between the expenditures at Michener Centre and community services began to change. Total dollars for the fiscal year 1975-76 were \$32 million, a 224 per cent increase in three years. The ratio of dollars spent at Michener Centre compared with community services shifted from 3:1 to 1.5:1.

During our years of fiscal restraint my predecessor, the hon. Helen Hunley, worked very hard to ensure that the commitments we had made and were making to the handicapped would not be lost. Attention to this very important area of social concern continued. The 1976-77 through 1978-79 budgets reflect that. We see a growth from \$37 million to \$47 million, with an even larger proportion of the budget going to community services for the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker, the department estimates for the 1979-80 fiscal year reflect two very significant factors in the allocation for the program for the handicapped. The total allocation, in the amount of \$54.5 million, represents an increase of 382 per cent over a seven-year period. For the very first time, the proportion of that allocation which goes to community-based services exceeds the moneys going to Michener Centre. We plan to invest \$26.4 million at Michener Centre and \$28.1 million for community services.

Mr. Speaker, I deliberately put my first emphasis on dollars and cents, not to suggest that's the most important aspect, but to save for members of the Assembly the human side for my second thrust. Because that's where the true measurement takes place. In March 1972, *Hansard* recorded there was a waiting list for admittance to Michener Centre of 600 people, 300 of whom were classified as emergency. There were plans at that time to construct 800 additional institutional beds, 400 in Edmonton and 400 in Calgary. As a consequence of our new focus on community services for the handicapped, those plans did not proceed.

Six new regional offices were established under the services for the handicapped division. That was part of our commitment to regional service and decentralization. Community residential space increased from 196 to 705; infant development program space increased from zero in 1972 to approximately 128 in the present fiscal budget; child development and day-training space have increased from 15 to 390; and vocational training spaces have increased from 543 to 1,380. One hundred and forty beds have been developed in smaller institutions operated by the department. I'm thinking of Cormack Centre in Edmonton and the Baker Centre

in Calgary. About six weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege, along with the hon. Member for Calgary North West, to visit the Baker Centre. We had a chance to chat with some of the staff and to see some of the youngsters and the kind of training taking place. It's exciting and very emotional.

The total population of Michener Centre — and this is a key factor — has been reduced by 500 beds since 1972. At the same time, residents required to remain at Michener Centre have had both their program content and the facility substantially improved. The establishment of the handicapped children's service program in 1974 has also contributed significantly to improving the availability of services for handicapped children in Alberta. This program, administered by the child welfare branch, has entered into agreements with parents of more than 3,500 handicapped children. It provided financial assistance to the parents for costs of special health and social services required for the child.

Mr. Speaker, our appropriation in the 1979-80 budget continues to reflect this government's deep concern and sincere commitment to a priority first articulated in the throne speech of 1972. I thought it appropriate, as we continue to build programs which help our fellow Albertans reach their full potential, to sketch a history of the road we have travelled. I invite my colleagues to visit some of the programs and institutions. Gone are the white uniforms, the sterile surroundings that allowed for no stimulation, and the white hospital gowns that the patients were required to wear. All have been replaced by color and a new form. The importance of texture has also been introduced. Very dramatic gains have been made: less reliance on medication; less respiratory infection; fewer medical complaints; and greatest of all, people have emerged from the institutions to live in the surrounding communities and in support homes.

Mr. Speaker, if we had believed in 1972 that the mere allocation of funds to this cause would automatically, or in some magic way, ensure success, we surely would have failed. If we had believed that programs designed, coupled with an infusion of dollars, would have been the key to success, we surely would have failed. If we need to spend money — and we need good program design, but we need people out there, people who care, people who have the patience, who believe the little fellow who happens to be blind and has other handicaps can be helped, can be taught to climb stairs, to feed himself, and perhaps one day to stand on his own and live on his own in the community. By "people out there", I mean the many, many volunteers as well as dedicated officials in our department.

As we prepare to debate the dollars and design of new programs such as aids to daily living and assured income for the handicapped, Albertans will be watching. We've come a long way in the eight years; we have a long way to go. I intend to bring to this Assembly, on behalf of my colleagues in the caucus, programs that will help the people of Alberta. They will be implemented. As a result, in meeting the needs of our citizens we must pay close attention to the commitments we have made and are currently making. If we don't, we will fail those Albertans who count on us to help them only until they can help themselves.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HYLAND: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in this budget debate. I would also like to compliment

the Provincial Treasurer on the delivery of the budget speech last Friday. It is a budget we as Albertans and members of this Legislature can all be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, upon delivery of a budget such as that, we have often been accused of looking after ourselves in Alberta and forgetting about the rest of Canada. But in the estimates of costs I've been able to find, it is estimated that the difference between the price we now receive for our non-renewable natural resources and the world price of oil, the loss of revenue, if it could be called that, could be approximately \$1 billion. Mr. Speaker, I think the people of Alberta could say that \$1 billion has been their contribution to assisting to the rest of Canada for the high cost of the natural resource. Also, not involved in that amount would be natural gas, for which, as we all know, we receive 85 per cent of par value of oil.

Mr. Speaker, a budget of \$4,521 billion, if my hon. seatmate's arithmetic is right — and he assures me his major in education was in mathematics, so we'll assume it's right — that means approximately \$2,260 of service provided to every man, woman, and child in Alberta. Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that is the highest service per person in Canada. I believe we heard today from another hon. member, I forget who, that our budget was about half that of one of the American states, with about one-tenth the population. So indeed, Mr. Speaker, that is a great amount of money for people service provided from the provincial budget.

In the field of education, I come from an area where most of the rural part is facing declining enrolment. Included in declining enrolment is high transportation costs in moving the students from their respective farms into the towns and villages where the schools are located. I sincerely hope the declining enrolment grant is going to be of great assistance in this area, because they are running into some heavy financial problems.

An example of the problems that one can run into: I have been working with the minister on a problem involving a child whose parents live about 17 miles from the end of the nearest bus stop. They ranch, and they live in an area where there is a group of families over in the corner of the province just a few miles north of the Saskatchewan-American border. There's a small number of families in that area, but none of them with young children except this family. We are faced with moving this child some 17 miles to the end of the nearest bus stop at Onefour, which is a federal research station, and then from there into Manyberries, which is the closest school. It seems like an easy problem, but there are complications we are trying to get ironed out. I believe we will get them ironed out in the near future.

I give you this example, Mr. Speaker, because it is not only in the northern part of the province where, in some instances, we face a large number of miles to move young children for education, but also in the southern part of the province, where farms and ranches are spread a long way apart.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of housing, I'm sure the new assisted programs we have for house ownership in the budget speech will be greatly appreciated by the residents of Cypress, especially those in the town of Redcliff. I believe the upward limits placed on houses there will qualify quite readily for the assisted home ownership programs we have proposed in the budget.

Mr. Speaker, in the field of agriculture, I was pleased

to hear in the budget of the 12 per cent increase for the promotion of Alberta products. It is very important that we promote our products in Alberta and abroad. As you've all heard me say many times, in Alberta we can grow almost anything, especially in the south where we have irrigation and a supply of water. But the big problem is to market it and move it through the system, and in some cases to get Alberta people thinking Alberta so they use their products. A good example, Mr. Speaker, is the television commercial we've all seen promoting milk and cheese, that I think must have been very successful.

Mr. Speaker, I was also pleased that again we've shown in the budget speech the \$100 million that is committed to the development of a port at Prince Rupert. This port will greatly assist grain movement from Alberta. Mr. Speaker, I think we have a unique opportunity at this point in time to develop something modern and up to date that can readily handle the product necessary to put through it. Also, the acquisition of the federal government elevators will greatly assist movement of grain. I think it is going to be a unique challenge to the government, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Economic Development to use these elevators to the utmost to move grain and whatever other product they can be used for through the system. The assistance of these large internal storage bins will enable us to move produce to the coast on relatively short notice.

Mr. Speaker, one of the major crops grown in my area is soft white wheat. In the last couple of years we have had some problems with this wheat. Part of the problem, the poor quality in last year's harvest, was due to the wet weather conditions. This wheat deteriorates quite quickly. We have a lower grade than normal, and a great many bushels of this lower grade.

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that the Wheat Board is not moving this grain very fast. Last year the Robin Hood flour mill company ceased the majority of its contracts in the area on very short notice. Early last winter, one of the other companies, Maple Leaf Mills, sent a letter to the growers saying that their contracts would be cut by 50 per cent. I must say that the second company did have the common decency to notify the farmers before their seed was cleaned and treated that they would be cutting their acreage in half, whereas the previous company just notified through the elevator agents and caused many hard feelings amongst the people in the communities. Shortly after that, Maple Leaf Mills put another proposal to the growers that if they delivered to the mill in the Hat they would be able to regain the entire acreage they had in the previous year.

Mr. Speaker, soft white wheat composes about 160,000-plus acres. I believe, in southern Alberta. My constituency grows approximately 80 per cent of that. Of the total amount grown, Alberta has about 97 per cent. Only about 3 per cent is grown in Saskatchewan. So it is a crop that is grown in a very small area of the province. It is a crop that produces very high bushels per acre, grown under irrigation. There's a different kind of flour from it, and it doesn't compete in any field with any other wheat or any other wheat quota allotment.

As a grower, when I received the letter in early December from Maple Leaf Mills, I telephoned Mr. Jarvis in Winnipeg. His secretary said he was busy on the phone and would call me back. I waited, and I must compliment the gentleman: he phoned me back in

about 10 minutes. We had quite a long discussion about the problems with soft white wheat. The same story came up: we don't have a market for it, and we can't look for a market until we have enough in stock.

Mr. Speaker, we've all talked about the chicken and egg theory before. You can't look for a market because you haven't got the stock; but nobody's going to build up the stock, so nobody's going to be looking for the market. So you look for something else to grow on irrigation that doesn't interfere with what can be grown elsewhere. I'm not sure there is such a crop. I asked Mr. Jarvis what he would advise, and he had no advice on what else one should grow.

I bring this up, Mr. Speaker, to prove we need aggressive marketing. Of any department of agriculture, I think the Alberta department has been the most aggressive promoter of Alberta products and grains, and we should again push the Wheat Board to look for further markets for our grains.

I might say that this particular wheat right now has many of the elevators in the irrigation area full. I know one elevator in particular has about 200,000 more bushels that have to come in, and no room and no chance of movement of the grain. As you can see, Mr. Speaker, the end loser is the farmer, because this grain is sitting in his bin and he has no cash flow.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the other night I had a phone call from the Foremost Chamber of Commerce. They were very concerned about the movement of grain in Foremost, and said there's some room for grain in the elevators in that area. The kind of grain now needed at the ports is No. 1 wheat. They have a good quantity of that wheat in the area but no quota, or the quota they have is filled. They're crying for it elsewhere, but they don't open up another quota to receive it.

Their concern was that if they did open a quota, they weren't sure it would get any farther than the elevator anyway, because the rail line going down there has had some upgrading, but not a great deal. They came down there a couple of years ago and plastered these huge signs: this rail line will be upgraded. You've all seen them. They're two sheets of plywood long, and cover most of those small tool houses they used to have. They hang over on both sides. Granted, they did come down and do some work and crush a great deal of gravel, but beyond that, in some of the areas all that's there is the sign. They've had a couple or three derailments between Etzikom and Manyberries in the last year, and I understand the track is very soft. I would encourage the government to try to put some pressure on the railroads to continue the upgrading.

The other problem they asked me about that night was that they hauled the gravel out of the area, some 6 or 7 miles south of the tracks, and piled it near the tracks. Now they're loading it again and hauling it to Raymond. I have no objection to helping out the Member for Cardston, but my people are concerned that the gravel supply in the area is limited and they would like their own line upgraded. If indeed they find that they do have excess, the Member for Cardston is quite welcome to the excess in the area.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the hour I beg leave to adjourn debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I move we call it 5:30.

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

[At 5:28 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Thursday at 2:30 p.m.]