

**LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ALBERTA**

[Leave granted; Bill 71 read a first time]

Title: **Friday, October 20, 1978 10:00 a.m.**

[The House met at 10 a.m.]

**PRAYERS**

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

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

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to table the second annual report of the Standing Committee on The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act.

This year the committee had the seven members of cabinet whose portfolios were responsible for the dispersal of funds under The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act come before the committee. All questions asked of the ministers by the committee were answered, and all information requested was provided. In addition, the Deputy Premier and Minister of Transportation agreed to appear before the committee to update the committee with respect to airport development, although no funds had been spent by his department in the 1977-78 report period. The Premier, being chairman of the investment committee of the heritage savings trust fund, also agreed to appear before the committee to bring it up to date on policies and procedures of the investment committee and answer any questions.

Mr. Speaker, 52 recommendations were received by the committee, of which 12 were passed and incorporated in this report. All recommendations were thoroughly discussed and considered by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the committee for their many hours of dedicated effort. On behalf of the committee, I would also like to thank Mrs. Bishop and the *Hansard* staff; Doreen Phillips; Janet Brons; and my secretary, Betty Maurice, for their dedication and hours of extra work. Copies of this report will be distributed to the hon. members this morning.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**head: INTRODUCTION OF BILLS**

**Bill 71  
The Statute Law  
Correction Act, 1978**

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill 71, The Statute Law Correction Act, 1978.

This continues a practice of this government perhaps once a year to introduce legislation which proceeds to correct drafting omissions, incorrect references, and certain errors that we discover in the course of our legislative review. I assure the House, Mr. Speaker, that no matters of principle or policy whatsoever are being changed in this legislation.

**Bill 248**

**An Act to Amend The  
Occupational Health and Safety Act**

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to introduce Bill No. 248, An Act to Amend The Occupational Health and Safety Act.

Very briefly, the bill before the House today would implement some of the recommendations of the Gale commission, particularly with respect to on-site health and safety committees for any site with more than 10 employees. It would clarify the responsibilities of the employer with respect to safety, and authorize workers to refuse to work at unsafe sites.

[Leave granted; Bill 248 read a first time]

**head: TABLING RETURNS AND REPORTS**

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the sixtieth annual report of the Workers' Compensation Board. There are copies for all members in the Clerk's hands.

**head: ORAL QUESTION PERIOD****Urban Development**

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct the first question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It really flows from a report that was done by a joint committee of the Alberta council of the Housing and Urban Development [Association] of Canada and the Department of Housing and Public Works, and also from a resolution this Assembly dealt with some time ago — put forward by Mr. Mandeville, the Member for Bow Valley — regarding the question of financing of servicing to residential lots.

My question deals with the committee's recommendations or comments regarding the annexation procedures. In light of the fact the government received the report in June of this year, what consideration has the Minister of Municipal Affairs had of the recommendations dealing with the procedures by the Local Authorities Board, so that the time to approve annexations could be speeded up a great deal in relation to residential land development?

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition has brought forward one aspect of the study presented by the Housing and Urban Development [Association] of Canada. While we recognize and have fully considered the recommendations of that group, and appreciate the time they spent to make them, it should be noted that another study is in the process of being completed; in fact it's just been received by us. That's by the Urban Development Institute. So we have to have a full understanding of the recommendations of both groups before we can perhaps fully weigh the recommendations.

I might just comment that it's true the annexation process in the metropolitan area specifically is time-consuming. However, for the reasons we have spelled out before in this House in terms of the priori-

ties given to agricultural land, the need to conserve agricultural land around metropolitan areas, the arguments with respect to costs and transportation corridors, and the sheer size of cities, I think the process with respect to metropolitan areas has to be long, protracted, and well-considered.

However, it should be contrasted with the process in some of the rapidly growing communities in this province, the smaller centres, where in fact the process acts very efficiently and effectively. There is ample opportunity for both sides to debate the process of simply transferring land from one jurisdiction to another. In those cases I think the process is acting very effectively.

So before you can really criticize the annexation process in a general way, you must be careful to separate the metropolitan considerations from the balance of the annexations in the province.

DR. BUCK: When are you going to say something?

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. One of the conclusions of the joint HUDAC/Department of Housing and Public Works committee was: "The Local Authorities Board does not have a specific outline of information requirements established for its hearings." That's one of the factors contributing to the long delays. What action has the minister taken since these conclusions were made known to him?

DR. BUCK: Nothing.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact I recently discussed with the chairman of the Local Authorities Board some of the policies the government thinks to be important in annexation questions. We've gone through this process in our cabinet committees over the past few months, and I have communicated those specifically to the chairman of the Local Authorities Board.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, talk is cheap. What action has the minister taken since the end of June?

MR. JOHNSTON: It doesn't matter what I say, Mr. Speaker. If I show action he considers it to be inaction.

I can assure the Member for Olds-Didsbury that in fact we are moving on the recommendations, but as I have stated, we'll make no apologies for taking time on annexation in the metropolitan areas. In fact it's necessary that we fully consider all the ramifications of expansion in metropolitan areas. In the case of the smaller communities, it's acting very efficiently and effectively as a result of our policies in balanced economic growth and decentralization.

DR. BUCK: That's one minister you have to move, Mr. Premier.

MR. LOUGHEED: He's doing great.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, another of the recommendations of this joint HUDAC and Housing and Public Works Department committee was: "The Local Authorities Board only considers information presented and cannot consider other factors in determin-

ing future land requirements of existing communities." My question to the minister is simply this: what action has the minister taken in dealing with that specific recommendation?

The minister can smile all he wants.

MR. JOHNSTON: I'm pleased to answer the questions, Mr. Speaker, that's why. It's a good opportunity for this to be brought forward.

Let me also note that there are other recommendations in the report which the hon. member is not mentioning, and they deal with the subdivision process. I think you'll find that the recommendations in there with respect to the subdivision process specifically have been adjusted. We have made major corrections as a result of communication with the Urban Development Institute and with the Housing and Urban Development Association of Canada, and they agreed to that.

On the question of land use and the way the Local Authorities Board process operates, it should be understood — and I will attempt to explain this to the hon. Leader of the Opposition — that the annexation process is not a forum where the debate on urban growth can be focussed. It is a debate only as to assessment, as to the need for land, and as to a broad understanding of the population directions of an urban community, where development control alone transfers from a rural community to an urban community. To add more to the process itself is clearly a misunderstanding of the Local Authorities Board process.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. Another of the recommendations from the same committee was that consideration should be given to "establishing a revolving capital loans fund for use by municipalities and . . . builders" so that main trunk utility services could be at the edge of developable land. My question to the minister: at what stage are the discussions between the department and the housing industry, and between the ministry and municipal governments across this province, specifically Edmonton and Calgary, on making such funds available?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, that aspect of the report — in fact the whole report, of course — is receiving very serious consideration by the department. That particular recommendation has had appreciable study and is in the process of being studied. There has been significant communication, of course, between department people and municipal people. I would hope to be receiving recommendations in the not-too-distant future in that area.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister. In 1975 when my colleague's resolution dealt with this question of getting money into the hands of municipalities so that land could be serviced, we got the same kind of answer from the government. Mr. Minister, when can you give a definitive answer to this Assembly on whether the government is going to move on this question of getting money into the hands of municipalities so that land can be serviced, so there's not going to be the

tremendous shortage of serviced lots in Edmonton that is anticipated next spring?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I guess the short answer would be, as soon as it's ready. But it's a complex issue. To set up this sort of revolving fund is not as simple as it sounds. A lot of work is being done on it. I'll assure the Leader of the Opposition that a lot of people are working very hard on it, but it's a complex question. I would expect to have recommendations in the not-too-distant future.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can the minister confirm that information he's received, both from the housing industry and from the city of Edmonton, indicates that there'll be a tremendous shortage of serviced lots in the city of Edmonton next year?

MR. CHAMBERS: I've heard that information, yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, in light of the minister having heard that information, can't he speed up this process so that rather than sit on a \$2.5 billion surplus, we can use some of that money to help cut the cost of housing to people and to have enough serviced lots available?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that I'm working very hard in the area. Obviously the city has a job to do too, and a lot of work has to be done in a lot of areas. I expect that good results will accrue.

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, to the minister. Can the minister assure the Assembly that by the end of this calendar year, the government will have in place a program that encompasses that recommendation?

MR. CHAMBERS: No, Mr. Speaker. You know that's not really a very logical question, if I may suggest. I'll make an assurance that when we have proper . . .

MR. CLARK: Why not?

MR. CHAMBERS: . . . assessment and logical plans in place, they will be recommended, [interjections]

MR. CLARK: Mr. Speaker, just one further question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. Having regard for the fact that in 1975 this Assembly dealt with a resolution recommending this principle to this government, why can't the minister give us a commitment that after more than three years you can have that kind of program in place, when this government's got \$2.5 billion of accumulated surpluses?

MR. CHAMBERS: Mr. Speaker, I don't know how the hon. Leader of the Opposition operates, but I believe in operating logically and . . .

MR. CLARK: And slowly.

MR. CHAMBERS: No, not slowly, either. But logically and with proper work and proper thought, not just shooting from the hip.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. TAYLOR: Not the hip; the lip.

DR. BACKUS: A supplementary question to the minister, Mr. Speaker. In order to speed up this work, would it be necessary to take on considerably more civil servants or consultants to get the process going? [interjections]

#### Alaska Highway Pipeline

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, as 80 per cent of the opposition was absent when the Legislative Assembly came to order today, I thought it would be appropriate if I put my name down to ask a question. So indeed I am going to refer a question to the Minister of the Environment.

Can the minister advise the Assembly what role will be played by the Department of the Environment in regard to the environmental regulation of the Alaska pipeline, which has moved forward one additional step during its traverse through the province of Alberta, as this is a federally chartered line under federal jurisdiction but will in fact disturb literally thousands of acres of land within the province of Alberta?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member hit the nub of the question when he referred to the fact that this is a federally chartered line. The discussions that our department has been involved in through FIGA have indicated that the environmental controls and standards are under the jurisdiction of the federal authority. Notwithstanding that, we have their assurances that every effort will be made to comply at least with Alberta standards insofar as environmental controls and reclamation procedures are affected.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. It has generally been the practice on massive projects which have very extensive environmental implications in the province of Alberta that public hearings are held. I would like to ask the minister if he has any intention of requesting the Environment Council of Alberta to hold hearings on the environmental and safety aspects of this pipeline; and whether, in making this decision, he has been or will be discussing the need for hearings with the federal government in connection with not only the environmental aspects but the actual location of this pipeline.

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, on the second part of the question dealing with the specific location of the line, the Department of the Environment would have no opinion with respect to the need for hearings on that.

With respect to the environmental aspects, at this time we don't believe it's necessary to hold hearings, and it's not our intention to ask the Environment Council to do so. We've arrived at that conclusion bearing in mind the long and good record of pipeline construction within the province and the assurance of the federal authority that Alberta's requirements and standards will be met insofar as reclamation and environmental controls are concerned.

MR. YURKO: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary in connection with route or site location. This is indeed a

critical problem, not only from an environmental but from a safety aspect. My understanding is that valve shut-off stations will be 50 miles apart. On a line 52 inches in diameter with 2,000 pounds per square inch, the explosive capacity is enormous, and somebody's going to have to make some decisions on how close to the towns and settled areas this line comes. I wonder who is going to be responsible for location of the line. Will it be the Department of the Environment, the Energy Resources Conservation Board, the federal government, or some other agency?

MR. RUSSELL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is now dealing with items that really belong to the ERCB. Therefore I refer that question to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources.

MR. GETTY: Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs has entered into an agreement and negotiations with the federal government pipeline authority. Should the pipeline even be constructed, I'm sure we'll be working under the umbrella of that agreement to make sure it fits the interests of both Canada and Alberta.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, if I may, to the hon. Minister of Agriculture. In light of the size of the pipeline, the problems alluded to by the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar with respect to the explosive potential of the pipeline, and presuming that the pipeline does go ahead, what special steps will be taken to advise farmers with respect to surface rights settlements?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, as has been mentioned, the pipeline — including the taking of the surface of land for pipeline construction — is really under the jurisdiction of federal legislation. With respect to that matter we have had a number of talks with Alberta Gas Trunk Line or Foothills Pipe Lines, which is one and the same in terms of securing land. We are confident that the company involved will treat farmers, in terms of the crossing of their land, as well as or better than they have done under the provincial Surface Rights Act. Our Farmers' Advocate has been working closely with officials of the company's lands division with regard to the kind of information that should be provided to landowners.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I don't see any difficulty, largely because of the excellent record Alberta Gas Trunk Line has had in this province in terms of the taking of land. I'm confident that farmers will be treated fairly and adequately by that company.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. minister. Will it be the intention of the Alberta government, through the auspices of the office of the Farmers' Advocate, to ensure that all farmers on the pipeline route, once it's decided, are fully aware of every conceivable right they possess, as well as what the standard rates are for right of entry?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, no, it's not our intention to get involved in calling meetings and ensuring that everyone is fully aware of his rights. On the other hand, my discussions with Foothills Pipe Lines Ltd. have indicated they are in fact prepared to carry that

out. In some cases meetings have been held already, individual landowners contacted, and in many cases their rights insofar as the pipeline crossing their land have been explained by that company. I think the onus is really on the company involved in crossing their land to make sure proper concern is given and information provided to farmers. As I said earlier, I'm confident that is occurring.

On the other hand, if any landowners in this province have a concern with respect to their rights, my office or the office of the Farmers' Advocate would be only too happy to provide them with any information we have.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, to the hon. minister. Can the minister indicate if his department has done any studies on the proposal by my colleague the Member for Little Bow that the authorities consider a rental agreement for right of way, rather than a straight cash settlement?

MR. MOORE: Mr. Speaker, representations were made by the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs to the appropriate ministers in Ottawa with respect to the taking of land. It was our belief that that could best occur under the Alberta Surface Rights Act, which does have provisions for annual rental as opposed to a one-time payment. In fact the government and the Parliament of Canada did not accede to that request, and the taking of land is now being carried out under the federal pipelines act and the Canadian Railway Act.

As I said earlier, although we don't think that's the best position, we are confident the company involved, which has had an excellent record in this province in terms of its dealings with landowners, will treat them fairly.

#### Occupational Health and Safety

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct this question to the hon. Minister of Labour. It flows from the Quasar Petroleum Ltd. provincial court ruling of several weeks ago that The Occupational Health and Safety Act was not clear enough to sustain a conviction. Is it the intention of the government to appeal that decision?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have not reviewed the findings or the form of judgment given in that case, and asked only that it be referred to the Attorney General's Department in order that we might be advised whether or not an appeal should be taken. As I understand it, the normal course at that point is that the counsel who handled the case — who I believe was a private practitioner rather than a member of the Attorney General's staff, although I'm not positive of that — would provide a report through his normal reporting route, which would be the Attorney General's Department. I will look into the matter to try to get that information, because I had said earlier, that if an appeal was possible we wanted to take one.

I think the only other point that might be mentioned is that if an appeal is not advisable in view of the legal opinion, perhaps some change to the regulations rather than to the act could be a way of correct-

ing any defect. But that would also be a matter of legal opinion.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General. Is he in a position to report to the Legislature today whether or not an appeal of this very important case regarding health and safety is viable?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I don't have that information readily at hand. I note that my colleague said he would check into it. Now both of us will.

MR. NOTLEY: I'm very pleased to hear that.

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Labour. In view of the court ruling, which the minister has indicated he hasn't had an opportunity to read yet but which did indicate the legislation was ambiguous, what consultation has taken place with the Alberta Federation of Labour with respect to its concern that the phrase in the act dealing with employer liability which says "as far as it is reasonably practicable . . . to do so" is in fact far too loose and as a consequence impossible to sustain convictions? What discussions have been held between the Minister of Labour and the Alberta Federation of Labour on that particular question, and will there be any intention to strengthen that section of the legislation?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the question of strengthening any particular section depends upon assessments made of it, primarily from the point of view of legal opinions, and certainly judgments that may be given, saying whether or not the terms or stipulations within the act have met the requirements we have.

As to consultation, we have a great deal of consultation, certainly much of it with the Alberta Federation of Labour. I can't say to the hon. member that the words he quoted to me from the act this morning were words precisely discussed with the federation. We also certainly refer matters for discussion and advice to the advisory council on occupational health and safety, which has proven to be extremely useful in coming forward with recommendations specifically relative to legislation. For example, we have asked them to consider certain specific points as to the policy. As I mentioned, from that point on, the members of the advisory council not being lawyers, it's really a matter of legal opinion whether the policy objective that the government might accept, after advice, is indeed reflected fully in the legislation or regulations.

So I want to assure the hon. member that consultation and many discussions certainly have taken place, as he would perhaps know. On the precise wording that he asked me of, I simply can't be sure.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the hon. Minister of Labour. With respect to the proposals contained in the Gale commission regarding mandatory health and safety on-site committees for work sites of 10 employees or more, as opposed to designated committees, is the government prepared to reassess its position on this matter and to consider the recommendation of the Gale commission for mandatory sites? Can the minister today supply the Assembly with any estimate of the total percentage of

committees on sites of 10 employees or more? Are we at 10 per cent, 15 per cent, as a result of the designated approach? What figures does the minister have on that question?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, I haven't worked out percentages, although I'm sure that can be done. At the present time 147 sites are covered by designations. I have under consideration the next phase in what should be done in respect to additional sites. Whether that is in precisely the same manner of designation as previously is what is being discussed.

As to making them mandatory overall, that is still not the policy of the government. The jurisdictions in which that has been attempted find that taking such a broad-brush approach and simply making requirements and putting them in respect to each site — whether it's a safe, medium-safe, dangerous, or hazardous site, or whatever — hasn't worked all that well for them. I think the hon. member would find that type of universal approach, which of course causes a great deal of additional work for everyone involved, including the cases where . . . Now I'm speaking of the workers and the managers on the site who have to carry on their business there. Looking at the amount of additional government reporting and intrusion that may be placed on them as a result of that, I think the hon. member would find the jurisdiction for that has been done. They haven't been able to show that this has produced any significant change, or indeed any change at all, in overall safety across the province.

MR. NOTLEY: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question to the hon. minister for clarification. The minister indicated that the government would be prepared to appeal the Quasar case or, if an appeal isn't practical, look at the regulations. My question is: would the minister assure the House that should a change or modification of the regulations not be practical, legislative changes in fact would be considered by this government, in view of the importance of the question?

MR. CRAWFORD: Mr. Speaker, the case the hon. member refers to was one of the more serious ones in its result. We have certainly had the greatest concerns about that case. I think giving an assurance as to legislative change is difficult without taking into account all the opinions we must have in regard to the legal matters. But I don't mind assuring the hon. member that if, as a result of what we've learned in respect to that particular case, a way can be found to make prosecutions more likely to find the favor of the court in cases of violation of the regulations, we would certainly want to do that.

#### **Treaty Indian Women's Status**

DR. BUCK: My question is to the Minister Without Portfolio responsible for Native Affairs. But before that I would like to say to the hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar that I apologize to the Legislature for being two minutes late. I'd like to say that I suppose that is a cheap shot on behalf of the member. He well knows, when there were nine opposition members, that you do have a little trouble with the days not being long enough. [interjections]

I'd like to say I suppose the member is touchy because the mayor of Edmonton would like to see the MLAs doing their job in this Legislature on behalf of the people of this city. [interjections]

But I would just like to inform the hon. members of a story that came out of our conference, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure this is a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Possibly the hon. member could give notice of his intention to tell that story.

DR. BUCK: Anyway, a former Speaker in the House of Commons said, you know we can't do . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I refuse to be defeated. [laughter]

DR. BUCK: So I'm returning to my question to the hon. minister. The man said, we can't do everything in 30 hours; so Ged Baldwin says, we can legislate it.

But Mr. Speaker, my question to the hon. minister stems from the Native Secretariat's rejection of funding to Indian Rights for Indian Women for a workshop dealing with the Indian Act. According to the minister, this proposal could not be handled by the provincial government because the Indian Act . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. In view of the preamble, the member is increasing my doubts as to whether he is going to end up with a question.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, if you'll wait, maybe you'll find out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The rules of the question period don't provide for any waiting before the question is asked. Would the hon. member please come to the question.

DR. BUCK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Member for Edmonton Gold Bar . . .

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member wishes to raise a point of privilege or point of order, he knows the appropriate time for doing that. Now if the hon. member has a question, would he kindly proceed to ask it.

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I was just at the last word of my preamble prefacing the question. According to the minister of the Crown, this proposal I previously mentioned could not be handled by the provincial government because of the overriding jurisdiction of the federal government.

I would like to know, Mr. Speaker: would the minister reconsider his position in light of the fact that many Indian women removed from the Indian Act by marriage eventually become the financial responsibility of the provincial government through settling on Metis lands? On those grounds would the minister reconsider his rejection of the proposal for funding?

MR. BOGLE: Mr. Speaker, I'm prepared to re-examine the circumstances surrounding the rejection by the

Native Secretariat of that particular application. I'm sure the hon. member and all other members are aware this is a very difficult area, not only for this Legislature but for other legislatures and for the federal government. The question of whether a treaty Indian woman should retain or lose her treaty status upon marrying a non-treaty Indian is one which has been debated and is clearly outside the jurisdiction of this Legislature.

The concern expressed to me by a number of former treaty Indian women who have lost their status is one which obviously generates a great deal of sympathy and empathy on my behalf, on a personal basis. As I've said, it is a question which I will re-examine and report on to the member who raised the question.

### Vandalism

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Attorney General. Are any steps being taken to encourage provincial judges to order restitution whenever possible after an accused person is convicted of damaging the property of others?

MR. FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, there was a very interesting case which arose out of the Court of Appeal in Manitoba and went to the Supreme Court of Canada on the matter of the capacity of provincial court judges to in fact order restitution. My information is that the Supreme Court of Canada upheld the provisions of the Criminal Code which would allow provincial court judges to do so, and that they are doing so in the proper case. I'm aware that the provincial judges are of course aware of that decision. I have not specifically discussed the matter with the chief judge of the provincial court. But it's a very important, interesting, and timely question, and when next we meet I'll be sure to raise it with him.

### Road Construction

MR. MANDEVILLE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the hon. Deputy Premier and Minister of Transportation. Could the minister indicate what portion is completed of the 8,000 or 9,000 miles in the secondary road program in the province?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, with respect, I think I could get that information for the hon. member, and would suggest he put the question on the Order Paper.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Has the minister a time line or any goal as to when the secondary road program is going to be completed in the province?

MR. NOTLEY: Especially with the heritage fund report today.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could use a line from the halcyon days of Social Credit: when it's physically and financially possible.

DR. BUCK: It's financially possible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CLARK: \$6.5 billion.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the minister indicate whether some of the municipalities are using all the funds appropriated for secondary roads to upgrade the roads that were built when the program first started?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, again that's a very general question. I would hope that perhaps even later this morning I might have an opportunity to say something about the secondary road program. One of the continuing difficulties is the fact that once a secondary road gets a number, having been designated, although still under the responsibility of the municipalities, they tend not quite to live up to their responsibilities in that regard.

MR. MANDEVILLE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In all cases, is it the municipality or the minister's department that designates the priority by which secondary roads are to be built?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, there is a joint process that designates the priorities in the secondary system. That process includes not only the municipal council or county council but indeed the engineering advice from my department and the general plan of tying in the various municipalities, towns, and cities in this province in an overall priority. I think the other factors that enter into that priority are a number of matters such as advice from the MLA in the area, advice relative to the ground conditions in the area and, to be very clear, a general fairness in doing construction throughout the province as opposed to any one particular area.

MR. GOGO: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Transportation. Due to the booming economy of the province, although funding is available has not the problem been that contractors have difficulty keeping up because of demand, and weather conditions in Alberta have been a factor with completion of road programs?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, certainly that was the fact until two or three weeks ago. We were really fearful that we weren't going to be able to complete our program. The improvement in the weather gives us a better chance to do that. But quite frankly we're using the physical ability of the industry in this province to capacity this year.

MR. R. SPEAKER: A supplementary to the minister. Could the minister advise the Legislature, as Minister of Transportation responsible for secondary roads, whether he's considering a 10-year program under the heritage savings trust fund at the present time?

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, at the present time we're trying to complete the program for this year. We do have five-year projections as to priorities and need. That again will depend on the physical capacity to do it. I'm sure the hon. gentleman appreciates that during the month of September, as an example, we didn't turn very many wheels. We have continuing problems in the area of trying to get right of way, which is a difficult problem these days, and other

matters do have some constrictions on them. But to be very specific at this time, we're not considering a 10-year program under the heritage fund.

#### Home Adaptation Program

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Social Services and Community Health. It's with regard to the home adaptation program. The minister has indicated that the program has not been utilized to a great extent by wheel chair users. I was wondering if any changes have been made in the program to adapt better to the needs of wheel chair people in their own homes.

MISS HUNLEY: Mr. Speaker, that doesn't happen to be a program of my department; rather it's an adaptation program in the Department of Housing and Public Works. But we do want to review that particular program to see what particular ways the adaptation of homes could be made more useful for those with handicaps. We'll be working together to see how we can make the program more effective.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. Is the minister considering the capability of the program applying to rental accommodation as well as home-ownership?

MISS HUNLEY: I think that would more appropriately be directed to the Minister of Housing and Public Works. That's the department which originally sponsored the program and is presently responsible for it.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, then I would refer the question to the Minister of Housing and Public Works.

MR. CHAMBERS: In response, Mr. Speaker, it is true that the take-up on the program has been less than we had anticipated. So we're happy to review ways to improve it. There's a brochure out on it, but maybe all members could spread more information about the program. Perhaps it's a case of more people needing to find out about it, or perhaps we need to change it in some ways. I'd certainly appreciate any recommendations from any of the hon. members.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the minister. In the program of review, would the minister consider bringing the matter to the attention of the joint MLA handicap committee or the handicap organizations in the province, through correspondence or his own presentation?

MR. CHAMBERS: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. LEITCH: Mr. Speaker, I have received certain messages from his Honour the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, which I now transmit to you.

MR. SPEAKER: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor transmits estimates of certain sums required from the Alberta heritage savings trust fund for the 12 months ending March 31, 1980, for the purpose of making investments pursuant to Section 6(1)(a) of The Alber-

ta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act in projects which will provide long-term economic or social benefits to the people of Alberta, but which will not, by their nature, yield a return to the trust fund, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly. Signed at Edmonton, October 18, 1978.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor transmits supplementary estimates of certain additional sums not otherwise provided for, required from the Alberta heritage savings trust fund for the 12 months ending March 31, 1979, for the purpose of making investments pursuant to Section 6(1)(a) of The Alberta Heritage Savings Trust Fund Act in projects which will provide long-term economic or social benefits to the people of Alberta, but which will not, by their nature, yield a return to the trust fund, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly. Signed at Edmonton, Alberta, October 18, 1978.

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

**Bill 46**  
**The Election**  
**Amendment Act, 1978 (No. 2)**

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of Bill 46, The Election Amendment Act, 1978.

Mr. Speaker, the principle behind this bill is simply to permit the Chief Electoral Officer to appoint a substitute returning officer in a situation where a returning officer is unable, through ill health, death, or otherwise, to complete his duties in connection with an enumeration or an election. It's a very simple, straightforward amendment, and I certainly solicit the support of the House for the bill.

While I'm on my feet might I just comment on the enumeration that is now taking place. It is the first annual enumeration under the new statute, and my understanding from the Chief Electoral Officer is that it is going very well. The Court of Revision sittings will be completed today, October 20. Although this is subject to a lot of checking and detail, the indication is that the list of electors for the next election will be something like 1.2 million — that is, the list of probable electors at this time — whereas during the 1975 election the list was 994,000 persons. So that's a pretty good example of the burgeoning economy of Alberta, the tremendous growth we have, as reflected by the list of enumerators. [interjections]

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We're really getting a long way from the substance of the bill. I assume the hon. member and the hon. minister in the House are aware that introducing such additional matter makes it completely fair for any other member subsequently to disagree or agree with the minister or to go further into the new topics he is raising.

MR. McCRAE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought it was the kind of information that members would be interested in.

However, I would simply move second reading of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

Dr. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak just for a moment on the matter of the bill. I would like to say

that I certainly support the section that deals with the replacement of dead returning officers or if somebody were incapacitated. I guess that would be pretty essential.

I would like to ask briefly that the minister respond on how the program of training returning officers is coming. I know that in years past it seemed to be almost a hit-and-miss system. I was involved in the revisions to The Election Act, I think way back in 1978 or thereabouts, when this was brought up. I'm sure some steps have been made in that direction.

I would like to say also, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member sponsoring the bill, that there seems to be possibly a little more publicity required in advising people of the purpose of the permanent voters' list, because everybody seemed to get very nervous when enumerators came around. They thought there was going to be either a federal election or a provincial election immediately. I have tried to indicate to people that we are trying to set up a permanent voters' list and update it as need be. I certainly think that is a progressive step.

Basically I just want to know how the program of training is coming — if it's working well, if it's serving the purpose — and to indicate to the electors of this province that even if they get missed on the enumeration and revision, they still have the opportunity to vote by being sworn in at the polls, both urban and rural.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Under the circumstances, since I intervened when the minister went outside the scope of appropriate debate for second reading of this bill, it would seem to me we ought to have the unanimous consent of the House before we open the debate as widely as has been indicated by the remarks of the hon. minister and the hon. Member for Clover Bar. Is there unanimous consent?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. R. SPEAKER: Mr. Speaker, if the debate has been broadened to some extent, I'd like to make one or two remarks with regard to some feedback I've had from enumerators in the rural areas, and I'd like the minister to take this under consideration in a continuous review that may take place on the bill.

The change that has occurred is that two enumerators now do the enumeration. Both enumerators must present themselves physically before the constituent or the person who is being enumerated. There has been some feedback that possibly it isn't necessary to have the two enumerators and, secondly, because of such familiarity with the people of a community in the rural areas — they know their neighbors, they know their friends, they know who votes, who doesn't — that there are some situations where enumeration could be done without all the direct physical contact.

I have gained a feeling from talking to some enumerators that maybe there should be a review of the matter after this enumeration. They said a lot of extra cost is involved in travelling back to a home where they know who lives there, how many voters are at the place. But, they said, under the act we must travel X number of miles to this home in the rural area and get the names. There may be some



experience that has come out of the present enumeration which could bring about some short cuts and certainly a saving of tax dollars.

I only raise it on the record so that the minister, if he is responsible for revisions, does examine that. Also I think the Chief Electoral Officer for the province should take it into account in his considerations in the next two or three years.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, in response to the Member for Clover Bar, relative to his question about training periods for the returning officers, the Chief Electoral Officer — and this is his first experience, naturally, under the act, having just been appointed last year — called meetings of the returning officers on a regional basis. I believe he had one in Calgary, one in Edmonton and, I think, one or more in northern Alberta and another one in southern Alberta. I may be in error as to where he held them, but he did hold regional seminars with the returning officers. He explained the responsibilities under the act and explained the new legislation to them, and I think did it very effectively. To my mind this first enumeration under the new act has gone ahead very successfully, and I think is probably a tribute to the effectiveness with which the Chief Electoral Officer is conducting his duties.

One of the problems he experienced, that he has advised me of, was the late appointment of returning officers in some areas, so that in fact the schools for the returning officers may have been conducted before a returning officer was appointed, in which case of course he met with the returning officer when he was appointed and fully explained the duties to him.

With regard to the question on the need for more publicity, certainly that was a factor in this first enumeration. As the people of Alberta become accustomed to the new enumeration process, I would think that will not be the problem it may have been this first time around. There is of course an ability for anyone who is not now enumerated to be placed on the list through the Court of Revision that will be conducted in connection with the enumeration that follows the calling of an election, whenever that may be.

With regard to the question about rural enumerators, Mr. Speaker, I would think that after the next election we would undertake a thorough review of The Election Act, having regard to the experience that comes out of the fact that the next election will be conducted in a shorter period. It is a 28-day period rather than a 35-day period. I am certain I can give the undertaking to do a complete review of any changes that are required and make them at that time.

His specific comment about rural Alberta and the fact that there are two enumerators: that of course came from the report of the select legislative committee on The Election Act in 1975. It was one of the recommendations at that time. I gather the House concluded it was a good recommendation at that

time. There may be some second thoughts on it, having regard to the enumeration that has just taken place. That again is something we could look at after the next election.

[Motion carried; Bill 46 read a second time]

#### Bill 65

#### The Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Amendment Act, 1978

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Speaker, I'd also like to move second reading of Bill No. 65, The Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Amendment Act, 1978.

The principle of this bill is to relieve constituency financial officers from having to issue a receipt for a portion of any admission charge made with respect to any function in a constituency that might be termed a fund-raising function. Under The Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Act, if a constituency organization has, let's say, a chicken dinner or any other function for which a very nominal charge is held, the financial officer was compelled to issue a receipt for a portion of the admission charge, which would be a tax credit. The amendment will permit the issuance of a receipt to a donor for a function under \$10, should the contributing party so request; if he does not request it, the financial officer will be relieved of the burden of issuing that receipt. It will relieve our volunteer financial officers of a lot of administrative and bookkeeping work in a situation that probably is not very meaningful in terms of the administration of the act.

[Motion carried; Bill 65 read a second time].

[On motion, the Assembly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole]

#### head: GOVERNMENT BILLS AND ORDERS (Committee of the Whole)

[Dr. McCrimmon in the Chair]

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of the Whole Assembly will now come to order.

#### Bill 46 The Election Amendment Act, 1978 (No. 2)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. McCRAE: I move that Bill 46, The Election Amendment Act, 1978 (No. 2), be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 65**  
**The Election Finances and**  
**Contributions Disclosure**  
**Amendment Act, 1978**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. McCRAE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 65, The Election Finances and Contributions Disclosure Amendment Act, 1978, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 52**  
**The Dairy Board**  
**Amendment Act, 1978**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill 52, The Dairy Board Amendment Act, 1978, be reported.

[Motion carried]

**Bill 58**  
**The Agricultural Development**  
**Amendment Act 1978**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are there any comments, questions, or amendments to be offered with respect to any sections of this bill?

[Title and preamble agreed to]

MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Bill No. 58, The Agricultural Development Amendment Act, 1978, be reported,

[Motion carried]

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress, and beg leave to sit again.

[Motion carried]

[Mr. Speaker in the Chair]

DR. McCRIMMON: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole Assembly has had under consideration the following bills, and reports the same: 46, 65, 52, 58.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

head: **GOVERNMENT MOTIONS**

20. Moved by Mr. Lougheed:

Be it resolved that this Assembly approve in general the operations of the government since the adjournment of the spring sitting.

[Adjourned debate October 18: Mr. Horsman]

MR. HORSMAN: Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the sitting on October 18, I had started my remarks, and I wish to conclude them this morning.

I wish to add my congratulations to those of other members who have spoken in the debate, to the people of Edmonton, and indeed to the people of the entire province of Alberta, for hosting the Commonwealth Games, a truly significant event in the life of our province.

I wish to advise the members of the Assembly that I took the opportunity to bring my family to Edmonton to participate as spectators throughout the entire length of the Commonwealth Games, during which we took in the various events, many of them in the Commonwealth Stadium, which is a very fine addition to the city of Edmonton for the people of the entire province. Significantly, of course, the people of this community can take considerable pride that they were able to complete those facilities within the original estimates of the cost; an example, I think, for other parts of Canada for future endeavors.

I felt there really was a great feeling of "family" associated with the Commonwealth Games. The people throughout the Commonwealth who came and participated as spectators or athletes made me abundantly aware that we share with our fellow Commonwealth members a very great tradition and a very great feeling of friendliness. Indeed it was like a family picnic on a very large scale. That's the way I felt about it, and I know that feeling was shared by the members of my family.

Indeed it was significant that Her Majesty the Queen and other members of the Royal Family were here with us, which serves to strengthen and unify the Commonwealth and, I believe, this country of Canada. Throughout our history as a nation we've had those who question the role of the monarchy in our society. I believe it is an absolutely essential and integral part of the parliamentary system, because it is through the non-partisan Crown that political power flows to governments. That is part of our very system of government, and I believe it should never be discarded. Indeed it is important to recognize that the wearer of the Crown in our day has proved to be an excellent example for all. Particularly, the family and its importance in our society are well exemplified by Her Majesty the Queen and the Royal Family.

It was a real pleasure for me to be in this Assembly and have the Queen visit to sign the book. I'm sorry she didn't come into the Assembly, but time limits being what they were, it was not possible. But for me and my family it was a very moving and, I felt, important experience, particularly for my young children.

I want to comment for a few moments as well, Mr. Speaker, on a very important program introduced in Alberta this past year, which my family took use of. I have my holiday passport, issued by Travel Alberta, which we used to participate in the Stamp Around

Alberta program. I'm very pleased this morning to advise members of the Assembly that the hon. Minister of Business Development and Tourism, Mr. Dowling, presented me with my set of medallions: the bronze, which indicates that together with my family I have visited six zones, and the silver, which proves that we visited 10 zones in the province. You know, Mr. Speaker, my children are absolutely determined that before this program concludes next year, we will have visited every zone in Alberta, and we will be able to add the gold medallion to our collection.

I say this because it is so important to have young people so enthused about this province of Alberta and this program. There is no question that they want to conclude it, and by doing so their knowledge and understanding of this great province of ours will be immeasurably enhanced. It is through programs like this and by actually visiting the various communities elsewhere in the province that they really come to understand and appreciate the people as well as the places of the province of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the minister and his department for this program. I know it has been greeted with a great deal of enthusiasm. In fact over 56,000 direct responses to the Stamp Around Alberta program have been received by Travel Alberta, and approximately 5,000 medallions have now been presented. The minister has been taking an active part in their distribution, and for that I commend him as well. I know there are people who felt it was a waste of money. I talked to some of the people in the department, and apparently some cranks in the province had sent them back and said it was waste of money, and so on. But without any doubt this program — and there may be some cranks in the opposition, although the hon. Member for Clover Bar certainly isn't a crank . . .

DR. BUCK: If you don't believe what the government says, you have to be a crank.

MR. HORSMAN: I couldn't resist that little comment. He's a happy and enthusiastic participant with us in the spirit of government in the parliamentary system, and I know that.

But this program — and I have digressed in my enthusiastic support of Stamp Around Alberta — should be continued and encouraged by all of us. From my own experience I can assure the members of this Assembly how important it is and how enthusiastically it has been greeted by the members of my own family. I encourage other members to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, as I said the other day, I had the opportunity of reviewing the speech by the Premier on October 11. I did want to comment specifically on one comment the Premier made as to the importance of economic diversification in this province, and indeed with respect to the very real problems being faced by the oil and gas industry in regard to the export of natural gas. The Premier said he's satisfied that the government is on firm ground in supporting natural gas export from Alberta to the United States on an intermediate term, in order to provide a necessary cash flow that that will bring to our producers and which will assist in maintaining jobs in this province.

This whole question is of vital concern to many

members of the Assembly, but to the people of Medicine Hat and southeastern Alberta it is particularly important. For many years natural gas has been the cornerstone of the economic life of Medicine Hat, Redcliff, and southeastern Alberta. Indeed it's a well-known statement, made by the late Rudyard Kipling, that Medicine Hat is a city "with all hell for a basement", in view of the very large natural gas reserves that have and continue to be discovered in southeastern Alberta.

But, Mr. Speaker, at the present time many shallow gas wells are not being used for production because there is an inadequate market for that natural gas. So I particularly wanted to emphasize in my remarks my very strong support for the government's position that we must find a way in the intermediate term to export that gas to the United States to provide the necessary income to producers. I think it's fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that very few people in my constituency of Medicine Hat who are not directly involved with natural gas production, development, and processing appreciate the very real effect this industry has upon the economic life of southeastern Alberta. In order to achieve the balanced growth in this province which is the very fundamental policy of this government, we must ensure that that natural gas is developed and sold. That is a very important factor for the job opportunities of Alberta residents, in particular those who reside in southeastern Alberta.

I just wish to comment briefly, if I may, on the question of Canadian unity, and say that I look forward to the debate on the constitutional position paper which was filed by the hon. Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs yesterday in the Assembly. On the whole question of Canadian unity, I think it is essential that Alberta continue to play a leadership role on behalf of provincial governments in ensuring that provincial rights are preserved and maintained, and that we do not continue the current erosion of those rights in favor of a strong centralist government. I know similar views are being expressed in many legislatures throughout Canada. I wish to commend the government and the Minister of Federal and Intergovernmental Affairs for the strong position paper which has been filed with the Assembly and will be debated later this session.

One other comment I wish to make with regard to the remarks of the hon. Premier relates to the excellent work of the Kirby Board of Review. I certainly wish to add my congratulations to that board for the work it has done with respect to the administration of justice in the province of Alberta. I look forward to continued implementation of the recommendations of those reports.

I could, as other speakers have, go through a long list of compliments to the retiring ministers. All of them have served this province well, as have the private members of the Assembly who have announced they will not be seeking re-election.

But I do want to single out, if I may, one particular minister — and I know there's danger in doing this, but I'm glad he's in his seat this morning — and that is the hon. Solicitor General. I think it is fair to say that in my term in the Assembly I have seldom heard the eloquence and great feeling expressed by any member as was expressed by the hon. Solicitor General in his speech on the debate on the Speech from the Throne earlier this year, [applause] His contribu-

tion to this Assembly in the years he has been here has been great indeed and will be sorely missed. But I am encouraged that he is not going to forget public life and that he intends to write a history of the province. I am sure that when he gets his pen to paper, that history will be a very interesting and entertaining review of this great province and its development.

I wish to let those remarks lead into a concern I have, and I know it is shared by the Solicitor General. That relates to the question of the moral strength of this province and the moral strength of this nation and the moral strength of the western free democracies, in the state of any province or in the state of any group of peoples we must periodically examine not only our economic welfare, growth, and benefits, how much money we've got in our pockets and how much that money will buy, but it is vital that we also take into account how people are acting and behaving toward each other. Regrettably we have seen a decline in the western democracies, including Alberta and Canada, in the state of our moral welfare.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer members of the Assembly to what I regard as a monumental speech on this subject by a very great philosopher, in my opinion, Alexander Solzhenitsyn. In an address entitled *A World Split Apart*, which he delivered to the Harvard commencement in June this year, Alexander Solzhenitsyn has thrown a challenge to us as legislators to re-examine the question of our moral values and strengths. I commend to the Assembly some of his thoughts, which I will quote, which I adopt as my own because he really has expressed in many ways my feelings and has done so in a way I would be hard pressed to emulate, and certainly to better.

The subtitle of his remarks was, *The World Demands from Us a Spiritual Blaze*. He goes on to analyse the western democracies and compares them to the mindless, soulless, communist system from which he has been expelled. He warns us in our democracies that:

A Decline in Courage may be the most striking feature which an outside observer notices in the West today .... Such a decline in courage is particularly noticeable among the ruling and intellectual elites, causing an impression of a loss of courage by the entire society ....

Must one point out that from ancient times a decline in courage has been considered the beginning of the end?

This speech was widely reported and reviewed in the United States of America, and a lot of people didn't like what was being said. Nevertheless I think it is essential that we examine what he has had to say. Nobody really likes somebody to come into your house and say, well you're not really running your house very well. And that's really what he did. But what he said is so important.

He goes on to urge upon us, as legislators and people who are in positions of influence, to urge voluntary self-restraint upon ourselves and upon the people. He goes on to say something about the legalistic society and points out that that's not sufficient, that's not good enough. Acting within the strict legal framework of the law is not sufficient if we do not have spiritual values and moral strengths to draw on as individuals and as nations.

He has something to say about the role of the media which I wish to quote. I don't think it really applies as much to our Canadian newspapers and various other media, but he says this:

The press, too, of course, enjoys the widest freedom .... But what use does it make of it?

There is no moral responsibility for distortion or disproportion. What sort of responsibility does a journalist or a newspaper have to the readership or to history? If they have misled public opinion by inaccurate information or wrong conclusions, even if they have contributed to mistakes on a state level, do we know of any case of open regret voiced by the same journalist or the same newspaper? .... A nation may be the worse for such mistake, but the journalist always gets away with it. It is most likely that he will start writing the exact opposite to his previous statements with renewed aplomb.

... it becomes necessary to resort to guesswork, rumors and suppositions to fill in voids, and none of them will ever be refuted; they settle into the readers' memory. How many hasty, immature, superficial and misleading judgments are expressed every day, confusing readers, and are then left hanging ....

Hastiness and superficiality — these are the psychic diseases of the 20th century and more than anywhere else this is manifested in the press. In-depth analysis of a problem is anathema to the press, it is contrary to its nature. The press merely picks out sensational formulas.

Such as it is, however, the press has become the greatest power within the Western countries, exceeding that of the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary. Yet one would like to ask: according to what law has it been elected and to whom is it responsible?

Mr. Speaker, my time is rapidly drawing to a close; I wanted to make some additional comments. But in quoting from this speech I wish to urge upon the media a re-examination of its responsibility to the people it is serving and to avoid falling into the dangers outlined so eloquently by Alexander Solzhenitsyn in this very impressive and, I believe, monumental address.

Mr. Speaker, I just wish to conclude by saying this: in order to continue our development, in order to be able to serve as examples for the people we are elected to serve, we must examine the necessity of a moral renewal and a refinement and rededication of ourselves and the people of this province to the spiritual values that are the very foundation of our society.

I regret that my time has concluded. I should like to urge hon. members of this Assembly to read this speech. It's available through our Legislature Library under *Vital Speeches of the Day*. Indeed it is a vital speech and an important cornerstone, I would think, for people who are wishing very seriously these days to see order brought out of some chaos. I urge those views upon you.

I just wish to say that I think we have a great province, a great nation. But the people require leadership. They require a re-examination of where we're going. On those remarks, I conclude.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Might the hon. Member for Drumheller revert to Introduction of Special Guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

#### head: INTRODUCTION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and hon. members.

I would like to introduce to you, Mr. Speaker, and through you to hon. members of the Assembly, the Drumheller Wolf Cub Pack, along with their Akela, who is the leader of the pack, Mr. Perry Shoff, and their Raksha, the mother wolf of the pack, Mrs. Isabel Shoff. Along with this group of splendid young citizens of our country are some of the parents: Mrs. Christine Graham, Mrs. Bonnie Young, Mrs. Lynn Chaprun, Mrs. Carol Lecuyer, Mrs. Helen Peers, and Mr. Gordon Smith, and the bus driver, Carol Peters. Along with them too are Mrs. Yorke and the mascot of the troop, Sharel Shoff.

I'm not going to ask the Wolf Cubs to give the grand howl today, but I am going to ask them to stand and give the Speaker and the members of the Assembly the Wolf Cub salute.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, could I have the consent of the Legislature in the same manner for the introduction of some special guests?

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, it's an honor for me, on behalf of my fellow MLA for Lesser Slave Lake, to introduce through you to the House some guests in your gallery. Joining us today are Mr. and Mrs. S.M. Afzal, Mrs. A.M. Ali, and Mr. Edward Saddy. Mr. Afzal, who is now retired, is the former chairman of the port and railway authority of Pakistan. Mrs. Ali is the wife of a late former Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Mohammad Ali. Accompanying them is Mr. Edward Saddy, an Edmonton lawyer. I would ask that they receive the recognition of the House.

#### head: GOVERNMENT MOTIONS (continued)

DR. BUCK: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take part in the motion we are debating, the president's state of the union speech. At times I seem to think we're operating under the presidential system in this Legislature. But after being at the conference in Quebec City, I believe the parliamentary process as we know it under the British parliamentary system is well and surviving, in spite of the fact that there seems to be a great imbalance in this House as far as numbers go. As I said to some of my honored friends down there, we're going to use strategy in the next election; we're going to surround them.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like very, very briefly to extend my feeling of appreciation to the members who have served in this Legislature. I hope we will still have the opportunity next spring to further enlarge upon that. I'd just like to say to my good friend the former minister, the Member for Edmonton Gold Bar, that we will miss him. All Albertans will

miss him. But by his leaving, Alberta's gain will be Ottawa's loss.

AN HON. MEMBER: Try that one again. They're getting worse.

DR. BUCK: I realize that some government backbenchers might not have got that just that quickly, but if they think about it for a while . . . Alberta's gain will be Ottawa's loss.

MR. NOTLEY: Say it again, Walt. They may get it this time.

DR. BUCK: But sincerely, I have known the member for a long time, personally and in this Assembly. And in spite of the fact that he takes himself too seriously at times, he has served very faithfully and diligently on behalf of the people of this province. That, hon. member, I can never take away from you. I say that in all sincerity. We know we like to shoot a few barbs at each other, but that's part of the fellowship of being in this Assembly. We are all here with the same honorable intention, Mr. Speaker, and that is to serve the people of this province to the best of our ability. I do not feel that any member of this Assembly has ever been elected to this Assembly for any other reason than to genuinely serve the people of this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Would you like to vote for him in the next federal election?

DR. BUCK: I don't think my hon. friend the Member for Edmonton Highlands has to worry about how I'm going to vote in the next federal election. But I would like to say to the hon. member, who is a Joe Who supporter, that if they resurrect the former Hon. John Turner, I think maybe a lot of people will change the direction of their voting. The hon. member who supported the leader of the Progressive Conservative Party had better hope that the present Prime Minister stays in his position, because if they resurrect John Turner it may be a new ball game. [interjections]

So I'd just like to say to the Member for Edmonton Highlands that politics have a strange way of turning around on a potential bad slide for one party; in a matter of months, the scales may tip. The very complacent, non-listening government had better remember what happened in the province of Quebec. The Prime Minister at that time, the Liberal leader, Mr. Bourassa, had one of the largest majorities they've ever had in the National Assembly of Quebec. Now he is not only an ex-Premier, he is an ex-party leader. So I'd like to give a word of caution to my learned friends across the way: large majorities sometimes can turn into small minorities; just a word of caution, because it's not what I or my colleagues say or what I do, but the electorate that will decide.

In a small way, it's encouraging to hear the Premier suddenly concerned with education in this province. Somebody over there has finally gotten the message back to the Premier that there's a concern out there. So we have a grandiose speech on how involved we're going to be with education in this province. Then a little message comes from the agricultural sector of this province back to those Conservative backbenchers. Finally it trickles up to the Premier.

So when the Premier is down in Ottawa, suddenly he's very concerned; he has discovered agriculture. So I say to my learned friends across the way: keep your ears open; if you do, you may learn a lot of things.

As a matter of fact, if you had had your ears open to the media yesterday, the mayor of this city said he feels there is a need for a minister for Edmonton affairs, because the Edmonton MLAs are not expressing to this government the wishes of their people.

MR. NOTLEY: Oh, shame. What are they doing?

DR. BUCK: Maybe we need a minister of Edmonton affairs, because the Edmonton MLAs are not doing their job on behalf of the people they represent. That would cause me great concern.

AN HON. MEMBER: We never hear them.

DR. BUCK: I feel it's rather derogatory, the quote used in one of our large local newspapers about the silent herd, the 19 MLAs that represent the people of this city in this Legislature. I think that's an unfair statement, because I realize that the MLAs have their minute and a half once a month to express their views in caucus.

MR. HORSMAN: That's the old way, Walt, under the Social Credit.

DR. BUCK: The Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff may say that's the old way, but I would just like to say to my learned friend across the way that all he has to do, even with his basic mathematics, is sit down and divide 68 into a three-hour caucus. After the legislation has been brought before the caucus committee, after the debate that goes on, exactly how many seconds does each member have in a month's caucus meeting? Then maybe we will dispel this myth about how much input the backbenchers have to caucus. How much input can you have when you have a caucus of 68 members?

MR. KING: Unlike you, Walter, we talk to each other more than once a month.

DR. BUCK: Just how much input? So this myth about how much input backbenchers have in caucus is nothing more than a myth, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to comment very briefly on Her Majesty's visit to Alberta. The members privileged and fortunate enough to have Her Majesty come through their constituencies were very privileged. I was one of those. We felt it an honor to have Her Majesty come to three areas in my constituency: Lamont, Bruderheim, and Fort Saskatchewan. I guess because I was a member of the opposition — this does disturb me a little, and I feel badly that I have to bring it up. I was not disturbed when the press accused the Premier of trying to upstage the Queen. I did not and do not believe that. But I was a little concerned and distressed that we were playing a little bit of politics about protocol. As I understand protocol, it applies to the way the game should be played regardless of which side of the House you sit on. So there should have been some consistency.

I don't cry, but I wasn't invited to two areas in my

own constituency. But the people in the area understand. That's fair ball. You're a winner or a loser, on the government side or the opposition. But, gentlemen, protocol is still protocol, and it should be treated the same way. I can understand the mayor of Grande Prairie being upset because he happened to be a known Liberal, so the MLA met the Queen before the mayor did. In another instance the mayor was the official representative because the opposition member happened to be the MLA. So there was a little lack of consistency there, but that's all part of the game. I accept that.

In getting back to the serious part of Her Majesty's visit, I felt we as the citizens of Alberta did impose just a bit too much on Her Majesty. The schedule we set down for her had to be absolutely gruelling. On the evening of the command performance, which I will comment on later, Her Majesty was at least half an hour late getting back from the Peace River tour. His Royal Highness Prince Philip was even half an hour later than that. Those two wonderful people had hardly more time than to take a quick bath, change clothes, and get over to the command performance: almost a Houdini-like act. We imposed upon their good natures [with] four days of schedule just as gruelling as that. On the rail tour through my constituency, the schedule was about 20 minutes or half an hour late. Her Majesty had to go by motor cavalcade from Fort Saskatchewan, have a press meeting here, change clothes, and get over to a state dinner; it was split-second timing. So if we're ever privileged again to have the Royal Family visit Alberta — I know it's nice to have them go to as many places as possible, but we still have to respect the fact that they are human beings who require a few minutes to themselves.

To show Her Majesty's humanness, her understanding and warmth as a person, I'd like to tell an amusing story of a very touching incident that happened at the visit in Fort Saskatchewan. Her Majesty was doing her walkabout, and two people from England who were visiting relatives in Fort Saskatchewan shouted, Your Majesty, we had to come all the way from our own country to visit you here. So she stopped and visited with them. These two elderly people said, we'd like you to meet our son-in-law, our daughter-in-law, and this is our grandchild. Her Majesty shook hands with each of these people and smiled graciously. She was really meeting the entire family. You could hardly keep from shedding a tear to see the humanness of this wonderful person. It conveyed to me, as the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff said, what a great institution [it is] and what a great representative she is of that institution.

In the few minutes I had, previous to the visit in Fort Saskatchewan, I said to the people assembled that there are people who are against the monarchy. I said, fine, I will accept that. But on the other hand, look at Her Majesty as a representative of the British parliamentary system under which we govern this province and this Dominion of ours. So if you're an anti-monarchist — I'm not one of those people — at least remember she represents the institution that governs us.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the Minister of Culture. I don't very often compliment ministers, because my philosophy in this Legislature is that nothing is so good it can't be improved. Every year

when we come to a new session, I make this speech to inform the new members that my battle ends the minute we walk out that door. We are here in positions of government or opposition, operating under the British system of parliamentary democracy. We have a role to play. As members of the government, your role is to govern; as the opposition, our role is to get you out of there because we think we can do a better job. [interjections] That is the system we operate under. Maybe the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly doesn't understand that system. He says, that's the way you operate. But that's his problem, not mine. I understand that.

MR. GHITTER: Point of order, Mr. Speaker. He's alluding the hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly. The hon. Member for Edmonton Beverly should be here to defend himself. I don't think that's a proper approach.

DR. BUCK: My apologies, Mr. Speaker. I guess the Member for Calgary Buffalo was the one trying to heckle me. [interjections] But if the hon. Member for Calgary Buffalo can't understand that . . . As a practising, very learned lawyer, he knows that's the mechanism we also use in the British judicial system; it's an adversary system. In his practice of law, I'm sure that many times the hon. member defends a person he knows is guilty. But it doesn't matter if he knows he's guilty. His responsibility is to defend that man. Fair game. Our role here is to get the government out, because we think we can do a better job. It's the government's job to govern.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff stated that he enjoyed and participated in the Stamp Around Alberta program. That's fine. But a statement that did disturb me was when the hon. member said that some kooks sent their Stamp Around Alberta passports back. Now that is an illness of this government: if you don't agree holus-bolus with what they advocate, the programs they are initiating, you have to be some kind of kook.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what kind of philosophy is that? What kind of philosophy is that: if you don't believe everything we do, everything we propose, you must be odd. Following that line of thinking, I suppose we five members of the opposition should agree with the government on every measure. Mr. Speaker, no government is that good, no government is that brilliant, and no government that wants to stay in power for very long should ever think that way. The comment was disturbing, but it is an illness, a symptom of the thinking of some members of this government.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to address to the hon. Deputy Premier my remarks related to the light rapid transit system that's in place in the city of Edmonton. I'm sure the minister is more than pleased with the light rapid transit utilization rate. At a social function involved with the Commonwealth Games, I went up to the mayor of the city of Edmonton and said with great enthusiasm that I felt the system was working well, that it was serving a genuine and very important need in trying to keep the automobile off the streets by moving people more rapidly, economically, and efficiently, and that the LRT was serving its purpose. The mayor said, right now the utilization rate of the light rapid transit is

beyond our 1981 expectations.

The pitch I would like to make to the Minister of Transportation, in light of the fact that he still has six months before a mandate is called — you never know, he may be here, he may not be here. You never know about these things. He may even resign. But nine people have beaten him to it, so he says he has to stay on another term. Mr. Speaker, I beseech the minister to continue his light rapid transit studies and to have a look at an extension into the areas that have the highest priority.

At the same time he's looking at that extension, I would ask him to re-evaluate the study that was done in Fort Saskatchewan. We had a study on the utilization of buses which indicated there was no desire for increased bus service. I would just like to say to the hon. minister that I would like him to re-evaluate that survey, because it just doesn't seem to jibe with what people really want. All you have to do is sit at any given point on Highway 16 east, Highway 16 west, Highway 15, Highway 2 north and south, and see how many one-driver cars there are. What a sad waste of non-renewable resources, what a sad waste economically. If we can move people for \$1 using light rapid transit . . . We as taxpayers had better wake up to how much money it's costing us to move those automobiles up and down those highways, how much energy is used. So I would like to say to the hon. Deputy Premier that the railroad track between Edmonton and Fort Saskatchewan is still there.

I did not feel badly when that little, gray rail liner that used to run from Edmonton to North Battleford was taken off. It used to carry about 10 passengers, and eight of those were CNR pensioners who were riding free. Politically I could have done a lot of hand-wringing and arm-waving and said, what a dreadful thing the federal government is doing by getting rid of that rail service. But I said, no, I think it's right to get rid of that service because it's not supplying the need. Knowing the initiative that the Deputy Premier is always so proud of, I feel that if light rapid transit was extended into the areas served by rail lines, we could have a high utilization rate. If the service was put in place at the hours and the number of time required, the people would use it. So I say to the hon. minister: I leave that to your department, to the people in your department for further study.

The question of rail relocation was brought up in the question period. I know there's not a simple solution, but certain things can be done and, I'm sure, are being done as far as moving tank cars through the town of Fort Saskatchewan is concerned. They are looking at making sure the speed limits are kept to a minimum. There's even a move to make sure that too large trains don't go through, do some shunting to make the chance of a major accident as minimal as possible. We will be pursuing that area, and I know the minister will be pursuing it.

It's always quite amazing to me how difficult it is to solve a problem when you don't want to solve it. The CNR, the CPR, and the Transport Commission can tell us hundreds of reasons why it shouldn't be done. Then all of a sudden, when they decide to go ahead, all they do is build six miles of railroad track across country connecting the CNR to the CPR, which gets you almost where you wanted to go in the first place. I guess the politicians are to blame. Suddenly they

found this great solution to a problem that had taken 20 years to solve. So I know that the Minister of Transportation, because he has a connection in the federal cabinet, will take a long and serious look to see if there can be some shunting of rail lines through the town of Fort Saskatchewan.

The comment about the stadium made by the Member for Medicine Hat-Redcliff. I certainly support his presentation that the city of Edmonton and the people involved with the Commonwealth Games were really, I guess, doing exactly what Proposition 13 in California was saying: spend our money, but spend it wisely and frugally. That's exactly what happened with the expenditure of funds in building the Commonwealth Stadium. Reading the small brochure that told us about the stadium, it was very interesting to note that by the expenditure of not too many millions of dollars, we could have a facility that would seat nearly as many people as the Olympic Stadium in Montreal at a tenth of the cost. Now are we that much better, or was the supervision down there that much worse? I think it was a combination of both.

I would like to know what plans the government has — or will we know after the next election, as the relation goes, Mr. Minister of Recreation, Parks and Wildlife — for the covering of McMahon Stadium in Calgary and Commonwealth Stadium in Edmonton. Now I know there are some pros and cons, but politicians have to provide some leadership. They have to provide some leadership, and they have to come clean with the electorate. Is this going to be a happening after the election, if this government should win? Or are we going to know the government's intentions beforehand? Mr. Speaker, the concern has been expressed to me on both sides: should the stadium be covered or should it not? That question I'll leave for a later time.

I would like to make a comment on the program . . . You know, naturally a minister who puts a program into place is not going to tell the whole world that one of his backbenchers or one of the opposition members came and banged on his door to have something done. But I would like to compliment the Solicitor General on the initiative shown on the flashing light program on buses, that I brought to his attention. I'm sure many other members brought it to his attention. Because it has brought to . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: He did it, not me.

DR. BUCK: He did it. Okay. I'm glad to see the Minister of Transportation is doing something, because he certainly isn't building any roads in this province anymore, [interjections] I know. I heard that story from the former Minister of Highways: that it's the weather or a shortage of steel or a shortage of equipment. Are we building any roads in this province, Mr. Minister? [interjections] I would like to know.

But, Mr. Speaker, the program of trying to indicate to the travelling public how important it is that they stop for buses that are coming towards them, oncoming traffic and traffic behind school buses . . . Many times, the school bus drivers in my constituency, fortunately — and I say fortunately — do not open the doors of their buses. Because up to now, cars have not been stopping for flashing lights. Unfortunately a

youngster lost his life on Highway 16 west last year. Fortunately we haven't had many instances of that.

Mr. Minister, it seems that the suggestion I gave you that possibly . . . I know we can't go to a testing program for everybody whose driver's licence expires. But again I say to you, Mr. Minister, that even if we send those people the little driver's manual and a self-administered test, and then the person fills in the blanks — at least they have to look in the book to find out how they should drive — and sends the questionnaire back to your department, maybe that small step will make some people understand that there are laws we have to abide by when we're driving motor vehicles. I know that's just a small step, Mr. Minister, but maybe that small step will save somebody's life.

The last point I'd like to make, because I'm also under the constraints of time, Mr. Speaker, is that I'm not quite as enthusiastic as the Minister of Agriculture and the government backbenchers when we tell everybody how great things are in rural Alberta. I feel that I have a very high percentage of relatively well-to-do farmers in my constituency, and they are concerned about what is happening to them in the cost/price squeeze. They are concerned about the high cost of energy. They are concerned about the rural gas co-op program now in place. They were told one thing when the program was going into place; when the fuel started flowing through those lines the prices had changed dramatically upwards. These are areas where we can't blame the federal government, where we can't blame the Wheat Board. These are things that we as members of this Legislature and you as members of this government should look at, areas where we and you can directly assist the agricultural sector of our province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope we do have a spring session. I'm not convinced we will, because the Premier may come back from Ottawa with fire in his eyes, saying we've been had again by Ottawa. Blakeney pulled it off and he got 43 [seats]. You've got to have a strong mandate to fight those terrible people in Ottawa. For how many elections has this worked? The 36 years the Socreds were in power, they did it. The eight years the PCs have been in power, they're doing it, and they're winning. Blakeney did it, and he won; B.C. Everybody fights Ottawa. People are getting a little cynical about our fighting with Ottawa. They want to know: has this government forgotten about us here in Alberta? The rumblings are out there. When the Minister of Municipal Affairs goes door-knocking, it's an indicator that there are some rumblings out there. That is a good indicator.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding I would like to say that we in Alberta are probably blessed with natural resources like no other province in Canada. I feel we had a good government for those first 36 years. This government is trying, but it has forgotten one very important basic fact: it must listen to the people it governs. Mr. Speaker, I say this government is not listening to the people it governs.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's your turn, Mr. Minister.

DR. HORNER: Mr. Speaker, that was quite an oration by the Member for Clover Bar, and we'll deal with it as we go down the road. Outside of his comments on the Monarchy, I didn't feel there was very much substance to anything he had to say. So I'm not



going to comment on it very much, except when I come to that area of my remarks relative to urban transportation and the LRT.

I did want to report to the Legislature, and indeed to anyone interested, the work my department has done in the last five months and, more particularly and importantly, the reorganization that's been put into place, the regionalization of the Transportation Department. Essentially that regionalization has coterminous boundaries with the Department of Agriculture. The senior people in each of the six regions are in place, and under those six regions are 15 districts. To give more effective service in the transportation systems in the various areas of the province, we have opened new district offices in High Level, Lac La Biche, High Prairie, Hanna, and Stettler. These are under the various regions which, I have said, are coterminous with the agricultural regions in the province. We think this regionalization will bring the services of our department more directly. More importantly — my hon. friend was talking about listening to the people — part of the idea of getting the people who are providing the service of government out there where the people are is for them to talk to them. I can report, Mr. Speaker, that all our regional transportation officers who are in charge of the various regions have already, in the short space of six months, had detailed meetings with every municipal government under their direction or in their region.

I think one should understand that fewer people are living in Edmonton and driving out every day. That of course, in my view, is what was needed to provide that service and perhaps to spend a little less time on the road and more time working on the road. I think that is happening, and I am very pleased with the way the regionalization of the department has gone. I can report that in effect it is complete, outside of the bridge branch, which we hope will also go forward this winter. We will have regional people throughout the province with the capacity and ability to make decisions in the field at the immediate point in time.

Relative to the safety programs, I should point out to my hon. friend that that will also be decentralized as we put people in the areas. They will not only be responsible for the various programs, but will also be doing some testing on school busses and the enforcement of the new signing program relative to school busses, passing, and so on. I think it will work better. Indeed, the inspection of school busses has been a major part of this summer's work. We would expect to extend that inspection to other busses, more particularly chartered busses in the senior citizen area. That's a growing industry in this province. Charter operators are transporting senior citizens on short tours throughout the province, indeed across Canada and into the United States. I think it's very important that these charter operations have their machinery checked from a safety point of view.

DR. BUCK: Even line busses too?

DR. HORNER: We will also be doing some spot checks relative to the scheduled bus lines. But we are satisfied, initially in any case, that on a scheduled line it's just good business for that particular bus company to maintain its equipment and have a program of preventive maintenance. I think the real need is in the charter operations first, but we will do some spot

checks on the scheduled lines as well.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend suggested we really weren't building any roads this year. I'm sure he had his tongue in his cheek when he talked about that, because we are in fact building or have under way the largest program in the history of Alberta, both in volume and dollar terms. This year we will be spending in the neighborhood of \$50 million on the secondary road program. That program, of course, is spread out through the province in an effort of fairness and of need. As I mentioned earlier in the question period, the priorities are set by a variety of things, but they are certainly set in close consultation with the municipal governments and with the MLAs in the area. That secondary program will take some time to complete, there's no doubt about that. But if we can continue to have the size of program we have this year, I think a substantial amount can be done in the ensuing five- and 10-year periods.

In addition to the secondary program, we're spending about \$110 million on the primary system. Through the past three or four years, a number of secondary roads have moved into the primary highway system. As a matter of fact, over the past year or two, almost an additional 1,000 miles of secondary roads have moved into the primary system. This does two things: when it becomes a primary highway the standard is slightly better, but it removes from the municipal jurisdictions the costs of maintenance in that area. So, Mr. Speaker, we have been moving very substantially in the primary and secondary highway program throughout Alberta, with very major amounts of money.

In addition to that, we have improved our direct grants to rural municipalities by something like 15 per cent this year. On top of the direct grants, we have been assisting them in special need areas, particularly when we have industrial haul roads that really are pounding municipal roads. We try to assist them to upgrade so they can take the impact of these very major loads that are now operating on our roads in Alberta. I might point out again, Mr. Speaker, that we have more trucks operating in Alberta than in the other three western provinces combined, and those trucks are getting bigger and bigger and bigger. These kinds of weights are having a major effect on the province's investment in its road system.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, we initiated the new towns and villages street and road improvement program this year. That entire \$4 million has now been allocated. We would expect this to be an ongoing program. Naturally a lot of towns and villages were not in a position, from either an engineering or a planning point of view, to come in this year. A number of them have indicated their willingness or readiness to go next year, and some even a year down the road from that. So we expect that to be an ongoing program, again assisting in an area of growth in all communities throughout the province. My hon. friend may not like it, but all our towns and villages are growing, and growth surely is a better problem than non-growth.

With regard to urban transportation, there seems to be some lack of awareness by a number of people relative to the kinds of policies we have had in effect over the past four years. Four years ago we announced an urban transportation policy which enunciated very clearly what we were doing for the cities

of Alberta. We said that for the two major cities, Calgary and Edmonton, we would allocate \$6 million a year on arterial roads, in which we share two-thirds of the cost, including the cost of land, Mr. Speaker, and that's a very important consideration. In addition, there is an additional \$6 million which was used in the arterial road programs in the nine smaller cities of the province.

On top of that, to the cities of Calgary and Edmonton we made the allocation of \$7.5 million per year relative to mass transit. That money was made without strings attached. Indeed they could bank it and collect interest on it. So they got that each year as well. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we have a transit deficit program in which they get an allocation of \$3.33 per capita to the transit deficit in their particular cities.

Two years ago, Mr. Speaker, we altered our arterial program and devised a new section, which we call our through-highway program, in the two major cities, which we hope to extend to the smaller cities in the coming years. That extension, relative to the Deerfoot in Calgary and the Yellowhead in Edmonton, in which we are picking up 90 per cent of the costs, again including the cost of land — and the cost of land has been a very substantial portion of the money we've paid out to the cities so far. This year alone, the two cities will have received a total of \$30 million in additional funds on these two major through ways through Calgary and Edmonton.

So while the cities may say their needs in transportation are going to escalate, I don't think they can say they haven't been properly looked at. I've made the commitment to the cities of Alberta that over the course of the next few months we would look very hard at the various programs and come forward with a longer term policy in which, again, they could plan for a period of time their required transportation commitments.

Insofar as LRT is concerned, that of course is a decision of the local cities to embark upon. But we did have the commitment from the city of Edmonton, prior to their embarking on the LRT, that no major expansion would take place until we had the chance to evaluate the system. The important evaluation is going to have to take place not in the summertime when things run pretty well, but indeed when it's 40 below and a blizzard is blowing. That's when we'll know whether the LRT will in fact be a proper component of the transportation system in Edmonton and is worth spending a very substantial amount of capital on.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the city of Edmonton doing a modest expansion into Clareview, which is a logical extension, and financially, relative to the benefits, has to be a major priority. I would say to the city of Edmonton, though, that in my view they would need to upgrade their land-use policies relative to that LRT, and I think the same thing applies to Calgary: to make it as effective as possible, that LRT cannot be approached alone but has to be approached relative to the land-use policies of the city.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted very briefly to cover some other matters which have been partially dealt with by the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks, and talk for a moment about the port situation we're so dependent upon. If we seem to be over-involved in

the ports of western Canada, I would simply point out that that's the key to Alberta's prosperity in the movement of our goods through the ports to markets not only around the world but in the rest of Canada.

Anyone who has ever bothered to look at the port of Vancouver will know very clearly and quickly that the congestion and problems are in the port and not necessarily with the railroads, although they take the blame. Surely, when you've got five different railways on short lines in the port of Vancouver, the objective of having unit or block trains move in there and unload quickly just cannot be achieved. Indeed, speaking to the grains council yesterday or the day before, the vice-president of the mountain region of the Canadian National put it very clearly: we can haul all kinds of cars through our expanded and upgraded main line down the canyon to Vancouver. But the blockade isn't in the railroad; it's after we get them to the port of Vancouver, in the Port Mann yards. I don't know whether he was quoting me or I'm quoting him: the key to unblocking the grain transportation system in this province is the development at Prince Rupert.

Mr. Speaker, I can report that my latest information is that the consortium is still on track and working. That's a major achievement. They have now identified the needs and agree with The Canadian Wheat Board that the markets are there if we can get the grain there. One of the difficulties is that I would hope the present policy of the federal government, in saying we're going to sell the inland ports and the present terminal in Prince Rupert, doesn't cause us to lose the major thrust we need at Rupert. Mr. Speaker, the obvious thing is that a number of the people in the consortium have a very major investment in Vancouver. If they were able to achieve their end by just getting the present terminal in Rupert and doing a little upgrading, they might be tempted to say, that's about as much as we need to do at the moment. I would hope they're thinking more broadly and much more largely than that. Indeed, from our studies, now confirmed by the consortium, we're talking about a 10 million bushel high through-put at Rupert. That is a major key in really unblocking the whole grain transportation system.

The Leader of the Opposition said he didn't know about that, and that we shouldn't be involved in the port of Vancouver. I disagree with him entirely. He has to understand that those elevators and terminals in the port of Vancouver are not built, at the moment, for high through-put from unit trains to the ship. The key in maximizing our turnaround time is making the most effective use of the hopper cars we now have. Surely it's only logical and prudent that we maximize the turnaround time on those hopper cars before we have a major program of additional cars and literally allow the railways to use them as a storage component on some siding between here and Vancouver or Thunder Bay.

Thunder Bay, of course, is important to us. The shift is going to be to the Pacific Rim, but we will continue to have major movements of not only grains but coal through Thunder Bay. So we're concerned about what happens there.

We're concerned relative to the port of Churchill, because it's an important escape valve, if you like, for the whole grains industry. The more we can use the port of Churchill, the better we'll be in western Canada generally. We believe new technology is

coming, relative to ice-breaking techniques, that will make the port of Churchill much more effective in the future. We have been pressing the Canadian National to live up to their commitment to rehabilitate the Herkemer Subdivision. We'll continue to put that pressure on both the Canadian National and the harbor board in Churchill.

I'd just like to comment, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Member for Vermilion-Viking, who is unable to be with us because of illness, has done a very excellent job representing me and the government on the Port of Churchill Development Board. I think it's important that we recognize it.

Mr. Speaker, if I could talk for a minute about the status of the Crow debate, because that's always very interesting, it continues to go up and down. In the last few weeks, of course, the Saskatchewan government has been making some statements which we'll only find out in the next few weeks whether they really meant. We'll have to evaluate their position, but it certainly differs from that of Manitoba and Alberta, in that we don't believe we as a provincial government should be tied into an ongoing subsidy situation in regard to Crow-related rates on processed products. We think there are other ways assistance can be given, more particularly in the capital area. We'll be looking at that over the coming months.

I would say again, though — and very emphatically, because the livestock feeders have been sold the bill of goods that the Crow rates are really hurting them — that in a time of surplus feed grains such as we are in at the moment, the Crow rates have absolutely no effect on the livestock feeding industry in this province. That should be made pretty clear, because I too have got the little pamphlet they're sending around. The essence of the matter is this, Mr. Speaker: when you have a surplus of feed grains in your province, that feed grain doesn't get into the system to go anywhere via Crow. It stays there and is only used if the livestock industry can use it.

I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that there has been a myth — and I'm going to come to the question of freight rates generally in a moment — relative to the question of transportation costs and whether you should process beef here or in Ontario. Perhaps central Canada propagates that myth to make sure their processing industry remains healthy. The fact of the matter is that it does [inaudible], and it's transportation-efficient to process our beef particularly, here in western Canada, and ship it as boxed beef or even in sides. It is cheaper, and there is an advantage here even with the present rates.

To move to other questions that have preoccupied some part of our summer relative to the question of railways, my hon. friend alluded to some connection I might have in the federal cabinet. I've come to the conclusion, relative to getting anything done, that the best way to do it is to try to negotiate directly with the railways and, if at all possible, not to pay any attention to either the federal cabinet or the CTC, if we're going to move ahead. In that regard, I think we've had some useful meetings with the senior management of both Canadian National and Canadian Pacific. I have an additional meeting scheduled in the early part of next month, and we hope to finalize some matters relative to some of the anomalies that have been going on for a number of years.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that both railways turned

a profit last year. Everybody should be aware that that profit was primarily generated in western Canada; if not totally, at least 90 per cent. In that regard I think both railways have a responsibility to listen to some of the problems we encounter relative to our industry. In fairness I'd have to say to the House that they have not held back in spending on rehabilitation on the main lines, particularly between here and Vancouver and Thunder Bay. Mind you, that's just good business on their part; that's where they're making their money, and they have spent their money there. There's a need for them to understand that they also have to have a look from their own point of view at the rehabilitation of branch lines, because those feeder lines are absolutely required if you're going to make your main line profitable. In my view, they have some responsibility there.

Relative to the problem the hon. Member for Clover Bar talks about in Fort Saskatchewan, it's not just a simple problem of building some extra mileage there. It's all tied up in the interrelationship of Canadian National and Canadian Pacific. I asked Canadian National very directly to approach Canadian Pacific to buy out their share of Northern Alberta Railways so we could move ahead with our northwest rail authority idea and try to effectively improve transportation in northwest Canada. They tell me they're having ongoing discussions and that the right to go into Fort Saskatchewan is one of the keys in those discussions.

Mr. Speaker, there is something I think needs to be said particularly to our industrial associations in Alberta. After the experience I've had in the past two or three years dealing with the railroads and with some of the problems they have, I believe some of our industry associations have to do more themselves in their negotiations with the railways to get competitive rates from the railways. I believe there's room to move here, and I intend to follow that up, not only with the bulk commodity people but indeed with the retail merchants of Alberta, to see whether they can get better rates by dealing with the railways as a whole. I believe they can, and I think that's where the action has to start. We as a department are quite willing to help, to provide our estimates of costs involved and that kind of thing. I believe we can improve ourselves not only by talking to the federal government and the CTC, but indeed by helping our industry do a better job of tough negotiation with the railways themselves. We have initiated that particular program, if you like; I don't know whether it's a program or a policy, but it's been initiated. Our initial response has been productive, and I intend to follow that up.

As I indicated earlier, Mr. Speaker, I didn't want to see the sale of the Prince Rupert terminal interfere with our opportunity to expand the terminal in a major way. In the same way, I wouldn't want to see the sale of the inland terminals in Alberta interfere with that consortium either. On the other hand, I believe the inland terminals here have never been used to anywhere near their practical efficiencies in the problems of storage, grain drying, cleaning, and indeed in having a capacity to allow the futures market to work more effectively by having a delivery point here in Alberta.

Relative to these inland terminals, I would point out one little item not noted by any of the releases from

the federal government: our initial estimate on the three in Alberta is that to meet environmental controls in this province would require an expenditure of something like \$10 million to \$15 million. They've known this has been required but have not had it done. So I hope we would understand that as we go along.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk very briefly about our airport program. Again that's been very dependent on the weather. We've had some delays in trying to complete the one in Grande Cache, but perhaps this month will see it at least to a graded and gravelled level. Also we hope to get it paved. We've really been bogged down on the work we're trying to get done in the Swan Hills relative to the airport there. In the past two weeks, we have been able to complete the paving of the airport at Rainbow Lake. I think that's a major improvement down the road. We've also completed the paving at Camrose and a whole number of smaller, community-based airports throughout the province.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I would have to admit that when I set out two or three years ago to try to encourage people to get involved in the third-level airline business and to expand the capacity of the third levels in Alberta to link more of our smaller cities with the major ones, perhaps we needed to have our airport program done first. It might be more important now that we make another attempt to improve third-level carriers in Alberta so we can improve our capacity to join this province together in a very major way.

I just wanted to clarify some things. I'm sorry the Member for Spirit River-Fairview isn't in his seat, because he's a master of distortion, particularly insofar as it affects Pacific Western Airlines. He didn't say it here of course, because he's afraid somebody might check him out, but he immediately goes out, gets on TV, and distorts everything he possibly can. I want to make it perfectly clear again, Mr. Speaker, that the merger with Transair will in fact increase the number of jobs available to both Pacific Western and Transair people by the inclusion of the new routes in Saskatchewan, and that there is absolutely no truth that there are going to be layoffs relative to that merger.

Secondly, the layoffs relative to the phasing out of the 707s are an economic decision I would hope any board of directors would take on our behalf when we turn the business management of an airline over to them. For the record, it's anticipated the new 737s that will come on stream and the new routings in Saskatchewan will more than make up any layoffs because of the world charter softness and because the 707 just can't compete with the 747 in the long-range charter market. We expect the 737s to continue in the domestic and the short-range charter, and short range is everywhere right down to Florida, San Diego, and into northern Mexico. These are all overland. You don't get across water in a charter unless you've got four engines, because of the international flying rules, but that may change in the near future. Again it's as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker, those are some very brief remarks I wanted to make relative to what our department has been doing all summer, outside of the month we were stuck in the mud. I can say, though, that the programs have nearly caught up. That's a tribute to

the industry. I don't think very many pieces of road-building equipment are sitting around idle in the province today. They've all been at work.

Just one little item, Mr. Speaker: for the first time in the history of Alberta, we've had five asphalt plants working in the Peace River country this year. I think that fulfils our commitment that we would place a stronger emphasis on catching up in some of those areas, more particularly in the isolated areas that have never had a road before.

As I've said, Mr. Speaker, with the weather we've had in October we hope to catch up. As my hon. friend from Drumheller would know, whether you ever do or not is a little bit difficult to say because of the problem with contractors having too many jobs at one particular place and not being able to move when you'd like them to move. These are all part of the business. I can't help but remark that the traditional thing has been that the contractor in the road-building business would like to get a contract in the early spring down in the south and then gradually work further north. That worked against him this year, because we were very wet in the south in the early part of the year. These are the kinds of things that do have a problem.

I would say though, Mr. Speaker, that we have been adopting more and more the proposition that we should tender on a regular basis throughout the year. That means we will have a carry-over of approximately 50 per cent of our projects. I think that's good business. I think the industry likes it because they're able to do a better job of planning. We'll be tendering right through the winter months. This will allow the industry to do some planning. In areas where gravel crushing is involved, of course, they can get that done. We would put some emphasis on the tenders we're going to put out from now on relative to that particular proposition. I'd be happy, Mr. Speaker, and again invite all hon. members, if they have any inquiries as to the program in their particular areas, to contact my office and we'll get them any detailed information they might require.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DR. WEBBER: Mr. Speaker, it's a real pleasure for me to take part in the debate on Motion No. 20, which has been referred to as the Premier's state of the province address. I too would like to join other members in their comments regarding the Commonwealth Games. I think all those volunteers and people who worked so hard to put the effort together and have it come off so successfully certainly need to be congratulated, and it's certainly in the spirit of Albertans that they can get together and do something like that.

Listening to the comments from the opposition, I thought one of the highlights of remarks made last week by the hon. Leader of the Opposition was his definition of a cutback. I'd like to quote from *Hansard* exactly what he said. He was talking about spending in the area of hospitals:

I say [cutback], because the previous year 19.7 per cent of the budget in this province went to hospitals; this year, 18.5 per cent.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, an 18.5 per cent increase in a budget in a particular department for hospitals. He's referring to that as a cutback, particularly when it's 18.5 per cent of a figure larger than the previous

year.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when I was a kid on the farm in the great metropolis of Endiang, Alberta, some of the farmers and ranchers in the area would get together and talk about the Social Credit funny-money theory. I was thinking about that last night. I thought, here we've got a new Social Credit concept which we'll call the funny-cutback theory. I think that kind of comment, coming from the Leader of the Opposition, is misleading. It's extremely misleading to use a term like that, and it's also lacking in any logic.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to turn to my remarks now. We had in my constituency of Calgary Bow what we would refer to as preessional meetings. We have them in each community once a year: the communities of Bowness, Montgomery, Parkdale, West Hillhurst, and Hillhurst. I know the hon. Member for Drumheller has used the preessional meetings very effectively over the years. I think it's a great opportunity for local constituents to come out and provide input to their MLA before he or she goes to the Legislature.

This fall, Mr. Speaker, the main concerns of the people attending those meetings were with regard to the general state of the economy in the country, and the actions of the federal government, particularly in terms of the detrimental effects on Alberta and Albertans. Certainly other provincial concerns and issues came up at those meetings. I see the Member for Clover Bar has a motion on the Order Paper dealing with utility costs. Certainly these increasing costs are a concern for senior citizens and those on low and fixed incomes. However, I'd like to reserve my remarks on those for the debate on that motion next week.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make some remarks about our economy in Alberta, and more specifically with respect to Calgary. There's no point in reviewing our national picture; we're all so familiar with that: high inflation, low productivity, not only high but careless government spending, and of course the devaluation of our dollar. It's been said by other members, and the Premier in his address, that the outlook for our economy in Alberta is that it is expected to continue to be strong. The basis has been our primary industries: the sale of our oil and gas, and our unprocessed agricultural products.

However, in the last 30 years we've developed a strong tertiary or service type of industry. In fact at the present time about two-thirds of our labor force is in the service industry. Of course it's the goal of this government to strengthen and diversify our economy by building up secondary industry. And the future activity looks very good. We've got the upcoming Alaska pipeline, heavy oil projects in northeastern Alberta, third and fourth oil sands plants in the not too distant future I hope, certainly growth of the petrochemical industry and, of course, continued conventional oil exploration activity. We have increased government capital expenditures for construction this year.

In urban areas we have, I believe, double the number of housing starts in the first four months of this year. The Royal Bank of Canada is now forecasting a real growth rate of 5.3 per cent for the year, which is higher than the earlier forecast. From the years 1972 to '77 we've had on the average 36,000

new jobs in Alberta every year, and it is expected that up to around 1984 the number would go up to the vicinity of 50,000 new jobs per year, with technical and vocational training demands the highest in the trades areas.

The unemployment rate, Mr. Speaker, is in the vicinity of 4 to 5 per cent, one of the lowest in the country. The national average is between 9 and 10 per cent. However, we do have higher unemployment rates, approximately 8 per cent, among the 15 to 19 year old age group, and of course among the native population. The labor participation rate is the highest in the country, and it's expected to increase into the 1980s. It's around 68 per cent at the present time.

With regard to our population, we are currently around the 2 million mark, increasing at a rate of a little over 3 per cent per year. In fact between April 1, 1977, and April 1, 1978, we had a 58,000 increase in our population. I think it's interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that this is 2.8 times the national growth rate. In fact the increase in the populations of Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and British Columbia for that period was 3,000 less than the total increase in the population of Alberta.

Mr. Speaker, I could continue with more statistics about Alberta. I guess it's appealing to someone with a mathematical background, generally not too appealing to others. However, with respect to Calgary, I'd like to make a few comments about our economy. We are particularly strong in the area of the service industries and in office and residential construction. Financial institutions and head offices are increasing at an ever-increasing rate. Currently, Calgary is the third largest financial centre in Canada, Toronto being first, Montreal second, and Calgary rapidly closing the gap on Montreal. It's the third largest head office city in Canada, with head offices of 32 major companies located there at the present time. Foreign banks: corporate branch and head offices increasing in anticipation of continued activity in the upcoming years.

With regard to our population, we now have a little over half a million people, with a growth rate a little higher than the provincial average. Approximately 1,500 people per month are moving into the city of Calgary, which turns out to be about 50 people per day. It is quite a growth.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to refer to the August/September edition of the publication by The Calgary Chamber of Commerce, which I believe gives an excellent review of the financial and business development taking place in Calgary. In fact, with regard to a financial institution, I recently had the pleasure of attending the opening in Calgary of a new office of the Heritage Savings & Trust Company, a company which started here in Edmonton, Alberta, and is now moving into Calgary. While referring to The Chamber of Commerce document, I'd like to say publicly that I think Mr. Norm Green, past president of The Chamber, has done a fine job in the past year. He certainly put The Chamber in the public spotlight, and I think that's good.

Mr. Speaker, in the context of looking at the economic situation, I'd like to comment on provincial guidelines, a topic which comes up occasionally. Members will remember that in the past several years we've had a policy of spending restraint. We established guidelines of 11 per cent and 10 per cent

in '76-77 and '77-78 respectively. There were some exceptions to those in the Attorney General's and the Solicitor General's departments in the '76-77 time period. And the supplying of funds for the natural gas price protection program in the 1977-78 budget of the Minister of Utilities and Telephones was above the 10 per cent.

We as a government participated in the federal wage and price controls, in a program related to wages and salaries of provincial government employees. I felt, and still feel, that spending restraints are important in terms of the continuing need to reduce inflation. We opted out of the AIB program at the beginning of this year; however, the private sector was still subject to that program. So, to have regard for what is fair between the public and private sectors this year, and in order to help combat inflation and reaffirm the government's policy that the public sector's share of the gross domestic product not increase at the expense of the private sector's share, we established provincial wage and salary guidelines. I felt that this was in line with what the public expects of a government responsible for financial management.

One question I'm often asked is: why did you as a government select the 6 to 7 per cent range? Based upon the cost of living for 1977, and the cost of living forecast for 1978, available late last year, information provided by the Provincial Treasurer, it was concluded that the guidelines should be in the area of 6 to 7 per cent. These forecasts were made by banking institutions, the Economic Council of Canada, and others.

Mr. Speaker, a lady phoned me the other day and said, you guys sure don't stick with your guidelines, do you; imagine, MLAs' salaries increased 15 per cent this year. Mr. Speaker, I think a number of people may think that way, and I think it's important to put the record straight once again: the members of the Legislature abided by the 6 to 7 per cent wage guidelines with a salary increase in the order of 6 per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER: Less than 6.

DR. WEBBER: Somebody is saying, less than 6.

DR. BUCK: Some are even worth less than that.

DR. WEBBER: Agreed.

I mentioned our policy regarding public- and private-sector wage and salary increases, and that the public sector should not lead the private sector. The process of comparing public- and private-sector salaries is not easy. But it's been said that since 1967, public-sector salaries have increased at a considerably higher rate than private-sector salaries. A March 1978 publication of the Economic Council of Canada outlines the reasons, and I'd like to quote these. I notice hon. members are pointing at the clock; they'd like to go home. But I'll use up a couple more minutes here anyway. It says:

Ordinarily, wage increases in the private sector decelerate during a recession because of poor demand for goods and services. But, since wages in the public sector are not restrained by market conditions and are very sensitive to inflation, they rise . . . more than in the private sector. Because this puts pressure on businesses to meet excessive wage demands, it increases

strike activity and unemployment. Consequently, the traditional trade-off relationship between unemployment and inflation breaks down and both prices and jobless levels rise.

Mr. Speaker, on the question of how well the public sector is doing relative to the private sector, I'd like to quote some figures from the private- and public-sector data in the Alberta Salary and Wage Rate Survey, 1977. And I won't go into what they define as private and public. Taking comparative jobs, between both sectors it turns out that some 76 per cent of some 21,000 public employees in Alberta are earning more than their counterparts in the private sector. From another perspective, comparing 110 occupations the public sector leads the private sector in 61 per cent of those occupations. Mr. Speaker, I think there's a continuing need to be concerned about public-sector wages and salaries leading private-sector wages and salaries.

Time is rapidly coming to an end here. A number of issues came up at our presessional meetings. One was strikes. Certainly in the past summer we've had unrest and conflict in labor negotiations: meat-packing, brewery, and teachers' strikes. I found it interesting that in Japan they haven't had a strike for several years. The last one that they had was a transit strike. It didn't last very long because as the workers left the job, the passengers beat up on them and they immediately went back to work. [laughter] And that's the last one they had in Japan. However, I think it's important for unions and union leaders to realize the importance of having a strong economy and a strong business sector. Only if we have that will the unions themselves be strong.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to talk about juvenile delinquency, increasing crime. I know I've said a lot of good things about the state of our economy; we have some growth problems. However, I'll reserve those comments for another time. I did want to make some comments in regard to seat belt legislation, but I'll wait on that until another time. Even though the minister is in the House now, I'll wait until he's in again.

Thank you for the opportunity to make a few comments on this, and I beg leave to adjourn debate.

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

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. HYNDMAN: Mr. Speaker, the business of the House next week is tentatively scheduled as follows. On Monday afternoon we will continue with bills at second reading and committee stage on the Order Paper. The debate on the government position paper on the constitution will commence on Wednesday, October 25, and probably continue Friday, October 27. Perhaps the debate may come back for consideration after the conference; that is, after November 1. On Tuesday evening and Thursday evening, October 24 and 26, we will review the estimates of the heritage trust fund capital projects division, both as to the supplementary estimates, 1978-79, and the new estimates for 1979-80. I move we call it 1 o'clock.

HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

---

[At 12:58 p.m., pursuant to Standing Order 5, the House adjourned to Monday at 2:30 p.m.]

